

put it. It is part of the institutional culture of humanitarian organizations to collect standardized information concerning the population to be administered. Hyndman (2002: 124) gives examples of the formats in which such information is collected and processed: so called „sitreps“ or situation reports, headcounts to assess total numbers of populations and their sub-groups, and refugee „biodata“, that is personal data concerning the individual's asylum claim. The example of headcounts leads to the application of „technologies of vision“. Partly an attempt to bring order into the messy reality of refugee camps, partly a strategy for planning and the allocation of funds, the visibility of displaced people is a primary concern of UNHCR and its implementing partners. The reality in „the field“ is being broken down and condensed into standardized comparable reports to make them digestible for headquarters in Geneva (ibid. 122).

Although less numeric in their character, sitreps as well bespeak a preoccupation with classification and numeric data, and it is common practice to use such data in order to drive forward a political agenda, that in some cases might put organizations' aspirations over client or staff welfare (ibid. 133). Hyndman (2000: 121) argues that while the endless maps, assessments, and statistics certainly are being conducted having client welfare as a primary goal, „their production often occurs without reference to the historical configurations of power that preceded them. In the context of refugee camps, cartography, counting, and recording are all acts of management, if not surveillance. They enact controversial power relations between refugees and humanitarian agencies“. During her research, Hyndman found field operations plans, that clearly present refugees as moral and statistical deviations from planning. She therefore refers back to Foucault's concept of governmentality with security, territory, and population as the key notions defining the scope of power relations: