

Globalization and Borders: Theorising Borders as Mechanisms of Connection

Anthony Cooper

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Royal Holloway, University of London

2012

Supervisor: Prof. Chris Rumford

I declare that the work presented in this thesis is my own.

Anthony Cooper

16th of May 2012

Abstract of Thesis

It is generally accepted that borders play a crucial role within processes of globalization, that borders are an integral aspect of globalization, broadly understood here as increasing global interconnectedness. To this end, current research on borders has tended to focus on securitisation and the ability of the state border to protect national (state) security. Such approaches are linked to the idea of rebordering, particularly post 9/11, and has led researchers to study the increasing interconnect between surveillance and borders. Biometrics and ‘virtual borders’ thus become pertinent, timely as well as case study oriented sub-topics of border research. Alternatively, but by no means separate, research elsewhere has focused on the ways in which borders form an integral aspect of our mundane daily life practices. Emphasis is placed on how people construct, resist or reconstruct overlapping social, cultural and historical narratives of and via borders particularly in relation to the idea of borderlands and spaces. All these approaches key into current and contested thinking within border research: (1) bordering should form the main aspect of border research as opposed to geo-political lines; (2) borders are not, by definition, solely situated around the periphery of states; (3) borders mean different things to different people; (4) border construction and maintenance need not fall into the remit of the state and traditional geopolitical performances of sovereignty. However, while the term ‘interconnected world’ as an integral component of globalization is almost a truism, the role borders play in this connection needs further development. This thesis proposes to bring connection to the forefront of border research and is predominantly interested in the ways in which borders connect beyond localities within which the border may be situated. The thesis will propose and discuss three overlapping components (mechanisms) or aspects (outcomes) of border connectivity: invoking scale; connection as a consequence of division; and empowerment through connection. Arguing that borders connect in this way deepens our understanding of the relationship between borders and globalization. Borders as mechanisms of connection, it is argued, form an integral aspect of our interconnected world.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	6
Chapter One	
Introduction: Conceptualising Borders as Mechanisms of Connection	7
Why study borders?	15
Locating borders	18
Some important points on current border thinking	22
Globalization and connection	25
Framing borders as mechanisms of connection	28
Outline of chapters	32
Chapter Two	
On Borders and Globalization	34
Current border thinking: Summing up the field	38
Borders in an age of globalization	50
Global borders	57
Concluding remarks	67
Chapter Three	
Borders as Markers of Difference (but also Connection):	
Conceptualising the Border as Interface	69
Border metaphors: A quick note concerning terminology	71
Current thinking about borders as interfaces	73
Extracting and conceptualising the idea of interface	78
Borders as markers of difference	87
Markers of difference: Connection and the ‘need’ for protection	94
Concluding remarks	96
Chapter Four	
Borders, Connection and Scale: Invoking Scale as a Form of Connection	99
Looking at borders in relation to scale	103
To be local or global: The ‘place of scale’ and the ‘scale of place’	109

Invoking scale as a mechanism of connection	119
Concluding remarks	125

Chapter Five

Border Politics: Possibility, Opportunity and Empowerment through the Mechanism of Connection 127

The power of border/ing and the border/ing of power: The importance of studying borders in relation to power	131
Opportunity, possibility and empowerment at the border	142
Conceptualising opportunity, possibility and empowerment in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection	149
Concluding remarks: Borders, connection and empowerment	154

Chapter Six

Concluding Thoughts: Borders as Mechanisms of Connection 156

Identifying and locating borders as mechanisms of connection: Globalization, interfaces, scale and power	160
Limitations and future prospects	170
Concluding remarks	171

Bibliography 174

Acknowledgements

I wish to start by thanking my supervisor, Prof. Chris Rumford, whose expertise and enthusiasm for the subject has been absolutely essential for the completion of this thesis. I also greatly appreciate the numerous opportunities that he has established during my time at Royal Holloway as well as his encouragement to participate in research projects, conferences and publications. I am grateful for his support, patience and remarkable 'endurance' as my supervisor, and it will never be forgotten. Thanks must also be given to Dr. Alister Miskimmon for his invaluable help and support over the years, particularly during the last few months of my PhD. I would like to thank all my colleagues and fellow PhD students at Royal Holloway, for offering sound advice and simply sharing the experiences and stresses of PhD life.

Thanks to everyone who gave comments and feedback during the development of my thesis as well as those who have provided me with different viewpoints on the subjects of my PhD work, especially the various participants of the Norface seminars and the Globalization and International Relations GSA Conference. Moreover, special thanks must be given to Chris Perkins. Not only a very good friend, but he has also been a productive and inspiring academic collaborator throughout my PhD life. Long may this collaboration continue!

Finally I would like to thank my family for providing an unquestioning safety net when needed. Above all, however, I would like to thank my partner Karian, who, perhaps more than anyone, needs to be credited with having remarkable 'endurance'. It is no understatement to say that without her, this PhD thesis would simply not have been written or completed.

Chapter One

Introduction:

Conceptualising Borders as Mechanisms of Connection

There is a crime for which I should certainly have been killed. I built a wall of no more than ten thousand lis from Lintao to Liaodong, and so in the course of this I surely could not avoid cutting through the earth's arteries. This then is my crime.

(Meng Tian [210 BCE], general to the Chinese Qin Dynasty, and architect of the original Great Wall)¹

Your wall does not separate our two worlds. It is the axis along which our influences mix and combine.

(Speaker unknown. Developed from a short extract concerning Tumen and Modun in Sima Qian's Historical Records)²

This thesis is predominantly interested in (geo)political borders/bordering. It offers a subtle critique of border studies starting from the general premise that current thinking fails to satisfactorily theorise borders in relation to global interconnectedness. Globalization here is broadly conceptualised in terms of increasing connectivity that empirically defines our contemporary world (see Tomlinson, 1999; Scholte, 2005), as well as being further characterised by the increasing awareness of the world as a single place (Robertson, 1992). Likewise, for

¹Taken from: Qian, S. [86 B.C.] (2007) *The First Emperor: Selections from the Historical Records*. Translated by Raymond Dawson. New York: Oxford University Press (pp. 58-59). While the original wall was built during the reign of the 'First Emperor', the wall that is visible today is largely the result of reconstructions made during the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) (Ibid, p.xxiii).

² Taken from: Michaud, R. Michaud, S. Jan, M. (2001) *The Great Wall of China*. New York: Abbeville Press.

the purpose of this thesis, borders are theorised more generally and abstractly. They are not, as is commonly the case in many other studies, located in a particular time or place and studied accordingly. A border, therefore, is simply taken to be a marker of difference but not, by definition, impenetrable division. Bordering, which has quite rightly become the primary and more fruitful focus of study, is taken to be the ongoing overlapping processes of construction, maintenance and deconstruction upon which difference marking (and maintaining and contesting) takes place. A border, in other words, constantly ‘makes and is made’ in van Houtum’s (2010a, p.290) terms, it is simultaneously, in this regard, an ‘end’ and a ‘means’. The processes of bordering, therefore, concerns the internalisation of an inside and the objectification of an outside (see van Houtum, 2010a, p.290), it is about belonging ‘here’ and not ‘there’. On this logic, following Anderson and others to a point, borders overlap with processes and politics of identity and unity formation in the sense that they convey meaning and have meaning conveyed upon them which changes over time. Encapsulating these factors, I have elsewhere (along with Chris Perkins) defined bordering as:

[A] form of sorting through the imposition of status-functions on people and things, which alters the perception of that thing by setting it within a web of normative claims, teleologies and assumptions. Bordering is, therefore, a practical activity, enacted by ordinary people as well as (nation) states, to make sense of and ‘do work’ in the world (Cooper and Perkins, 2012, p.57)

John Searle’s idea of ‘status functions’ aside³, this working definition captures the processes behind why any given border is considered to be a border, and it is concerned with the legitimacy of the multitude of different meanings both given to, and projected by, borders. Such a definition also enables the researcher to determine what a border is and does, which will, of course, be discussed in due course. Indeed,

³ Searle (1995) seeks to understand the nature of social facts within the context of ‘social reality’. In part, he argues that material objects only have a function imposed on them by conscious observers, which, in turn, is not intrinsic to the material object, i.e. the ‘status function’ (See: Searle, J. (1995) *The Construction of Social Reality*. London: Penguin (p.14); See also: Cooper, A. Perkins, C. (2012) ‘Borders and Status Functions: An Institutional Approach to the Study of Borders’. *European Journal of Social Theory*, (15)1, pp.55-74.

what a border is and does in general terms will be expanded upon as this chapter, and thesis, progresses.

Far from being a borderless world, the current (global) state of affairs has seen a proliferation and multiplicity of new borders and much recent theorising has focused on 'rebordering', particularly in the context of governance and (re)securitisation. In this regard much attention has focused on the ways in which important borders have become 'asymetric membranes', functioning to regulate (and divide) the flows, mobilities and networks that are supposedly central to globalization and notions of global connectedness.

Yet, given such a proliferation of nuanced borders supposedly present under the gamut of globalization broadly put, the relationship between connection and borders remains underdeveloped. So much so that connection, when it is seriously taken into account, is usually framed in terms of the facilitation of desirable mobilities across borders, the abstract linking of an inside to an immediate outside, or, in certain ideal cases, the mixing of difference within specific spaces or borderlands. These approaches, albeit in different ways and in different measures, tend to over privilege the simplistic and unhelpful, but still prevalent, idea that borders are first and foremost wholly divisionary or 'barrier-like'. Likewise, in different ways, they also tend to privilege the state as being the primary border and borderer. While many approaches place bordering and experience at the heart of the study, there remains a sense in which people are reacting to the 'top-down' imposition of state borders. This, of course, will be explained in more detail later in this chapter (see also Chapter Five).

The core argument progressed throughout this thesis asserts that borders themselves function as mechanisms of connection, that borders, in other words, form a fundamental and integral part of global interconnection. However, while acknowledging the standard ways in which borders connect proximate localities (the facilitation of crossing, or spaces of contact and cooperation), borders as mechanisms of connection differ because they connect to places far beyond the locality of the border in nuanced and subtle ways. Borders as mechanisms of non-proximate connection, it is argued, enable individuals to engage with the wider world, facilitating contact with multiple 'others' that would not normally communicate – what could be termed here 'distant localities' (See Giddens, 1996 for an application of this term; See also Chapter Two). Borders thus connect more than an inside to an

immediate outside. They can be ‘navigation points’ that act as gateways to not only the networks, spaces and scales that appear to be immediately bordered out, but also to networks, places and scales that may be wholly distant from the border itself.

Corollary to the central argument, three accompanying and overlapping arguments will be put forward in order to explain how borders enable non-proximate connection, as well as the subsequent outcomes and consequences of such connection. Note that each argument will be contextualised and framed more fully as this chapter progresses, as well as constituting the principle subject matter for individual chapters (see therefore Chapters Three, Four and Five respectively).

The first assertion, then, focuses on demarcation in the sense that many borders act as markers in some capacity or another, even when approached in terms of bordering. Yet, rather than invoke notions of rigidity, fixity and ultimately division, emphasis is placed on the concept of the border as an interface or connection point. Interrogating the term/concept interface, and subsequently tailoring it to the debate on borders and connection initially outlined above, it will be shown how some borders facilitate connection through linking and networking identities that would not normally communicate. However, interfaces, on this logic, also act as markers. Conceptualising borders in relation to interfaces moves away from rigid logics of division and internalisation while retaining a more malleable idea of demarcation build around an outward looking logic of ‘meeting space’.

The second aspect focuses on scale as a mechanism for non-proximate connection. While it is now commonly recognised that borders are multi-scalar, and should be studied as such (see Newman and Paasi, 1998), it will be argued that borders can be initiated to scale well beyond the (proximate) locality of the border. This keys into Robertson’s *et al* conceptualisation of ‘glocalization’, a concept that attempts to capture the interdependency of different scales – mainly the local and the global – in such a way as to discard the idea that globalization is somehow wholly indicative of a division between the local and some abstract all encapsulating global. Beck’s (2002) assertion that globalization is not a linear process but ‘reflexive’ is also indicative here, whereby supposedly opposing principles such as local/global, or universal/particular, are not antithetic but mutually implicit. Looking at scale in relation to borders and connection places borders at the heart of these debates.

While the previous two points focus the specific mechanics through which borders connect to what is non-proximate – to distant localities to borrow from but

build upon Gidden's (1996) idea – the final aspect of connection to be considered looks at the empowering potential of connection vis-à-vis borders. The argument progressed here is that borders as mechanisms of connection provide a means through which individuals and groups achieve political opportunity and empowerment. Emphasis is placed on 'grass-roots' bordering and border utilization with an aim to show how connecting globally, through border construction, maintenance and/or narration, can be reasonably conceptualised as a form of 'tangible' mobility that does not amount to or require conventional forms of movement across borders. Movement, that is, conventionally understood as being resistive to, or channelled by, borders. Importantly, looking at the ways in which people become empowered through border/ing and connection dilutes emphasis on state borders. It will be argued that connecting globally – to distant localities – is rooted in border construction, maintenance and contestation, performed by a variety of actors in a variety of places and across a variety of scales.

Likewise it will be shown that borders conceptualised as mechanisms of connection – incorporating the three components just outlined – need not, by definition, be located at traditional territorial peripheries. Neither are they limited to being state territorial borders. Rather, powerful and tangible connection processes will be shown to take place at traditionally recognised borders, but crucially also at different borders located in different places. This keys into the ways in which borders are multiplying – becoming plural in Beck's (2002) terms – and transforming under conditions of contemporary globalization.

This study, then, focuses on the relationship between the inside and outside, however it will put forward an idea of border/ing that captures processes of belong 'here' but also 'connecting' there. Borders become less about division and internalisation in and of itself, and much more about the communication – and ultimately the acceptance and/or rejection – of socio-spatial differences across time and space (see also van Houtum, 2005).

I have defined borders in a more general sense because it allows this study to incorporate many border types and border locations. It allows me to locate borders that are not, in the first instance at least, the product of top-down state imposition or politics. And it also allows me to approach discussions regarding the 'why' of border/ing rather than overt focus on the 'where' and 'how'. Most importantly, incorporating the previous three points, it allows me to look at different borders

through a lens of connectivity, a methodological observation which forms the central pillar and indeed argument of this thesis.

Therefore, by way of contextualisation, the following three points are important in terms of the arguments just outlined: First, this thesis is predominantly a theoretical exploration of the concept of the political border in general terms rather than being wholly based upon specific border/ing sites (although certain preliminary examples will be offered). It is also multidisciplinary, critically and pragmatically borrowing from, and building upon, discussions and concepts from border studies, global studies, political sociology and political geography amongst others. The theoretical approaches put forward represent ‘thin’ (universal) understandings of connection in relation to borders – ‘conceptual invariances’ in Paasi’s (2009, p.224) terms – that have the potential to be ‘thickened out’ in particular instances (see Cooper and Perkins, 2012 for a recent illustration of this move; See also Appendix). This broadly follows Gilbert Ryle’s (2009) discussion concerning ‘thick description’, whereby thin descriptions necessarily abstract allowing general concepts, objects or actions to be highlighted. Yet, in doing so, any thin description ultimately forms the bottom layer of a multi-layered (multi-context) thick but malleable description that applies to each generalisation. In between the thin and the thick lies a hierarchy of different meanings. Following this logic heeds Paasi’s (2009) warning that any ‘universal’ theory of borders is inherently problematic. Such a theory, he argues, would by definition render borders fixed and thus separate from the (lived) social, cultural and historical contexts within which borders are continuously constructed, maintained and deconstructed (see also Tatum, 2000, p. 96).

It is therefore acknowledged that the border as a concept can be viewed from many different, often contradictory, meanings, perspectives and viewpoints (Balibar, 2002; Bauder, 2011), hence the difficulty, or impossibility, in generating a single coherent concept (Paasi, 2011). It is the intention here to make visible and add weight to the connection aspect of the concept of the border (I will discuss in much more detail the meanings attributed to the border as a concept in the next chapter).

To this end it is also useful at this point to mention a few points concerning the legitimacy of definitions. There is clearly some conceptual leeway when determining what a border is (and indeed what a border does), both within the academy as well as public consciousness in general. Indeed, questions of ‘who knows’ and ‘who defines’ have ontological as well as epistemological implications,

whereby the former refers to the study of what borders are, and the latter refers to the study of how we know what borders are (see van Houtum, 2005, p.674). In most cases the question of border definition is answered by taking into account the relationship between the researcher (observer) and those who are experiencing the border. In other words, the knowledge of what borders are is generated from experiences and observation. This is particularly the case when borders are approached as being processes. Indeed, as Tatum (2000) has pointed out, the danger of theory and abstraction distances the researcher from the lived experience deemed so crucial to the study of borders (see also Struver, 2004). However, as stated above, this thesis is theoretical and conceptual and, as such, its findings are not based upon any direct empirical observation of those doing border/ing, although examples are given. To this end, my thesis does not heed the call that all credible border studies should take into account the lived experiences of particular borders. I have touched upon this elsewhere; suffice to say that I do not want my work to wholly focus on or be related to specific (real world) borders given its conceptual and theoretical approach.

Therefore, in terms of this thesis (and its theoretical approach outlined above), it is the author who defines what a border is and does. As van Houtum (2005, p.674) points out, this conforms to particularly post-structural approach whereby “borders are the product of our knowledge and interpretation and that they as such produce a disciplining lens through which we perceive and imagine the world”. This is, of course, true for both researchers and those experiencing the border. However, I do not fulfil the role of social observer. Rather the way in which I define borders is rooted in, and qualified by, the extensive border studies literature upon which the theory presented here is designed to be an intervention. It uses and builds, therefore, upon definitions provided by other border scholars and aims to discuss other border rationales that I deem to require much more attention. The pertinent question to ask, then, is whether the findings of my thesis represent the ‘reality’ of bordering as based upon experience. It is my intention to provide a lens through which borders can be logically approached anew, an approach that can be utilised (or tested) at particular border locations. However, as will be discussed in Chapter Six, to avoid reflexivity it is my intention to further this research by highlighting various borders that can be defined through their potential and capacity to connect, with an aim of shaping the theory as well as highlighting specific borders.

The same goes for knowing and defining connection. Like border definitions and interpretations, I derive the ways in which borders connect from a critical reading of the border studies and surrounding literatures. This is also informed by looking at some preliminary examples whereby the border is narrated through a discourse of what I consider to be connectivity. Therefore, while those experiencing the border, or doing borderwork, may not define their actions in terms of connecting, or even bordering, a (macro) theoretical approach such as this enables the researcher to conceptualise general processes that may be underappreciated or missed when focusing on specific borders.

Secondly, this thesis primarily offers a particular reading of borders through the lens of connection. In other words, arguing that borders and connection are also mutually constitutive, and that connection does not by definition take place at the expense of borders but rather as a result of them, has implications for border studies. It is not therefore my intention to make specific interventions or claims regarding globalization. However, arguing that borders connect in the ways outlined above nevertheless contributes the following to the global studies literature: First, borders become more central to any conception of globalization or the global, even when defined in terms of increased interconnectedness. More specifically, the ability of non-state actors to take part in meaningful and tangible (non-state) border construction, maintenance and reconstruction becomes an integral aspect of global connectivity. Second, looking at borders in this way offers a useful and precise insight into how ‘globalization is made’⁴, whereby globalization is seen “both as an outcome and as a context for human activity” (Holton, 2005, p.2), producing both opportunity and constraint in equal if also uneven measures (see also Chapter Five). To this end, placing borders at the heart of the many ways in which people ‘make globalization’ moves away from what Bude and Durrschmidt (2010) call ‘flow speak’, that particular aspect of theorising that subsumes globalization to limitless flows of information, people and things. Globalization and borders will be discussed in detail later in this chapter and in even more detail in Chapter Two.

⁴ This is an intentional ‘past tense’ rephrasing of Robert Holton’s pithy book title ‘Making Globalization’. See: Holton, R. (2005) *Making Globalization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. While Holton uses the idea to describe how the term globalization is given different (often conflatory) meanings, I put the idea to use to capture how globalization is enacted from the bottom up by people in their everyday lives. In other words, how ‘ordinary people’ make globalization.

Lastly, it is important to point out at the beginning that the idea of connection (or linkage) in relation to borders and associated processes is not completely new in the sense that much has been written about contact, interaction, crossing and cooperation, and so on. However there has yet to be any extensive or conclusive study, theoretical or otherwise, that fundamentally examines the overlapping relationships between borders, bordering and connection, particularly in relation to globalization and non-proximate (global) connection. It is a fundamental underlying aim to assert that the relationship between borders and connection should be an important area of study within the border studies and surrounding literatures, a central aim, I might add, upon which this thesis rests – indeed, this final point will resonate throughout the thesis.

Logic dictates that this introduction sets the scene for the rest of the thesis. In order to further qualify the main points raised thus far the next part of this introductory chapter offers a contextual framework in order to explain why a specific focus on connection is important for border studies. Here I make the case that contemporary borders studies needs to take into account the connective potential of borders as a way of locating borders in contemporary global process. Leading on from this, the chapter then discusses the types of border that can operate as mechanisms of connectivity. The case is made that by looking at borders through the lens of connection highlights the ways in which processes of globalization both transform borders (that borders are everywhere) and make new ‘types’ of border important and thus rife for study. Finally I will outline the structure of this thesis, detailing the discussions and specific arguments made in each chapter.

Why study borders?

We only have to look at a standard⁵ political map of the world to observe the power, resilience and importance of borders in the contemporary world. Such maps, as evidenced from their popularity in school class rooms, library’s and homes, form, and subsequently entrench, a somewhat neat topological and historical meta-narrative of

⁵ By ‘standard’ I mean the Mercator projection which, although problematic in terms of accurate spatial representation, is commonly used in posters and wall charts because of its convenient ‘rectangular’ dimensions.

global spatial understanding⁶ – a ‘state meta-geography’ in Taylor’s (2004, p.218) terms. Vertical, horizontal, diagonal and curved lines dominate this two-dimensional representation of global space, lines that are familiar to most and even comforting to many because they both create and delineate distinct compartments of familiarity as well as (managed) difference. In other words it is from within these compartments – the outcome of intersecting lines – that compartments are viewed and subsequently (over) coded: world maps commonly feature illustrations of national flags to accompany and give/fix meaning to the compartments they in turn function to visualise. This simple (obvious) example illustrates the way in which borders have been, and in some quarters continue to be, traditionally conceptualised. It is a border imagery that amounts to (nation) state imagery insomuch as the border, on such a reading, simultaneously delineates the beginning and end of state territorial space and law making capacities – what Vaughan-Williams (2009, p.2) calls the “concept of the border of the state”. Likewise it highlights how borders have traditionally been taken to divide, and in doing so fix, what is immediate: to divide territory is to divide sovereign entities, providing a tangible limit within which, to paraphrase Weber’s (2004, p.33) famous principle, human communities lay claim to a monopoly of legitimate physical violence.

The basic example also provided a starting point for some interesting critical debates occurring at the end of twentieth century, particularly in IR and global studies, which questioned the ‘ontological legitimacy’ of bounded state territorial lines/space – the territorial trap in Agnew’s (1994) terms. “Everyday life is transversal”, argued Campbell (1996, p.23), “because it cannot be reconciled to a Cartesian interpretation of space”. Borders on this reading were rendered ineffectual by nature and, particularly in territorial fixed form, became exposed as an imposed artificial construction. In this way “everyday life”, Campbell (1996, p.23) continues, “[is not] a synonym for the local level, for in it global interconnectedness, local resistances, transterritorial flows, state politics, regional dilemmas, identity formations, and so on are always already present”. Via global and transnational processes the concept of the territorial border was problematised because its inability to uphold a primary function was exposed. The territorial border, in other words,

⁶ In other words, geopolitical borders presented and observed in this way represent the defining limit of state territorial sovereignty that, almost by definition, is portrayed as territorially static and the consequence of geopolitical and historical arguments between states. See Newman, (2006, p. 145) and later in this chapter for an outline and, importantly, critique of this position.

could never keep out the external because the outside world is always at the same time inside. Globalization – itself an empty term – became wholly defined as a jumble of powerful fluid border traversing, deterritorializing, processes in which “computerised data transmissions, radio broadcasts, satellite remote sensing and telephone calls do not stop at customs posts” (Scholte, 2005, p.136).

Clearly the current global condition is not one of borderlessness and the ‘borderless world thesis’ as asserted by Ohmae (1995) has generally (and correctly) fallen by the academic wayside. But it is also equally regarded that the compartmentalising fixed lines on a map grossly oversimplify the empirical reality of borders and people who experience them. In terms of border studies, it is now accepted that the supposed border traversing power of globalization – posited as the antithesis of (state) borders – does not reduce the importance of studying them. “Notwithstanding the growth of global flows” argue van Houtum *et al* (2005, p.1) “the number of ordered and bordered id/entities has not diminished”. Indeed it is now considered that studying the fundamental relationships between borders and globalization better illuminates the complexity and dynamic nature of borders. To this end border researchers correctly argue that the recent acceleration of transnationalising tendencies has actually facilitated, rather than prevented, the current high degree of institutional interest in state borders (see Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002; Vaughan-Williams, 2009; van Houtum *et al*, 2005; Rumford, 2010). Partly alluding to the reasons behind this interest Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson (2002, p.7) contend:

Borders should be studied not just because they enclose and hence shape national politics and societies, but because they are a central constitutive element of our contradictory world system. They continue to serve as sites and agents of order and disorder in a dynamic global landscape.

Moreover the border becomes more than a thing in and of-itself, inasmuch as it can be conceptualised as being spatially produced and relational. That is, connected to, and even directly implemented in, the way in which people interpret the world (van Houtum, *et al* 2005, p. 3-4). Studying borders, therefore, is now less about studying lines, and even the transformation or shifting of lines, to more emphasis on how people experience the borders. Emphasis is placed on how people construct

narratives and meaning of and via the border, and how borders are constructed by, but also have an influence upon, those experiencing the border (see Struver, 2004; Paasi, 1996, 2005). Studying borders therefore, is no longer a study a simple geopolitics. From the point of view of this thesis studying borders allows researches to learn and gauge how people experience the world for better or for worse, and it becomes increasingly apparent how much borders constitute a fundamental part of the world writ large. Borders form part of people's mundane daily life practices (Newman, 2006) through the construction and reconstruction of narratives and stories manifesting as textual and material constructs such as newspapers, paintings and monuments among many others (Paasi, 1996; 2005). While constituting the subject matter for the next chapter, what follows a succinct look at the ways in which border have been approached in relation to globalization or the global.

Locating borders

Within and throughout the literature, the border as a concept, idea or thing has been described in numerous ways. As will be discussed, consensus generally falls upon the notion of the border as a process – upon the importance of studying bordering rather than fixed geopolitical lines – but there are different approaches regarding what (or who) is being observed and where and how it is to be studied, approaches that ask different methodological and disciplinary questions. For example, while acknowledging that important borders do not map directly onto the traditional geopolitical landscape, many researchers argue that the only borders worthy of consideration primarily belong to the state. In not too dissimilar fashion, researchers have also found the European Union (EU) to be a fruitful 'test bed' in which to study borders and, in particular, have observed the transformation of state borders and the increasing primacy of European networks and regional borders. Other researchers, however, have sought to think about important and tangible borders that are not imposed and/or orchestrated by the state or EU, observing and theorising less visible borders that are the result of, or gain a new relevance from, bottom-up socio-political relations and processes.

Indeed, several overlapping approaches can be put forward that locate the position of borders in the context of the global. Firstly, arguing that borders are sites

and agents of order and disorder in a dynamic global landscape, Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson still retain the state territorial border as a cornerstone of border research. However this relationship between borders and globalization is defined in terms of the dynamic and transformative capacity of territory itself. In a global context, "[T]he potential advantages of studying borders", argue Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson (2002, p.7), "are perhaps best seen in the broader context of territoriality and its roles in the construction and reproduction of states, nations and other territorial entities". State borders should be studied because they become "frontiers of identity" (Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.7; Donnan & Wilson, 1999; See also Giddens, 1984, p.4), when placed within a framework of territoriality. That is, borders become places within which different systems come into contact and become directly comparable. While the logic of territory often generates conflict, it is at state borders that the "'contradictory unity' of 'politics/economics' is revealed in sharpest form" (Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.7). Systemic contradictions being played out at state borders are more frequent and brought into sharper relief when aligned with the acceleration of globalization, which in turn creates greater interest in borders.

The supposed exaggeration of the power of global flows is tempered by placing the study of borders at the crux of the matter. On this logic spaces of flows and place have always co-existed in a dynamic relationship within which one defines the other. In this way 'spaces of place' are not fixed but are constantly being re-defined in relation to 'spaces of flows', thus creating new 'places' in the process. Of course, Deleuze and Guattari's much cited discussions capture this thinking, whereby they argue that territory in itself becomes "the precondition for change" (cited in Elden, 2009, p.xxvii). In other words, Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p.54) argue "Deterritorialization must be thought of as a perfectly positive power that [...] is always relative, and has reterritorialization as its flipside or complement. Deterritorialization on a stratum always occurs in relation to a complementary reterritorialization". State borders, then, are the sites where 'flows' meet 'place' and vice versa, and the study of state borders, by definition, serves to illuminate these complex and pivotal processes (or perhaps collisions) (Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.10).

Another area of research has of late tended to focus on securitisation and the ability of the state border to protect national security. Such approaches are linked to the idea of rebordering (Andreas, 2003), particularly post 9/11, and has led

researchers to study the increasing interconnect between surveillance and borders (Vaughan-Williams, 2008). Biometrics and virtual borders have thus become pertinent, timely as well as case study orientated subjects of border research (see Amoore, 2006). Conceptual emphasis is placed on the negation of the problem of inside/outside, as well as the experiences of those experiencing the border usually in terms of categorisation. Rarely simply impenetrable barriers designed to keep things in or out, many (state) borders are increasingly akin to permeable asymmetric membranes (Hedetoft, 2003, p. 153): borders that unevenly and disproportionately channel inward and outward flows of information, goods and particularly people. Indeed, it is this 'categorisation' function that has arguably led to the border, and associated processes, becoming a crucial focal point in the study of identity, mobility and subjectivity. Identity vectors such as nationality, ethnicity, gender, religion, political affiliation, class (see Balibar, 2002, p. 82) and indeed non-citizenship (see Bosniak, 2006, p.10) may determine the level of ease of passage across national borders that, in other words, facilitate easy access to some while simultaneously preventing or hindering entry to others.

Crucially, these membrane-like borders are not necessarily confined to the territorial limits of the state, or even at other traditional points of entry such as train stations and airports (membranes are typically described as flexible as well as porous); they are unfixed and mobile, diffused throughout, within and outside the state (see Rumford, 2006; Walters, 2006; Vaughan-Williams, 2008). They are, as Etienne Balibar has stated numerous times, 'dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people, and things is happening and is controlled' (Balibar, 1998, p. 1; see also Bigo and Guild, 2005). Primacy is placed upon mobility and permeability, not just in terms of the mobilities crossing the border (migrant labour, tourists, citizens), but the actual border itself. The process of bordering here becomes a kind of mobility management business that operates throughout and beyond the state, where securitisation and protection does not categorically mean 'closing the door' but rather continued, and indeed, increased focus on mobility, categorisation and thus control. In other words, the border becomes a portal that depends upon the movement of goods and people (Vaughan-Williams, 2009b, p. 4). Securitisation no longer emphatically implies the power to 'keep out' in the physical sense, but to categorise and indeed re-categorise global flows of people and things under the umbrella threat/power of exclusion.

Much attention has been given to the advent of the biometric border. Louise Amoore alludes: “in effect, the biometric border is the portable border par excellence, carried by mobile bodies at the very same time as it is deployed to divide bodies at international boundaries, airports, railway stations, on subways or city streets, in the office or the neighbourhood” (Amoore, 2006, p. 338). Again, borders here are mobile, dispersed throughout society wherever they are needed; they are a far cry from the static geopolitical borders that provide much needed national and territorial identity. Biometric borders are in many ways still lines on the map, but cannot be compared to physical lines (Epstein, 2007, p. 116). In other words: “they are no longer the classic portals of sovereignty, where power was exerted by granting or withholding access at the gate (Epstein, 2007, p. 116). On the other hand, “borders are strengthened and sovereignty is reinvigorated, albeit reworked” (Epstein, 2007, p. 116) by the very implication and effectiveness of biometric management and e-borders.

Alternatively, research elsewhere has focused on the ways in which borders form and an integral aspect of our commonplace daily life practices. Emphasis is placed on how people construct narratives of and via the border (Paasi, 1996b; Anderson, 2004; Struver, 2004; Newman, 2006) particularly in relation to borderlands. In other words, borders are both ‘meaning-making’ and ‘meaning-carrying’ entities, forming an integral part of cultural landscapes (Donnan and Wilson, 1999, p. 4). For Donnan and Wilson, border discourses are important, as different groups may carry out border narration, in the sense that they impose their own border meanings within the borderland, which in turn can act to either reinforce or destabilise the national border in question in relation to other groups who also narrate the border. Indeed, working in the context of the Bengali borderlands, van Schendel (2005a; See also van Schendel, 2005b) argues that the study of borderlands should be less state centric, because borderlands are spaces of interest in their own right.

Donnan and Wilson use the border and resulting borderland between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland as a case study, and point to the diverse graffiti, used by the different groups and communities to territorialize the border, that has accumulated over the years. Thus, visitors, locals, and indeed the soldiers that once inhabited the border region have been, and still are, surrounded by symbols of resistance branded on bridges, government building and on the side of housing estates

in the form of the famous murals (Donnan and Wilson, 2001, p.75). In this way, the border is imposed by state actors, but is in turn narrated by those living within its vicinity in a multitude of different ways. Moreover, while the traditional securitised border has, in many places at least, been dismantled, the border is still present through its absence remaining through processes of discourse and narration which can symbolise change and progress as well as negative connotations attributed to division (see also see Struver, 2004 in relation to the Dutch/German borderland).

Noel Parker (2008, p.4) seeks to show how margins are tension with the centres and how 'the spaces of the socio-political order can be understood from the perspective of marginality. Parker, and others, seeks to show how the margin has an agency in terms of determining or influencing the supposedly dominant centre. In other words it is not only the centre that determines the politics at the periphery or margin. The periphery for Parker is passive either shaped or excluded from the centre whereas the term 'margin' conjures up notions and meanings of challenge. Such theorising challenges the perception of a given centre to, by definition, organise and dominate space around it thus encapsulating other entities (Parker, 2008, p.8). The margins possess certain qualities, certain possibilities, that are not present towards the centre.

Ultimately, here, emphasis on borders as spaces of contact which in turn can highlight the relationship between the border and the people (see also Stuver, 2003; 2004). In this sense, Inge E Boer (2006), for example, argues that borders or boundaries offer subjective, temporary and changeable spaces of negotiation, the outcome of which changes the boundary (borderland) dynamic. Emphasis is placed on negotiation, cooperation and even negation, which is also indicative of Martinez's (1994) work on the US/Mexico borderland, Delanty's (2007) work on the cosmopolitan reorientation of EU borders, and Konrad and Nicol's (2008) study on the US/Canadian borderland, a body of research that will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Some important points on current border thinking

These approaches key into what Balibar (1998; 2002) has termed the heterogeneous and polysemic nature of borders, where the former implies that borders are becoming

diffuse throughout society, and the latter asserts that borders mean different things to different people. Research into border securitisation, for example, has illuminated ‘non-traditional’ border practices taking place in ‘non-traditional’ places (Walters, 2004) such as major transport routes or city centres (Walters, 2006; Lahav and Guiraudon, 2000). At the same time the border can become a symbol of protection, comfort (van Houtum, 2002) and reassurance (or not, see Rumford, 2008), or the final hurdle worth crossing for a better life beyond. Likewise, experience centred approaches illuminates the constant but often viscous narration, representation and meaning applied to and received from monuments, literature and architecture (Paasi, 1996b; 2005).

Summed up, the idea that borders are everywhere – that borders are present in multiple locations away from state territorial peripheries and other common locations such as airports – can be separated into two overlapping approaches. On the one hand notions of borders and bordering form an integral aspect and outcome of our everyday life practices rooted in social practices and discourse. While on the other hand, as particularly espoused in the securitisation literature, borders become locatable wherever the movement of people is controlled and manipulated. The former approach centres on border processes in and around experience and representation (see Struver, 2004) and constant but often viscous narration of monuments, literature and architecture (see Paasi, 1996b), and so on. And the latter approach places border processes in surveillance practices enacted by non-state actors – often citizens themselves (Vaughan-Williams, 2008) – at non-traditional places such as major transport routes and city centres. However a recent ‘intervention’ piece in the journal *‘Geopolitics’* leads with the question “where is the border in border studies?” And alludes to what is seen as an increasing ambiguity as to just what the border conceptually is, given the extensive and varying research trajectories in border studies (Johnson et al. 2011, p.1). Borders are now more commonly being studied from a variety of disciplinary vantage points (see Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002; Paasi, 2011).

Nevertheless the approaches, succinctly outlined above, help bring to the fore current, dominant and contested thinking within border research: (1) bordering should form the main aspect of border research as opposed to borders theorised as geopolitical lines between states; (2) borders are not, by definition, solely situated around the periphery of states; (3) borders mean different things to different people,

which, in turn, brings to the fore experience centred approaches to studying borders; (4) border construction and maintenance need not fall into the sole remit of the state. The primacy and strength of these key themes may be contested, particularly in relation to one another. But there is a unitary theme in that they all acknowledge, and are situated within, a concept of globalization that implicitly includes borders. In other words, considered integral to serious explanations of the 'global', borders shift and transform, become contested here and encouraged there, are even carried around over space by body and mind (Ernste, van Houtum and Zoomers, 2009), and form an integral aspect of bottom-up empowerment (Rumford, 2008; See also Chapter Five).

However, in terms of connection, while the idea of an interconnected world is almost a truism, the role borders play in this connection remains underdeveloped and fails to reach its potential. Borders are not solely considered to be divisionary. They are commonly conceptualised in terms of liminal spaces within which, in some but not all cases, connection can reasonably be theorised in terms of contact and cooperation between borderland dwellers. Alternatively, borders can be said to connect in terms of the ways in which they facilitate the movement of some and not for others. While the barrier function of borders becomes apparent, they also prove conduits and channels through which people move. For certain elites connection is experienced by the ease and speed of movement from here, movement that is actively facilitated by the border. The point however is that the connection on offer here tends to be defined in terms of proximate movement across borders. And the border in question tends to be the imposition of state borders, even in terms of borderlands whereby the state border, and relationship between the two (nation) states separated (or connected) by it, defines the borderland dynamic (see Martinez, 1994; and Chapter Two). In contrast, borders as mechanism of connection are fundamentally required for connection, and the remaining parts of the chapter will outline a framework within which this is possible.

Much research has focused on 'liberal borders' and their ability to be membrane-like (Hedetoft, 2003), where borders unevenly and disproportionately channel inward and outward flows of information, goods and people. It is this 'categorisation' function that has arguably led to individual borders, and associated processes, becoming crucial focal points in the study of identity, mobility and subjectivity. Invoking Simmel borders, on this reading, act as bridges, connecting and facilitating some, but they also act as doors, blocking others. Either way, this

process is a process of division. The door often prioritises the bridge and operates to create internal solidarity at the expense of the/an other. Crucially while borders and bordering relate to practices of othering (van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2002, p.134) – the construction of otherness is integral to the construction of borders – otherness often equates division, and, as such, division must be overcome in order to connect. Even more nuanced studies of borders which incorporate ‘otherness’ into ideas of connection do so in relation notions of proximate contact and crossing whether physical or metaphorical. To name a few van Houtum and Struver (2002, p.143) place emphasis on the people (not the door) who experience the border arguing “It is in their own hands to open the door or step through the door themselves, reach out and get in touch with the ‘other’”. What role do borders play in an interconnected world? The next part of the chapter locates these questions within ideas of globalization that will be pursued throughout this thesis entire.

Globalization and connection

Throughout the various literatures, globalization broadly described is commonly associated with ideas relating to connection and connectivity in one way or another. To name but a few, Roland Robertson (1992, p.6), talks about globalization in terms of “the compression of the world into a single place”, and “the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (Ibid, p.8). Acknowledging the difficulty of describing the term, Jan Aart Scholte (2005, p.8), posits globalization as “best understood as a reconfiguration of social geography marked by the growth of transplanetary and supraterritorial connections between people”. And, elsewhere, John Tomlinson (1999, p.2) provides a starting point definition of globalization as being “an empirical condition of the modern world” specifically understood as “complex connectivity”. Placing connection at the centre of his book-length discussion on globalization and culture, Tomlinson further defines the idea of ‘globalization as complex connectivity’ as “the rapidly developing and ever-densening network of interconnections and the interdependencies that characterise modern social life” (Ibid).

An obvious way to theorise connection is perhaps encapsulated in the work of Manuel Castells regarding networks. Famous for his three volume (grand narrative)

work on the 'information age and the 'network society' (See Castells, 1994; 1996; 1997; 1998) he describes the theoretical mechanics of networks as follows:

A network is a set of interconnecting nodes. A node is the point where the curve intersects itself. A network has no centre, just nodes. Nodes may be of varying relevance for the network. Nodes increase their importance for the network by absorbing more relevant information, and processing it more efficiently. The relative importance of a node does not stem from its specific features but from its ability to contribute to the networks goals [...] Networks process flows. Flows are streams of information between nodes circulating through the channels of connection between nodes" (Castells, 2004, p.3).

Through focusing on networks, although not necessarily in the same vein as Castells, Saskia Sassen, for example, has studied the idea of networked cities by questioning the dominance of states in controlling and organising cross border flows. "We see a rescaling of what are the strategic territories that articulate the new system", Sassen (2002, p.1) states "With the partial unbundling or at least weakening of the nation as a spatial unit come conditions for the ascendance of other spatial units and scales". Thus, international spaces, mobilities and flows place increasing emphasis upon sub-national entities, and, in Sassen's case, particularly the city. Such rescaling, Sassen argues, involves enormous geographic dispersal and mobility in such a way that the global economy exists not through states as such, but rather a growing network of global cities that in turn are becoming less 'national' and more 'global' (Sassen, 2002, p.9). Thus cities become important nodes in vast global networks that transcend nation-state demarcations. Such (state) border traversing 'mobilities' can range from corporeal travel in terms of work, leisure, migration and escape; physical movement of objects delivered between producers and consumers; imaginative travel through images and places broadcast on global television networks; virtual travel on the internet; and finally communicative travel through person-to-person communications such as letters, fax and so on (Urry, 2002).

Although these ideas posit globalization in terms connection and interconnectedness, they are nevertheless aware of the danger of subsuming globalization (or connection) into what Bude and Durrschmidt (2010) call 'flow speak'. The 'spatial turn', so influential in the social and political sciences, and so

often attributed to globalization, is damaging to empirical and analytical purchase of the term. Bude and Durrschmidt (2010, p.483) argue:

The spatial turn in globalization theory in our view has also fostered an understanding of a society without limits. Space is emptied out of its social significance in a world where any distance could potentially be compressed into co-presence. Access to global space then implies first of all a multiplication of options. Moreover, global space is predominantly seen as backdrop against which generalized projections of ‘constant availability’ and ‘technologically restored intimacy’ foster a vision of ‘omnipresence’ and ‘all-at-onceness’⁷.

The solution for Bude and Durrschmidt is not approach the study of globalization exclusively in terms of disembedding but also in terms of reembedding, to go from routes to roots (Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010, p.491/497). To this end they evoke the figure of the ‘homecomer’ to evoke a sense in which the contemporary world is less defined in terms of flows, and more in terms of social bonding. It is this concept of globalization that is of interest here.

In terms of this thesis connection is used to imply and capture similar concepts such as relation, contact and interaction. The reason why connection is used as a ‘catchall’ term relates to the idea of non-proximity, an idea that forms a strong theme and core argument of this thesis. For Tomlinson (1999, p.3), however, there is a danger that connectivity can imply increased spatial proximity, that proximity/intimacy does not, by definition, equal connectivity, that proximity has its own overlapping but separate phenomenological and metaphorical truths and dynamics. For all time space compression, the argument goes, “people in Spain really

⁷ Castells does discuss how networks have a binary logic of inclusion and exclusion. From the outside the network itself may span the globe in terms of distance and coverage, yet within the network the distances between the nodes that constitute it is minimal if not zero, and it is in this sense that networks are often said to shrink the world both temporally and geographically. However, this is only the case for those belonging to, that is, existing within networks. For those excluded and thus outside the network Castells uses the metaphor of infinite to describe their exclusion: while the distance between those on the inside is zero, it is the opposite for those not included. However Castells also discusses resistance to such exclusion particularly in terms of identity affirmation. Through what he calls ‘the exclusion of the excluders by the excluded’ (Castells, 2010, p.391), resistive and/or defensive identities are constructed in relation to the excluding network that both challenge while at the same time reinforce - but perhaps on different terms - the exclusionary ‘border’ that serves to define the inside and outside of the network.

do continue to be 5500 miles away from people in Mexico (Tomlinson, 1999, p.4). Yet a cautionary Tomlinson goes on to suggest that connectivity means that we now experience physical distance in different ways. In cultural terms he argues that:

If connectivity really does imply proximity as a *general* socio-cultural condition, this has to be understood in terms of a transformation of practice and experience which is felt actually within localities as much as the increasing means of access to or egress from them (Tomlinson, 1999, p.9).

This is what I am aiming to capture by using the term connection in relation to borders. Borders as mechanisms of connection are implicated in the ways in which distant places are brought closer and shape local happenings, as well as the ways in which local endeavours shape happenings elsewhere. However, borders as mechanisms of connection are also all about the local, and emphasis is placed upon lasting bonds as much as global access. In fact, in terms of the connection on offer here, it is argued that the two go hand in hand. Connection, therefore, has been chosen above other terms because of its general ease of application that can, depending on context, provide specific interactions, contacts and relations.

Framing borders as mechanisms of connection

Ganster and Lorey (2005, p.xi) flag up what they consider to be a seemingly problematic relationship between ‘globalization’ and state territorial borders. They highlight “an intriguing paradox” in which “globalization is preceding everywhere while at the same time political borders separating peoples remain pervasive and problematic”. In other words, the world has become, and increasingly continues to be, interconnected, compressed and explained through the lexicon of ‘transnationalism’, while conversely, “borders between nations and ethnicities appear to be as strong as ever” (Ganster and Lorey, 2005, p.xi). On this logic, assertions that borders connect (as well as divide) appear to place the term border within a lexicon of seemingly opposing terms, ideas and concepts that have of late been employed within the literature to problematise borders. The idea that borders themselves can become mechanisms of connectivity is seemingly problematic considering such a

conceptualisation of borders runs counter to dominant (liberal) binaries of 'inside/outside' 'us/them', 'networks/borders', 'mobilities/borders', and 'connection/division' and so on. Indeed, the concept of the border in terms of its function is often implicated in the construction of such binaries.

As discussed, popular (common sense) assumptions of borders often assert them to be first and foremost divisionary, connected to territory and state centred, while, in contrast, so called 'postmodern spaces of flows, de-territorialized connections, and de-localized identities' (Axford, 2006, p.4; See also Bauman, 2006) have been seen by many to be the antithesis of borders insomuch as, by definition, these networks render borders (functionally) ineffectual. Moreover, explicit within the general border studies literatures, the divisionary and exclusionary function of borders is often reinforced through an overlapping recognition of 'Otherness', forms of 'Othering', and 'difference creation' vis-à-vis processes of bordering. On this logic, the creation of 'Otherness' and difference that bordering is often associated with can seemingly impede the potential and/or capacity of borders to actually connect to spaces, scales, and networks - indeed worlds - that appear to be bordered out.

However, to use van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer's (2005, p.3-12) turn of phrase, borders are 'janus-faced' (See also van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2001, p.127). Rather than being visible lines on a map providing common sense partitioning functions, borders possess an inherent ambiguity (van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer's, 2005, p.12; Rumley and Minghi, 1991; See also Chapter Two) whereby borders and their inherent function(s) evade easy categorisation. Theorised generally and abstractly they exist in a 'superposition state' - a term usually employed by physicists to describe something that can occupy two states at once, rather than simply being in one state or the other. Borders in this sense can be continually and simultaneously good and bad, open and closed, including (purifying) and excluding, visible and invisible, dividing and connecting, and so on. In other words, borders are always 'becoming' in ontological terms because they form part of our lived experience: they are continuously socially reproduced, observer and place dependent, enacted, maintained and experienced by multiple actors, and as such can function in many different and yet simultaneous ways. For better or for worse borders do not 'block out life' in the sense that borders are very much integral to living.

It is arguably through such thinking that ideas of connection in relation to borders can be located and inserted. “Producing a safe interior”, as van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer (2005, p.3) argue, “borders create a membrane or buffer zone separating an inside from an outside, while linking both in a particular way”. Thus borders can manifest as lines of difference connected to overlapping ideas of security, protection (fear) and wellbeing (See van Houtum and Pijpers, 2007; Rumford, 2006). They can promote conflict and violence (Durr Schmidt, 2006; See also Campbell 1996; Connolly 1995 amongst many others). As well as at the same time encapsulating notions of crossing, contact, cooperation, negotiation, expectation, and indeed connection (van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer, 2005, p.3; See Martinez, 1994; Boer, 2006; Rumford, 2006; Delanty 2007; Konrad and Nicol, 2008; Cooper and Rumford, 2011; See also Chapter Two). What and where borders are, and what ‘state’ they manifest/become (border ontology), and subsequently how and why they are recognised as borders (border epistemology)⁸, depends of course upon the lived experience of the border by those at the border, but it also depends, I would add, upon how the border is ‘utilized’ and to what ends, and subsequently how borders are studied and theorised taking this into account. It is therefore the way in which borders ‘link’ that is of interest here.

To this end Harrison C White argues that the concept of the (social) boundary is analogous to an interface indeed, according to White (1982, p.11), the term boundary should be replaced altogether:

A boundary is a social "act," an act hard to keep together and sustain; it is not a skin. I propose that we throw out the term altogether in social system analysis because it is so misleading, such an inappropriate borrowing from natural science. "Interface" is a term with appropriate connotations, especially that any "dividing line" in a social system is a two-sided affair which must be actively created, perceived and reproduced on each side, in order that there be a demarcation. Interfaces sustain themselves on differences among variances.

⁸ Alluding to a border philosophy, van Houtum (2005, p.674) describes border ontology as being the study of what borders are, and border epistemology as being the study of what and how we know what borders are. Interestingly, for Mignolo and Tlostanova (2006, p.208), border epistemology equates to ‘border thinking’, having roots in anti-imperial responses to colonial difference. For further discussion on border ontology and epistemology see also Vaughan-Williams and Parker et al (2009).

While White is referring to social and cultural boundaries the idea of interface adequately explains the way the border connects an inside to (multiple) outsides where inside and outside are commonly taken to be different and necessarily distinct spaces. Interface here is taken to mean connection, that is, linking things that do not normally directly communicate - in this sense an interface can be seen as a common border about which difference congregates. Subsequently, and as we have already seen, the border is not a container – a skin in White’s terms – but rather points of connection through which communication with difference occurs and is located. White’s idea of the interface, then, can, in the context of borders and connection, be theorised as a site of tactical modification in which differences can connect – even negotiate the terms of connection – without being reduced to sites of fixity and division. Those on both sides determine the border as interface and, as such, it becomes a process of connection that, furthermore, is not necessarily and by definition located at and around (territorial) peripheries.

For van Schendel an important aspect of being a ‘borderlander’ is the capability to *scale* beyond the state, and that the state scale or level for borderlanders does not act as the intermediate between the local and the global. Rather, envisioning a different, non-hierarchical, idea of scale, the state border represents both the local and the global resulting in the possibility of borderlanders being involved in transnational practices in their everyday lives (van Schendel, 2005b, p.49). This becomes more interesting when scale is considered not just a matter of size and level but also as a relation (Howitt, 1998, p.49). For example Howitt (1998, p.56) states ‘It seems increasingly clear that applied peoples’ geography must urgently tackle the crucial questions of how to act at multiple scales simultaneously; how to think globally and act locally, at the same time as thinking locally and acting globally (and at other scales simultaneously). This will be considered in detail in chapter four, but what is interesting here is the level of agency attributed to the borderlanders, and the ability to borderlanders to use the border to interact with different scales. Running through van Schendel’s work is the idea that borderlanders through everyday practices can have transformative effects on the border, the state border, in other words, is not simply imposed upon them. What van Schendel does not do, however, is explain in any great detail how borderlanders supposedly jump scales, as well as possible ways to study this.

So it is argued that borders are mechanisms of connection. In other words, it is argued that border/ing creates the means through which particularly non-proximate connectivity can occur. Defining, and thus focusing on, the border as a mechanism allocates connectivity to be an outcome of particular bordering processes. The main thrust of the study will therefore be to show the workings (mechanisms) of the border rather than an overt focus on connectivity in and of itself. To this end, two mechanisms of connectivity are discussed in terms of difference (and interfaces) in Chapter Three and the politics of scale in Chapter Four.

Outline of chapters

The next chapter is titled 'On Borders and Globalization'. It continues the debates preliminary offered in this introduction on two fronts. First, first it charts the border studies literature and outlines the principle contemporary debates taking place. Second, it takes these debates and conceptualises them in terms of the globalization/global studies literature. The principle argument in Chapter Two continues from the introduction in that border studies should take into account the ways in which borders connect rather than, as is often the case, positing connection as a second order observation. Positing this as a starting point allows for less convention forms of connection to be considered.

As outlined at the beginning, and framed in the latter half of this introduction, Chapter Three will focus on division and connection. It will focus on Harrison C. White's concept of an interface and extract it from his overall body of work. This idea will then be 'transplanted' to the border/connection debate in order show how borders can theoretically connect to other identities far from the proximity of the border. Crucial to the concept of interface is the need to move beyond ideas of the border as being wholly dividing but a marker of malleable difference. Chapter Four focuses on the ways in which scale can amount to connection in relation to borders. Emphasis here is placed upon the experience of the border and how it can invoke multiple scales for different people. The work of van Schendel provides an obvious starting point and his work is built upon to show how scale is enacted via the border as well as the implications of this both on the border and those doing connecting.

Chapter Five looks at the empowering and opportunity providing potential of connection in terms of those doing the connection. It observes the ways in which borders are traditionally theorised in terms of power and argues that connecting to distant localities provides new and novel routes to political empowerment. Chapter Six concludes the thesis and, after summing up the individual chapter arguments, makes the case that connection should constitute a primary research focus of border studies. To this end it discusses and proposes future avenues of study that place connection at the centre of study, particularly to what is non-proximate, and particularly in terms of empirical research.

Chapter Two

On Borders and Globalization

The border has traditionally been understood as a single, staffed physical frontier, where travellers show paper-based identity documents to pass through. This twentieth century concept can be subject to abuse with controls often geared to fairly crude risk indicators such as nationality [...] This philosophy will not deal with the step change in mobility that globalisation has brought to our country.

(UK Home Office, 2007)

The meaning of the term globalization remains somewhat elusive (see, for example, Beck, 2003, p.19; Scholte, 2005). As Tomlinson (1999, p.1) points out, globalization is a concept of the highest order of generality and consequently heavily contested in its meaning – it has become something of an ‘empty-signifier’ in Laclau’s (1996, p.36) terms. Indeed, for many, there remains a difficulty ascertaining in any concrete way the core argument that ‘globalization theory’ is trying to push, or even if such a theory still offers valid explanations of 21st century society (See Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010). That said, and in terms of this thesis, much of the extensive literature concerning the study of (hyper) globalization focuses, or has focused, on the geopolitical border traversing power of flows, mobilities and networks. Dazzled by the force of these supposedly wholly de-territorializing processes in electronic economic form, particular observers argued that states (and state territorial borders) were becoming ineffectual. “In terms of real flows of economic activity”, noted Ohmae (1995, p.11), “states have already lost their role as meaningful units of participation in the global economy of today’s borderless world” (See also Strange, 1996 for a continuation of this position). In many ways this thinking continues to be mirrored by a particular normative idea of a borderless world epitomised by global

political movements such as ‘no borders’, or ‘reporters without borders’, and so on, which form one powerful dimension of contemporary (global) popular consciousness.

I touch upon some of these debates in the past tense because we do not, of course, live in a borderless world and globalization does not, by definition, equal de-territorialization. There seems to have been no “abandonment of geography itself in visions of a de-territorialised world” (Axford, 2006, p.161) that some commentators so confidently and excitingly predicted. Rather, borders are continually being strengthened here and weakened there and, as will be discussed in due course, the ‘borderless world’ argument mentioned above “is, at best, profoundly uneven” (Elden, 2011). Many have questioned, or at least sought to qualify, the wholly ‘fluid’ nature of these border traversing networks and flows, that is, to question the premise that they are somehow external to any form of institutional (territorial) power or structure (See, for example, Urry, 2000; Beck, 2002; Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010). Avoiding the rather unhelpful dialectic cul-de-sac that was (is) the ‘borders versus no borders debate’, researchers are increasingly finding more substance examining the complex and nuanced relationships between the ‘fixed’ and ‘unfixed’, re-territorialization and de-territorialization, the local and the global, and, of course, borders, networks and mobilities. These relationships will form the primary focus of this chapter.

Current debates in border studies capture very well the ways in which borders are transforming under conditions of contemporary globalization and global interconnectedness. Usually framed in terms of securitisation, or ‘re-bordering’, borders are no longer found solely at traditional locations. They have been observed as asymmetric membranes, themselves displaying network-like qualities, and functioning to (bio)selectively channel the networks, mobilities and flows that are considered to part and parcel of our contemporary global condition. Likewise, much attention has been given to the ways in which people increasingly experience borders (particularly in the context of the EU), whereby “borders abound” but in ways that are “frequently encountered as non-boundaries, and so for many people are much easier to cross” (Rumford, 2006, p.156). Indeed, as we shall see, placing border experience at the centre of analysis now forms the foundation upon which many research endeavours rest, epitomised by the widely excepted methodological shift from borders to bordering.

These debates and observations will be further discussed in due course, suffice to say at this point that they are occurring in an era of supposedly increased globalization and connectedness. It is a current state of affairs, in other words, that is somewhat paradoxical for those who endorsed the ‘borderless world’ argument as some sort of empirical and teleological reality (see also Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p.38). Perhaps ironically, in what is also indicative of the central theme of this chapter, Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson (2002, p.7) contend that the current and impressive scholarly interest in borders is brought about directly because of our current global condition. They argue that systemic contradictions being played out at (state) borders are more frequent and brought into sharper relief when aligned with the acceleration of globalization.

The aims of this chapter, then, are twofold. In the first instance, it offers an overview of contemporary debates surrounding and influencing the study of borders and contextualises them in relation to globalization. But in doing so the chapter argues that, more often than not, dominant debates and observations tend to reify the state border – however dynamic and complex it may be, and wherever it may be located – as well as the divisionary or barrier aspects of the border. In other words, borders may very well be everywhere, but they tend to be state borders functioning to divide and regulate. A key reason for, as well as an outcome of these dominant approaches is that globalization becomes reduced to networks, flows and mobilities, and the strength of borders amounts to their ability to regulate. This severely limits the scope of in which borders can be theorised in relation to connection, whether it is connection across borders, or in the context of borderlands or border spaces.

Following on from this, the second aim of the chapter introduces some relevant discussions from the (loosely collated) global studies literature in order to provide a better and more productive foundation upon which to put forward the type of connection on offer throughout this thesis. These discussions incorporate the work of several authors including Roland Robertson, Anthony Giddens, James Rosenau, George Ritzer and Ulrich Beck, amongst others. These thinkers, in one way or another, focus on the relationships between the local and the global, relationships, it is argued, which provide a useful framework for the discussions put forward in the subsequent chapters. The discussions are useful because they help to show how local process – or politics of the local – are linked to the wider world in particular ways that do not amount to traditional mobility or proximate contact. As discussed in the

previous chapter, the borders as mechanisms of connection being advocated here are not limited to traditional border locations, and they connect localities beyond what is immediate.

Building upon the general discussions put forward thus far, and given the overlapping aims of the chapter, the remainder of the discussion will proceed in the following way. In the next section, in what will be a predominantly descriptive and empirical discussion, I will outline how the study of borders has developed in general terms. In doing so I want to highlight not only the crucial shifts and prominent studies that have progressed border studies, but also prominent advancements that help to reasonably conceptualise the ways in which borders can be framed in terms of connection. I agree with Vaughan-Williams (2009, p.38) when he talks about the fragility and disputability of any attempt to generalise the (sub) field, to the extent that any review will be somewhat incomplete. With this in mind emphasis will be given to the ways in which research has moved from dry empirical analysis of single borders to more general, theoretical and conceptual approaches (however this is not to deny the importance and fruitfulness of empirical study, particularly when linked to, or embedded within, theory or concept). Crucial here too, and very much overlapping with the last point, is the disciplinary wide methodological shift from studying borders to studying bordering.

Having established the current state of the art in border studies, the chapter will then discuss the ways in which borders have been theorised in relation to the globalization (or the global) more directly. The section will look more closely at the relationship between borders and globalization (or representations of the global). For example, writing in the introduction of his special issue on the theme of global borders, Rumford (2010) makes the point that the concept is under theorised and somewhat simplistic. Rather than simply being 'world defining' (or world dividing) described by much of the literature, Rumford argues that the relationship between borders and the global is, at the very least, a lot more complex demanding further, more focused, analysis, hence the purpose of the special issue on the subject. I contend that conceptualising and theorising borders as mechanisms of connection keys into this train of thought.

The final part of the chapter will introduce some key approaches to globalization which help to frame borders as mechanisms of connection. These approaches do not simply subsume globalization into a language of flows, mobilities

and networks, but rather take consider the dynamic and complex relationships between locality and globality. In other words, global interconnectedness need not, by definition, amount to physically moving around the world and traversing borders.

Current border thinking: Summing up the field

It is fair to say that the study of borders is becoming increasingly attractive, evidenced by the impressive volume and quality of academic papers, edited books, workshops and conferences currently being produced on the (sub)ject. A cursory look across this body of work quickly tells us that many researchers have recognised the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of borders (See, for example, Newman, 2006). It seems that ‘border studies’ is no longer the sole preserve of human and political geography, if indeed it ever was, reflected perhaps by a recognition that borders as a subject matter in and of themselves have become important and integral to a diverse set of disciplines, including architecture (see Romero, 2008), theatre studies (see Nield, 2006; 2008), and even musicology (see, Dwinell, 2009). Add to this, of course, the fact that many different disciplines can bring their own theoretical and methodological approaches to bear on the study of borders¹. Indicative of (or the continued and increasing need for) such interdisciplinary approaches, the border now finds itself at the centre of the politics concerning mobility, identity, citizenship, cosmopolitanism and economy (Bauder, 2011, p.1126), areas of interest that, as we shall see in the next section, are also at the centre of global studies. And, regardless of the discipline, what often ties these diverse ‘border studies’ together, to certain degrees and in one way and another, is that they contain a starting point engagement with a core literature.

Placing this current interest in borders into some kind of perspective, Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson (2002) argue that the increasing scholarly emphasis on the minutia of border dynamics is a relatively new and contemporary undertaking. The reason being, they stipulate, can be found in what they consider to be a traditional (disciplinary) ‘paradoxical’ neglect of borders. For them (state) borders have been

¹ Although, that said, the progression of any meaningful and general border discussion can also be laden with contradictory disciplinary and methodological vantage points. Anderson (2004, p.319), for example, argues that even academic disciplines are also subject to a ‘border/boundary’, ‘inside/outside’ narration.

commonly conceptualised as being fundamentally attached to territorially defined societies providing a tangible ‘society-defining’ function. Here the border is directly experienced through the control of state welfare provision and education and so on (see also Brenner, 2004, p.29). Arguably embodied in the concept of a ‘container model of society’ (Beck, Bonss, Lau, 2003, p.1), this paradoxical neglect, or downplaying, refers to a general ‘taken-for-granted’ approach to borders that, up until recently, has been traditionally employed within the broad disciplinary gamut of the social sciences.

The presumed tacit – society defining – importance of borders was deemed, in other words, to be a relatively unimportant constant and therefore sociologically and geopolitically static. Focusing on the social relations within territorial insides, many scholars, by definition, inadvertently relegated state borders to the periphery of states (see also, Walters, 2004) ². Within this logic of neglect, those living within borderlands, or in and around the violent and politically relevant ‘flashpoints’ of state border contestation, were taken to be the minority and the exception to the general geopolitical rule. A position strengthened, of course, by the seemingly outwardly, and increasingly, stable appearance of ‘European’ state borders post 1945 and particularly post 1989 (Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002, pp. 2-3). Ultimately, Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson (2002, pp. 3- 4) contend, the consolidation and institutionalisation of the social sciences as a discipline occurred at the same time, and thus mirrored, the consolidation and institutionalisation of state borders³. The ‘paradoxical’ irony here being that such concentrated focus on state centrism should, at the same time, render state borders apathetic, unimportant and even invisible.

Early border studies, then, concentrated on the empirical analysis and quantification of geopolitical borderlines and, in doing so, establishing correct

² Again, this is where borders, in part, become codified as a dividers and limits: “State borders were strengthened as states heavily regulated their national markets [...] The overriding metaphor of state borders as legitimate barriers prevailed” (O’Dowd, 2002, p.17). However, rather interestingly, while it has been argued that a certain aspect of globalization has reduced the importance of borders (to be further discussed), the upsurge of interest in the complexity of (state) borders has come to mirror somewhat the increased and accepted questioning of the traditional territorial state ‘container’ model as a ‘lowest common denominator’ unit of analysis (see Brenner, 2004).

³ Moreover, various ‘border friendly’ disciplines within the social sciences such as political geography, political anthropology and regional sociology, like the borders they wanted to study, were pushed to the periphery in the sense that they came to be defined as sub-disciplines (Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.4). Indeed you could argue that, even given the phenomenal increase in overlapping interest which serves to expand border studies as a general and distinct discipline - that is, containing a common disciplinary language (see Newman, 2003) - border studies is still nevertheless regarded as being a sub-discipline of the social and political sciences.

terminologies, particularly throughout the 20th century (Konrad and Nicol, 2008, p.24). Borders, here, become primarily understood as empirical and physically tangible manifestations of political territorial units, whereby the geopolitical borderline serves to contain state sovereignty and jurisdiction (See Prescott, 1965). Borders, on this thinking, become visible lines in space. Yet, even as far back as the 1950's, Richard Hartshorne (1950, p.100) noted that political geographers inherited core ideas from conventional physical geography often, somewhat problematically, resulting in the study of physical phenomena first in order to locate conclusions regarding human behaviour. Although primarily noted for his work on the contemporary characteristics of particular borderlines indicative of his contemporaries (Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p.40), Hartshorne's observation in many ways tacitly promotes the need to consider borders from different analytical perspectives. That is, perhaps, the need to at least equally take into account human behaviour, within and across political communities, as an analytical starting point to progress our understanding of border dynamics.

Sharing similar concerns, other scholars argued the need for more theoretically nuanced approaches, a call that can still be heard – and, as we shall see, contested – in contemporary border studies (see, for example, Newman, 2003a/b; Kolossov, 2005; Paasi, 2011). Writing at the end of the 1950's, Landis Kristof (1959, p.269. Cited in Konrad and Nicol, 2008, p.21) argued that, while thorough, border research lacked conceptual and theoretical understanding:

There exists a quite extensive literature dealing with the subject of frontiers and boundaries. There have been also successful attempts at classification and development of a proper terminology. Few writers, however, tackled the problem from a more theoretical point of view.

Vaughan-Williams (2009, p.39), echoing the point made above by Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson in relation to political borders being 'taken for granted', makes the point that a perceived lack of theory is perhaps understandable given the entrenched and dominant imaginary of the border as a geographical edge. This has led to the repeated call not only for more theory per se, but also the possibility, desirability, and/or consequences of a 'catchall' border theory. Newman (2001, p.137), for example, argued not too long ago that many (state) border studies have

“been descriptive and case study oriented and has not been translated to into the construction of meaningful boundary/border theory”. And Malcolm Anderson and Eberhard Bort (2001, p.13) have commented that “A general theory of frontiers has been a recurring intellectual temptation because boundary making seems to be a universal human activity”.

However, when analysing the progression of border studies in general terms, and focusing as we are on a perceived lack of border theorising, there is a danger of throwing the baby out with the bath water. It is right to continue to promote the constant need for theoretically nuanced studies of borders. Yet doing so should not ignore or reduce the significance of the different ways in which borders have been theorised as being much more than simply fixed geopolitical or territorial lines, particularly over the past decade or so. In the 1960’s, for example, the anthropologist Fredrik Barth discussed the ways in which borders could be cultural and socially constructed (See also Chapter Four). And, along the same lines, the likes of Julian Minghi and other geographers began to consider the relationships between natural and social landscapes within their analysis of borders (Vaughan-Williams, 2009). Indeed, as many scholars have noted, recent nuanced interest in borders – theoretical or otherwise – has been, in part at least, fuelled by earlier but perhaps still niggling arguments positing a borderless world (Newman, 2003; Kolossov, 2005; See also, Rumford, 2006), as well as the nature and direction of European integration (Donnan and Wilson, 1999). It is to these later studies that our attention now turns.

In many ways, critical, constructivist and post-structuralist ‘turns’ particularly in political geography have transformed the study of borders, as well as other disciplines across the social sciences. This shift of analytical and methodological direction reflects and acknowledges the ways in which borders have multiple meanings and functions, that the border as a concept cannot be reduced to a singular perspective, viewpoint or meaning. And, very much overlapping, perhaps one of the most important observations in border studies over recent years, a product these shifts, is to approach and observe borders as processes and not fixed lines. Border thinking, in other words, has seen a theoretical shift from ‘nouncing’ to ‘verbing’ (See, for example, Lapid, 2001) in the general sense that the study of processes (bordering)

is deemed more rewarding than the study of lines (borders in and of themselves)⁴. What follows, then, are some prominent approaches in the literature that capture nicely the ways in which border studies have moved away from the study of fixed lines, to embracing the multi-dimensional nature of borders.

Malcolm Anderson (1996, p.1), approaching the field from a historical and theoretical perspective, has described borders (or as he terms them frontiers⁵) as the basic political institution (See also Anderson, 2004, p.318). To this end Anderson (1996, p.1) argues: “no rule-bound economic, social or political life in complex societies could be organised without them”. To be sure, borders on this logic are very much instruments of the state and therefore symbolise state power and identity (See Anderson, 1996, p.1) yet, importantly, this is not to suggest that state borders are necessarily simply lines of separation. Anderson is critical of describing borders as ridged lines in space insomuch as political life is problematic to the extent that it is difficult to determine where one jurisdiction ends and another begins. He reminds us, following the discussion in Chapter One, that borders are not somehow part of a natural order of sovereign nation-states, but rather “different conceptions of the frontier as an institution existed before the modern sovereign state, and other kinds will emerge after its demise” (Anderson, 2004, p.319).

For Anderson borders are no longer only institutions insomuch as they are also processes. As institutions they are regulated by law and established by political decisions were the border becomes visible in its traditional form of territory demarcation representative of the organisational power structures of the state. As processes, however, Anderson argues that borders have four dimensions. First, perhaps not surprisingly, borders remain instruments of the state and are operated to their advantage (Anderson, 1996, p.2). In this way, although there is no simple relationship between inequalities of wealth and power and the border, states nevertheless seek to change the location and/or function of the border according to their own advantage (Anderson, 2004, p.319). Second, the state’s ability to control its borders enhances or impedes its policy-making capacities. And, third, borders are

⁴ The ‘processes’ approach - or placing primacy on bordering rather than borders is particularly influential in contemporary border studies. See, for example, van Houtum, Kramsch & Zierhofer (2005) ‘B/ordering Space’ in: van Houtum, H. Kramsch, O & Zierhofer, W. (eds) (2005) *B/ordering Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate. Or, for a Critical IR approach, see Albert, M. Jacobson, D. Lapid, Y (2001). *Identities, Borders, Orders*. Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press.

⁵ Note that Anderson uses the term ‘frontier’ to highlight the conceptual slippage and emptiness of the border as a concept (as also noted by Baader, 2011, p.1135).

markers of identity and form political and mythical beliefs about unity, heavily embedded in nationalism (Anderson, 1996, p.2), although Anderson has come to acknowledge that political identities can exist on micro as well as macro levels (Anderson, 2004, p.319). Fourth, and very much a continuation of the third point, borders are a term of discourse, as meanings are given to borders in general as well as specific borders, which change over time (Anderson, 1996, p.2). Indicative of his third and fourth dimensions of border processes, Anderson (2004, p.320) argues:

What frontiers are, and what they represent is constantly being reconstituted by human beings who are regulated, influenced and limited by them. But these reconstructions are influenced by political change and the often unpredictable outcome of great conflicts, against a background of technological change.

New, more critical, approaches have open up the possibility to bridge the gap between empirical observations of borders and theories which take into account non-empirical 'symbolic' or 'abstract' bordering practices by people. This form of *critical* geography (see Newman and Paasi, 1998; van Houtum, 2000) is not directly concerned with where the border lies insomuch as it is more concerned as to what the b/order means and what it represents to (different) people experiencing the border. More importantly the process of bordering in this way is concerned with the way in which such meaning is constructed, maintained, and reproduced. There is a move, therefore, away from concentrating on the territorial dividing line, to the way in which people experience borders through constructing their own 'insides' and 'outsides', and such a move sees the border as a space in which these identity dynamics can play out.

Paasi and Newman, both together and individually, are particularly interested in the processes through which territorial identities are constructed and reconstructed anew. Paasi's work concerns borders/boundaries as forming part of the practices and narratives of the construction and governance of social groups and their identities (Paasi, 2005). He is particularly interested in the relationships between borders/boundaries and identity construction and maintenance. "Boundaries are means of and media for organizing social spaces", Paasi (2005, p.28) argues, "where the questions of power, knowledge, agency and social structure become crucial".

Indeed, for Paasi, in a globalising world – a world of flows – borders are no longer material, at least in their traditional guise as material limits, inasmuch as they are social process and practices. Newman outlines the overlapping categorisations of borders as institutions through which internal rules are created and inclusion and exclusion is governed, as well as borders as processes, where the bordering process creates order the construction and maintenance of difference. Creating a multidisciplinary space for border studies requires increased focus on the following: boundary demarcation, boundary management, transition zones and borderlands, border perceptions, boundary opening and removal and borders and power relations. For Newman (2006, p.151) to study the spatiality of the line is key to uncovering reciprocal relationships between identities, borders, and orders:

It is the transition from the study of the line per se to the social and spatial functions of those lines as constructs that defines the nature of inclusiveness and exclusiveness, which would appear to characterize the contemporary debate concerning boundaries and borders...The point of contact is to be found where ethnic and national groups desire to erect their new borders and fences of separation but at the same time benefit from the permeability of boundaries in the economic and information spheres of activity, in other words, the forces of globalization.

Both Newman and Paasi (1998, p.194) have discussed the ways in which borders are constitutive of social action and, as such, are not only barriers but also “sources of motivation”. They argue, like Anderson, that borders and importantly their meanings are historically contingent, and, even if they are arbitrary lines between states “they may also have deep symbolic, cultural, historical, and religious, often contested meanings for social communities. They manifest themselves in numerous social, political and cultural practices” (Newman and Paasi, 1998, p.188). Borders, in this sense, are social constructs. This is very much indicative of the ways in which geographers began to observe borders at this particular time. While other disciplines such as IR concentrated on relations between states, or for some the deconstruction of territorial lines, geographers observed the changing meanings of these lines and, in doing so, their social construction.

The work of van Houtum has also been at the forefront of critical, post-structural, approaches to the study of borders. Situated within the methodological 'areas' of critical, political and economic geography, as well as predominantly focusing on 'European borders', much of van Houtum's work is concerned with the ways in which borders order social space and produce difference. To this end, often summed up through processes (and the language) of 'Othering', more emphasis is placed upon the social process of bordering as opposed to geopolitical lines' or borders 'in and of themselves', although the former is not studied at the expense of the latter. Van Houtum and van Naerssen (2002, p.125), for example, have described bordering as "relating to practices of othering", which in this specific instance, is framed in terms of economic or liberal bordering and the resultant conditions/issues of "(im) mobility". For van Houtum and van Naerssen (2002, p.134), processes of bordering, ordering and othering - of constructing difference - is "intrinsically territorial" and guided by "normatively debatable decision making processes", presumably incorporating different levels of governance. Ultimately, the construction of difference through 'othering' forms our current image of borders, an image that requires constant critical evaluation. The construction of otherness is integral to the construction of borders and directly implicated in the process of forming borders. Otherness, in other words, is a requirement of border construction and, as such, is constantly reproduced to maintain the semblance of order and stability of territorially demarcated society.

Through placing emphasis on the socially constructed nature of borders, van Houtum also posts that borders do not necessarily manifest in material terms, as actual things, but can be imagined, mental, borders. In other words the border, for van Houtum (2005) on this reading, is located as the outcomes of people's need to make differences which allows borders to become simulacra, to be the product of imagination, and to become invisible in non-material ways. Van Houtum and Struver (2002, p.142), for example, argue that borders do not necessarily require material fences or watchtowers, but rather a 'bounded entity' also creates borders through the construction of strangeness and otherness that is always imagined but never present. To this end, in relation to economic borders and bordering, van Houtum (2002) has also argued that non-material borders/bordering - that is the bordering/capturing of assets - can manifest in the production of space within which wealth is shared. Put differently, it is solidarity, and not solely wealth, that becomes bordered and, in the

process, a way of distinguishing ourselves socially within social space is generated. This is also indicative of van Houtum and Pijpers' (2007) notion of the EU as a 'gated community'. Therefore, "overcoming borders", van Houtum and Struver (2002, p.142) argue, "is mainly about overcoming the socially constructed imaginations of belonging to a certain place and of the need for a spatial fixity".

Rather interestingly, van Houtum (2005, p.676) has emphasised the importance of (and need for a return to) the 'why' of borders in border studies⁶. This assertion is positioned as a 'complementary' criticism of what he has identified as a tendency in modern border studies to overtly focus on the (bottom-up) social construction/narration (and re-construction/narration) of particular (state) borders⁷ - in other words a tendency that emphasises a post-structurally influenced 'how' of borders (van Houtum, 2005, p.676). van Houtum argues that border studies as a general discipline has satisfied an inherent and instinctive need to move away from positing borders as ontologically fixed and natural, hence the way in which 'contemporary' studies predominantly posit borders as ontologically man-made, rooted in processes of representation, performance, language and identification (see also Williams, 2006, p.6). On this logic the general move away from theorising borders as 'natural' was achieved at the expense of studying the nature of borders - a situation that arguably still exerts tacit influence over the literature. The solution, suggests van Houtum, is to proactively balance the question of 'how' with the (re-introduced) question of 'why', that is, to correctly argue that borders are not fixed and natural 'in and of themselves', while at the same time equally focusing on the nature of borders. In this way the frequent and extremely useful focus on the social construction of borders "could be widened to open up for a debate on alternative ways to produce territories and spatialise our social lives" (van Houtum, 2005, p.678).

Nicely capturing the ways in which border are not simply imposed lines, anthropologists Donnan and Wilson have observed the ways in which different groups

⁶ Within the general context of the 'why' of border studies van Houtum (2005, p.676) posits the following "important and thought provoking questions": Why does humankind produce borders? Is the b/ordering of space in any way intrinsic from a biological point of view or it is merely a strategic choice than can be put on and off? What precisely drives the seemingly persistent human motivation to call a territory one's or our own, to demarcate property, to make an ours here and theirs there, and to shield it off against the socio-spatially constructed and constitutive Them, the Others. Is the desire for the construction of a socio-spatial (id)entity necessary or avoidable for humankind? See also Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2002; Boer, 2006 for alternative calls for the question of why in border studies.

⁷ My use of the word 'particular' in this context reflects the way in which specific borders/borderlands tend to form the basis of contemporary border research, as opposed to the study of borders in a general or perhaps more abstract sense.

may carry out border narration. That is, the ways in which different groups impose their own border meanings particularly within borderlands⁸. This in turn can act to either reinforce or destabilise the national border in question in relation to other groups who also narrate the border. They use the border between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland as a case study, and point to the diverse graffiti, used by the different groups and communities to territorialize the border, that has accumulated over the years. Thus, visitors, locals, and indeed the soldiers that once inhabited the border region have been, and still are, surrounded by symbols of resistance branded on bridges, government building and on the side of housing estates in the form of the famous murals (Donnan and Wilson, 1999, p.75). In this way, the border is imposed by state actors, but is in turn narrated by those living within its vicinity in a multitude of different ways. Moreover, while the traditional securitised border has, in many places at least, been dismantled, the border is still present through its absence remaining through processes of discourse and narration which can symbolise change and progress as well as negative connotations attributed to division.

Finally, another prominent thinker to consider is Etienne Balibar⁹, who has alluded to the difficulty of defining borders in the general sense, as there is no universal essence that that can be attributed to all places or experiences in all time periods. Balibar (2004, p.1) states:

The term border is extremely rich in significations...The borders of new sociopolitical entities, in which an attempt is being made to preserve all the functions of the sovereignty of the state, are no longer entirely situated at the outer limit of territories; they are dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people, and things is happening and is controlled—for example, in cosmopolitan cities.

The idea that borders permeate society has increasing currency within the border studies literature particularly concerning issues of border securitisation. While Paasi

⁸ To this end Donnan and Wilson describe borders as having three elements: The legal borderline, officially separating states; the physical structures of the state, composed of institutions and people who act to protect it and subsequently may penetrate deeply into the territory of which the border demarcates; and territorial zones which extend across and away from the state border, creating sites of identity behaviour in relation to the nation-state in question (Donnan and Wilson, 1998, p.9).

⁹ Rumford (2008) has pointed out that Balibar's extensive work in the area of border studies is somewhat underutilised in that it is often mentioned only in passing.

hints at the ways in which national bordering/boundary processes can be present throughout society, that is, at locations away from the traditional territorial edge, Balibar observes mechanisms of exclusion being increasingly scattered throughout society. Balibar (2006, p.3) is concerned with the following questions: who surveys the border, and for whom? Who crosses the border, or not? How can paradoxical border-effects such as enclosing outside and liberating inside walls be explained? It is to this end Balibar introduces to the discussion three equivocal aspects of borders.

The first aspect, termed *overdetermination*, refers to the relative nature of borders. He states (2002, p.79). In other words local borders can be intrinsically connected to other-global-geographical divisions that change through time: borders can represent more than the divisions between states, as borders have the potential to create separations and categorisations between people on a global level (2002, p.79). Again the obvious example here is the Berlin Wall, built as a physical barrier across the city of Berlin it nevertheless came to symbolise the ideological division between two ideological 'worlds' of east and west. The resulting 'overdetermined' border became a border experienced thousands of miles away from its physical locality. Although Balibar (2006, p.2) mentions the wall was essentially built by the communist regimes in order to deny their own citizens the 'right to escape'. Therefore, the symbolism and meaning of the border extends out across other territories and spaces.

The second aspect, what Balibar calls the *polysemic* character of borders, refers to the idea that borders represent different things to different people. However, rather than have meanings imposed on the border as suggested by Anderson and Donnan and Wilson, Balibar (2002, p.82) asserts that, on the one hand borders are designed to give individuals who enter the border area an example of the law and civil administration, while on the other hand they actively differentiate on the basis of social class. As we shall see, the polysemic nature of borders, along side the idea that borders are everywhere, is particularly indicative of the direction border studies has taken of late, particularly in terms of securitisation. Borders thus actively discriminate-no longer necessarily in terms of social class-in terms of those who are generally deemed desirable, such as (in a European or western context) business men and women, and academics and so on, while on the other hand preventing the 'crossing' of those deemed undesirable. Specific mechanisms, applications, and implications of this thought within the literature will be discussed in due course.

The third and final aspect, the *heterogeneity* of borders, implies that borders are becoming more diffuse in the sense that they no longer constitute the site in which politics, culture and socioeconomics coincide, successfully achieved by nation-states. Borders are no longer necessarily situated at the border (Balibar, 2002, p.84), indeed, as Balibar (1998, p.217) has previously stated in relation to Europe, borders can be so diffuse to the extent that while “most of the areas, nations and regions that constitute Europe had become accustomed to thinking that they had borders, more or less “secure and recognised,” but they did not think they were borders”. More of this ‘spatiality’ aspect shortly, but importantly for Balibar the traditional relationships between the state and its supposed territory and (national) identity is changing under conditions of globalization processes, leading not to borderless world, but a world in which borders are increasingly frequent. “borders are both multiplied and reduced in their localisation and their function”, Balibar (1998, p.220) tells us, “they are being thinned out and doubled, becoming border zones, regions, or where one can reside and live”.

This ambiguity of borders, therefore, amounts to the polysemic and heterogeneity of borders. Borders mean different things to different people and can amount to some borders being visible to some whilst being invisible to others. This is particularly pertinent when theorising borders as being heterogeneous, that is, present throughout society. In this vein Chris Rumford, who has arguably engaged with Balibar more directly than other scholars working on borders, takes issue with the three aspects of borders in terms of the following overlapping points. The overdetermination of borders-which Rumford argues has much more purchase in the cold war-requires that there must be a shared understanding as to where the important borders are situated. For example in the cold war the major players and blocs recognised exactly where the division between east and west fell. “Both sides had a common understanding”, Rumford (2008, p.40-1) argues, “both of what constituted an important border and hierarchy of borders that existed to divide the world”. This is much the same as Balibar’s idea of polysemic borders. Borders may mean different things to different people, but the idea still relies on the border being recognised equally by all concerned (Rumford, 2008, p.42). Rumford argues that a striking feature of the world today is that borders can be invisible to some whilst being visible to others, in other words, the border, as Rumford (2008, p.42) puts it, “may not appear as a border to all concerned”. The border may be very visible to those who are being

bordered out, but not be recognised as such by the majority of the population. This brings the discussion to the topic of global borders and globalization theory more generally.

Borders in an age of globalization

So far the chapter has focused on the shift from description to theory and borders to bordering within the study of borders. Much of the work focusing on the social construction of borders, their relation to the construction and reconstruction of meaning and difference, and their polysemic nature, has occurred in an era of so-called globalization. What follows, therefore, is an attempt to observe borders more specifically under conditions of what are commonly and generally considered to be globalization processes, with an aim to understand how borders fit into, and how they operate within, a global framework.

Clearly, a border that has been overdetermined has, by definition, a predominant global aspect. In the first instance, while the idea of overdetermination lends itself to cold war geopolitics – a geopolitics framed in terms of Waltz's (2001) structural realism – there remain overlapping notions of the concept of global borders – or hyper-borders (Romero, 2008) – in which certain borders can be observed/examined at the global level. In a comprehensive and in many ways unusual study of the US/Mexico border¹⁰, for example, Fernando Romero's (2008, p.16) states "the US-Mexico border has the potential to provide useful insight for how to manage borders elsewhere in the world", adding, "tactics piloted along the US-Mexico border that prove to positively influence the region's conditions could therefore potentially be utilized as models for the rest of the world". Yet, even though the concept of overdetermination may imply it, Balibar is careful to move away from traditional border imagery. In the context of European borders, Balibar (2004) cautions against the illusion whereby borders manifest as lines and edges,

¹⁰ Romero's work here details the US/Mexico border through a rich tapestry of maps, charts and interviews with academics and various personnel working at the border, all presented in a graphical and stylised way. The fact that Romero is an architect perhaps best explains this somewhat unconventional, but nuanced, approach to studying the border. In many ways, this keys into the discussion above, in the previous section, which focused on the fact that the border, as a subject matter in and of itself, increasingly lends itself as an important object of study from many diverse disciplines (see Romero, F. (2008) *Hyper-border: The Contemporary U.S.-Mexico Border and its Future*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press).

instead suggesting that we (Europeans) are increasingly situated in the midst of a “ubiquitous and multiple border, which establishes unmediated contacts with all parts of the world – a world-border” – albeit a world-border with distinctly European histories, geographies and politics.

The ambiguity of ‘the line’, particularly in an age of globalization, has occupied scholars, particularly from IR, who sought to problematise the dominant, and taken for granted, starting point logic of the (state) border as a territorial container – or, put differently, the structural territorialization of space (Agnew, 1994). In terms of globalization, the point was made that territorial states are not fixed and static, and that the supposed, or assumed, distinction between inside and outside is not so distinct. International Relations came to represent space as clearly defined territorial boundaries, and in doing so, disregarded other spatial scales such as the local and the global (Agnew, 1994, p.55). Thus social relations taking place within the state is seen to be the focus of political theory, and, as such, relations between states become the focus of IR (see Walker, 1993). Therefore, many of the debates revolve around the issues of state territorial transformation and important associated issues such as citizenship and national identity. Such thinking also coincides with recent upsurge in the securitization literature, which in many ways, in terms of border studies, incorporates the above-mentioned debates.

Rarely simply impenetrable barriers designed to keep things in or out, many (state) borders are increasingly akin to permeable asymmetric membranes (Hedetoft, 2003, p. 153): borders that unevenly and disproportionately channel inward and outward flows of information, goods and particularly people. These membrane-like borders are not necessarily confined to the territorial limits of the state, or even at other traditional points of entry such as train stations and airports (membranes are typically described as flexible as well as porous); they are unfixed and mobile, diffused throughout, within and outside the state (see Rumford, 2006; Walters, 2006; Vaughan-Williams, 2008). They are, as Etienne Balibar has stated numerous times, “dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people, and things is happening and is controlled” (Balibar, 2004, p. 1; see also Guild, 2005). The primacy placed upon mobility and permeability, not just in terms of the mobilities crossing the border (migrant labour, tourists, citizens), but the actual border itself, is

striking¹¹.

On this logic, the process of bordering becomes a kind of mobility management business that is located throughout and beyond the state, where securitisation and protection does not categorically mean ‘closing the door’ but rather continued, and indeed, increased focus on mobility, categorisation and thus control. In other words, the border becomes a portal that depends upon the movement of goods and people (Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p. 4), while securitisation no longer emphatically implies the power to ‘keep out’ in the physical sense, but to categorise and indeed re-categorise conducted within the wider, yet increasingly less important, context of the threat of exclusion.

Indicative of this Peter Andreas (2003, p. 78), for example, suggests simply “more intensive border law enforcement is accompanying the de-militarization and economic liberalization of borders “. In other words, while predominantly western borders seem to be less significant in a hardened military sense, allowing for greater cross border flows, they are in fact becoming (remaining) securitised in more subtle ways. While it was the military as well as economic regulation that usually had strong border connotations, both protecting territory and symbolizing state power in traditional ways, a fundamental shift to policing has caused a reconfiguration of the border: it is becoming less militarised as such, and more a site of stringent law enforcement. Crucially, policing cross border flows in this way becomes a form of border control because the new goal of policing is to ‘*selectively* deny territorial access’ (Andreas, 2003, p. 78 emphasis added), or, perhaps more pertinently, access to rights and dominant identities.

Therefore, according to Andreas (2003, p. 107) the reconfiguration of the border

[h]as involved creating new and more restrictive laws; constructing a more expansive policing and surveillance apparatus that increasingly reaches beyond physical borderlines; promoting greater cross-border police cooperation and use of neighbours as buffer zones; deploying more sophisticated detection technologies and information systems; redefining law enforcement concerns as

¹¹ To add weight to this position, the UK home office stated in 2002: “One of these is clearly the perception that Britain is a stable and attractive place in which to settle. This view arises not simply because of our buoyant and successful economy, and the employment opportunities it has brought, but also because the universality of the English language and global communication flows mean that millions of people hear about the UK and often aspire to come here” (Home Office, 2002).

security concerns; and converting war-fighting agencies, technologies, and strategies to carry out crime fighting missions

Illustrative of thinking, the UK government in particular has begun to integrate and consolidate agencies that traditionally had separate border remits such as the creation of the new UK Border Agency, as well as promoting close ties with the police force. The UK Cabinet Office (2007) has stated:

Whatever the long term proposals for policing the border, close collaboration between the new organisation and the police will be crucial [...] The police balance their role at the ports with their wider territorial responsibilities, and respond rapidly as threats move between the border and inland within their regions

Again, particularly in the context of globalization generally put, emphasis is placed upon movement as threats move between the border and inland within their regions. Didier Bigo notes that internal and external security is denoted through the notion of the 'enemy within', the 'outsider inside' which becomes inexplicably linked with the now 'catch all term 'immigrant'. Thus "the outsiders are insiders", Bigo (2001, p. 112) argues, because "the lines of who needs to be controlled are blurred". The blurring of the line can also involve, and be indicative of, the movement of the line, as asymmetric and membrane-like borders become more and more intimately connected to movement. This movement of borders can also be a way to move beyond or reformulate the logic of inside/outside. Three intriguing examples can be extracted from the literature (remote control; citizen-surveillance and juxtaposed borders), in order to expand on the ways in which changing mobility is affecting the spatiality of borders. The following examples are borders in that they monitor and scrutinise the mobility of individuals. Yet crucially without the literal physicality of movement 'across them' they stop being borders.

First, then, certain states have enacted a strategy of privatisation of their border practices and processes such as surveillance and in many respects border policing, albeit within the confines of strict state control and guidance. Often called 'remote control' (Lahav and Guiraudon, 2000), truck drivers that frequent major transport routes across Europe, usually destined for the UK, are being encouraged to

repeatedly check their cargo for illegal immigrants using increasingly sophisticated methods commonly found at traditional border sites (Walters, 2006, p. 194), long before reaching and crossing the line demarcating UK territory.

Second, citizens themselves can be said to be undertaking bordering practices, such as downloading pictures of wanted suspects onto mobile phones, or being provided with phone numbers to ring if a suspected or suspicious person is identified. In this way Nick Vaughan-Williams conceptualises the notion of the 'citizen-detective', thus placing ideas of citizenship within the context of the 'war on terror' (Vaughan-Williams, 2008, p. 63). He argues that the use of the citizen-detective, through such schemes as the 'Life Savers' anti-terrorist hotline in London (basically a phone number that can be stored on mobile devices and dialled if the user deems someone acting suspiciously), redefines the position of the border as well as explaining its proliferation. In this way, connected to surveillance practices, borders remain "a site where a control takes place on the movement of subjects" (Vaughan-Williams, 2008, p. 63).

In similar vein, it seems supermarket checkout staff are being trained to recognise abnormal practices. Put simply, supermarket checkout staff are being instructed to be on the lookout for the 'extremist shopper' supposedly in the business of buying, for example, extreme quantities of toiletries or food stuffs, which could be used in the development of explosives (Goodchild and Lashmare, 2007. Referenced in: Rumford, 2008, p. 1). In this respect Chris Rumford suggests: '...the supermarket checkout now resembles a border crossing or transit point where personal possessions, goods and identities are routinely scrutinised' (Rumford, 2008, p. 1). In slightly different, but connected example, UK Border Agency is now vetting Universities up and down the country to prevent bogus application claims as a means of entering mainland Britain. Colleges that want to recruit 'overseas'-non EU-students now face tougher checks and greater controls throughout the application process, and students will require a biometric identity card. The list of colleges, previously held by the, now disbanded, Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills, is now run by the UK Border Agency, which demands that colleges and other institutions have to re-apply to be on their new 'approved list' (BBC News, 2009)

Third, the UK has already enacted with gusto what it calls juxtaposed borders. In other words UK border control is now present in Brussels and Paris, and in reciprocal fashion, the French border control is present at St Pancras Eurostar terminal

in London. Such border rationale is particularly endorsed because it is seen as both a securitisation strategy as well as a means of stemming the ‘perceived’ wave of ‘illegal’ immigrants heading for the UK. Again the Home Office states:

Juxtaposed controls in France and Belgium have contributed to a 70 percent reduction in unfounded asylum claims since 2002. The juxtaposed process is an excellent example of what we can achieve when we work with our European partners (Home Office, 2007).

A major development in the supposed fluidity of the border, something that perhaps incorporates and keys into border spatiality described above, is the e-border. On the one hand e-borders fix and subsequently screen identity, while at the same time the biometric border becomes itself mobile, as Louise Amoore alludes: ‘in effect, the biometric border is the portable border par excellence, carried by mobile bodies at the very same time as it is deployed to divide bodies at international boundaries, airports, railway stations, on subways or city streets, in the office or the neighbourhood’ (Amoore, 2006, p. 338). Again, borders here are mobile, dispersed throughout society wherever they are needed; they are a far cry from the static geopolitical borders that provide much needed national and territorial identity. Biometric borders are in many ways still lines on the map, but cannot be compared to physical lines (Epstein, 2007, p. 116). In other words: ‘they are no longer the classic portals of sovereignty, where power was exerted by granting or withholding access at the gate (Epstein, 2007, p. 116). On the other hand, ‘borders are strengthened and sovereignty is reinvigorated, albeit reworked’ (Epstein, 2007, p. 116) by the very implication and effectiveness of biometric management and e-borders. Moreover, biometric borders and e-borders do not just channel the movement of people across the border insomuch as they mould mobilities into pre-determined categories that are based upon racialised stereotyping (Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p. 15). These in turn become incorporated into ideas of pre-emption, in other words equipping borders to be able to ‘act early’, before suspected individuals reach the territorial border.

Therefore, securitised borders as described no longer necessarily plot a geopolitical or territorial boundary line indicating the periphery of territorial entities; the border has become spatial, diffuse and mobile. Moreover, their reliance on mobility- in terms of their scrutiny of mobile bodies, which in turn creates the

movement of the border itself-is the 'lifeblood' of the border. Without movement, these borders no longer exist as borders, manifest as they do within a particular time and place. Particularly within the dominant discourse of securitisation, re-bordering (or the formation of new borders) better suggests a transformation of borders-a re-bordering of borders themselves-in the sense that the very success and effectiveness of these new borders actually relies upon their ambiguity as non-lines in the strict geopolitical sense.

The traditional, fixed, border is being made increasingly visible through new uniforms and signage, what Walters has called domopolitics that is fixed and rational conceptualisation of a home (Walters, 2004), while at the same time borders are becoming less visible, unfixed, mobility-requiring membrane-like. Those borders that constantly require movement are increasingly inhabiting what Rumford (2008a, p. 639) has called 'spaces of wonder', particularly those overseas. Their low visibility perceives them to be different, untrustworthy and ineffectual-not border-like at all-prompting the construction of traditional, fixed and more visible border forms. In other words 'spaces of wonder' become domesticated and familiarised (Rumford, 2008a, p. 642), the more government opt for less visible border options, the more it has to instigate traditional, more familiar and increasingly visible borders in equally familiar places. On this reading the blurring of the demarcating 'line' needs to be constantly readdressed in visible and tangible terms. The visible border becomes an act of display by the state aimed at the public 'audience' (de Lint, 2008), which is needed to rectify the problem of the states supposedly increasingly visible lack of sovereignty. Willem de Lint sums this up: 'the border is a site, *par excellence*, for the staging of such performances. It looks like it can stop further interpretations on security, and then *it looks like* it looks like it does' (de Lint, 2008, p. 167). This reproduces traditional binaries that act to legitimate the need for borders 'elsewhere'; the visible border produces the spectacle of meaning by imposing simple categories upon mobilities.

Yet, given the ways in which state borders have been transformed into surveillance oriented and thus processes orientated mechanisms of control, mobility, it has been argued, brings about other transformations which effect the border. For example, asymmetric and membrane-like borders thrive upon categorising and sub-categorising, and thus creating, workers, students, tourists, and terrorists. Sandro Mezzadra has identified two faces of citizenship, the first institutional and the second

social, and describes the second as being “a combination of political and practical forces that challenge the formal institutions of citizenship’ (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2003, p. 22).

Moreover, in this second sense, the question of citizenship raises that of subjectivity (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2003, p. 22). Thus, alluding to the second face of citizenship, migratory movements are themselves a form of citizenship that challenge the borders-in this sense, fixed and ridged-of the traditional, institutionalised, first face of citizenship. In other words, this citizenship does not conform to the institutions that want to monitor and regulate movement, it is a citizenry that thrives upon movement (Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos, 2008, p. 220). The mobility of mobilities makes bordering impossible in the sense that certain border rationales are reconfigured along the lines of mobility themselves, and as such the difficulty of bordering institutionalised citizenship becomes increasingly visible. In a way, citizenship becomes less connected to the state, as other forms of citizenship are legitimised by the states lack control and resulting in the use of asymmetric membranes in order to allow differential access to institutionalised citizenship.

Global borders

It is clear, then, that borders are still very much part and parcel of our contemporary global condition. It is apparent, as much as can be shown in the context of the chapter, that under the umbrella of globalization, borders are being observed as very much connected to mobility inasmuch as they channel mobility and in doing so become mobile themselves. The increased frequency of people on the move forms a dominant processes attributed to contemporary globalization and rather than simply overcoming border – traversing them with ease – mobilities have become integrally intertwined with borders and vice versa. Indeed, rather than mobility being detrimental to borders it is increasingly recognised that borders generate new kinds of mobility, actively facilitating ‘goods’ and filtering out the ‘bads’ (Cooper and Rumford, 2011). When summing up the common threads that run through both sections above, it seems that the borders – or more accurately bordering – on offer are predominantly state borders. Territoriality may go through a constant, if at times

viscous, processes of 'de and re-territorialization, borders may be asymmetric and network-like, but they are predominantly state borders nevertheless. In general terms this may not be a problem, but part of the argument presented here are the ways in which different borders can be in effect global and facilitate connection. The remainder of the debate considers how borders can be global in ways that not simply subsumed into mobility. Indeed, a particular aspect of the overall thesis argument presented in the previous chapter was to consider the ways in which borders as mechanisms of connection facilitate different forms of mobility. While building upon the previous two sections, what follows in this section effectively establishes the framework within which borders as mechanism of connection can be conceptualised and theorised.

As we have seen, borders have been directly and indirectly theorised in relation to the global or globalization, at the very least in terms of the fact that borders now constitute a rich subject matter, arguably more so than they ever have done in the past. In their excellent article, in which they put forward their research agenda outlined in the previous section, Newman and Paasi (1998), for example, talk about border (fences and neighbours) in a postmodern word, to which end they put forward a six point agenda for border studies, capturing the shift from object to process discussed earlier:

1. Geographical studies of boundaries should reinsert the spatial dimension of these phenomena more explicitly back into the discussion.
2. Geographers should become more aware of the multidimensional nature of boundary studies.
3. The implications of creating or removing boundaries should be understood through a multicultural perspective.
4. States and other territorial entities, as well as their boundaries, are not static. Boundaries studies should be approached historically as part of a dynamic process, rather than as a collection of unrelated unique case studies.

5. The idea of nature should be expanded within the context of boundaries. Nature can be understood equally as a physical, environmental and/or ideological construct.
6. The study of narratives and discourse is central to an understanding of all types of boundaries, particularly state boundaries.

Recently, too, Rumford (2010) guest edited a special issue directly on the topic of global borders. The purpose of this special issue, the very need for a special issue, is to move away from the dominant debates, part of which has been described in the previous section, but also includes the notion of global borderlands and ‘overdetermined’ – world dividing – borders described in the first section. Rumford (2010, p.951) essentially argues that the current thinking on *global* borders needs further consideration, and in this regard some points are made.

Current thinking on global borders, Rumford (2010, p.952) argues, relies on a simplistic idea of globalization, a point that is also indicative of current debates elsewhere that take issue with the dominance of ‘flow-speak’ when describing globalization. For Rumford any debate concerning global borders must take into account the complexity and multidimensional nature of globalization, whereby the world is not an easily divided whole, to be potentially overcome by powerful and external global forces. Rumford also makes the point that considering the global equally in terms of borders allows greater scope for a multidisciplinary border studies and, in doing so, points out some common threads which are paraphrased below¹²:

- Focusing on global borders adds a new important ingredient to border studies, requiring scholars to rethink or clarify how we should best study borders, their nature and interconnectedness.
- There is a need to emphasise the lived experience of the border, rather than generalise/theorise about the nature of borders, which maybe at odds with geopolitical imaginaries, and increasingly involve local/global relationships.

¹² Paraphrased from: (Rumford, 2010, pp.952-953).

- Very much connected, global borders provide opportunities for people to make remake borders in bottom-up fashion, based upon a reduction in the dependency on the state the current era of globalization.
- Global borders are tailored and deployed as tools of global governance, reflecting the connection between borders and mobilities as opposed to geopolitical borders.
- Exploration of global borders enables us to see the borders 'buried' by nation state borders for example, colonial borders or borders of religious communities.

Rumford makes a final point in relation to global borders that is best not to paraphrase and quote directly, given that it is a point that links global borders to processes of connection.

The dichotomous border (us/them, inside/outside) is too simplistic. As well as marking boundaries and divisions, borders are also the site of encounters and connectivity. Studying global borders represents an opportunity to explore an under researched dimension of bordering: the ways in which borders work to connect, as well as divide, the world. In this sense, consideration of global borders opens up border studies to new challenges, new approaches, and new core issues (Rumford, 2010, p.953).

Before moving directly onto the last theme touching upon connection, it is worth briefly discussing the thrust of the papers that make up the special issue. The reason being, as Rumford acknowledges, that the idea of or agenda for global borders outlined here remains general and wide ranging, with discussions and examples often directly reflecting the debates the special wished to deviate away from.

For example O'Dowd seeks to 'qualify' in a particular way the relationship between borders and globalization, which places primacy on the state. Globalization is not antithetic to borders and, for O'Dowd, the complex reality of state borders - as well as the subsequent ways in which they can be used as an analytical lens - assigns

state borders a global function. Thus “[C]ontemporary state borders” argues O’Dowd (2010, p.1031), “are the primary global borders in the sense that, few, if any, other borders, have attained comparable levels of globalised and institutionalised recognition”. In other words, compared to other border variations, state borders are the most recognised and accepted “dividers of world space” (O’Dowd, 2010, p.1031). Indeed, this global recognition also facilitates institutionalised forms of communication - albeit tempered by geopolitical proximities, state power, size and wealth, and membership to regional blocks - which defines the inter-state system writ global (O’Dowd, 2010, p.1032). In many ways O’Dowd is looking to temper the role of globalization in relation to borders, at least terms not allowing borders to become wholly mobile to the point where they either lack agency or somehow assume ultimate agency.

O’Dowd argues that, somewhat paradoxically, contemporary border studies, heavily influenced by studies of globalization, has increasingly discredited the primacy of state borders. The crux of this argument posits that, while useful, this line of thinking endorses a particular historical narrative in which we now find ourselves in a post-modern (post nation-state) condition where state borders are not abolished or even in decline, but reduced to being one of many. Summing up this particular aspect of contemporary border studies, O’Dowd (2010, p.1032) suggests:

“While this literature usefully points to many of the ways in which contemporary state borders are being reconfigured, it tends to obscure and downgrade the multi-dimensionality, distinctiveness and globality of state borders. It draws excessively and selectively on the experience of a few large states, notably in Western Europe; it discounts the global significance of a changing inter-state *system* comprising a great diversity of states, in terms of size, resources and historical trajectory and it underestimates the multi-dimensionality and flexibility of states’ infrastructural power and its territorialising thrust”.

For O’Dowd (2010, p.1032), placing other borders “above, below and beside the state” not only reduces the distinctiveness and multidimensionality of state borders, but also their globality. Such thinking ultimately ‘denies history’ to varying degrees because the traditional, ideal, historically inaccurate model of the state is reinforced

and/or reaffirmed - a particular model that, as previously discussed, has been rejected by many border scholars stemming different disciplines. This particular state/border model, in other words, state borders remain a conceptual reference point, an exemplar from which border change, or even decline, can be measured (O'Dowd, 2010, p.1034)¹³. By definition, the supposed novelty of contemporary border change is over emphasised, privileged and reified, thus intrinsically denying the current rich diversity of states and, importantly, the continued influence of past and present empires.

O'Dowd questions the over privileging of non-state actors, that is, focusing on the ongoing process of bordering, as opposed to, for example, the logic of the border as an outcome - although O'Dowd by no means advocates concentrating solely on outcomes. Again, he argues that an exclusive focus on agency "can make the state as such disappear from the analysis altogether" (O'Dowd, 2010, p.1040), the reason here being that state borders are "outcomes rather than a set of practices". Borders, on this reading, become fluid and mobile, capable of being manipulated and reconfigured by agents to the point where they become too dilute for tangible analysis to take place (O'Dowd, 2010, p.1040). Indeed, for O'Dowd, the same can be said for general process approaches taken to the extremes, that is, wholly subsuming borders to bordering, to which end O'Dowd (2010, p.1040) argues:

A tendency to dissolve structure into process and agency implies a world of proliferating and fluid borders characterised by voluntarism, choice, mutable states and mobile borders – a perspective which obscures inherited structures that enable, constrain or channel contemporary boundary work.

In contrast, but in the same special issue, Olivier Kramsch (2010) looks to move away from top-down interpretations of territoriality. Focusing on the lived experience of borders, using the Rhine as a specific case in point, Kramsch is partly concerned with the role of agency in relation to border change, of the latent (political) possibilities contained within borders (this will be further discussion in Chapter Five). Thus for

¹³ As previously discussed, O'Dowd is particularly concerned with 'bringing history back in', that theorising borders and globalization all to often envisage simplified, historically inaccurate versions of the (nation) as being 'container-like' and organically linked to a nation. . In other words "contemporary border studies have failed to balance spatial analyses with an adequate historical analysis which recognises the way in which empires and national states, imperialism and nationalism, have mutually constituted each other" (O'Dowd, 2010, p.1032).

O'Dowd, the state border is dynamic and open to contestation, but for Kramsch (2010, p.1011) the specifics of this contestation remain opaque. Kramsch uses French historian Lucien Febvre's work as an analytical lens the scope of which does over concern this chapter. However the thrust of the argument is clear enough, that in relation to mainstream thinking on territorially, as described directly above and in previous sections, what is needed is the ability to interrogate from the standpoint that dissipates:

border territoriality as an autonomous theoretical object and concomitantly derives possibility from an understanding of border space in terms of a worlding that ceaselessly calls into question its own institutionalized power through confrontation with *difference*. This is what makes borders not merely expressions of state power but privileged sites [...] for the contradictory and eminently 'contestatory' politicization of space (Kramsch, 2010, p.1011).

The point here is to suggest that the idea or concept of the global border is very much contested, with various ideas of global borders often contradicting themselves. Returning to Rumford's final theme of connection outlined above, and indicative of many of the others, I want to focus on borders and connection in order to add another (perhaps contradictory layer) to the discussion. Placing borders directly in relation to processes of global connectivity brings much to the discussion on global borders. The final part of this chapter will focus on borders in relation to global studies, particularly in relation to local/global relationships.

For Scholte (2005, p.60) the term globality resonates spatially. Moreover, globality as a concept identifies the planet as whole as a field of social relations (ibid; see also Albrow, 1996), and social interaction takes place in and across 'transplanetry' spaces. The crux of this thinking for Scholte is that, while not all the time and in an uneven fashion, globality can nevertheless touch all aspects of social life. Globality, in this regard, manifests via communications, travel, production, markets, money, finance, global organizations, military, ecology, health, law and consciousness (Scholte, 2005, p.76). Crucially, for Scholte, this is not at the expense of territoriality - which still very much exists - but rather something that ignores, or does not require it, at least in its traditional form. Any end to territorialism, argues Scholte (2005, p76), will "not mark the start of globalism. More recently Bude and

Durrschmidt (2010) highlight a problem with this general position pointing out that it is a globalization without limits. They argue:

The spatial turn in globalization theory in our view has also fostered an understanding of a society without limits. Space is emptied out of its social significance in a world where any distance could potentially be compressed into co-presence. Access to global space then implies first of all a multiplication of options. Moreover, global space is predominantly seen as backdrop against which generalized projections of ‘constant availability’ and ‘technologically restored intimacy’ foster a vision of ‘omnipresence’ and ‘all-at-onceness’ (Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010, p.483).

Overall they argue instead for a globalization based upon an idea of being in the world that is rooted and integral to a commitment of lasting bonds. This keys into the ways in which border both connect as well as divide, whereby connection to the world is very much rooted to the earth, so to speak, to connection and commitments to immediate tangible others. This brings into focus debates concerning local/global relationships.

From the perspective of global studies, several authors are useful in that they offer relevant local/global imaginaries. Robertson’s (1992; 1994) particular notion of ‘glocalization’, for example, is useful because it disregards the idea that globalization is a macroscopic collection of forces, in favour of placing sociological emphasis on the ways in which globalization involves ‘real people’ and, importantly here, the networking of localities (See also, Kennedy, 2007). This is conceptualised within a definition of globalization whereby it becomes possible to think of the world as a single place. For Robertson the local and the global must not be considered separate, rather the local must be considered as being fundamentally part of the global. Glocalization is therefore, in a sense, a coming together of localities. Along the same lines¹⁴ Giddens (1996) talks directly about ‘distant localities’, a term I make use of to

¹⁴While I extract here for the purposes of my own argument what is eluded to be similar or overlapping imaginaries of local/global relationships, it must be noted that Robertson takes issue with Giddens on a number of points concerning the study of globalization. Most notably, Robertson makes the point that Giddens’ attempt to explain the current *world* system, rooted in his own social theory, is centred and framed in his wider discussion concerning the current *state* system (see Robertson, 1990, p.29). This cumulates in Giddens (1996) arguing that globalization is a modern phenomenon, an argument that Robertson forcefully refutes. While footnoted for the purposes of qualification, and to be touched

explain what borders connect to (see Chapter One), and which he employs to capture the ways in which local/global relationships are fundamentally entwined. To this end, Giddens (1996, p.64) defines globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa”.

Similarly Rosenau (2003) talks about ‘distant proximities’ in his book by the same name. According to Rosenau our everyday routines are becoming influenced by events from elsewhere rendering them, in effect, distant proximities. Indicative of the local/global relationships touched upon above, variations at one level are by definition linked to variations at other levels. In this way Rosenau (2003, p.xii) posits “what differentiates people today is not so much their commitment to conservative, liberal or radical perspectives as it is their orientations toward the near and distant worlds in which their lives are ensconced”. This thinking is also indicative of Ritzer’s (2003, p.199) position when he argues that the truly ‘local’ no longer exists inasmuch as the local should be better described as the glocal. To this end, “the glocal”, he argues “is an increasingly important source not only of cultural diversity, but also of cultural innovation” (Ibid).

It needs to be noted at this stage that the debates touched upon above do not in the first instance directly or by definition concern borders. At best borders become porous and secondary to the more dominant vertical and horizontal local/global relationships, and at worst they do not necessarily fit at all in relation to these imaginaries. Not purposely shunned, it seems that borders considered ‘in and of themselves’ are simply not the main subject of consideration here. But they should be. Local/global relationships have ramifications for borders and, perhaps more importantly, border transformations of the nature to be discussed in this chapter have important ramifications for local/global relationships. For example, the notion that everyday life is affected by distant proximities, as argued by Rosenau, potentially alludes to a reduction of the traditional border inasmuch as it loses its traditional capacity to regulate and determine the ‘division/distinction’ between inside/outside and local/global. Indeed, Rosenau purports a polycentric politics whereby a plethora of different global actors directly compete with one another, albeit some are more powerful than others (see also Chapter Five).

upon again in due course, this debate/argument does not affect the argument progressed in this or subsequent chapters.

For his part Giddens (1996) argues that the relationships occurring between the local and global levels are intrinsically dialectical. While localities share an intrinsic relationship with the global, they may nevertheless transform in ways that proceed to oppose the very ‘distant localities’ that instigated, influenced or shaped the transformation in the first instance. While both overlap, the latter point in particular keys into what Rumford (2006) has called ‘borderwork in the face of everyday fear’, whereby citizens or ‘ordinary people’ take it upon themselves to construct or bolster their own effective (local) borders as a consequence of no longer trusting the state to ‘border out’ external threats.

Of course, the purpose of this chapter, and thesis entire, is to directly locate borders within these local/global relationships and give them an active and dynamic role to play. In this regard the work of Ulrich Beck becomes a rich and useful resource to show how borders are not simply being weakened or strengthened in relation to global processes, but are rather becoming plural and horizontal. Beck (2002, p.19) alludes to a pluralisation of international borders, a ‘globalization from within’, causing disagreements over the drawing of borderlines, and what he views as the “axiom of the incongruity of borders”. Globalization, on this logic, brings into sharp relief state territorial border as the all-defining border. Rather, it is more accurate to take into account a multitude of overlapping state and non-state borders such as cultural, political and economic and so on. Bordering hierarchies, in other words, are levelled in the sense that state borders no longer become the all-defining catch all borders that define other borders. Therefore, placed against a backdrop of increased global interconnectedness and awareness, borders become increasingly challenged, constructed and legitimated anew across multiple scales. For Beck, Bonss and Lau, a product of reflexive modernization is that boundaries become multiplied, but, in doing so, cease to be given and instead become choices.

Another useful aspect of Beck work worth mentioning is the idea that borders are mobile patterns that facilitate overlapping loyalties. He states:

Borders arise not through exclusion but through particularly solid forms of ‘double inclusion’. Someone, for example, is part of a large number of circles and is circumscribed by *that*. (Sociologically speaking, it is quite obvious that, although this is not the only way in which borders can be conceived and lived, it may be an important way in the future). In the framework of inclusive

distinctions, therefore, borders are conceived and strengthened as mobile patterns that facilitate overlapping loyalties (Beck, p.51-52).

This is particularly interesting in relation to connection and borders. It focuses on the mobility of borders, that they are not limited to state territorial peripheries. And it captures the ways in which borders operate to bring together in the sense that border, on this logic, facilitate competing loyalties to different social interests. As we shall see, this mirrors somewhat White's notion of the interface, particularly in its extracted form, as it is utilised in this thesis (see Chapter Three).

Concluding remarks

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide the foundation for the next three chapters which will discuss individually aspects of border as mechanisms of connection. These individual aspects are rooted in the discussion presented in this chapter. First that borders should be better considered, and certainly approached in terms of analysis, as processes. This will be shown later (particularly Chapter Five) how borders are constructed and contested in order to control the nature of connection, that is, the identity that is connecting. Equally crucial is the relationship between borders, difference and Othering, as outlined by van Houtum and others. This relationship forms the basis for Chapter Three. The chapter has shown how borders are commonly conceptualised in relation to globalization. Far from being a borderless world, as is often now quoted, borders are becoming tools of governance in order to manage the mobile bodies that move across them. And, it has been observed too, that borders, via their relationship to mobility, are becoming mobile and in many ways unrecognisable as traditional geopolitical borders, which, for their part, visible as they are, have taken on a more performative function.

The chapter then provided the basis for discussion that will directly continue into the next two chapters, namely the ways in which local/global relationships are commonly conceptualised. Indeed, as will be shown in the next chapter, herein lies a fundamental aspect of connection, whereby borders become directly implicated in, and not secondary to, the linkages between the local and the global. To this end, the next chapter will show how borders as mechanism of connection facilitate a

horizontal connection between non-proximate localities - what, along with Giddens, is described as the connection between distant localities.

Chapter Three

Borders as Markers of Difference (but also Connection):

Conceptualising the Border as Interface

To rescue difference from its meladictory state seems, therefore, to be the project of the philosophy of difference.

(Deleuze, 2004, p.37)

A boundary is a social "act," an act hard to keep together and sustain; it is not a skin [...] "Interface" is a term with appropriate connotations, especially that any "dividing line" in a social system is a two-sided affair which must be actively created, perceived and reproduced on each side, in order that there be a demarcation. Interfaces sustain themselves on differences among variances.

(White, 1982, p.11)

This chapter details how and why borders, in certain contexts and from certain perspectives, can be logically conceptualised as mechanisms of connection. The chapter concentrates on the nature of the connective mechanism in particular, in doing so recognising on the one hand that borders are involved in, and are part of, complex processes of demarcation, 'marking' and place making, but crucially equally recognising that borders at the same time form part of complex process of connection. Specific attention is therefore given to the ways in which (certain) borders form a 'framework' within which non-proximate connection becomes meaningful, realisable and tangible. To this end the chapter argues that borders, as mechanisms of connection, are best thought of as 'interfaces', a framework that, when applied to borders, nicely captures the potential to link places (and identities) that would not normally communicate. In other words, in terms of connection, rather than focusing

on borderlands – which, as previously discussed, are often taken to be primary sites where connection via (proximate) contact traditionally takes place – it is argued that the imaginary of the border as interface best captures processes of non-proximate connection occurring at different border types and at various border locations.

Following on from this, yet very much overlapping, it is further argued that the concept of the border as interface also recognises that borders often serve to demarcate (although borders are by no means defined by processes of demarcation) and operate as markers (see Anderson, 1996), but crucially in ways that do not by definition amount to, or evoke, division and associated notions of ontological fixity. The point here is to assert that concepts of difference and differentiation (not fixity and division) are integral (not antithetical) to the way in which borders are able to connect. While retaining a more malleable idea of demarcation built around an outward looking logic of ‘meeting space’ or ‘cultural encounter’ (Rovisco, 2010; Boer, 2006), borders conceptualised as interfaces, it is argued, act as reference points through their capacity to order, which in turn facilitates connections to the wider, and less immediate, world. Again, note the key logic here in that notions of ‘meeting space’ and ‘cultural encounters’ indicative of the interface need not be proximate and/or framed in terms of a specific borderland – spaces commonly defined by a visible international borderline. Rather, the meetings and encounters in question can take place at (border/ing) locations situated away from traditionally recognised borders and can stretch across geographical space and time.

In terms of subject matter this chapter is predominantly conceptual. As such it is important and useful at this stage to briefly point out (reiterate) how this chapter sets the scene for the proceeding two chapters – which together will introduce two examples. It will be shown that borders as mechanisms of connection, explained and hence framed using the imagery of the interface, act as gateways to not only networks, spaces and scales that appear to be immediately bordered out, but also to networks, places and scales that may be distant from the border itself. On this logic the relationship (or for some, non-relationship) between borders, networks, and mobilities can be mutually constitutive and self-serving. Likewise, the overlapping concepts of interface and connection being proposed and put forward in this chapter does not deny that processes and politics of exclusion take place. Indeed it may even be the case that a politics of exclusion form a crucial dynamic of the border/connection interface, in that, importantly, connection for some can mean

disconnection for others. To this end the next chapter argues that an effect or dynamic of the interface in terms of connection is to bend and/or restructure scale for 'connective ends', and Chapter Five will subsequently focus on the politics of empowerment and disempowerment surrounding the border as a mechanism of connection.

This chapter, then, proceeds as follows. The first half will predominantly involve looking at terminology. The next section will therefore briefly and necessarily consider the commonly used terms employed to capture particular aspects of borders. Then, the ways in which borders have been framed in relation to interfaces in the literature will be discussed. To this end, it must be noted that conceptualising borders as interfaces is nothing wholly new. The section will therefore discuss the how and why of borders conceptualised as interfaces in the context of connection, and consequently different ideas of interface will be considered. The main point here is to argue that the imagery of the interface requires more detailed attention than it has currently received, that it potentially captures much more than it does when traditionally employed. Looking at interfaces in more detail is beneficial when also looking at borders as mechanisms of non-proximate connection.

The chapter will then specifically focus on the work of Harrison C. White and his particular definition of interface. This definition will be detached from White's general sociological schematic in order to make it more compatible with the concept of borders as mechanisms of connection. The final part of the chapter will look at the dynamics of difference and contact with difference in relation to borders. Focusing on the work border scholars such as van Houtum, as well as 'political theorists' such as Connolly, the ways in which borders have been theorised in relation to difference and 'Otherness' will be considered. The main argument advanced in this section is that, as already sketched out above, borders are not, by definition, strictly divisionary in the sense that they are markers of distinctly malleable difference. Borders as markers thus create connective potential and do not hinder it, general processes that complement and key into the concepts of interface.

Border metaphors: A quick note concerning terminology

Given the importance placed upon the term ‘interface’ it must be noted that, in many ways, this is a chapter about border terminology (to which end the chapter will also deal with more general social science concepts in the preceding sections). It is, therefore, a useful starting point to quickly look at the various commonly assigned terms that have, in one way or another, been used to describe borders generally, or at least certain characteristics attributed to them. As discussed in the previous chapters, many of the terms attributed to borders capture, intentionally or otherwise (and indeed some more than others), dynamics or ‘kinds’ of connection such as ‘membrane’ (Hedetoft, 2003), ‘scape’ (Rajaram and Grundy-War, 2007), ‘milieu’ (Martinez, 1994) and ‘conduit’ (Ackleson, 2003). There are also accompanying terms such as ‘channelling’ and ‘carving’ (see Tsing, 2005), amongst what is sure to be many others. More often than not these terms are used interchangeably and overlap in the sense that they are employed to capture in a single word or simple metaphor the idea that borders are not, by definition, wholly divisionary and barrier-like – that, pertinent for this chapter, borders both divide and connect.

Examples of this are clear enough. The idea of the membrane conveys porosity whereby the border functions to allow, prevent and/or expel, depending on how the ‘border machine’ has been programmed (see van Houtum, 2010). The membrane borrows the biological imagery of a cell wall that allows beneficial material to pass through it, while simultaneously preventing or expelling other material that is damaging or unnecessary to the ecology of the interior. Moving from the biological to the social (but by no means separating them), the imaginary of the ‘border as membrane’ captures a particular and complex relationship between the (usually state) territorial border, and the border traversing flows and mobilities indicative of contemporary globalization. Connection is achieved via governance, through the institutionalised facilitation of ‘good’ or ‘desirable’ mobilities in relation to the blocking and expelling of less desirable mobilities (or mobile-bodies). The imaginary of the membrane is therefore very much linked to neo-liberal bordering and securitisation. In similar fashion, the term ‘conduit’ has been employed to describe the dynamic complexities of state borders with neo-liberal ideals on the one hand, and security threats on the other, particularly where the border becomes perceived as a route for migrant flows and terrorist networks. Likewise, ‘Channelling’ has also been employed to convey the idea that flows are created and carved with great and often

violent force rather than conform to (pre) established tracks (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2008).

Alternatively, terms like 'scape' and 'milieu' are less about border securitisation and much more about liminal and peripheral (panoramic) spaces within which contact with others and negotiations of difference takes place. In this regard, proximate contact can be summed up in terms of connections made possible because of the border (see Chapter Four). It is now useful to consider the ways in which the meanings of terms such as 'membrane', 'channelling' 'scape' and 'milieu', and so on, mirror and overlap with the term interface, as it has been employed in the literature. To this end, the next section focuses on the concept of interface in general terms, but also what connotations the term has for connection, which, along with borders, is often contextualised with similar metaphors of fluids and flows.

Current thinking about borders as interfaces

In order to understand how borders function of mechanisms of non-proximate connection the imaginary of the 'interface' is employed. This is because, in general terms, the use of this imaginary allows me capture, in one central idea, many different border types and locations, an imaginary that, by its very definition, also evokes the idea of connectivity. The particular usage and meaning of the term, however, needs to be moulded to better fit the aims of this thesis via critical readings of the way the term interface has been employed and theorised in the literature. Interface, then, in the first instance, signifies connectivity. It implies connection whereby things meet each other. It implies a commonality made possible between two or more sides. And it provides a means through which 'information' flows across separate points. Understanding the concept of interfaces, therefore, creates a better understanding of borders as mechanisms of connection. The border, on this logic, creates the possibility for people to interact with the wider world. What is a stake, however, is the way in which borders as mechanisms of connection can act as visible interfaces that serve to mark and facilitate. What follows are some detailed points concerning interfaces.

The first point to be made is that the very concept of interface implies 'bridge-like' qualities and therefore some sort of connection on some terms. A typical

dictionary definition tells us that, amongst other overlapping computer science related imagery, the interface forms (1) “a surface forming a common boundary between two regions, things, etc, which cannot be mixed, eg oil and water”, and/or (2) “a common boundary or meeting-point between two different systems or processes”¹. This is, of course, true of borders whereby they connect to some conceptual ‘outside’. To this end, a second point to be made is that it must be acknowledged from the outset that this general meaning, and thus use, of the term interface has not been lost on border scholars as a way of capturing the dynamics of borders and bordering, particularly under contemporary global conditions². Indeed, as noted above, it is not the intention of this chapter to posit the term interface as something wholly new or original to the theoretical/conceptual or for that matter empirical study of borders. However, in reference to the discussion in the previous section, the concept of interface arguably becomes a catch all term, incorporating all the other border metaphors touched upon thus far into one overarching singular meaning: that borders both make separate (or make distinct), but also function in some way or other to ‘bring together’.

Again, this is clear. The idea of ‘meeting point’ referred to in the definition above keys into the heart of many discussions and observations of borders that do not utilise the concept of interface directly. These discussions and border observations have been analysed in the previous chapters, and will not be wholly regurgitated here, but they include those works that deal with liminal and peripheral spaces of contact and negotiation (see Boer, 2006; Martinez, 1994; Donnan and Wilson, 1999; Konrad and Nicol, 2008, amongst many others). That is, the notion of the border as interface tends to constitute, to reiterate Konrad and Nicol (2008, p.32), “a zone of interaction where people on one side of the border share values, beliefs, feelings and expectations with people on the other side of the border.” Therefore, while not directly mentioned, observing borders as spaces within which contact takes place acknowledges that borders are both barriers and bridges, a dynamic captured by the

¹ Taken from: *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*. Chambers: Edinburgh. p.708

² Indeed, as a simple internet search will show, the notion of the border as interface in general terms – as a connector and barrier – is common across a range of disciplines such as physics, biology and chemistry, electronics and computer/software engineering. As a somewhat interesting aside, the UK border agency talks about ‘interfacing’ in relation to its e-borders programme, whereby air carriers have to build compatible computer systems in order to share information with the border agency. Under the subheading ‘Interface Stage’ the website states: “To provide the required information, most carriers will need to build an interface that will allow their systems to connect with the e-Borders system and transmit information to it”. Available online: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/business-sponsors/transportindustry/ebordersrequires/aviation/commercialcarriers/startupphase/>

concept of interface. The notion of ‘meeting point’ also equally applies to the type of connection captured by the term ‘membrane’ and so forth, even though the connection or ‘meeting point’ here has very different connotations.

Elsewhere, however, the term has been employed more directly and specifically. For example, writing in the context of the transformation of the state under conditions of contemporary globalization, and using the US/Mexico as a case in point, Cunningham (2002, p.186) has argued that social movements at the border have created “new interfaces of power (and consequently protest) between states and social movement actors”. In other words, and in general terms, the interface on this logic connects state institutions and social movement actors in such a way as state borders are redrawn to reflect politically dynamic social landscapes. Returning to the US/Mexico border Cunningham (2002, p.187) argues “social movement actors and state representatives [...] are engaged in distinctive processes of ‘reading’ the contours of these new interfaces as they negotiate the meaning and mounting of protest”. In another example, this time concerning borders, place and transnationalism, Ernste, van Houtum and Zoomers (2009, p.578) explain that borders are increasingly “interfaces between people that show themselves and are represented contingently”. The interface here implies connection – between people – but a qualified connection that differs under certain conditions and contexts, and therefore cannot be universalised.

Perhaps indicative of all the ‘interface examples’ noted above, and indeed all the other border terminology mentioned thus far, Nelles and Walther (2011, p.4)³, argue that:

Rather than asking whether borders are barriers or interfaces – a sterile debate because most borders have both functions – scholars have tended to conceptualize those regimes in terms of a set of rules, norms and procedures which regulate borders and control their effects on both social, political and economic actors.

³ Available online: Nelles, J. Walther, O. (2011). ‘Changing European Borders: From Separation to Interface? An Introduction’. *Journal of Urban Research* [Online], (6) 2011. Available from: <http://articulo.revues.org/1658>

This is, of course, true enough. As should be apparent it is now generally and correctly accepted that borders are much more than simply lines and barriers. To invoke Simmel's (1994) pithy metaphor, borders function as both bridges and doors, and as such manifest differently depending on social and geographic context. This is also certainly true of the interface being constructed and put forward in this chapter. Yet, as far as this chapter (and indeed overall thesis argument) is concerned, some overlapping observations can be made concerning the common usage of the term interface as it is employed within border studies generally. First, while pertaining borders to be simultaneously both, the quote above implies nevertheless that borders become barriers or interfaces depending on governance regimes – that is, either barriers or interfaces in the sense of allowing/connecting some, while at the same time blocking others. This can also be true of borderlands whereby, as Martinez (1994, p.2-5) tells us, 'alienated borderlands' describes a model in which "cross boundary interchange is practically non-existent. Here the border is barrier-like. Yet, in a different geographical, political, historical context, the 'integrated borderland' refers to a model in which the defining border becomes mutual, with capital, products and labour moving across the border much more freely. In this regard, the border is more akin to an interface. The point to be made in the next part of the chapter is that borders, as mechanisms of connection, are interfaces directly because they are markers (but not necessarily barriers). In this sense, connection becomes a key defining aspect of borders (see also Chapter Six).

Second, the concept of the interface as alluded to thus far, tends to envisage proximate connection within a distinct setting, context or framework, in other words, connection that is usually considered to take place between those directly on either 'side' and in range of the border. In this regard, emphasis is placed upon border stability, whereby stability becomes a prerequisite for the border to function as an interface and therefore connect. Third, the common deployment of the 'border as interface' tends to assume a visible recognisable (and usually national/state) border. As is the case with 'Schengen', the 'border as interface' here does not have to be made visible vis-à-vis fences, watchtowers and passport checks, however the border still tends to be configured as national and/or state limits nevertheless, and in many ways part and parcel of the ongoing and frequently discussed re/de-territorialisation process. Fourth, even in the case of borderlands, the interface on this logic tends to be framed in terms of physical or actual crossing in the sense that the border as interface

becomes something that allows and facilitates movement across itself⁴. Finally, the imagery of the interface tends to be employed to describe predominantly neo-liberal bordering whereby borders become less defined as markers and more observed as economic resources to be utilised through opening and closing (Nelles and Walther, 2011). Again, particular attention is given here to the relative benefits that (stable) 'open' borders provide for both the states that share and institutionalise particular regional borders, as well as the private interests that fall on either 'side'.

However, the argument being put forward in this part of the chapter is that borders as mechanisms of connection – and the particular connection on offer here – cannot be accurately defined in terms of 'membranes', 'conduits' and 'channels', and so on, because, in turn, they reify other 'fluid' metaphors often associated with contemporary globalization and traditional forms of mobility. Neither can borders as mechanisms of connection be defined in terms of 'scapes' and other terms that try and capture border spaces brimming as they are with proximate contact. And, to this end, borders as mechanisms of connection cannot be defined by the term interface – that is, in terms of its common deployment – which arguably subsumes all the border terms and metaphors discussed thus far. This is because the common usage of the term 'interface' primarily merges into other terms discussed above such as 'membrane' and 'conduit' and so on which all convey connection in terms of physical and/or proximate movement often, but not always, across, or in relation to, some recognisable (state) barrier or sovereign limit. Likewise, and in this regard, simultaneous logics of neo-liberal blocking and facilitating, and associated notions of inside and outside, also become defining functions of the interface.

To reiterate some key points. Borders as mechanisms of connection need not, by definition, amount to traditional borders located at traditional locations. Likewise, they do not, by definition, have to be recognised as important borders by everyone coming into contact with them. As such, the point being made here is that the term 'interface', to be utilised in this chapter as a conceptual device to capture a particular type of non-proximate connection, does not have to imply, or be defined in terms of,

⁴As an example of the first two points in particular, Nelles and Walther's (2011, p.2) comment on the concept of interface is very much situated in the context of the EU, in which regional spaces, by definition, become prime sites where "flows meet spaces of places" – and subsequently prime sites to study borders (Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2003). In terms of borders, particular attention is given to the transformative power of networks, flows and mobilities, as states struggle to keep their borders open for business but at the same time closed to risk.

physical movement. Therefore, in the next part of the chapter, it will be shown that borders as mechanisms of connection – as interfaces – can facilitate a different kind of ‘movement’ and global mobility that can be theorised and explained without recourse to the common and fashionable ‘hydraulic’ metaphors of liquids and flows. Following on from this, the term interface will be employed to conceptualise how contact with otherness and difference need not be proximate, as is normally the case in terms of borderlands, and can importantly take place across space. In order to do this, the concept of interface, as applied to borders and bordering, merits and/or requires further discussion as an important concept in and of itself. That is, in ways that separate the notion of interface as a distinct and useful concept in relation to other border concepts, terms and metaphors. To this end, the next section will focus on the work of Harrison C White, who posits a particular idea of the interface within the social sciences.

Extracting and conceptualising the idea of interface

It is hopefully now clear that the concept of the interface, at the very least, carries a high degree of potential and usefulness when attempting to understand the connectivity potential of borders – a term that captures and provides a framework for conceptualising borders as mechanisms of connection. To this end, Harrison C. White offers a particularly useful understanding of the concept that can be utilised and built upon to conceptualise a version of interface that captures a non-proximate connection that does not, by definition, rely on common or traditional notions of mobility. The following section discusses (and in many ways unavoidably abstracts) White’s understanding of interface located as it is in what is generally recognised as being a large, complex and often kaleidoscopic body of research. It is not the intention here to engage directly with White’s sociology, as doing so would far exceed the scope and aims of not only this chapter but also this thesis. What immediately follows, rather, is brief overview of the interconnected core themes within White’s general sociological schematic in order to locate and ‘extract’ his concept of interface.

White has sought to provide contemporary social science with a new (scientific and often formalistic) empirical understanding and foundation upon which

to build a general theory of the social (see Azarian, 2005, p.1). A particular driving force behind this agenda is a primary interest in how complex social systems come into existence – something which is arguably an omnipresent feature of human existence – and how they are sustained and reproduced over time, without recourse to any master plan (Azarian, 2005). At the core of White's sociological approach is a general critique of the social sciences in which he argues that many fundamental – starting point – concepts are empirically unfounded, empty and therefore unscientific. More specifically particular criticism is directed towards the ways in which the foundational concepts of 'individual' and 'society' are used and subsequently posited as unproblematic, that is, put forward by social scientists as methodological starting points upon which to build definitions of reality. In other words, even it is acknowledged that that these concepts (of the individual and social) are indeed socially constructed, the concepts are still posited in the first instance nevertheless, and arguably mould and control the direction and content of study – directions which search for the constructions of such concepts without questioning why they are constructed at all. For White, this is ultimately a violation of the scientific method; a case of theoretical and abstract (almost *a priori*) constructs moulding reality into a particular 'shape', rather than reality, through empirical (*a posteroiri*) observation, informing theory.

Moving through this sociology, and in terms of the relationship between the concepts/constructs of 'individual' and 'society', White takes what is regarded as being a middle position which entails a rejection of both constructs. As already alluded, this rejection is tempered by a reaction against approaches that theorise society as somehow being pre-given or pre-existing, but in particular it is a reaction against atomistic approaches that privilege the 'individual' as being something distinct, separate and whole. Indeed, for White, it is the latter that has created the perception of the former. To this end in his influential work *Identity and Control* (1992), where he attempts to bring all of his sociological thinking together, White argues that it is the relations between people that constitutes identity, rather than identity being a sole possession of individuals. In this regard, White is fundamentally interested the relations (or connections) between social actors, and their subsequent embeddedness within these relations. Indeed, this is 'social reality' for White, a vast unfathomable mesh of dynamic networked relations within which social actors are

embedded and re-embedded⁵. And herein lies White's middle position. Rather than relying on the two traditional constructs, White's starting point focus is instead the empirical observation of social relations in order to understand the complexity of social organisation and the semblance of order out chaos (White, 1992; Baecker, 1997; see also Azarian, 2005). White is thus a relational thinker. It is the interactions of and between 'real' people that, for White, provides the basic foundation of social organisation, and the primary data with which to study it. In White's (1992, p. 8) own words: "persons in the ordinary sense of the term, are neither the first nor the only form in which identities appear [...] Persons should be derived from, rather than being presupposed in, basic principles of social action". The obvious question that arises out of such thinking is how distinct identities form out more networked social relations, in terms of borders and boundaries this includes the formation of supposedly or seemingly bound social entities.

So what of interfaces? White's focus on relations (and connections) is important here. Yet before going into detail, it is worth mentioning two preliminary points, not only to contextualise his notion of interface in relation to his own general work, but also to contextualise the term in relation to this chapter – that is, in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection. The first point is that, for White, the reality of the interface is inherently social (White, 1982), thus making his version distinct from other disciplinary definitions (see Baecker, 1997). In this regard it was pointed out above that White is keen to dispel common, starting point, constructs that he thinks continue to have prominent methodological importance across the social sciences, because they lack concrete analytical purchase. It is arguably the same logic that fuels White's dismissal of term 'boundary – taken here to overlap with borders generally (see Chapter One) – on the basis that it is inadequate and too conceptual – "quasi physical" (Baecker, 1997, p.1). Rather, the term 'boundary', according to White (1982) should be replaced by the more profitable, encapsulating and accurate

⁵ Indicative of White's style, and alluding to the complex nature of (inter) social relations, White states: "We humans live as if in a shambles of theaters, both proscenium and in-the-round, with innumerable spotlights darting now here, now there, illuminating situations. These shifting situations bring to focus first one, then another sort of theater context or domain. The spotlights are triggers for social action and, in turn, for various selves of each of us and for neighbors and for unacknowledged network-mates some number of ties distant in the network of that building domain" (White, 1995, p.1035-1036). In other words White is implying a complex reality that includes difference, but equally also a reality in which social actors are embedded, always connected and never separate.

term 'interface', which for him better captures actual social, organisational relations and operations.

A second preliminary point to note is that, while White (1982, p.11) talks in the language of 'dividing lines' being, to quote, a "two-sided affair which must be actively created, perceived and reproduced on each side, in order that there be a demarcation", he is not, by definition, talking about 'physical' boundaries – or borders. That is, he is not necessarily talking about boundaries/borders in terms of the kind that forms the principle subject matter of interest in border studies generally put. In many ways, much of his thinking on interfaces is born out of his analysis of market structures, whereby "markets are not marked off from the firms" (White, 1982, p.11), hence his notion and application of interface. It is arguably the case for White that the term 'boundary' (or border) is insufficient as a sociological device because it incorrectly evokes a sense of division and closure, whereas the term interface more tangibly captures the complex relations required in the construction of seemingly stable and ordered social systems. Granted, applied to borders, this may be nothing new for most, if not all, contemporary border scholars. Yet, one of the key aims of this chapter is to argue that borders and interfaces are (can be) one in the same, thus disagreeing with White that they are, by definition separate. But the chapter also argues that borders, functioning as they do to as markers, create a sense of order that is not based upon closure or rigid demarcation but rather (in this case non-proximate) connections. This tacitly agrees with White that the semblance of order and structure (difference) is based upon connections and relations between people. To this end the discussion will proceed to look at Whites discussion of interfaces in relation to his overlapping ideas of identity and control, in doing so highlighting aspects of his thinking on interfaces that can be extracted, reconfigured and built upon to provide a foundation for borders posited as mechanisms of connection.

So, to reiterate for a second time, what of interfaces? In as much that has already been discussed it is difficult to extract a concrete, clear or direct stand-alone definition to build upon. Baecker (1997, p.1) argues that, for White, the interface defines an identity, whereby its emergence and presence that defines and maintains identity (again, this is in keeping with White's base logic that relations between people are key to social structure and organisation and not basic, unquestioned, *a priori* constructs). Baecker (1997, p.1) sums this up thus:

An interface with White is thought to be able to define an identity. He is not starting with "identity" and then seeking its relationship with its environment. He is not taking an identity to be a "subject" of some kind. Instead it is by the emergence of an interface that an identity is constituted, defined, and maintained.

For White (1992), then, the emergence and maintenance of identity is the control of its distinction and an interface becomes integral to this. To this end, in what may arguably be a preliminary, if somewhat abstract, definition, the embodiment of the interface is posited as “the formation committed to continuing delivery of identity as tangible production” (White, 1992, p.30). Thus an interface, White continues, is akin to a ‘cafeteria meal’ which “effectively delivers food into people”. The interface, in other words, delivers or allows identity back into the environment it seems to be cut off from. This requires further discussion and qualification, being careful, however, not to detract from the main thrust and flow of the chapter/argument. In *Identity and Control* White (1992, p.30) defines the discipline of interface alongside two other disciplines which he terms ‘arena’ and ‘council’. Cumulatively, they form three species for the delivery and thus analysis of identity formation and stabilisation. Continuing the ‘meals as social processes’ metaphor in which the interface is described as a ‘cafeteria meal’, the ‘arena’ becomes a ‘sit down urban diner party’ defined much more in terms the identity of the evening as a whole, an identity given semblance and form via the assemblage different guests. The ‘council’ thus becomes akin to a “church supper which orders and balances conflict in terms of overall prestige” (White, 1992, p.30).

The interface, therefore, simply constitutes a delivery mechanism for the formation of some identity. The ‘arena’, painted by White using the example of an “urban dinner party between urban professionals”, becomes a discipline for making some sort of ordered distinction – it is made up of social relations between different guests, which, taken as the sum of its parts, forms an identity for the evening. The council, for which White uses the example of a church supper, becomes a discipline concerned with a constant balancing and disciplining of conflicts. In many ways this particular discipline is concerned with entrenching and maintaining an identity – in White’s example, what is at stake is the prestige of a more general and all encapsulating religious identity. While White technically considers each discipline

(interface, arena and council) to be layered but nevertheless separate, others have argued that they can be considered to be much closer and overlapping. Particularly in terms of this chapter – advocating as it is borders as mechanisms of connection as interfaces – White’s interface can arguably be pushed further as a key discipline which defines and constitutes the others. That is, more specifically, the aggregated organisation of the arena, as well as the more entrenched and prestigious social arrangements of the council, both constitute interfaces. This chapter ultimately follows this logic, which will be returned to very shortly.

Before doing so, however, it is useful to first focus on another (overlapping) aspect of the interface in relation to ‘inside/outside’. Commenting specifically on White’s conceptualisation of interfaces, Baecker (1997, p.3) argues that it should be analyzed as a distinction being re-entered into the domain it distinguishes, further suggesting that it is a coupling mechanism involved in the definition of an inside, while at the same time providing a link to the outside. In many ways this can seem paradoxical: a logic in which the interface necessarily and fundamentally makes possible the defining of some inside but at the same time necessarily makes possible the introduction of an outside. Indeed, borders are also conceptualised as connecting an inside to an outside. Yet, as already mentioned (and for the reasons already mentioned), White is not positing a notion of identity or interface that is defined as a clearly demarcated (bounded) social structure. Somewhat interestingly, and indicative of the discussions in the previous two sections, White (1992, p.31) compares the interface to the membrane, arguing that both terms connote ‘passing through’ and ‘transformation’. Yet crucially distinctions abound:

[The] interface is without the latter’s implication of a sharply demarcated material body; instead, an interface is a mutually constraining array of contentions for control which yield as net resultant a directed flow, a committed flow [...] The matching of variances is the key so that the average or total sizes of flows being generated through this interface is divorced from the self-reproduction of the interface’ (Ibid: 31).

So, for White, a membrane is more ‘border-like’, signifying “a sharply demarcated material body”, whereas an interface is a “mutually constraining array of contentions”. This distinction apart, however, both are similar in the sense that they

channel and direct 'flows'. As previously discussed, 'borders as membranes' channel mobilities, involved as they are in the institutionalised governance of predominantly mobile people. Interfaces, on the other hand, at least as White envisages them, channel 'variances' vying for control within the context of the interface. Yet ultimately a fundamental difference of White's interface – there are many but relative to the aims of this chapter – is that it functions to connect and match multiple differences – “an array of contentions” – rather than channel specific bodies to specific places, framed as this usually is in terms of actual movement. Alternatively, rather than a membrane, the interface here could perhaps be seen as being more akin to a 'borderscape' or 'border milieu', whereby peripheral border spaces provide the context in which difference is brought together in a less controlled and/or institutionalised manner. Yet, White's interface implies much more than this because it does need to be 'limited to the limits', that is, the border as interface need not be restricted to territorial peripheries. To this end, White (1982, p.11-12) further elaborates on his concept of interface. He states:

Persons work through interfaces, and work to be in interfaces and work at interfaces, and in all these senses an interface is an envelope of the actions different individuals on each side take with respect to one another's perceived actions. The fact that it is an envelope reflects an interface's being an aggregator, a gearer of constituents into an overall pattern, a locale for conversion from "micro" to "macro"

It now becomes increasingly possible to apply White's thinking to borders as mechanisms of connection. In the main, borders as interfaces can connect and 'match up' multiple connections. Interfaces do not simply provide the context or space within which two 'sides' to connect or come together in the traditional sense; neither do they have to be peripheral and defined by 'one' border. Rather, borders as interfaces have the capacity to (potentially at least) 'match up' multiple sides – multiple interfaces – for their own ends (to this end, Chapter Five will discuss in more detail the politics surrounding the interface and connection). Indeed, the interface on this logic overlaps in many ways with Beck's (2000) notion that borders as are akin to 'mobile patterns', discussed in the previous chapter, whereby the border does not divide loyalty in specific, fixed or structured ways, but rather creates overlaps and the

possibility for connection (although for Beck (2007) the ability not to belong – or connect – is also key). Whilst perhaps sociologically distant, both White and Beck would the somewhat dominant idea of the border as fixing an inside and an outside – of the border being a visible skin. Furthermore, borrowing White’s imagery indicates tangible connection that involves some sort of contact, or matching, but crucially a connection that is not framed in terms of physical movement from ‘A to B’, or likewise actual movement across some proximate demarcation.

However, while very much originating from White’s ideas, this logic – of defining borders as mechanisms of connection as interfaces – begins to move away from the many assertions he puts forward. First, and perhaps the most obvious point of departure, is to define borders as interfaces rather than necessarily separating the two. Of course, as far as this chapter is concerned this deviation does not pose any particular problems; in fact, placing the two together is one of the key points here. White considers boundaries or borders to be sharply rigid, while, as we have seen, borders are far from being fixed and rigid. They are much better and more accurately approached as processes, and bordering is very much part and parcel of everyday social relations (see Chapters One and Two). Within border studies, of course, borders are no longer considered to be static, fixed demarcating lines. Even security driven ‘membranes’ are part and parcel of bordering processes that have no “sharply demarcated material body”, and there have been numerous recent studies that show us how and why this is the case (see, for example, Vaughn Williams, 2009; Amoore, 2006, amongst others).

The second point of departure is located in the fact that White is keen to separate the concept of the interface from the ‘variances’ being matched as a product or outcome of the interface. In other words, while the interface is a key discipline in the formation of various identity structures, for White the interface acts more as a catalyst in the sense that it remains unchanged by the ‘differences’ it is matching. To this end, White (1992, p.31) tells us that interfaces, lacking any visible fixity or rigidity, are transparent and therefore hard to locate. Indeed, Baecker (1997, p.2) asks the question “what is White watching when he watches the interface”, going on to argue that he is in fact “watching and *conceptualising* a boundary” (original italics). In many ways this is true of borders theorised as processes in the sense that bordering does not, by definition, amount to (visible) borders. This is perhaps also true of borders as mechanisms of connection because they tend to be located away from

supposedly traditional border locations, or, they can be invisible to most. But the point of departure here is that, based upon White's relationship between the interface and identity, borders as mechanisms of connection also act as markers of difference. In fact, in terms of borders, the ability to be markers in one way or another is intrinsic to their ability to connect.

Very much overlapping, the third point of departure returns to some previous points made above. Mainly that, while there is a fundamental relationship between the three control disciplines of interface, arena and council, for White, they also remain separate. Borders as mechanisms of connection, however, require the interface to constitute the identity structure more firmly. That the marking of some difference is at the same time part and parcel of the connective processes. As previously stated, this implies far greater integration between the interface, arena and council. To this end, the next section of this chapter will look at 'difference' in relation to borders, difference in relation to interfaces and in difference in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection.

To conclude this section, then, when theorised specifically, and in much more detail, interfaces capture so much more than simply connection and division, whether these occur simultaneously or otherwise. Utilising the White's work we can begin to understand the interface as being distinct and cut off from the inside or locality in which it is embedded while at the same time having a connection to it. However, while being distinct from the inside it also connects elsewhere, to multiple outsides. Borders as mechanisms of connection, then, defined in this way retain a demarcating function, but a function that actively and necessarily facilitates connection to an outside. White's 'interfaces' form a pre-requisite for 'identities' in relation to one another, but do so in a way that does not, by definition, posit an identity as a starting (ontological) subject. Rather, it is the emergence of an interface that constitutes, maintains and shapes identities, with emphasis subsequently placed on operative acts of distinguishing and thus controlling 'distinction'. Thus identity, for White, goes hand in hand with control and the ability to constantly embed and re-embed identity. However, while the interface provides the social terms in which people can and do act, it is also an envelope of action within which people from different 'sides' act in relation to one another. The idea of the interface explains how the border facilitates connection through linking identities that would not normally communicate.

The implications of defining borders as interfaces need to also be considered. For White, the term boundary no longer adequately sums up, if indeed it ever did, the multitude of social acts within a social system that produce it, arguing that the term boundary connotes rigidity and ‘skin-like’ properties. However, van Houtum (2005) has pointed out a critical shift in border studies (from boundary studies), whereby the study of borders becomes the study of human practices and construction, maintenance and communication of socio-spatial differences. The border, in other words, is not a rigid line and on this logic many would argue that contemporary ideas within border studies already imply interface properties. I would argue however that discussing and defining borders as interfaces pushes researchers to consider aspects of borders that are not normally considered. However, it must be noted that the use of the term interface here is designed to be part of a methodological lens of connection and it is not implied that all borders are interfaces in the context of its application throughout this thesis. Indeed, within this thesis, it is important to determine when, where and why a border displays interface properties. Moreover, the idea of interface put forward is one that has been critically changed from the generally employed idea of interface within border studies and elsewhere. The next section will now elaborate and discuss the ways in which borders can be makers of difference, with emphasis on how this can be an integral aspect of connection.

Borders as markers of difference

In general terms the notion of ‘difference’ is an important aspect of White’s interface, and can therefore be elaborated on in and of itself to further in order to better conceptualise borders as mechanisms of connection. The point here is that, in relation to borders, the notion of difference does not need to be wholly tethered to processes of fixity (division) usually accompanied by the vilification of a proverbial, but not necessarily known, ‘Other’. In other words, continuing and building upon White’s discussion of the interface above, division becomes indicative of ridged inward looking practices and processes, whereas *difference* on the other hand, can arguably, and more accurately, be conceptualised as outward looking and better located within processes of connection in relation to borders. This is perhaps a play on terminology or an overemphasis on individual viewpoints – one person’s difference is another

persons division and so on – but there has been enough written on difference to suggest a plausible distinction. In general terms, for example, the Oxford English Dictionary describes ‘difference’ using nouns such as a *point*, *state*, *condition* or *quantity* of dissimilarity (which, in many ways, is not antithetic to White’s interfaces), whereas ‘division’ is described as ‘the *action* of *separating* something into parts’⁶ (which, while not wholly antithetic to the interface, begins to move away from it nevertheless). While the divisionary aspect of borders is commonly perceived – albeit arguably more so outside of academia/border studies – it is the idea of borders as points, states, and quantities, rather than acts of separation, that is to be advanced and discussed further in this section.

From the disciplinary vantage point of political theory, Connolly has taken a more ‘malleable’ definition of difference when set in relation to identity and processes of identity formation. For Connolly identity is established relative to multiple, socially recognised differences. “These differences are essential to its being”, according to Connolly (2002, p. 64) because, “If they did not coexist as differences, [identity] would not exist in its distinctness and solidity” (see also Hall, 1996). In other words an identity needs be able to ‘stand out from the crowd’, but crucially here in ways that do not leave it isolated from the crowd from which it craves distinction. In response to criticism of his 1991 work *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of a political Paradox*, Connolly argues that adhering to seemingly fixed foundations upon which claims of identity and difference rest, avoids the connections and debts to difference in which identity – or fixed definitions of it – are implicated (Connolly, 2002, p.xvi)⁷. Connolly highlights the perception that identities require difference in order to be distinct, ordered and to have meaning, and that, within this process, identities often require the perception of fixity commonly achieved via the manipulation of difference. On this reading, in order to stand out from the crowd, a given identity may seek to manipulate other members of the crowd to gain distinctiveness from it.

⁶ Taken from ‘Oxford Dictionaries’ online. Available from: <http://oxforddictionaries.com>. Accessed on 12th May 2010. Italics added.

⁷ Here Connolly is responding to the criticism that by not endorsing particular claims to identity-such as majority (universal)/minority (enclave) amongst others-consequently amounts to giving up ‘a place from which to speak’ (See Connolly, 2002, p.xvi). Opponents argue that such a ‘place’ has to be, by definition, ontologically anchored (that is, fixed) in order to have meaning.

Difference, in this regard, becomes 'Otherness' and it is this production of Otherness from difference that Connolly (2002) loosely describes as an 'Identity paradox': On the one hand identity needs difference in order to define itself in relation to what it is not, however, on the other hand, a given identity often vilifies the very difference it needs to give the perspective of distinctness thus producing otherness. Connolly calls the tactics in which 'Otherness' is produced as a form of self-empowerment 'the second problem of evil'; the first problem outlining the fact that in the first instance identities tend to separate themselves from any difference that poses a threat to their perceived 'purity' as identities. This is not to say that borders constitute some sort of ontological requirement for identity, as if any given identity needs a 'ridged' border making the identity visible and anchoring it into place. For sure, identities overlap with borders/boundaries, and borders may very well indicate some identity, but they do not, by definition, amount to the same thing (Tilly, 2004). Indeed, in many ways indicative of and building upon White's interface, any given border/boundary can indicate many identities, which reintroduces the question of the possibility of order in terms of networked social relations.

Indeed the identity paradox outlined by Connolly, mirrors the way in which border functions are used to divide and limit. The objectification of space, and the associated management of mobility, paves the way for logics of comparison between demarcated units (we are special and distinct). For many western states the protection of welfare becomes paramount, as does the overlapping security from the 'Other'. Van Houtum and Van Naerssen (2001, p.128) state:

In a presumably more liquid society, territorial borders are still used as key strategies to objectify space. It is implicitly argued that the territorial demarcation of difference that borders provide ensures a geographical ordering of presumably governable spatial units. The resulting categorisation and classification of places in space allows mappable comparisons of differences in spatial institutionalisation, naming, identifying and performance.

Within this logic van Houtum and Pijpers (2007) argue that border securitisation and liberalisation – which, as we have seen, often in the form of asymmetric membranes and surveillance practices, or neo-liberal mazes (Ibid, p.306) – is akin to a 'gated community'. However this is not because security rationalised bordering necessarily

tames the outside through mobility management, but also because the idea of the gated community is analogous to the condition and experience of those on the inside. “[T]he notion of gated communities”, they argue, “speaks to what this bordering practice also does to those inside and their ever present generalised anxiety and desire for comfort and protection” (van Houtum and Pijpers, 2007, p.306). Indeed Bauman (2006), for example, draws attention to the victimisation of the ‘stranger inside’ when the concept and experience of the familiar, experienced by those deemed familiar, is abruptly and often violently brought into question in relation to, and by, those deemed unfamiliar.

Echoing Connolly touched upon above this is a mechanism in which difference becomes Otherness: “The would-be victims are not feared and hated for being different – *but for not being different enough*, mixing too easily into the crowd”, stresses Bauman (2006, p.58. Original italics) continuing, “Violence is needed to make them spectacularly, unmistakably, blatantly different”. Such violence is often equated with borders in terms of the ability to impose and maintain them. What follows from this fear of the outside inside is pre-emption through division, that is, the “digging of deep, possibly impassable trenches” in Bauman’s (2006, p.59) terms, between an inside of structured familiarity and an outside frequented by, and indicative of, “tempests, hurricanes, frosty gales ambushes along the road and dangers all around” (Ibid). Bordering in this sense becomes geared towards blocking out – that is, continuously performs the role of (specific) barrier holding back an external difference. What is of interest here are proactive ways in which bordering actually connects to external differences in ways that avoid complete reduction to the ‘border as barrier/divider’ mentality.

A return to Connolly’s work may be useful here. The acknowledgement of, or connection to, other differences, in other words, create possibilities to empower. “Boundaries provide preconditions of identity, individual agency and collective action”, Connolly (1995, p.163) has argued, “but they also close off possibilities of being that might otherwise flourish”. In other words, through theorising difference as being less fixed and malleable Connolly discusses how perceived differences can act in relation to, that is, when in contact with, other differences in ways that may not amount to vilification, fixing and Othering. This ‘deep contingency of identity’ (Connolly, 2002) alludes to the negotiation of difference through contact with difference. Connolly (2002, p.xvii) states “Sometimes aspects of the unreflective

background of experience are challenged by others in a way that dislodges them and renders them possible objects of tactical modification”⁸. Borders as markers of such a difference are more open to such constant (tactical) negotiation, rather than simply functioning to block off contact and thus possibilities.

Therefore while it is crucial that bordering is not used as a mechanism for fixity amounting to, and directly implicated within, processes of ‘Othering’ – such bordering practices lead to inexplicable human suffering as is painfully and wholly apparent – it is important to understand that borders can also be markers of difference while not being implemented in strict divisionary practices. Connecting borders to difference in this way does not deny some sort of ‘bordering out’ – indeed, for White the interface brings together competing differences – but it does offer a way in which borders can remain markers of a difference which is more open to negotiation, contact and connection. Bordering to divide – even in terms of governance and regulation – by definition isolates and cuts off difference often vilifying it, whereas bordering to mark difference, as conceptualised here, acknowledges and meets other differences.

Connection to difference (and not separation from it), in other words, becomes a requirement for negotiation in the sense that it is through such logic that borders themselves become places, spaces and processes of contact, negotiation (with difference). As Barth (1969, p.10) puts it in the context of ethnic boundaries “ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundations on which embracing social systems are built”. This is, of course, very similar to White’s general sociological approach discussed above, whereby connections and relations are fundamental to social formations, and as a consequence should provide a starting for any study of them.

In many ways, in terms of borders, van Houtum (2005, p.672) alludes to this nicely, arguing that borders are spatial constructions and markers of differentiation on the one hand, but are also involved in the communication of such differentiation on the other. On this logic, and again it could be argued indicative of the interface extracted from White’s sociology, the study of borders is therefore concerned less about territorial lines, and more about the construction and *communication* of socio-spatial differences. Indeed, it is such a reading of borders that helps us to better

⁸ For Connolly (2002), the challenge of an ‘Other’ resulting in a ‘tactical modification’ of the self (or group subject) is embedded in his larger, more general, argument that to act ethically at the same time puts identity at risk in the sense that it ruptures fixity and causes (tactical) modification of individual or group identity.

contextualise, for example, Boer's (2006) notion of borders as spaces of negotiation and Martinez (1994) idea that borders and their associated borderlands can become places of cooperation and contact rather than securitised and defensive walls. Ultimately division is an end in itself whereas difference – and the bordering/markings of difference – is always and necessarily so, a work in progress.

Yet borders as mechanisms of connection move away from the notion of borderlands and peripheral spaces of negotiation, and they most certainly move away from the security driven and institutionalised governance regimes captured by terms such as the 'membrane' discussed earlier. It has been already been mentioned in Chapters One and Two that borders have been theorised as being everywhere, mainly due to the methodological shift from borders to bordering. The point here – which is being made across all the chapters – is that borders can become mechanisms of connection in traditional and 'supposedly' non-traditional locations (to this end the next two chapters will introduce two examples). This requires a return to the interface but this time whereby the interface itself becomes a more visible maker of social organisation – a marker of social organisation that fundamentally involves difference. In terms of borders as mechanisms of connection

For Jones (2009, p.179) "categories appear to play a crucial role in how we make sense of the world, while, at the same time, these categories limit and control those same experiences" (see also Reichert, 1992). Jones sums up the problem of seemingly fixed categories by way of the following paradox: on the one hand we cognitively think of categories as containers, which are in turn separated from other self-contained categories by fixed and stable boundaries (Ibid, p.179). On the other hand, however, any serious study of categories (and indeed borders as alluded to by Newman and others) quickly ascertains that categories (and indeed borders) are contingent, fluid and permeable. Ultimately the task for political geography, argues Jones, is to not abandon categories, as some have argued, but rather to accept categories while at the same time embracing and focusing upon the porosity of the boundaries/borders that separate them. The intriguing aspect here is the importance given to the border. The border serves to make distinctive, but by the same token also necessarily serves to connect, the categories that Jones argues are required to make sense of the world. Distinction in this regard facilitates connection.

The border, or bordering processes, enables people to construct 'social focal points', However, the construction of borders – distancing oneself from difference in

van Houtum's terms – can also, and somewhat paradoxically – be placed within the context of outlooks and orientations, that 'bordering out' can conceptually and metaphorically mean something different than simply keeping out – even in terms of asymmetric membranes (See Hedetoft, 2003). The so-called post-modern word of perpetual movement creates the desire for what Van Houtum (2002, p.44) has termed 'borders of comfort' – mental borders - in order to impose order upon the world in the form of social focal points. Given that the otherness created by the borders is also in motion, borders of comfort in their ideal - that is, fixed - sense can never be realised. Yet it is argued that the notion of the 'social focal point' can be reconfigured - that such points of comfort do not need fixity to be important, and more importantly, do not need to be described in terms of distance. Indeed, reiterating Jones earlier in this section, borders can be theorised as 'ways of seeing' (Nevins, 2002, p.7; Jones, 2009). We can say that the border does not solely function to keep out, inasmuch as the difference making capacity of the border also functions in terms of 'seeing out'. The idea of a 'social focal point' raises the possibility that borders - as markers of malleable difference - can be conceptualised as important and prominent 'Archimedean' navigation points, what I think Balibar (1998, p.216-7) partially alludes to when he asserts 'to contextualise the border is to conceptualise the line on which we think'. Proposing a phenomenology of the border Balibar (2010, p.316) sums up thus:

“[B]orders are never purely local institutions, never reducible to a simple history of conflicts and agreements between neighbouring powers and groups, which would concern only them, bilaterally, but in fact are always already 'global', a way of dividing the world itself into regions, therefore places, therefore a way of configuring the world or making it 'representable' as the history of maps and mapping techniques testifies. Hence the development of a 'mapping imaginary', which has clearly as much anthropological importance as the imagination of historical time and is probably not to be separated from it. I should add that borders are, therefore, constitutive of the transindividual relationship to the world, or 'being in the world' when it is predicated on a plurality of subjects”.

Moreover, the border 'line', rather than demarcating/containing a singular identity or singular allusion to difference, becomes more network-like constituting its own changing topological space (Karafillidis, 2008), working behind the appearance of fixed categories (Jones, 2009), and subsequently points to 'a new spatiality of politics' (Rumford, 2006, p.160). The border, in other words, can interweave between multiple categories/identities taking the characteristics of spatial networks rather than ridged (containing) lines, whilst, I argue, still retaining its navigation function necessary for connection. Theorising connection and difference in this way allows us to understand that our relationship with 'others' does not necessarily have to take place in the immediate locality, but rather connection through bordering also allows difference to be experienced and negotiated from afar and at a distance. In these terms the border becomes less implicated within the immediate locality-that is, socio-spatial differences in space-and more implicated within socio-spatial differences across space. To this end, the next chapter will discuss a particular way in which borders as mechanisms of connection can connect to what is non-proximate in the context of scale.

Markers of difference: Connection and the 'need' for protection

The borders theorised here function as both mechanisms of connectivity and markers of difference. In fact, the key here is to show how the latter (difference) is an important aspect of the former (connectivity). Yet, as discussed, a border marks some space (*something*) in order to connect, a border/ing rationale that in turn raises certain questions. For example, does the border as a marker of difference dilute the capacity of the border to function as a mechanism of connection? Do borders as mechanisms of protection provide, or satisfy a need for, comfort and protection, particularly in a democratic context whereby the law is 'of our own making' (see van Houtum, 2010a, p.289)? Finally, what is the dynamic between this so-called protection (or in this instance disconnection) and connection?

In terms of the first question the answer, which is in itself the focus of this study, is no, the border as a marker of difference does not, by definition, dilute the capacity of the border to 'connect'. What is being argued is that, for certain borders at least, the marking function of the border also makes possible its connectivity

function. Clearly borders can seemingly function as markers of difference in order to distance a subjective inside from an often vilified outside. Yet even this kind of border/ing – this distancing – is illusory because it requires and implies some form of connective relationship, in many ways somewhat indicative of the first two stages of the Hegelian dialectic: a thesis requires and is bound to an antithesis in the same way as an inside requires a specific and corresponding outside and so on. The argument advanced so far focuses on another connectivity dynamic whereby a border can be orientated to connect (bring closer) multiple and distant (non-proximate) others (see also Chapter Four). This connectivity is made possible because the marking aspect of the border can serve to advertise and make visible a particular difference that is in some way desirable to others. In other words, while borders do not provide an ontological starting point of any given identity, they nevertheless provide the constant means of identity ‘amplification’, robustness and protection. The specific mechanisms behind the border’s ability to connect have been outlined in this chapter and will be further advanced in Chapter Four. However, the ways in which borders both mark and connect can be further elaborated by answering the second question.

While the ways in which borders as mechanisms of connection provide comfort and protection merits further study beyond the scope of this thesis – this is in many ways a question solely concerning the why of bordering – some ideas can be drawn from the theory and examples put forward thus far. In terms of the ideas put forward in this thesis, the locality of the bordering – the marking – is very much located in what van Houtum (2010a, p. 295), via Deleuze and Guattari in particular, has outlined as the *paranoid* desire for fulfilment, safety and order on the one hand, and the *schizoid* desire to escape from ‘surrounding and silencing walls’, on the other. For van Houtum, (2010a, p.285) the border “is a dynamic result of our desire and of the reverse, our fears”, desires and fears that can never be realised. The (border) question to ask, then, is always in the present: do we currently desire order and the comfort it brings, or do we fear (challenge) it and desire the opposite? Do we accept the b/order (truth) or do we resist/resent its order. Border/ing, on this logic, is invariably the constant balancing of our changing desires: to belong or not to belong may well be the cosmopolitan question (see Beck, 2007, p.162), but it seems it may well be the border/ing question too.

Therefore, those involved in maintaining borders as markers of difference but also mechanisms of connection are both connected and disconnected. They exist in a continuum of connection and disconnection, but crucially here the former need not be at the expense of the latter. The theory, and indeed examples, put forward here amount to a need to create, bolster or maintain identity/security on one, usually local, axis, but in doing so create the means of non-proximate connectivity on many other axes. This is, in part, illustrated by Deleuze when he argues that opposition and difference exist on more than one axis, and therefore what exists in complete opposition on one axis, can have a totally different relationship on another. To reduce difference to an identity and its opposition (an inside to its immediate outside) amounts to covering up and ‘ironing out’ the multitude of other axes as things become strictly segregated (Widder, 2006, p.278). Another example of this can be found in Luce Irigaray’s (1985) idea of the two ‘flat’ mirrors. In looking at the relationship between the masculine and the feminine, where the feminine is often seen in relation to the masculine, Irigaray alludes to an image that passes between the two mirrors. This image remains the same, and the reflection represents identity. However, everything changes when the mirrors are curved, in which case the images become different and fluid, even though they reflect the same object and remain the same distance apart (Irigaray, 1985; Widder, 2005, p.41).

Looking at border/ing through the lens of connection, therefore, ‘warps the mirrors’ in the sense that it allows borders to be observed from perspectives other than simply what is immediate. Borders do not exist in two-dimensional space. On one axis it provides (satisfies) a need for truth order and identity of both the self and the other, but on many other axes the same border, through ordering, also provides a means of escape from what is immediate (from surrounding walls). The extent of this invariably depends on time and place. Chapter Four will outline in more detail the ways in which borders connect along multiple axis (scales).

Concluding remarks

The original title of this chapter was going to be ‘Division but also connection’, which the reader may or may not agree is emotive, if somewhat terse – even for a heading that will be elaborated upon and qualified throughout the chapter proper. The change

came about because within ‘border studies’, of course, border/ing is quite rightly not considered to be divisionary but more accurately explained in relation to processes of difference. And, in terms of this chapter, the notion of difference can be better located in relation to connection.

To this end, the logic of this chapter ran as follows: The concept interfaces was put forward as an ideal framework that adequately captures what is being implied by borders as mechanisms of connection. At first glance, this seems at best a logical move and at worst somewhat unoriginal and/or stating the obvious. However, the chapter first considered how the term interface has been generally applied to borders, and concluded that its base meaning was similar to most other border terminologies also applied to borders, such as ‘membrane’ and ‘scape’, and so on. Indeed, on the generally logic that borders both divide and connect, the term interface becomes a somewhat empty or ‘catchall’ term. In this regard, one of the key assertions of the chapter effectively argued that the idea of interface merits greater theoretical focus in relation to its application to borders – that the notion of interface, in relation to borders, merits a move from simple terminology to more detailed concept. Doing so provides a far better, more detailed context with which to describe, contextualise and locate borders as mechanisms of connection of the kind advanced in thesis. In terms of this entire thesis, therefore, connection means something more than crossing or experiencing the border in general terms. It means something more than the *mêlée* of contact and often cooperation present in borderlands - although a connection of sorts certainly takes place within these contexts.

Following this movement from term to concept, the next section concentrated on the idea of the interface as a concept in and of itself with particular focus on White’s conceptualisation of the term. White’s interface was extracted from his general sociological schematic and woven back into the context of borders and connection. Doing so shows how different borders – that is, not simply state borders in traditional places – could act as reference points that function to bring together identities that would not normally communicate. Thus borders as mechanism of connection create visibility by marking out a particular place. But it is not about creating division. The locality of the border is set apart, but at the same time, and in such a way, as to (pragmatically) link cultural values and interests that originate well beyond the locality of the border. This connection has implications for the meaning of border/interface itself.

The final part of the chapter focused on the ideas of ‘social’ and ‘navigation’ points in particular, as way of building upon and fleshing out White’s idea of interface in terms of borders as mechanisms of connection. Here, the chapter proposed the idea that borders should be better understood as markers of difference where difference is better understood as being malleable and as such open to otherness. Indeed difference in this sense is extremely accommodating to processes of connection. Conceptualising borders in this way – theorising borders in relation to malleable difference – fits within the study of bordering as a process while at the same time allowing borders to be markers in one way or another. Indeed, borders as markers on this logic become a requirement for connection.

So the mechanism of connection is, in the first instance, driven by the capacity of borders to mark difference and make distinct. Indeed, this is the argument at the heart of the thesis, that borders do not simply ‘divide’ (make distinct) or connect depending on time or context but more accurately achieve both dynamics simultaneously. This is often rooted in both the *paranoid* desire for order and protection (fixity) and the *schizoid* desire to, in the case/theory presented here, escape locality. It is this simultaneous dynamic to be both local and non-local (distinct) that powers connection at the border, and, as also previously discussed, it need not be the case that connection is the prime motivation for bordering. In the case of the two examples to be outlined in Chapters Four and Five, both are illustrative of the need to detach from immediate surroundings – to become unique – but in ways that amplify and project identity ‘outwards’, well beyond the locality of the border in question. Moreover, both examples highlight very different kinds of border.

The next chapter, therefore, will continue to look in detail how borders as mechanisms of connection connect to what is non-proximate, and in doing so continue to frame this logic in terms of the interface put forward here. In order do this the following chapter will focus on the ways in which scale can be invoked to the point where it becomes a component and mechanism of connection via border/ing.

Chapter Four

Borders, Connection and Scale: Invoking Scale as a Form of Connection

I am not worried about the opening of borders; I am not a nationalist. On the other hand, I do worry about the elimination of borders and the very notion of geographical limits. This amounts to a denial of localization that goes hand in hand with the immeasurable nature of the real time technologies. When a border is eliminated, it reappears somewhere else. If there is a solution possible today, it lies in reorganising the place of communal life...the main question is to regain contact.

(Virilio, 1999. Referenced in Escobar, 2001, p.139-40).

This chapter will discuss logics of scale and place in relation to borders. It keys into the discussions put forward in the previous chapter concerning local/global relationships, as well as introducing some new but overlapping discussions that focus on issues of scale generally, particularly scale approached and conceptualised as a socially constructed political concept. The chapter essentially argues that borders as mechanisms of connection can in certain contexts ‘flatten out’, ‘warp’ or ‘distort’ otherwise seemingly vertical and traditional impositions of scale and in doing so make possible more ‘horizontal’ forms of socio-spatial relations and connections. It will be shown that these connections can be achieved through (1) a ‘disconnection’ from the dominant framing mechanisms of the traditional state (border) and, increasingly of late, global levels, as well as (2) the creation and maintenance of powerful networking opportunities, all made possible because of borders.

This flattening out of social spatial relations via borders is key, because it can have the effect of making the non-proximate, proximate. That is, such a scalar

flattening, or reconfiguration, of socio spatial relations allows what appears to be separate, global and distant to have the effect of becoming local and ‘close’ from the perspective of the border/ing in question. This flattening processes, however, is not to be mistaken for Friedman’s (2005) ‘economic flattening’. Rather, the border/ing (and hence flattening and restructuring) on offer here, wherever the border/ing is located, both creates and connects to what has been referred to in the previous two chapters as ‘distant localities’, of bringing ‘others’ closer. Pursuing this train of thought offers, albeit theoretically and conceptually at this stage, a picture of the world that is very much interconnected and increasingly so, but in ways that fundamentally includes borders and is attributed to bordering. Moving on from notions of interface and difference previously discussed, this chapter, will therefore propose a specific but overlapping aspect and attribute of connection that is not considered when borders are traditionally theorised in relation to connection and scale. To this end, the arguments put forward in this opening section require further elaboration and framing – in terms of both borders and scale – before beginning the chapter proper.

As we have seen, borders are discussed and theorised in relation to both connection and scale. To briefly reiterate some key points from the previous two chapters, relevant discussions on connection focus on ‘proximate connection’ and contact with ‘difference’ often (geographically) framed in terms of borderlands. Likewise, in terms of scale generally, but by no means exclusive of borderland dynamics, focus is placed on the ways in which specific borders can be observed, experienced and studied at different scales. Newman and Paasi (1998), for example, point out that “national boundaries can have a differential impact at different scales of analysis”. For Newman and Paasi, a (usually state) border is inherently multidimensional – it can display different characteristics at different scales – and consequently one way to examine this aspect is to take into account geographical scales when studying borders. Elsewhere, in the context of the Bengali borderlands, van Schendel (2005b, p.46) argues that borders should be better understood “as dynamic sites of transnational reconfiguration”. Indicative of this chapter’s title (and argument), van Schendel significantly argues that ‘borderlanders’ can invoke and therefore jump scale as part of their everyday lives. On this logic, the border can be further understood as something more than a limit: it can be experienced as a local phenomenon, a national edge, or as a staging post to the wider world. Importantly, van Schendel’s work will provide a foundation upon which an understanding of scale

in relation to borders and connection can be constructed – a foundation for the core arguments presented in this chapter – and will therefore be discussed in due course.

But, inasmuch as it has been touched upon thus far, what of scale in general terms? As we shall see, the conventional imaginary or formula of scale particularly when applied to the study of natural and social phenomena – the study of borders included – is that of a distinct hierarchy of levels or spaces, representative of a fixed, naturalised and vertical politics. There are two points to be noted here. First, certain scales tend to become privileged sites of power and politics, with the national or state ‘level’ providing a traditional and in many ways still dominant case in point¹. Taylor (2004, p.219), for example, observes the ever-present nature of the nation/state in the commonly used language of ‘international’ and ‘subnational’, and so on. He notes too, that even some concepts employed to capture local/global relations, rely on an exclusionary slight of hand, whereby the state, while not explicit, remains present and dominant through its absence (Ibid) (although the concentration of this non-explicit presence of the state varies depending on the ‘glocalization’ theory). Second, but very much overlapping, many approaches to scale analysis consider individual levels and spaces to be separate from each other, with each level containing distinctive and unique politics and processes that wholly become the focus of study in their own right. It would seem that connection – of the kind that incorporates and subsumes different scale levels – and geographical scale do not easily go hand in hand, particularly, as is the case here, involving borders that are not wholly indicative of the state. However the empirical reality that is contemporary global interconnectedness, in all its contradictory guises and consequences, problematises the taken for granted assumptions about which political processes should take place at particular scales, as well as which actors these processes traditionally involve.

Looking at borders and scale together in the first instance brings into sharp relief the fact that nation state borders have become the primary focus of most border studies. The global outside is made separate and distinct from some, typically national and territorially defined, inside – an state defined inside that, while often deemed oppositional, usually provides the context for local spaces to be made and/or experienced, framed as they are in terms of, or in relation to, the state level. To this

¹ To this end, the ‘global’ and ‘local’ have, of late, also become privileged sites of power, particularly in terms of agency and the politics of resistance, where the privileging of one is usually constructed dialectically in relation to the other.

end, much has been made about how ‘society’, or ‘the social’, has become heavily defined by sovereign territorial limits within which dominant and important politics takes place. And much has been made recently about how such thinking has come to define the social sciences which has long taken for granted this particular ‘geographical’ discourse. This general orthodoxy, to varying degrees, includes the work of van Schendel as well as Newman and Paasi mentioned above. The (nation) state border commonly provides a dominant and privileged site/level of politics, determining and framing borderlands, and acting as an (imposed) ‘edge’ or ‘limit’ to the wider world. Yet, as will be shown, there are prominent and useful discussions on scale that, taken together, seek to disrupt this train of thought by acknowledging the wider geographical and entangled patterns of global interconnectedness. The point of this chapter, then, is to utilise these particular discussions on scale in order to argue that borders can function to alter and muddle – or as we shall see, ‘bend’ in Smith’s (2004) terms – traditional hierarchical imaginaries of scale, as well as the traditional role borders seemingly perform within this hierarchy. This ability forms part of, but is also crucial to, the connective qualities of borders.

The chapter progresses the argument as follows. First, I want to draw attention to the ways in which borders have been theorised in relation to (particular) imaginaries of scale. Of interest here is to understand the effects of borders on scale, and the effects of scale on borders. The discussion continues to focus on the work of Newman and Paasi, along with others, with particular relevance scale. The aim is to show that many border studies rely on conventional accounts of scale, which are no doubt useful when placed in relation to borders, but somewhat limited for the purposes of this chapter. This section also focuses on the work of van Schendel who, as touched upon above, talks about borderlanders jumping scale. Although, it must be acknowledged that van Schendel does not frame his idea of jumping scale directly in terms of connection.

Next I will discuss theoretical approaches to scale generally. This includes returning to the ‘framing’ debates stemming from global studies already touched upon in the previous chapter such as local/global relationships, as well as overlapping discussions that stem from the wider geography literatures focusing on the politics of globalization and making of place. The main purpose of this section is to establish the field of debate and a particular terrain within which invoking scale as a form of connection can be located. It is therefore not intended to either provide an in depth

discussion on scale and place, or to offer original contributions in these areas. Rather, understanding the ways in which borders can invoke scale needs an equal understanding of how scale is constructed, naturalised and, in many cases, imposed. Crucial here too are the implications of scale politics upon borders in the sense of where borders, particularly as mechanisms of connection, fit into these conversations (to this end, Chapter Five will discuss power specifically in relation to borders and connection).

Critically building upon the previous two sections, the final section considers in detail how borders as mechanisms of connection, wherever they may be, can invoke scale to connect and create distant localities. Again, while Chapter Five will cover the ‘concrete’ politics such connections can or may have, and Chapter Four will discuss in detail the overlapping notion of the border as a portal or interface, the aim of this chapter is highlight the theoretical and conceptual mechanisms that make it reasonably possible to posit scale in relation to connection and borders. The main thrust of this final section, then, will be to show how different borders connect to ‘distant localities’ via invoking scale and making it horizontal rather than vertical. Utilising this logic and building upon the general discussions above, it will be shown how connection to place can also at the same time constitute connection to other (non-proximate) places. In order to show this, the section will introduce two examples – Berwick-upon-Tweed on the Scottish/English borders, and the (new) PGI border surrounding the English town of Melton Mowbray. The examples will also be used in the next chapter but approached from different perspectives.

Looking at borders in relation to scale

This opening section continues some of the debates introduced in the previous chapter but with a particular focus on scale. The purpose is to briefly sketch out some of the ways in which borders have been typically observed in relation to scale, before moving on to look at scale generally in the latter half of the chapter, particularly, of course, with regard to borders and connection. The importance of scale in the context of borders has been recognised. Setting forth a research agenda, and thus highlighting what they consider to be significant themes within border studies, Newman and Paasi (1998, p.197) argue that geographical scale is a key topic (see also Chapter Four).

That, at a simple level, borders exist “in different spatial contexts, ranging from the international to the national to the regional and local/administrative and metropolitan”. They argue that state borders have no universal territorial meaning or function, inasmuch as they take on varying concrete and symbolic forms simultaneously depending on scale, whether it be the global/international geopolitical landscape, the nation-state system, or local life (Ibid.). Borders and territoriality are, therefore, contextual when placed in relation to scale:

[A]t the global scale, this context is the geopolitical and economic landscape of the world, while, at the scale of the state, it is the continual nation-building process which manifests itself in different social practices. The third significant scale is the sphere of everyday life experience, where the meanings of (state) boundaries are ultimately reproduced and contested (Newman and Paasi, 1998, p.197).

The third sphere – the scale of ‘everyday life’ – is, in many ways, given particular prominence in their summary of scale, because, they argue, it is the level at which aspects of identity and meaning construction becomes complex and therefore challenging for border studies. Indeed, this is perhaps not surprising given their larger body of work taken as a whole, both individually and collectively, which, as we know from the previous chapter, generally focuses on border narration, construction and reconstruction. While the state is regarded as the basic frame for discussing borders, posited as empirical reality², the experience of the border can vary from different ‘local’ contexts. Thus, for people living within the state (hinterland) generally, the border can be experienced through school curricula, monuments, folklore and mainstream politics via the media, and so on. For people living in around a recognised border (in borderlands), the border becomes much more immediate in the sense that it becomes more essential and visible in defining peoples lives (Newman and Paasi, 1998, p.197), the extent of which presumably depends on the type of borderland type in question (Martinez, 1994). In both aspects of ‘local’ experience, it must be said, the border manifests as social and cultural practices.

² Newman and Paasi (1998, p.197) maintain that [at the time of writing] “we live in a world of some 190 states. Our world is a world of ‘territorial containers’ but it is also ‘interterritorial’ - almost every portion of the settled ecumene is part of the sovereign territory of some state”.

To be sure, the construction of borders on all levels, irrespective of scale, is due to what they call ‘narrativity’ (Newman and Paasi, 1998, p.195), that is, the manifestation of borders on all scales of analysis are a product of social narration and construction – borders are being continually made and remade regardless of scale level. And, to this end, looking at the importance of scale in relation to borders keys into the importance both Paasi and Newman place on dynamics of inclusion and inclusion (see Chapters Two and Four), dynamics, they assert, that operate at numerous scale levels. As Kramsch (2010, p.1009) notes in relation to Newman and Paasi’s thinking on borders in general terms “the existential boundary-making is made conceptually subservient to wider restructuring processes, notably those taking place at the subnational, regional and state territorial scale”. However, notwithstanding discussions on borders in the previous two chapters, the problem with this (scale) logic is that it continues to privilege the state as the dominant/natural frame (and scale) in which to discuss borders (Kramsch, 2010, p.1009). Moreover the state border becomes implicit in the hierarchical compartmentalisation of scale in that the state provides a median point by which other scales are measured. As we shall see in the next section (and even in the work of van Schendel about to be discussed), this approach to scale – of privileging the scale level of the state – has been heavily criticised in certain quarters.

Scale is also implicit in van Schendel’s work on borderlands. Again, to quickly extract some key points made in the previous two chapters, borders may be implicit in the separation of some sort of inside from an outside, but importantly they link both in a particular way (van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer, 2005, p.3). While, in not too dissimilar fashion, van Schendel (2005a, p.44) argues that “borders not only join what is different but also divide what is similar”. The point of this latter quote is that, like many others, van Schendel is keen to move away to away from ‘previous’ and/or dominant assumptions that posit a neat and easy correlation between state, territory, society and nationhood, to which end the spatiality of the borderland provides a particularly visible case in point. Therefore, while the borderland is described as a “zone or region within which lies an international border”, more importantly, a borderland society is “a social and cultural system straddling that border” (van Schendel, 2005b, p.44; See also van Schendel, 2005a). Although van Schendel is particularly interested in illicit (cross border) trade in the context of

borderlands, in terms of this chapter, there are some very useful insights that can be extracted and built upon.

Focusing on scale more specifically, and indicative of the work of Newman and Paasi noted above, scale is very much connected to the notion of ‘restructuring’, somewhat apparent when van Schendel (2005b, p.46) posits, “International borders are becoming crucial localities for studying how global restructuring affects territoriality”. Note, here, the use of ‘international’, ‘global’ and ‘local’ in relation to restructuring, borders and territoriality. Framed, therefore, in terms of a current condition of global restructuring (connected to wider debates concerning globalization), borders must be taken seriously as “localities of importance”, that, more specifically, they must be “understood as dynamic sites of transnational reconfiguration” (van Schendel, 2005b, p.44). van Schendel’s use of scale becomes interesting because different scales seem to be ‘juxtaposed’ in the sense that the ‘international’ and the ‘global’ are placed along side the ‘local’ as opposed to being ordered and fixed hierarchically. To this end, in terms of conceptualising borders as mechanisms of connection, of which ‘scale’ is a key component, this aspect of van Schendel’s work requires specific attention.

Again, mirroring somewhat the discussion concerning Newman and Paasi above, the local level of everyday experience is also important for van Schendel. Yet, whereas for Newman and Paasi the same state border manifests, and is thus experienced, differently at specifically defined scale levels, for van Schendel the state border represents both the local and the global resulting in the possibility of borderlanders being involved in transnational practices in their everyday lives (van Schendel, 2005b, p.49). Summed up in his own words:

For borderlanders, the state scale is not overarching and does not encompass the more ‘local’ scales of community, family, the household or the body. On the contrary, to them it is the state that, in many ways, represents the local and the confining, seeking to restrict the spatiality of borderlander’s everyday relations. Scales that most heartlanders experience as neatly nested within the state scale – face-to-face relations of production, marketing networks, or community identities – are experienced very differently by borderlanders. In their case, these scales are often less ‘local’ than the state; they breach the

confines of that scale, spill over its limits, escape its mediating pretensions, and therefore set the scene for a specific borderland politics of scale

Put differently for the purposes of this chapter, borderlanders, via the border, can invoke and engage scale at different levels simultaneously, whereby the border gains the potential to be a transnational staging post that can be potentially framed in terms of connection. Given the themes of this chapter, the ways in which scale is invoked in relation to the border requires further consideration.

For van Schendel the ‘politics of scale’ is all about ‘rescaling’ and ‘restructuring’ within borderlands, which fundamentally involves the politics of bordering (to this end, the politics of scale will be discussed in the preceding section, and borders, connection and power will also be discussed in Chapter Five). It is useful to point out here that, for van Schendel, scale politics specifically involves the inability of the state scale to prevent clandestine (unauthorised) cross border activity. The state scale, in other words, is unable to achieve complete hegemony because it is constantly being challenged by the restructuring/rescaling capabilities of borderlanders – what van Schendel (2005b, p.55) has summed up as “everyday transnationality”. A crucial component of this everyday transnationality is the ability to construct internal cognitive maps, whereby borderlanders can envisage and situate themselves across multiple scales of which the state is only one. This ability of borderland dwellers to redefine scale amounts to scale dwelling and jumping whereby the state border acts as a staging post and not a limit. In the context of the India/Bangladesh borderland, van Schendel gives a few examples such as an arms smuggler who uses the pronoun ‘we’ to simultaneously refer to fellow Indian citizens, to other cross-border smugglers, and to a regional religious category. Or, alternatively, when an Indian government official accompanies his pregnant wife to her parents’ home in Bangladesh, flouting the citizenship laws of both states, and affirming multiple individual and family links that spans the border (van Schendel, 2005b, p.55-56). Again, here ‘scale jumping’ becomes all about scale cognitive ‘positionality’ made possible because of the borderland.

Therefore, before moving on to look at scale more closely in general terms, it is useful at this stage to briefly summarise some key insights that van Schendel offers to the discussion on borders and scale, particularly in terms of conceptualising scale as a component of connection. First, as discussed in the previous chapter, borders are

defined as being much more than simply barriers and limits, regardless as to whether the (nation) state tries to institutionalise them as such. Second, and overlapping, state borders (and/or scale) represent only one, albeit important, scale amongst others. Those experiencing the border/land as part of their everyday lives can potentially utilise different scales for their own ends (again, Chapter Five will look at empowerment in relation to connection). Third, the state border does not operate as an all-defining framework, which encompasses 'lower' scales such as the 'local' or the 'community' and so on. Rather, for borderlanders, the state border in itself becomes local and importance is placed on the level of the everyday. As a corollary of this, the state level is restructured as a staging post of sorts whereby people can construct and inhabit their own scales to serve their own purpose. Fourth, and again overlapping from the previous point, van Schendel's work on borderlands envisages a looser hierarchy of levels. For Newman and Paasi discussed above, the border may manifest and be experienced differently at strictly defined scales, but in many ways it remains the state border across all scales. The border for van Schendel, however, allows for scales to be constructed and reconstructed simultaneously, whether the state is compliant or not (usually not), allowing 'scale jumping' and cognitive 'mapmaking' to occur.

In many ways, for van Schendel, the state border provides the means upon and within which borderlanders can resist and challenge its dominance through enacting powerful restructuring/rescaling practices. Indeed, this is very much indicative of a dynamic whereby border meanings and narratives are constructed from, but also have an influence upon, the people experiencing (and in many ways rescaling) the border in their everyday lives, the recognition of which is something that is crucial for van Schendel. However, in terms of the connection being advanced in this chapter, two distinct problems arise that relate back to the discussion concerning borderlands discussed in the previous chapter.

First, the ability of people to jump scale is very much framed in terms of, and contained within, the borderland created by a dominant national /international border. Moreover, it is the state territorial border that makes possible, and in many ways even determines, the scales that are being 'invoked'. Ultimately, it may be the case that, while van Schendel observes the borderland as a peripheral space in which the state scale is no longer overarching and in which the imposition of the state border can be resisted, it is still the border of the state that makes this restructuring (and weakening)

possible. In many ways, a paradox (of sorts) arises because it seems to be the case that the powerful influence of the state border, imposed by the state to control and regulate provides the very basis for its own weakening. This may be fine for van Schendel, focusing as he does on the study of borderlands in and of themselves, but it is ultimately up to the individual reader to determine the severity of this problem. To be fair, however, van Schendel is not positing borderlessness as a teleological end product of these restructuring/rescaling processes, and as such his observations may provide examples of how state borders are constantly transforming, perhaps under conditions of contemporary globalization, indicative of wider re/de-territorialization processes in general.

Either way, the point of interest here is how various borders, many of which are be separate and/or located away from the state border, can also invoke scale, which leads onto the second problem. While van Schendel's observations of borderland dynamics undoubtedly go some way to explaining how borders connect in relation to scale, it remains unclear how 'jumping scale' through the construction of cognitive maps, and thus the ability to rescale/restructure the state border, amounts to tangible connection. Again, to be fair, conceptualising scale in terms of connection so is not on van Schendel's agenda, however many of the points raised can be further elaborated in such a context. To this end, another overlapping point can be made that, for van Schendel, the ability to jump scale and so on, is down to the particular and unique properties of the borderland and not the border directly. The next section will look at some various approaches to scale and connected notions of place in general terms. The aim here is to provide a framework within which borders and connection can be better understood in relation to scale. The point being to understand how supposedly local borders and places can connect to other places that appear, through conventional lenses at least, to be non-local, located as they are on other scales.

To be local or global: The 'place of scale' and the 'scale of place'

Having just looked at some ways in which borders can be observed in relation to scale, various ways in which they can be conceptualised should now be apparent. Despite being often taken for granted and considered unproblematic, it seems that scale remains a rather allusive concept (Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde,

2004), with many scholars arguing that it must be theorised better (Howitt, 1998; see also Brenner, 1998). While others, still, argue for the elimination of scale as a concept in human geography altogether (Marston, Jones and Woodward, 2005). There are numerous journal articles and edited volumes specifically dealing with the topic, and, while not necessarily considered directly, underlying perceptions of scale are present throughout a diverse range of disciplines spanning biology and (quantum) physics, as well as geography and other social science subjects (Sheppard and McMaster, 2004). When considering scale as an analytical framework to be operationalised, or even when factoring scale into existing research methodologies, there are numerous approaches. These range from cartographic interpretations which relate to the ratio (representative fraction) between measurements on the ground and measurements represented on a map; or ‘operational scale’ that necessitates the locating of a logical scale at which specific geographical processes take place (Sheppard and McMaster, 2004, p.3). Alternatively, ‘observational scale’ refers to the area covered by any particular study – as in large or small scale study – and elsewhere ‘measurement scale’ focuses on the smallest observable part (or resolution) of an object (Lam, 2004, p.25).

Having briefly mapped out some general approaches and applications to scale, it becomes apparent that the bulk of the literature is much too broad, unnecessary and even contradictory when placed in relation to the aims of this chapter. The different types of scale mentioned above are all approaches and methodologies that seek to represent or make visible some ‘actual’ or ‘physical’ geographical reality, and therefore fix place and/or space in terms of size and level (see Howitt, 1998). That said, however, there remains a diverse body of research that is united by its focus on the social construction (and indeed re-construction) of scale. Taken as an approach in its own right (see Sheppard and McMaster, 2004), specifically focusing on social construction not only problematises the various types touched upon above, particularly in terms of their application to the ‘real’ world, but importantly can also be utilised to help explain how ‘scale’ forms an important element in the border/connection nexus. Therefore, it is to this latter approach – the social construction (and deconstruction) of scale – and importantly the ramifications of this thinking, that this chapter now turns.

Easterling and Polsky (2004, p.66) offer a definition of scale stating it “is human construct that locates an observer/modeler relative to a set of objects

distributed in space, time and magnitude”. To which end they continue: “It explains nothing in and of itself, but its perspective may influence the discovery of pattern and process”. The point here is to show that, although focusing on social construction, Easterling and Polsky’s definition, as just noted above, still alludes to scale as size and level – although size and level do not, by definition, have to be considered as fixed or taken for granted (Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde, 2004; Howitt, 1998). Indeed, the framing and deploying of scale in terms of size and level remains common throughout the social sciences. To this end, ideas concerned with local/global relationships – again, as we have seen, ideas that are commonly deployed throughout the core social sciences and political geography – can be used to illustrate this point further. For example, in terms of ‘size’, the global can be seen as larger than the local, often encompassing the whole world, or a larger area of study than went before. In terms of scale as ‘level’, but very much overlapping with size, a hierarchical order is envisaged, whereby complex and distinct levels or spaces exist separately from each other (see Taylor, 1982). Keeping with the traditional local/global relationship the local becomes the bottom or lower level/scale and the global becomes the higher or top scale/level, with the national or state level, of course, located in the middle. Indeed, while they certainly would not deny the socially constructed ‘reality’ of scale, this notion of scale as size and level is indicative of Newman and Paasi’s discussion on the ways in which borders manifest at different levels noted above. In many ways, van Schendel’s work concerning ‘scale jumping’ moves away from such a reality of scale.

To be sure, whether social construction is taken into account or not, using hierarchical scale as an analytical tool employed to observe and gather data at specific levels – i.e. local, regional, national and global, and so on – has been and remains fruitful. Observing natural or social systems through particular ‘scale lenses’ continues to provide detailed analytical insights that can, for example, be compared and contrasted against other data collected from other scales. Yet, particularly within the context of this chapter, a distinct problem with thinking wholly in terms of, or by definition, size and level is that scale (and indeed thinking about scale) can become an unchanging, stable and compartmentalised spatial structure (Lietner, 2004), with particular geographical and/or social organisation taking place within each compartment (Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde, 2004). Presenting a particularly linear view or framework of the world, the danger here is that analysis

tends to be limited to one defining or privileged scale and/or level. Furthermore, while relationships, connections and overlaps between scales are not necessarily excluded from consideration outright; the nature of the connections remains unclear, simplistic and/or secondary to the level or size in question. To this end, trying to study particular social phenomena at different scales as, for example, Newman and Passi advocate above in relation to borders, can be inherently problematic. As Smith (2004, p.195) points out “the choice of different scales of investigation can lead to very different kinds of statements about the realities being researched”.

More specifically, scale conceptualised in this way – as hierarchical size and level – has a tendency to be considered unchanging, ontologically fixed, pre-given, and ultimately an unproblematic category of analysis (Marston, 2004) and/or way of observing the world as a segmented whole. Often indicative of specific (sub) disciplines, different bounded levels become privileged sites of analysis, a prominent example of this being the scale level of the nation or state³. Supposedly over recent years, Agnew’s (1994) famous ‘territorial trap’ has been observed, made permanently visible and subsequently avoided by, amongst other things, scholars reducing the primacy of the state or national level as the privileged site of important politics, and in doing so acknowledging multiple locations in which power resides⁴. Yet, rather adversely, and in certain quarters, this has tended of late to involve an ‘upward’ shift to privileging the global in what Robertson (1992) has termed ‘globe talk’, or, as we have seen in the previous chapter, what Bude and Durrschmidt (2010) have more recently called ‘flow speak’. As discussed in the previous chapter, this shift to the global has had little time for fixed places or ‘rootedness’, particularly in the form of bounded nation-state territorial politics, privileging instead a ‘space of flows’ over ‘spaces of place’ (see Castells, 2000, p.1). This oft quoted space of flows has been commonly framed to varying degrees in terms of mobilities (Urry, 2000), urbanism and networked cities (Friedman, 1986, 2005; Sassen, 1991), ‘scapes’ (Appadurai, 1996) and, of course, even borderlessness (Ohmae, 1995).

³ In many ways this is indicative of how space became (and in some contexts remains) commonly theorised as territorial and defined by territorial (nation) state boundaries, particularly in IR (Agnew, 1994), as well as ‘traditional’ sociology (see again Beck, Bonss, Lau, 2003). Indeed, while many scholars working within the general discipline of geography have come to scrutinize scale more thoroughly, Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde (2004, p.457) argue that “the unproblematic uses of scale as a pre-given, natural category remain prominent in the rest of the social sciences”.

⁴ Again, van Schendel’s work on borderlands noted above provides a case in point.

Again, this ‘upward shift’ in effect returns to the more traditional thinking that it was employed to problematise and deviate from. That is, separating or making distinct the local and the global, even creating a binary, whereby the global becomes a limitless “space that is dynamic, thrusting, open, rational, cosmopolitan and dominant, while the local is communitarian, authentic, closed, static, nostalgic, defensive (but ultimately defenceless)” (Ley, 2004, p.155). This has led many scholars to reassert the importance of the ‘local’, ‘place’ or indeed ‘glocal’ in relation to global space (Robertson, 1996; Tomlinson, 1999; Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010), as well as (re)asserting the agency of people living everyday lives in relation to their place in the world (Ley, 2004; see also Cooper and Rumford, 2011). What becomes apparent throughout these discussions concerning the creation and imposition of scale thinking is the crucial role of power in the construction of scale.

Returning, then, to discussions specifically concerning social construction, Leitner (2004, p.238) argues that conventional approaches to observing scale – again, particularly as level and size – fail to take into account the relations amongst different scales, as well as the ways in which processes supposedly operating at different scale levels influence each other, particularly the national. Positing a constructivist approach, Leitner (2004, p.238) argues that scales become “both the realm and outcome of social relations and struggles for control over social, political, economic and geographic space”. Crucially, the politics of scale, Leitner (2004, p.238) continues, is therefore about “relations of power and authority by actors and institutions operating and situating themselves at different spatial scales”. In other words, scale is taken to be a “central organising principle according to which geographical differentiation takes place” (Smith, 2000. Referenced in Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde, 2004, p.458). To this end, consider van Schendel’s ‘politics of scale’ discussed above whereby borderlanders can, through various (cognitive) means available to them, challenge the ‘framing’ power of the state scale. For Leitner, the ‘politics’ involved here is both rhetorical and material, involving concrete practices and struggles in relation to the construction of scale. As such, power can be conceptualised via two points:

First, numerous (material) approaches put emphasis on structural power rooted in the global capitalism. Taylor (1982), for example, posited a three-part structure consisting of the micro scale, which is mapped onto the sphere of urban experience; the meso scale of the nation state, which is mapped onto the sphere of ideology; and

finally the macro scale of the global, which becomes mapped onto scale of reality. Positing the global as the privileged scale of the moment, Taylor argues that the hierarchy of this structure emerges out the expansion of the capitalist mode of production (see also Marston, Jones and Woodward, 2005, p.417; Mamadouh, Kramsch and van der Velde, 2004). While, elsewhere, Brenner has noted that different phases of capitalism requires distinct scalar configurations from the establishment of national capitalist territorial organisation in the 1930's, to the denationalisation of capital territorial organisation from the 1970's onwards (Brenner, 1998. Referenced in Leitner, 2004, p.240). On this logic – from the perspective of locating power and scalar construction in relation to capitalist world structures – ‘rescaling’ occurs when existing scalar orders become ineffectual for the promotion and continued accumulation of capital (Leitner, 2004, p.240).

Second, other approaches either seek to move away from an exclusive focus on capital production as a location of power implemented in the reconstruction of scale. Emphasis is placed on the social production and reproduction of scale rather than political economies (see Marston, 2000). Although Leitner (2004, p.240) is somewhat critical of this position arguing that, while the role of non-economic structures and ideologies should be given far greater consideration, the power to reconfigure scale is in fact located across a whole range of entangled actors and institutions, all situated in terms of social, cultural as well as economic reproduction (see also Delaney and Leitner, 1997). To this end there are no clear-cut limits between social, cultural, political and economic aspects of reality. Much of the thrust of this latter view in many ways centres on the role and location of political life in the sense that, as Claval (2006, p.216) argues, “during the twentieth century; the bases institutionalised relations within civil societies relied upon have been progressively eroded”. That is, because of globalization processes (or at least the ways in which the study of globalization has influenced researchers of scale), a wider array of scales has to be taken into account, but at the same time scales have become increasingly blurred (Claval, 2006, p.218). Indeed, it is this latter (general) approach that lends itself to conceptualising borders as mechanisms of connectivity.

To take these discussions forward, that is, to extract some key points that help to understand how scale can be implemented in connection *viv-a-vis* borders, two overlapping approaches and ideas that are particularly interesting. The first approach concerns networks. For Leitner, the spatial connectivity of networks cannot be

reduced to, or rather stand outside of, the politics of scale, at least understood in their traditional form. In relation to distinctive spatial connectivity of networks she argues:

By comparison to the familiar scaled political map, such networks have a different spatiality, spanning space rather than covering it. They connect to places horizontally across the bounded spaces of political territorial entities, which themselves are part of scalar state structures. Networks of spatial connectivity thus constitute a distinct sociospatial project that cannot be subsumed under scale politics (Leitner, 2004, p.252).

However, rather than over privileging networks, Leitner (2004, p.250) still retains a 'politics of scale' discussed above inasmuch that "networks help construct and contest scales and (re)configure scalar relations", while on the other hand, "scalar structures construct and contest networks". This thinking effectively challenges scale as the hierarchical fixing of size and level by positing an approach that emphasises the changing relationships and linkages between vertical hierarchy and horizontal networks. Indeed, this is indicative of other approaches elsewhere. Taylor (2004, p.233), for example alludes to this way of thinking when he argues: "[t]he social sciences are ripe for seeking a new balance between attribute and relation, between places and flows, that will problematize scale as simply territorial size". While Brenner (2001, p.605) argues against the convergence of (state) territoriality on one single dominant framework of scale:

[S]cales evolve relationally within tangled hierarchies and dispersed interscalar networks. The meaning, function, history and dynamics of any one geographical scale can only be grasped relationally, in terms of upwards, downwards and sideways links to other geographical scales situated within tangled scalar hierarchies and dispersed interscalar networks.

Thus, for Brenner, in relation to the radical re-scaling of state institutions, global social space becomes better understood as a "complex, tangled mosaic of superimposed and interpenetrating nodes, levels, scales and morphologies" (Brenner, 2004, p66), rather than the traditional Cartesian model of homogenous, interlinked blocks of territory associated with the modern interstate system" (Ibid.).

The second idea incorporates and overlaps with the effects of networks but captures and conceptualises these effects somewhat differently – what Neil Smith (2004, p.193) has termed ‘scale bending’. Many events are challenging the traditional imaginary of scale and the role and place of private individuals, city governments, global corporations and even national governments within this imaginary. It seems that the current condition of global interconnectedness (economic, cultural and political) is upsetting our assumptions about what kind of social and/or political activity traditionally takes place at any given scale. Indeed, this concept of scale bending offers, perhaps for the first time in this opening section, an inkling of how scale can key into ideas of global connection. For Smith, current examples of ‘bending’ include the ability of city governments to bypass the nation state for political or economic benefit, private individuals negating or dwarfing the national state by bankrolling other state and transnational institutions, or, pertinently perhaps for this chapter, ‘domestic’ activists ‘jumping scale’ and appealing international organisations to resolve local issues (Smith, 2004, p.193). According to our dominant imaginary of hierarchical scale outlined above these events are not supposed to happen, they do not conform to the sedimented layers within which local/domestic, national and global politics traditionally take place. Summing this up Smith (2004, p.201) argues:

The eruption of scale bending incidents and events [...] suggests on the contrary, a period of scale reorganization in which an inherited territorial structure no longer fulfils the functions for which it was built, develops new functions, or is unable to new requirements and opportunities. New social activities erode the coherence of old scales and/or crystallize new ones; old activities no longer fit in or support the scaled spaces that hitherto contained them. It is not just that the spatial arrangements of social society are being reorganised but that the basic territorial building blocks of the social geometry are themselves being restructured. Episodes of scale bending emanate from these deeper shifts.

It must be said that ‘Scale bending’, for Smith, is not new inasmuch as it has been part and parcel of modern state formation as well as the formation and global reach of market capitalism. Modern states unified what had previously been city

states, principalities and clans etc, and, in relation to market capitalism, the nation state provided a 'spatial solution' – a national level – able to combine and forge cooperation as well as common conditions for emerging capitals. Indeed, the point is now commonly made that much of the same processes that allowed the national or state to become a privileged level of power and politics, are now in many ways causing its demise and bringing it into question (Smith, 2004, p.204). In many ways, as with Leitner's horizontal socio-spatial networks, this builds upon the move away from solely vertical relations, in which the traditional border is implicated in terms of defining levels, but also the associated idea that scale is not just a matter of size and level, but, much more importantly, it is also a matter of relation (Howitt, 1997, p.49). Howitt (1997, p.56), for example states that "It seems increasingly clear that applied peoples' geography must urgently tackle the crucial questions of how to act at multiple scales simultaneously; how to think globally and act locally, at the same time as thinking locally and acting globally". To achieve this Howitt argues that what needs to be taken into account are the ways in which scale can be subjective and subject specific, that is, to ask how and, importantly, why specific concepts of scale are invoked in particular situations. Again, this very much overlaps with van Schendel's work discussed above.

Therefore, to briefly reiterate, this section has succinctly outlined some common approaches to scale as well as considering place in relation to scale. In doing so the following overlapping observations/conclusions will be taken forward and inform the remainder of this chapter. The observations are, in many ways, similar to the previous discussion above looking at borders and scale. First, while there is no doubt that useful data can be mined from observing social processes through specific scale lenses, many problematise this approach because, amongst other things, it serves to entrench traditional state thinking whether the state is present or absent. Second, the ability to define and thus privilege scale – whether in terms of size or/and level, or any other conceptualisation – is fundamentally rooted in relationships of power that are both, to varying and overlapping degrees, agency and structurally centred. It is important, in other words, to acknowledge the politics of scale when researching social phenomena. Third, there is a primary focus on the overlapping but often contradictory relationships between scales. Indicative, of van Schendel's cognitive 'scale politics' – 'scale jumping' – the relationship between scales involves taking into consideration the ability to not only bypass, but also the ways in which people

can inhabit multiple scales simultaneously - again, power relations plays a crucial determining role here.

As far the argument being developed in this chapter goes, the relationship between scales is important. In terms of the first point concerning networks – and importantly in terms of borders, scale and connection – linking the vertical and the horizontal goes some way to forming an understanding of horizontal connectivity. That is, how a vertical politics of scale does not disappear, insomuch as under certain situations the vertical can be made horizontal. However, a problem arises in that these approaches seem to privilege spaces of flows insomuch as spatial connectivity moves across borders. At best, borders – as we have already seen more often than not defined here as state territorial borders – are at best secondary or at worst detrimental to the essence of the spatial connectivity being pursued. Although Leitner, for example, is careful not to reify the power of networks to make horizontal connections, by acknowledging the changing relationship between the horizontal and vertical politics, it seems that borders do not easily fit into this imaginary. The following quote by Leitner captures this problem:

Transnational networks represent new modes of coordination and governance, a new politics of horizontal relations that also has a distinct spatiality. Whereas the spatiality of a politics of scale is associated with vertical relations among nested territorially defined political entities, by contrast, networks span space rather than covering it, transgressing the boundaries that separate and define these political entities (Leitner, 2004: 237).

The argument put forward in this chapter is that horizontal networks do not simply span borders rendering them unimportant or secondary. Within the general logic of scale discussed here, borders must be understood as something other than representing, or being indicative of, vertical (nation state) politics and processes. The argument here is that, like the relationship between borders and mobility discussed in the previous chapter (see also Cooper and Rumford, 2011), it is certain types of borders that can facilitate horizontal spatial connections. The next section will therefore consider the ways in which borders can be utilised to connect using scale as a component of connection.

Invoking scale as a mechanism of connection

This section looks at the ways in which borders as mechanisms of connection incorporate scale, but in ways that do not, by definition, directly rely on the traditional state border, or fall under the gamut of traditionally recognised (or researched) borderlands. Furthermore, the point to be made in this section is that, rather than serving as springboards where the ‘jumping’ of hierarchical scale is made possible, borders as mechanisms of connection themselves ‘level out’, blur and bend spatial relations. Indicative of Newman and Paasi’s (1998) formulation above, borders span but also entrench traditional markers or politics of scale, but, at the same time, they also corrupt this logic by operationalising horizontal forms of spatial connectivity that cut across traditional scale politics. In this sense, the border becomes a crucial catalyst for the transformation of, and the rescaling relationships between, the local, national and global.

Thus utilising the border to reconfigure scale should not necessarily or by definition be thought of as moving from the local to the global level. Rather the border, when theorised in terms of the connection on offer here, reduces the verticality and compartmentalised nature of scale, making it horizontal, and allowing contact with ‘Others’ that would normally be hierarchically separated and distant. Via the border, in other words, what appears to be distant, unfamiliar and ‘beyond’ to some (a vertical imposition of scale), can be equally local, similar and ‘near’ to others (what could be described as a more horizontal imposition of scale). Two different examples can help to illustrate these points further⁵:

⁵ The two examples Berwick-upon-Tweed and Melton Mowbray were devised by Chris Rumford and originate from a Nuffield foundation funded research project, taking place in 2009 which I acted as research assistant. The example of Berwick has been published online and can be found at: www.borderwork.wordpress.com. The example of Melton Mowbray has been included in the following book chapter: Cooper, A. Rumford, C. (2011) ‘Cosmopolitan Borders: Bordering as Connectivity’ in Magdalena Nowicka and Maria Rovisco (eds) *Ashgate Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. Farnham: Ashgate (see Appendix). It is therefore not my intention to present these as my own original examples, insomuch as want to use them to first highlight the type of bordering activity that is of interest, and second, to highlight the ways in which borders can function to connect. Therefore, while the examples are not my own, the way in which the examples are approached in this thesis, as well as the conclusions reached, is my own work. Indeed, it is worth mentioning that it was when working on this project that my ideas concerning borders and connection began to be generated and take shape.

The first example focuses on the English town of Berwick-upon-Tweed that is located next to the English/Scottish border. Once heavily contested, it is now a stable administrative land border between the two countries. Indeed Berwick is situated on the north bank of the River Tweed once deemed the natural borderline between Scotland and England. Although the border is signposted along major crossing points there is, for the most part, little noticeable indication to the presence of a demarcating border⁶. Berwick has changed ‘nationalities’ many times in its long history – the national border being constantly redrawn – rendering Berwick either Scottish or English, Berwick often constituting the ‘spoils of war’ between two national identities. In recent years, then, it seems that there has been an emphasis on re-bordering in and around Berwick connected to the politics of devolution in Scotland. To this end, Scotland has been perceived by many in Berwick to have better public services in relation to England such as free education and better public transport provision for the elderly, and so on, resulting in the border becoming extremely visible and relevant for those living on the wrong (southern) side such as parents about to send children to university.

In terms of Berwick some ‘nationalist’ residents campaigned for Berwick to return to Scotland, to effectively redraw the border to the south of the town. The rationale for this was rooted in nationalist (and pragmatic) fervour. Berwick was originally a Scottish town, and still very much part and parcel of nationalist rhetoric, the administration in London is geographically distant (and sufficiently different). Campaigning to re-draw the border around Berwick, or for that matter not to re-draw it, thus constitutes ‘borderwork’ in the sense that it is some residents of Berwick that are actively involved in the bordering process. However on closer inspection it becomes clear that the residents of Berwick are using the border in more subtle, nuanced and arguably more effective ways. The border is being used to create a distinctive identity for Berwick as being unique, an identity that is neither wholly English nor Scottish. Indeed further examination paints a more complex and nuanced picture of how the residents of Berwick in general experienced, interacted with, and ultimately utilised the border to their own ends. A previous, unrelated,

⁶ At the time of writing, however, there are plans by the Scottish administration to make the Scottish/English border more visible by creating and installing a border monument at Gretna. The winning design was titled the ‘Star of Caledonia’. See: www.urbanrealm.com/news/2996/_%E2%80%98Star_of_Caledonia%E2%80%99_to_adorn_border_with_England.html

study which interviewed the residents of Berwick also alludes to this idea, the authors stating:

People from the town regularly transgress some of the most common identity rules and develop alternative ones of their own. Indeed, people in the town turned out to be claiming, attributing, rejecting, accepting and side-stepping national identity, in ways that we had seldom or never previously encountered (Kiely, McCrone, Bechhofer & Stewart, 2000, 1.6).

In many ways the proximity of Berwick in relation to the border, situates the town in a borderland of sorts, and therefore affords the residents many of the opportunities that van Schendel observed in his own study of borderlands discussed earlier in the chapter. It seems that, for Berwick, the state border has lost some of its defining or framing influence, whether institutionally imposed or directed by Scotland, England or both. It no longer demarcates the division between England and Scotland, and the 'side' that Berwick is located becomes at best secondary to the identity creating opportunities that are found elsewhere, well away from the immediacy of the border line or space. This is not to reduce the impact of the border, however, inasmuch as it becomes redefined and has the effect of re-orienting Berwick, to use Durrschmidt and Taylor's (2007, p.54) terms, "towards the global socio-cultural landscapes rather than towards immediate neighbours".

To this end, what is also clear from the example of Berwick is the multitude of transnational networking opportunities made available because of its proximate location to the border. An example of the way in which Berwick created a sense of distinctness, via the border, is the establishment of an international film and media arts festival in what is a relatively small town. In previous years the major themes of the festival have been pertinantly border related. The inaugural festival which took place in 2005 featured the theme of 'crossing and exploring boundaries', a trend that would be continued in subsequent years such as 'Inner States' which took place in 2008, and 'Drawing the Lines' which took place in 2009. In terms of the 'Inner States' theme in 2008, the official festival website describes how the organisers "used the location of Berwick to explore geographical and emotional states of

independence”⁷. Examples of ‘networked Berwick’ include: ‘The Walled Town Friendship Circle’, which consists 152 other towns from around the world, and the ‘Cittaslow’ movement.

The second example involves the creation of a non-state border of sorts⁸. The English town of Melton Mowbray successfully applied for the European Union (EU) protective geographic Indication (PGI) for its famous brand of porkpies that essentially bans pies that are produced outside of a 25-mile radius of the town to be labelled ‘Melton Mowbray’. The PGI border was the result of a small number of producers in and around the town – all situated, of course, within the new border – who fought a long and arduous campaign to bring the border to fruition. At first glance the construction of the border may seem firmly rooted in local and regional politics, and indeed it is. It entrenches Melton’s local and regional position in the context of the UK, providing the town with distinctive marketing and branding opportunities such as labelling the area, to state the regional boundary demarcation sign, “a rural capital of food”. The construction of the border, and the politics surrounding its construction, are very much rooted in local geography and history to which end the border is both connective and protective (See Chapter Five for a detailed elaboration of this aspect), or, in terms of this chapter, the border represents a vertical as well as horizontal order of scale.

However, in terms of horizontal scale and connection, like the Berwick example above, the construction and proximity of the border is an example of how bordering can connect to places beyond the immediate locality of the (demarcating) border. Intriguingly this opens up the possibility of the UK having meaningful borderlands in non-traditional places, borderlands in which, for certain people/interests at least, restructuring/re-scaling opportunities become available. Indicative of this aspect the Melton border is, in many ways, effectively a European border – an EU border in the heart of England – connecting Melton with other food producing localities across the

⁷ Taken from the official website: <http://www.berwickfilm-artsfest.com/about-us> (Accessed on 1st July 2010).

⁸ The way in which the EU PGI border circling Melton Mowbray constitutes a traditional and tangible border, that can be logically understood in the same context of other traditional state borders, is discussed in the following journal article: ‘Borders and Status Functions: An Institutional approach to Studying Borders’, which I co-authored with Chris Perkins. Here we argue that any border is given legitimacy because the rules under which a tangible border functions are embedded in a web background assumptions that constitute what a border is and what it is supposed to do. A copy of the article has been placed in the appendix, under heading A, for consideration.

European Union. Likewise, the creation of the border allows Melton to market itself beyond its locality as a ‘food capital’ within the UK, or for that matter the EU, but to also hold a prominent place on the ‘global food map’. Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, the news of Melton’s ‘food border’ was not only reported in the national UK press, but also as far and wide as Malta, South Africa and New Zealand.

Therefore in general terms the two examples highlight the way in which important and tangible borders can be invisible to most but extremely visible to some. To this end, Chapter Five will focus on politics and empowerment and use the examples to show how connection for some can mean disconnection for others. As far as this chapter is concerned, however, the point is to show how borders can be utilised to connect to non-proximate localities incorporating scale as a component of that connection. The examples show that depending on (geographical and political) context, borders can be part of horizontal or vertical scales. The border in both examples – somewhat insignificant to most but hugely resourceful to some – becomes a local marker but also, by definition, an interface to the wider world. The border becomes a foundation upon which the respective residents can construct their ‘mental maps’, and consequently the towns become situated across multiple scales. The border creates horizontal networking opportunities that connect both Berwick and Melton to other distant localities to use Giddens’ terms, but this is not to over privilege these networks as Leitner warns. Distant localities are brought closer while more immediate geographical neighbours are pushed further away. This is an example of ‘scale bending’ whereby by traditional scales buckle under the weight of the bordering processes taking place, directly as a result of the interests of the respective borderers. Looking at borders in this way allows us to understand how connection to what is non-proximate is made possible in general terms. But also, and perhaps more pertinently, it highlights how the meaning of proximity, and the actualisation of connection, changes in different contexts. As Sheppard and McMaster (2004, p.15) point out “the actual distance between two places may have little to do with the miles separating them”.

The examples represent borders that are not situated in traditional borderland settings, where, as we have seen, connection in relation to borders is usually discussed and contextualised. Nor are the borders in question security borders, which, again as previously discussed, tend to filter and facilitate movement across them. And, while Berwick is situated in the proximity of what is technically a national border, albeit

relatively invisible and benign one to most, the border at Melton provides an example a non-state border in the sense that it has not been imposed by a state in ‘top-down’ fashion (again, see Chapter Five for a discussion of the ‘bottom-up’ politics surrounding the bordering of connection). To varying degrees and in different ways, the bordering on offer here evidences the ‘scale politics’ discussed above and, in doing so, scale becomes incorporated as a component of connection. Both examples and contexts show, particularly in Berwick, how the border was used to disconnect from the dominant and/or overarching framework of the state level.

Again, albeit to varying degrees, this disconnection created similar dynamics and thus opportunities afforded and available to the borderlanders of which van Schendel described earlier in the chapter. It must be noted here that disconnection from the state level does not mean wholesale disconnection from the state, which would be improbable and some would argue undesirable. Rather, as Leitner, Smith, and van Schendel argue, it implies that the scale of the state becomes one of many scales that can be utilised to various ends. The examples illustrate how localities become networked to and through the world because of borders and not at their expense. Indicative of Brenner’s (2004, p66) imagery, borders as mechanisms of connection allow places to become part of the “complex mosaic of superimposed and interpenetrating nodes, levels, scales and morphologies”. We are, in short, placelings, as Escobar (2001, p.143) alludes, but, as the examples show particularly well, connection to place does not, by definition, exclude connection to the world writ large. Far from it, both Berwick and Melton show how connection to other non-proximate places can actually enhance and empower locality and place:

Subaltern strategies of localization still need to be seen in terms of place; places are surely connected and constructed yet those constructions entail boundaries, grounds, selective connection, interaction, and positioning, and in some cases a renewal of history making skills. Connectivity, interactivity and positionality are the correlative characteristics of attachment to place (Escobar, 2001, p.169).

However, as will be shown in the next chapter, in the context of borders as mechanisms of connection, attachment to place is rooted in border politics and consequently involves processes of empowerment and disempowerment, winners and losers.

Concluding remarks

The main thrust of the arguments presented in this chapter stem from a general dissatisfaction in the way borders are omitted from, or secondary to, debates concerning the relationship between localities and the world writ large. Debates which, more often than not, tend to be cumulatively put forward to describe globalization and global interconnectedness. This chapter, therefore, showed how different types of border, found at different locations and scales can, as the chapter title suggests, be used to invoke scale as a mechanism of connection. With particular focus on concepts and politics of scale, the chapter discussed particular mechanisms detailing how certain borders at the very least can operate to ‘bring together’, while at the same time functioning to ‘make distinct or separate’. That is, to reiterate the main themes of this thesis in general, the chapter introduces examples (revolving around scale) of the ways in which various borders can function to connect as opposed to, or by definition, wholly functioning to divide and, likewise, how borders are required for connection and not secondary to it.

The chapter thus highlighted the ways in which scale politics not only effects our everyday lives, but also the ways in which contemporary social relations are shaping constructions of scale and crucially how we experience this. In doing so, concepts of scale were discussed and subsequently rejected as ontologically given categories (Marston, 2004), that is, the ways in which scale is seemingly put forward as fixed hierarchical spaces within which specific political and social action take place (and subsequently be observed as such) was dismissed. Therefore, irrespective of traditional, dominant or taken for granted hierarchical scale, the chapter argued that certain borders, often representative of place, can function as portals to other places. More specifically certain borders can become mechanisms for spatial connectivity by distorting and restructuring traditionally imposed hierarchies of scale. Borders can, in other words, function to connect multiple places that seemingly exist on different, closed off and perhaps even conflictory scales in such a way as to render them all ‘distant localities’.

In this sense, borders do not keep separate the local and the global, or, for that matter different scales or levels, but rather constitute important mechanisms in blurring and displacing these taken for granted relationships, which are often

presented as visibly distinct and often dialectical or antagonistic. On this logic, providing limits in one context at the same time also problematises, disrupts, blurs or restructures limits in other contexts. The ‘post modern world’ does not become wholly flat, because horizontal connectivity does not occur at the expense of borders but, as theorised here, directly because of them. Borders as mechanisms of connection still act as markers – perhaps evoking a sense of verticality – but at the same time they operate to level out in particular directions based upon the type of marking taking place.

Chapter Five

Border Politics: Possibility, Opportunity and Empowerment through the Mechanism of Connection

[W]e may be able to produce new insights about the character and the power relations embedded in borders and frontiers if we relax the assumption that the border is a necessary property of the state. For bordering is a social function that is enacted through diverse means, in various settings and for different purposes.

(Walters, 2006, p.165)

Borders as mechanisms of connection, then, are simultaneously both markers and interfaces in the sense that one requires the other. Following on from this, borders as mechanisms of connection also invoke scale as an aspect, form or mechanism of connection. In turn this chapter examines how borders (and more importantly processes of bordering) constitute, ‘contain’, signify and/or establish sites of ‘vertical’ and ‘horizontal’ power relations, and explores the ways in which bordering empowers some at the expense of others. It argues that connection via borders, of the sort described in the previous chapters, is rooted in processes of power, and that furthermore, bordering to connect can create ‘grass roots’ political opportunity and empowerment.

Although painted with a broad brush at this introductory stage, routes to empowerment and opportunity, vis-à-vis borders, have tended to converge around ‘bottom-up’ resistance and contestation in the face of ‘top-down’ (usually state centric) territorial governance and governmental practices. In this regard, borders are usually formalised as state institutions (Anderson, 1996; O’Dowd, 2010), are constitutive of and constituted by horizontal and vertical power relations inherent to or surrounding the production and reproduction of bounded spaces (Paasi, 1996a,

2010; van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer, 2005) – that is, the construction of dominant binary logics inherent to the production and reproduction of (state) territoriality – and have become synchronised with novel and powerful disciplinary technologies of control (Amoore, 2006; Walters, 2006; Salter, 2008; Vaughan-Williams, 2009).

Overlapping, ‘borders’ have been equally observed as ‘liminal zones’ (Donnan and Wilson, 1999, p.64), or borderlands (see Martinez, 1994), within which the local, ethnic, cultural and (trans)national identities of borderland dwellers are frequently contested, asserted and simultaneously multiple (see also Pieterse, 2001). Supposedly due to the diluted influence of institutional and centralised power at the (state) territorial ‘periphery’, it has been noted that ‘borderlanders’, via direct exposure to difference, ‘ideas’ and even consumer choice, have access to ‘meaning-making’ and ‘meaning-breaking’ opportunity structures that are unique to the borderland and therefore not available to those situated away from the ‘borderland milieu’ (Martinez, 1994; see also Anderson and O’Dowd, 1999). Indeed, when taken as a generalised whole, even the borderland itself has been described as having a certain potency or agency – what Parker (2008, p.11) calls ‘positive marginality’ – that has the power to determine or influence the policy defining and/or institutional power of the centre/state.

Modalities of power in relation to borders can therefore be traditionally found circulating through cartographic practices of naming and maintaining place, whereby border/ing becomes embedded within, as well as an outcome of, horizontal (everyday) social practices and processes (Paasi, 1996a; 2010; Struver, 2004), as well as at the same time framed within and intersected by vertical processes consisting of centralised (state) institutions and associated elites (see also Anderson, 1996; Newman, 2003). Alternatively, yet still very much related, modalities of power (and empowerment/disempowerment) can be further framed in relation to mobilities. On the one hand, as discussed in Chapter Two, borders and associated processes function to divide (channel), facilitate and exclude mobile bodies and things usually dependent on the level of threat to the state (see Amoore, 2006; Epstein, 2007), as assessed and narrated by powerful and institutional elites within or of the state (Newman, 2003; Balibar, 2006). On the other hand, concomitant and corollary to this ‘divisionary channelling’, power can also be observed and ‘measured’ by the capacity to resist or even exploit being blocked, categorised or excluded (Papadopoulos *et al*, 2008; See

also Appadurai, 2006). Commonly observed as being ‘bottom-up’, ‘polycentric’ or non-state, such resistance manifests as (potentially) border traversing ‘things’ and ‘bodies’, particularly narrated by the state to be surreptitious, or, as Andreas’s (2003) conceptualises them, ‘clandestine transnational actors’ (again, see also Papadopoulos *et al*, 2008).

The problem, at least as far as this chapter is concerned, relates to the ways in which *rationales* and *outcomes* of power relations, in the context of borders as briefly described above, often conceptually amount to or surround ‘*barrier*’ construction, imposition and maintenance. This in turn narrowly frames the forms, contexts and rationales of ‘bottom-up’ or ‘grass-roots’ opportunity, empowerment and possibility available, that is, ‘resistance’ to borders is often formulated in terms of unauthorised crossing or contact on the one hand, and/or the ability to re-narrate borders for specific ends at the territorial ‘periphery’, on the other. Although it should be noted that such ‘resistances’ do not, by definition, lead to opportunity or empowerment, particularly when conceptualised as ‘outcomes’.

Wholly focusing on relations of power in this way, however, is unhelpful when trying to theorise borders in relation to connection for the following reasons: In general terms such logic tends to over-privilege state territoriality (however dynamic) and the overlapping territorial concepts of ‘limit’ and ‘periphery’ (to be either imposed, managed or overcome), and grinds up against the resistive power of mobility or liminal spaces, with the success of one in relation to the other often constituting a determinant measure of opportunity, empowerment/disempowerment as well as institutional border ‘change’ (Newman, 2003b; Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos, 2008). Focusing on power in relation to borders in this way consequently fails to grasp (and even keeps its distance from) the ways in which borders form part of what could be termed here a lived experience of non-proximate connection. Importantly, the dominant ‘optic’ of such barrier logic in relation to empowerment, opportunity and possibility, fails to adequately capture the ways in which people connect and engage with the world writ large – becoming empowered in the process – without, by definition, resorting to crossing or residing close to (resisting) divisionary borders/barriers, and the interplay of power therein.

In response, this chapter will continue to focus on connection in relation to borders. It will put forward and advance the idea that borders can produce (bottom-up) routes to political (and even economic and social) opportunity and empowerment

through their ability to generate new forms of ‘non-proximate’ mobility, representation and exchange (see Cooper and Rumford, 2011; See also Chapters Three and Four for the mechanics of this move) that do not require ‘movement’, ‘resistance’ and ‘contact’ understood in their conventional sense (see also Cooper and Perkins, 2012). It will be shown how ‘grass roots’ border utilization is frequently operationalised, but more pertinently how the pragmatic utilization of non-proximate ‘identities’ and ‘resources’, via border/ing, produces new and empowering opportunities that are not necessarily or only available or achievable ‘locally’. On this ‘new’ logic, it is argued, connecting globally through border construction, maintenance and/or narration can be reasonably conceptualised as a new form of ‘tangible’ mobility that does not amount to or require conventional forms of movement, that is, conventional forms of movement that are commonly observed to have a capacity or potential to resist or, alternatively, be defined by borders.

Before proceeding, it must be noted that, for the most part, this thesis takes connection and connectivity to be positive aspects (outcomes) of the border/ing process (or at least benign). On this logic disconnection is taken to be negative and undesirable. Overall, the ways in which borders connect (act as reference points) is deemed positive because it opens up possibilities that would not otherwise be present in the absence of a border. While the possibilities and politics of connectivity through bordering will be discussed in due course, some points concerning connectivity in general terms need to be further outlined (particularly in relation to this thesis).

It has been pointed out that war or conflict could be reasonably termed a kind of connection and, as such, disconnection can be benign. More generally connection/connectivity on this logic is not, by definition, normatively good in any universal sense. This seems wholly reasonable, and it highlights the need for a more comprehensive study of all aspects of connection in relation to borders and the consequences this has on the border/borderers in question (see Chapter Six). However the problem with a more negative form (or outcome) of connection is that it can revert back to the unhelpful dichotomy whereby the border signifies a simplistic division (connection) between inside/outside and us/them and so on. Here, the paranoid desire for fixed identity often amounts to the vilification of the ‘Other’, what Connolly termed a ‘paradox of identity’ in Chapter Three. There is a danger, in other words, that when negative connection/connectivity is taken into account – negative

connectivity which is in itself subjective – traditional divisionary processes at the border are reinforced.

This thesis, however, has aimed to avoid this as much as possible. It has focused on non-proximate connection that is generated by different border types. What will be taken into account is the politics of border/ing and connection in terms of political and social empowerment and disempowerment. The logic of this move is to show that non-state actors (individuals and groups) can connect to world writ large via seemingly unimportant and less visible borders. Of direct interest however are the grass roots politics and social interactions that power border/ing (and connections) at different sites.

To begin the next part of the chapter looks at the power of border/ing in general terms. It begins by expanding on the afore mentioned debates and observes that, when placed together generally, relations of ‘power’ inherent to borders can be loosely conceptualised and framed within overlapping processes of ‘construction’, associated maintenance (bordering) and ‘containment’ (inclusion), as well as associated notions of ‘crossing’ (mobility) and ‘contact’ (liminality). These processes are also seen as being framed in relation to the state. Using examples, the latter half of the chapter will show that focusing on the novel ways in which borders connect to ‘distant localities’, in turn opens up a different way of understanding grass-roots political empowerment and ‘bottom-up’ resistance. This is particularly the case when the state is considered to be only one (albeit very powerful) actor capable of bordering, and, likewise, that state borders are not the only tangible borders rife for study, as principally argued by Rumford (2006, 2007, 2010; See also Walters, 2006; Cooper and Perkins, 2012).

The power of border/ing and the border/ing of power: The importance of studying borders in relation to power

When placing together two broad and yet context specific social processes as ‘borders/bordering’ and power generally put, there is a danger that coherently mapping their complex and intrinsic relationship at a general level quickly becomes difficult, over complicated and even ‘ahistorical’. To be sure, border/power relationships can be mapped very differently from discipline to discipline, depending,

of course, upon different disciplinary questions, frameworks and methodological boundaries (see Anderson, 1996; also Newman, 2003)¹. It is important to note, therefore, that the following section (or indeed chapter entire chapter) is not intended to be an in depth theoretical or philosophical exposé of power as a subject matter in and of itself, but rather a focus on how power has been discussed in relation to borders generally put, and how such discussions can be used to critically push forward the ‘border/connection nexus’ outlined thus far. Indeed, when trying to observe ‘empowerment’ it becomes useful to also equally observe its intimate opposite – disempowerment – by focusing on the ways in which power relationships influence and shape choices and opportunities across different social alignments. The first part of this section concentrates on borders/power relative to notions of construction, maintenance and containment. What immediately follows is a starting point focus on territory.

While the concept and history of territory easily constitutes a detailed and nuanced subject matter in its own right, placing many debates beyond the scope of this chapter, there are some interesting key issues relating to notions of construction, maintenance and containment that merit particular focus. Indeed, in many ways, the production and maintenance of territory has become centrally important to many scholars interested in configurations of power at and surrounding borders. The traditional notion of territory can be broadly understood, as much as it needs to be here, as the logic of spatial ordering manifesting as ‘bounded spaces’ under the control of a group of people (see Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002; Elden, 2009; Paasi, 2010). Gently pushing this logic further in terms of border/ing and power, particularly when conceptualised ‘territorially’, it becomes possible to describe or initiate borders as a “means of control involving the use of bounded geographical spaces” (Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.6). In many ways this constitutes a dominant and/or popular border imaginary and, for many scholars, the study of border/ing gains important analytical purchase when trying to understand tangible, locatable and quantifiable relations and symbols of power and control. On this general ‘starting point’ logic, then, it is the form, appearance and nature of such control in relation to borders that is of specific interest here, as are overlapping questions of who borders, how and why.

¹ Anderson (2004, p.319) for example argues that even academic disciplines are also subject to powerful logics of territorial ‘inside/outside’.

Territory is traditionally seen as a precondition for (modern) statehood (see Elden, 2009), to which the state – or for that matter other ‘state-like’ entities – provides a seemingly obvious answer to the question of ‘who’ borders, an answer that also informs and codes the questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’. Through the creation of static segments – or ‘rigid segmentarity’ in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1986, p.211-212) oft-used terms – space becomes institutionalised and, by definition, supposedly ‘fixed’. The resultant ‘institutionalised territorial state’ – itself both constituted by and constitutive of bounded space – manifests and becomes recognisable as a sovereign institutionalised source of ultimate authority and jurisdiction, capable of equally recognising (and respecting) other bounded sovereign authorities (see Sassen, 2006). Although Chapters One and Two touched upon the historical and empirical ‘real world’ inaccuracy of the state’s perceived ability or power to overcode territory or bounded space, van Houtum (2005, p.676) has alluded that we are nevertheless “still haunted” by this Hobbesian definition of (state) borders. That is, still haunted by the dominant imaginary of the geopolitical border *line* that has traditionally constituted a tangible and visible limit within which, to paraphrase Weber’s (2004, p.33) famous principle, human communities lay claim to a monopoly of legitimate physical violence.

The way in which borders constitute a “key domain where the state’s ideological effect is maintained and upheld” (Gainsborough, 2009, p.4), provides an interesting example of the continued prevalence or outcome of such ‘haunting’. One of the key attributes of this ‘ideological effect’ is the ability of the state to appear ‘free standing’ and separate from society, thus creating conceptual, traditional and normalised ‘objective’ border logics – state/society, public/private, and so on – that do not hold any real distinction beyond the objective and conceptual realm. That is, while state power functions to make internal hierarchical borders visible and tangible, there exists no clear distinction between these ordering thought processes in the ‘real world’ (Ibid, p.3). The state’s ideological effect is thus a product of, but in turn also masks, “the real way state power is exercised, namely through the production, reproduction and policing of a boundary which is portrayed as being distinct when [...] it is anything but” (Ibid, p.3). This is ultimately advantageous for the (territorial) state because it can use the general acceptance of distinct borders by citizens – a product of ‘ideological effect’ – to add legitimacy to its judicial disciplinary function. Incidentally, it is along these lines that Foucault (2007, p.155) has argued: “the

growth of the State in Europe has been partly assured by, or in any case, utilized as an instrument, the development of juridical thought. Monarchic power, the power of the State, is essentially represented in law”; a form of power that Foucault would successfully render problematic and too simplistic.

The example above highlights a way in which the sovereign institutionalised state positions itself as being capable of fixing and thus shaping and controlling a distinct inside from the rest of the world. And, complementing this recognition, that this is a thoroughly natural and visible state of affairs, when in fact it is anything but. To this end Elden (2009) usefully points out that the (again perceived) ability or power of the state fix and control space rests upon a particularly modern – and technical – definition and development of the concept of space itself. Elden (2009, p.xxvii), following Lefebvre, argues that while boundaries have existed on different scales and at different times, our modern interpretation of territorial boundedness relies in the first instance on the formulation and acceptance of Cartesian mechanisms of calculating, quantifying and commanding space/territory, mechanisms upon which borders can be established and implicated as a means of control².

On this logic the modern – or what could also be equally termed ‘European’ – territorial border is defined in relation to the “imposition of a Cartesian idea of space which is external, material, absolute, and objective, rather than belonging to a cognitive and subjective category internal to the subject as argued by Aristotle and later by Kant” (Cooper and Rumford, 2011, p.267; See also Lefebvre, 1991). The Cartesian science of producing space arguably becomes a vector through which state institutionalised power is implemented and helps to explain and conceptualise the spatial mechanism upon which notions of ‘construction’, ‘maintenance’ and ‘containment’, in relation to borders, depend. But it also has implications, however, as it becomes clear that power and associated violence does not remain limited to the ‘inside’, that borders are not “harmless ‘fences between neighbours’ that serve to delimit violence” (Vaughn-Williams, 2009, p.66).

Through operationalising Cartesian calculating and quantifying mechanisms – or, taken cumulatively, ‘spatial technology’ – the (modern) state gains the power to supposedly capture and compartmentalise space. Acknowledging the social/political

² Elden (2009, p.xxvii) quotes: “A properly critical political theory of territory needs to investigate the quantification of space and the role of calculative mechanisms in the commanding of territory, and the establishment of borders”.

construction of space – indeed focusing on this fundamental construction as starting or framing ‘point of departure’ – allows more critical geopolitical approaches the scope to deconstruct the ‘natural’ and/or ‘ontological’ foundation of bounded space. That is, to make visible the powerful Westphalian (Hobbesian) ghosts that haunt traditional, but still very much present, thinking on the spatiality of power (Agnew, 1994; Vaughan-Williams, 2009). For Vaughan-Williams (2009, p.43), focusing on border construction raises important questions about violence, sovereignty, and power that previous border imaginaries leave unproblematised. For Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp.385-6) one aspect of border construction/practice/violence amounts to or is summed up by the artificial (or Cartesian) capturing movement itself:

It is a vital concern of every State not only to vanquish nomadism but to control migrations and, more generally, to establish a zone of rights over an entire "exterior," over all of the flows traversing the ecumenon. If it can help it, the State does not dissociate itself from a process of capture of flows of all kinds, populations, commodities or commerce, money or capital, etc. There is still a need for fixed paths in well-defined directions, which restrict speed, regulate circulation, relativize movement, and measure in detail the relative movements of subjects and objects.

Deleuze and Guattari’s quote ‘captures’ some notable insights in terms of borders and manifestations of power. Importantly, it points to the ways in which the state (increasingly) uses border/ing as a technology to control, manipulate and vertically govern transnational mobility – not only to vanquish nomadism, but more importantly to create ‘fixed paths in well-defined directions’ – which will be further discussed in relation to empowerment/disempowerment in due course. Indeed, this also overlaps the discussion in Chapter Three concerning border metaphors. In general terms, though, it simply highlights very well the main overlapping points of the discussion thus far: the constructed illusion of the territorial container state, the ‘smoke and mirrors’ of the state’s ‘ideological effect’ as a catalyst for institutional objectivity and legitimacy, and the top-down imposition of clearly defined and clearly quantifiable borders – conceptual, ideological, or otherwise.

However, as particularly noted and discussed in Chapter Two, space does not form a background or container upon or within which political acts happens. Rather,

space itself is dynamic and active, constitutive of and constituted by overlapping vertical and horizontal social (Paasi, 1996) and political (Lefèbvre, 1991) empowering and disempowering processes. Space folds and overlaps with other spaces and on one level at least territory is thus always in a continual process of being contested and re-contested, made and remade. This keys into van Schendel's observation in Chapter Three concerning territorial contestation and restructuring, where by international borders become 'localities of importance'. Borders serve as "sites and agents of order and disorder in a dynamic global landscape" (Anderson, O'Dowd and Wilson, 2002, p.7), whereby "deterritorialization", as famously argued by Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p.60), "always occurs in relation to a complementary reterritorialization". On this logic, Newman (2003b, p.15) argues that new forms of territorial organization of power taking place across different scales, by association, mirrors new forms and contours of borders. And this, of course, keys into the idea that borders should not be viewed as fixed points in time and space, but rather as complex and overlapping horizontal – bottom-up – as well as vertical – top-down – processes rooted in continual politics of affirmation and contestation, empowerment and disempowerment. The power of, or inherent to, 'processes' in relation to border/ing will now be discussed in the remaining part of this opening section.

Partly as a result of the need to add theoretical substance to the 'bare bones' of earlier, more descriptive or 'outcome' based approaches to studying borders (see Hartshorne, 1950), the last decade or so has ushered in more nuanced and 'real word' accurate descriptions that have (correctly) given due diligence to the constant process of bordering and, in this sense, the complex modalities of power that bordering entails (see, for example, Paasi, 1996a; van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer, 2005; See also Chapter Two). Indeed, when framed in terms of 'verbing' (see Albert, Jacobson, Lapid, 2001), power can be seen to circulate through social processes that forms a foundation upon which visible and objectifiable territorial borders rest, as aptly summed up in the following quote, which is also indicative of more critical approaches:

Border objects are not relevant in themselves, as are the objectification processes of bounded spaces informing people's everyday spatial practices. This power of borders, that which exceeds their constraining material form, is derived from their specific interpretation and a resultant (often violent)

practice. Most importantly, a territorial *b/order* is a normative idea, a belief in the existence and continuity of a territorially binding and differentiated power that only becomes concrete, objectified and real in our own everyday social practices (van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer, 2005, p.3).

In other words, what the border does and how it functions to do it exists in non-material form – as normative belief – which becomes locatable and tangible in everyday social practice. The power of the visible traditional (state) territorial border is really located in the power to narrate its visibility, function and importantly its desirability.

The violence of border/ing or border production alluded to above is brought into sharp relief when framed, as is often the case, in terms of ‘bordering out’. Indeed, border/ing is still very much framed in terms of bounded space, whereby power, and border practice, becomes associated with the production of boundary myths, symbols and meaning making, the production of belonging and non belonging, familiarity and unfamiliarity, nostalgia and foreboding. On this logic, even critical approaches tend to focus, in one way or another, on exclusion as a primary ‘lowest common denominator’ of border/ing. Connolly (1995, p.xxii) has pointed out that, while the noun territory is commonly presumed to derive from *terra* meaning earth, soil and nourishment, thus giving the sense of sustaining a ‘people’, territory can also tangibly be etymologically linked to *terrere* meaning to frighten or terrorize (see also Elden, 2009). This can be deemed to logically manifest in the form of exclusion, which is summed up simply enough:

Territory is sustaining land occupied and bounded by violence. By extension, to territorialize anything is to establish exclusive boundaries around it by warning other people off. A religious identity, a nation, a class, a race, a gender, a sexuality, a nuclear family, on this reading is constructed through its mode of territorialization (Connolly, 1995, p.xxii).

Some notable approaches to border/ing exist that offer useful ‘optics’ for observing modalities of power. Newman (2003b, p.15) argues “it is the process of bordering, rather than the border line per se, that has universal significance in the ordering of society”, territorial or otherwise. For Newman the bordering process

creates order through the construction of difference, a construction determined and imposed by those power elites – those with ‘myth-making capacities (Kramsch, 2010, p.1007) – who control and script the hierarchical values and codes which determine the included from the excluded, membership from non-membership, and so on (Newman, 2003b, p.15; 2006; see also Kramsch, 2010). In more operational terms, border institutions – heavily influenced and determined by power elites within a given society – govern the extent of inclusion and exclusion, the degree of permeability and the laws governing trans-boundary movement (which will be discussed in due course). On this logic, elite codified exclusion is based upon the ‘liberal’ doctrine of access to ‘rights’ and ‘representation’, a doctrine that ideologically underpins the concept of the modern (European) state. Importantly for Newman – in relation to power elites over-coding state territorial space – the border ‘comes to life’ at the level of narrative, discourse and communication. Thus Newman (2006, p.152) states “we often delude ourselves into believing that we are living in a borderless world when, in effect, some of our more mundane daily life practices and activities demonstrate the continued impact of the bordering process on societal norms”. Ultimately, the location of borders will change over time, but they will “always demarcate the parameters within which identities are conceived, perceived, perpetuated and reshaped” (Newman, 2006, p.148).

Likewise, for Paasi (2011, p.2), the power relations inherent to bordering processes are complex and embedded in “daily lives and state related practices and in institutions such as language, culture, myths, heritage, politics, legislation and economy” (Ibid). This is one of the ‘immeasurable’ reasons for which Paasi has long argued that a nuanced general theory of borders is not possible in any meaningful and useful way. What Paasi has argued, however, is that borders, by definition incorporating the complex processes above, can only be reasonably and generally ‘theorised’ as part of a wider production/reproduction of territoriality/territory, state power and agency. For Paasi, therefore, borders are essentially manifestations of territoriality whereby borders manifest all over a given territory embedded, as they are, in ‘horizontal’ social relations. Paasi (1996b, p.10; See also 2005, p.28) thus demonstrates how borders can be discursive to the extent that the “construction of social communities and their boundaries takes place through narratives and ‘stories’ which bind people together”. In this way the border can be reinforced through material and textual constructs such as newspapers, books, maps, drawings, paintings,

songs, poems, various memorials and monuments (Ibid, p.13), all of which “reveal and strengthen the material and symbolic elements of historical continuity in human consciousness” (Ibid).

Olivier Kramsch, on the other hand, offers useful criticism of Newman and particularly Paasi that resonates with the purpose of this opening section, mainly, to put forward the observation that modalities of power are wholly wrapped up within processes of state centred ‘construction’, ‘maintenance’ and ‘containment’ whereby each overlapping process is considered an outcome of power play. Kramsch points out the genuine usefulness of Paasi and Newman’s joint and individual approaches, whereby they focus on the crucial role of nation-state induced nationalism in overcoding the social construction of boundaries between social collectives, as well as the influence of different scales upon acts of boundary making, as discussed in Chapter Three. However, in terms of power/empowerment/disempowerment and so on, Kramsch (2010, p.1009) also points out that, while Paasi and Newman acknowledge that territory is contested and thus constantly produced and reproduced, the state and associated territoriality still provides the overarching framework for discussing borders. As a result, Kramsch (2010, p.1009) argues that Paasi and Newman’s boundary making becomes reduced to “a timeless ritual with no clear geo-historical coordinates by which to measure conjunction sensitive effects, fields of force, and capacities for negotiation and adaptive resistance to state power”. Consequently, while both thinkers recognise the complexities of power that weave in and out of social border production and reproduction occurring on different social scales, they nevertheless:

[P]rovide no guideposts for assessing different forms of border-making power, their potentially positive or negative effects, and actual capacities for contestation [...] We seem to be standing before a normative limit in which the problematization of power at the border is at once ceaselessly invoked and deferred. (Kramsch, 2010, p.1009)

While Paasi, for example, acknowledges and is directly interested in the production and reproduction of borders/bounded spaces (re/de-territorialisation), taking into account structure and agency (which for him is historically contingent), it remains at best unclear where resistance and agency, and the form it takes, fit into this

production/reproduction repetition. It is as if border/boundary production and reproduction, although directly influenced by specific histories of place, simply and continually repeat or, as Kramsch (2010, p.1007) puts it, this territorial production/reproduction becomes “an eternal return of the same”.

From a slightly different angle, Henk van Houtum offers a useful schema that brings into sharp relief traditional/conventional border production or border/ing processes indicative of Kramsch’ concerns. For van Houtum (2010b), of course, a critical analysis of any ‘socio-spatial entity must focus on its processes of border production. In doing so the power relations involved in border production can be analysed through the overlapping, but context specific, abstract dimensions – ‘conceptual invariances’ in Paasi’s (2010, p.224) terms – of what van Houtum has usefully summed up as ‘bordering’, ‘ordering’ and ‘othering’, particularly in terms of (im)mobilising people via logics of inclusion and exclusion (van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2001, p.126). On these terms, ‘bordering’ involves the continual legitimisation and justification of border demarcation and location, claiming a singular exclusive territory/identity/sovereignty. It involves, therefore, ‘containerisation’, silencing internal differences, and the continual making of a socio-spatial order (van Houtum, 2010b, p.962), in other words, “an ongoing strategic effort to make a difference in space among the movements of people, money or products” (van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2001, p.126).

Operating under the umbrella of ‘bordering’, and of crucial importance to its success, ‘Ordering’ involves emptying and purifying a/the previous social order or container, erasing the older codes with those of the new. Van Houtum (2010b, p.962) states: “If not military, this is done symbolically through the production of belonging and nostalgia through the selective invention and narration of community and tradition via common rituals, memories and history”. Resistance is tamed through processes of ‘normalisation’, a standard by which exception or (non-belonging) is measured³. Finally, ‘Othering’ captures the production of dichotomous relationships, and, by definition, the production of imagined ‘we’ or ‘ours’. For van Houtum (Ibid), the vector of Othering manifests as the “politicisation and discrimination in spatial differences” (geopolitics), and “the politicisation and consequent discrimination in

³ Indicative of Foucault’s formulation, power here, of course, is not quantifiable in terms of ‘possession’, but rather involves ‘normalisation’ and ‘subjection’ revealed through ‘language politics’, ‘labour politics’ and ‘education politics’ defined as the territorialized norm (van Houtum, 2010, p.).

time differences, expressed by terms like development, underdevelopment, lagging behind, speed, race, modernity, post-modernity and a-modernity” (chronopolitics). The configuration of the dominant political regime determines access to the ‘order’, and consequently the border/ing becomes implicit in the production of ‘Otherness’.

Crucially, over the course of this ‘Bordering, Ordering and Othering’ we see not only the overlap between geopolitics and biopolitics, but also the shift from the former to the latter (see Vaughan-Williams, 2009) and even also to chronopolitics, particularly in relation to ‘Othering’. While the historian Eric Hobsbawm (2008, p.28), has pointed out that there are now comparatively few disputes between states over international (geopolitical) borders, ‘conflict’ and border violence increasingly manifests in “national forces seeking to moderate, control and regulate these variously powerful networks and flows criss-crossing their porous borders” (Urry, 2000, p.1), also alluded to in slightly different terms by Deleuze and Guattari above. Indeed Deleuze and Guattari use the following apt quote by Paul Virilio who states "the political power of the State is *polis*, police, that is, management of the public ways," that "the gates of the city, its levies and duties, are barriers, filters against the fluidity of the masses, against the penetration power of migratory packs" (Virilio, 1986, pp.12-13 cited in Deleuze and Guattari, 2005, p.386).

Framed in terms of mobility it is more often than not institutionalised state borders – heavily influenced and determined by power elites within a given society – that govern the extent of inclusion and exclusion, the degree of permeability and the laws governing trans-boundary movement (Newman, 2003, p.14). The border here – or ‘border machine’ in van Houtum’s (2010b) terms – becomes implemented in the separation, categorisation and exclusion of mobilities, resulting in mobile bodies becoming ‘portable borders par excellence’ (Amoore, 2006, p. 338), whereby, as Epstein (2007, p. 116) tells us, borders “are no longer the classic portals of sovereignty, where power was exerted by granting or withholding access at the gate” (see also Chapter Two). These biometric borders and e-borders do not simply channel the movement of people across the border inasmuch as they mould mobilities into pre-determined categories that are based upon racialised stereotyping (Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p. 15). These in turn become incorporated into ideas of pre-emption, whereby non-traditional borders in non-traditional places allow the state – increasingly consisting of what Papadopoulos et al, (2008) term ‘liminal porocratic institutions’ – to ‘act early’, before suspected individuals reach the territorial border.

The border thus becomes 'grid-like' - but not necessarily 'fixed in the traditional sense' - the imposition of which transforms, categorises and even territorializes imperceptible bodies into subjects (Papadopoulos et al, 2008).

In summary, then, while power in relation to border/ing narrows attention to the more horizontal and constant processes of meaning making and affirmation of place (and the complex relationship between horizontal and vertical relations of power), many dominant studies still include and even reify the state and the associated (increasingly technical) imposition of governmental practices, of making space calculable and controllable. This was the key point pursued in this opening section, that power in relation to borders and bordering revolve around and circulate through 'inward' looking processes and tendencies. Where, therefore, is the bottom-up resistance? And how are borders political in the sense that possibility, opportunity, and empowerment are possible at the border? Likewise, for Kramsch, how does the border transform in ways that render the 'new' suitably different from the 'old'? The central pillar of discussion in the next section will consequently focus on the ways in which border imposition can be/is resisted, as well as the bottom-up opportunity and empowerment that can result from such resistance. It is worth noting, however, that, as stated in the chapter introduction, the debates in this section unsatisfactorily shape the debates and outcomes of the next section.

Opportunity, possibility and empowerment at the border

For Durrschmidt (2006, p.245) "borders carry an intrinsically ambiguous opportunity structure", through which borders ambiguously (and simultaneously) function as bridges for some and barriers to others. Likewise, while remaining exclusionary for some in terms of mobility, they also equally provide spaces of contact, negotiation, possibility and thus opportunity. In this section two approaches to the ways in which borders empower will be discussed. The first aspect focuses on the resistive and transformative capacity of mobility upon the institutional technologies of control designed to channel mobility at different speeds and in multiple directions. The second approach focuses the ability of non-state actors to become empowered through taking part – more often than not even taking the lead – in tangible and meaningful border/ing practices, what Chris Rumford has termed 'borderwork'.

In terms of mobility, and to reiterate Newman (2006), the borders enabling entry to, or exit from, spaces and groups are normally determined by political and social elites as part of the process of societal ordering and compartmentalization. The ability of these elites (or the state) to determine the filtering (bridge/door) function can be quantified in relation to the ability of others to challenge this specific function. Institutional borders on this reading are self-perpetuating and resistant to change, yet, as Newman (2003, p.14) also points out, borders are also there to be crossed: “from the moment they are established, there are always groups who have an interest in finding ways to move beyond the barrier”. Moreover, “since institutions are self-perpetuating and resistant to change”, argues Newman (2003, p.14), “it often requires an increase in levels of trans-boundary interaction on the ground for the norms and regulations to undergo any formal process of change”.

On the one hand, border ‘crossing’ can create possibilities and opportunities for empowerment through the development of ‘cosmopolitan’ attitudes, whereby ‘border crossers’ tend to be more open to foreigners and outside influences because of their border crossing experiences (see Mau, Mews and Zimmerman, 2008). Indeed Boer (2006, p.3) reminisces about travelling on vacation as a child, that “one of the attractions was the crossing of the boundary between countries” (see also Donnan and Wilson, 1999). However these border experiences tend to be connected to a particular kind of ‘traveller’, travelling for usually recreational or business purposes. These travellers legally cross borders with ease because most borders are designed to specifically facilitate them through the vector of traditional forms of citizenship. Border experience is indeed crucial to notions of possibility, opportunity and empowerment, but, on the other hand, crossing borders, and the experience of crossing them, can have a much more resistive and transformative capacity, where resistance can become a form of empowerment. It is this latter aspect that is predominantly of interest in this section.

A good example of this is the work of Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) whose work frames ‘resistance’ in the Deleuze and Guattari influenced concept of ‘escape’. Much like the conclusion in the previous section, Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) recognise the power of the ‘constructed’ institutionalised state in classifying and controlling society, the ability of the state, that is, to impose and position the grid-like border based upon vertically imposed and

horizontally maintained rights and representation – what Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) terms ‘the double-R-axiom’. They state:

The double-R-axiom is central to national sovereignty, not only because it organises political life inside the national space, but also because of its unavailability to certain social groups in the realm of the nation state and, of course, outside of it. The double-R-axiom not only binds people and territory but also designates the nation state’s relation to other states and their people (Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos, 2008, p.6).

Importantly, a major point of their work is to outline the agency of resistance – how to escape the structurally imposed ‘double-R-axiom’ – something, they argue, Giorgio Agamban’s much used and oft-lauded concepts of ‘bare life’ and ‘exception’ fail to do. Moreover, the agency on offer here is not just defined as simply the capacity to resist the imposition of border/ing in a general sense – to be divided or categorised, to ‘get away with it’ – but rather to also have the capacity to alter and transform the very regimes of control that are being resisted. To this end they also state:

The postnational process of border displacement should not, however, be understood as resulting from the actions of sovereign states attempting to extend their power. Rather, it has been effected a complex struggle in which the existing regime of mobility control is itself challenged by fluid, streamlined, clandestine, multidirectional, multipositional and context-dependent forms of mobility (Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos, 2008, p.163).

The key to ‘resistance’ or ‘escape’ lies in the ‘imperceptibility’ of mobility. Papadopoulos et al talk about imperceptibility of migrants in terms of continual ‘becoming’ whereby those ‘chased’ by regimes of control are able to constantly utilize those very regimes for their own ends. As van Houtum (2010, p.973) argues, “no matter how high the wall, there is no wall high enough that will block off migration”. The game, here, no longer concerns ‘visibility’ but imperceptibility where active political subjects refuse to become the subject of institutionalised politics, instead seeking to transform conventional notions of belonging and

citizenship, rights and representation. Migrant centres become places to reconvene before moving on, identity papers become tools of travel, a means of reinvention and evasion. It is also about the continuous experiences of crossing and being in-between 'here' and 'there', of experiencing the difference between 'here' and 'there'. Indeed, on this logic, the border is not necessarily, or by definition, an enemy of the migrant, but rather something that enriches understanding, providing as many opportunity structures than are 'closed off'.

The idea of escape, as advanced here by Papadopoulos et al, offers useful and nuanced insights concerning the resistive agency, and overlapping transformative capacity particularly in areas of rights and representation, inclusion and exclusion. It offers, in other words, useful explanations of the ways in which those who are experiencing the world at the same time have capacity or power to change it. As discussed, border institutions and regimes of control are themselves transforming, themselves becoming mobile and liminal, as response to the new and novel pressures given to them by migrants in a constant state of 'becoming'. Utilizing this logic, it becomes clear how the increasingly nuanced and powerful disciplinary technologies of control actually "generate the means of their own overcoming" (Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos, 2008, p.166). As soon as mobility tactics are uncovered and deemed to be a security problem, new mobility tactics are produced that either exploit any as yet undiscovered opportunities, or, for that matter, recent changes (Ibid). The state's Cartesian mechanism of generating quantifiable space is brought into sharp relief

However, as far as this chapter is concerned, this logic of 'resistance as escape', although of course linked to resistance and transformation, still posits a logic of institutionalised power on the one hand, and more nomadic and fluid forms of agency/power on the other, whereby both are engaged in a constant dialectic. While the intrinsic relationship between the two arguably moves away from modalities of power operating on a vertical scale, in many ways placing the state's need to control mobility and the resistive/transformative capacity of mobility on more of a horizontal axis, it nevertheless conforms to barrier construction that in turn frames the forms and modalities of resistance, and vice versa. Ridged notions of territoriality may be problematised, and territory observed to be transforming across different social scales, yet in many ways, the mobility observed here constantly weakens but also strengthens the barrier logic of the institutionalised state.

Likewise connection – both in literal terms as well as in the more conceptual sense of engaging with the world – is based upon conventional movement. The way in which Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) frame and use mobility is fine, but in doing so this mobility thinking neglects other forms of resistance and ‘movement’ that require greater visibility built upon forms of ‘rootedness’. For Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) ‘imperceptibility’ is built upon a lack of identity/subjectivity – the inability of state’s to satisfactorily impose it – because a powerful (bottom-up) mobility tactic is the ability to pragmatically choose or swap identity when the situation demands and/or allows it. Alternatively, there are also other powerful ‘mobility tactics’ that actually require identity production, narration and maintenance, which merit further discussion.

What is of interest are the ways in which tangible and meaningful borders can be constructed and maintained, as well as contested ‘horizontally’. Indeed, an important purpose of this chapter is to understand how more horizontal and bottom-up approaches render the state only one of many actors capable of bordering, of which there are two distinct motivations: firstly, to understand how non-state actors actually do or make borders, and, secondly, whether non-state actors can produce new forms of border/ing, when the state is removed as a central or dominant focus of analysis. Ultimately, of course, this chapter intends to highlight, amongst other things, how non-state actors can use non-state borders to connect to the wider world, becoming empowered in the process. The next part of the chapter, therefore, discusses these ideas in more detail.

Perhaps the best, and most useful, example that encapsulates the concept of non-state borders and actors is Rumford’s idea of ‘borderwork’. With equal focus upon the way in which people experience borders in their ‘everyday lives’, Rumford’s idea of ‘borderwork’ is placed at the centre of his border research agenda. Rumford (2006; 2008) argues that citizens and indeed non-citizens are commonly observed to be able to utilize borders to their own advantage – drug smugglers, tourists, as well as affirming borders via nationalist tendencies for example – but there is little mention of people ‘doing border/ing’. In other words “Citizens, as well as states”, Rumford (2006, p.165) argues, “have the ability to shape bordering and re-bordering”. Crucial, therefore, to this particular agenda is the assertion that non-state actors – for example, citizens/non-citizens, NGO’s, and entrepreneurs – are able to take part in tangible and meaningful bordering activities (See also Johnson *et al*, 2011). Borderwork thus

signifies the ability of citizens and non-state actors to construct, maintain and dismantle borders, and become empowerment in the process. Moreover, Rumford argues that borderwork rarely takes place at the territorial periphery of states, but rather is more likely to be dispersed throughout society, becoming, for many, an everyday practice.

Rumford highlights two aspects of borderwork that are embedded within an idea of globalization that challenges the traditional conception of state centred border construction. The first aspect, what Rumford (2008, p.6) terms 'borderwork in the face of everyday fear' (which in turn is a reference to Massumi, 1993) plays upon the perception of increased risk and fear. An increased perception of global 'singularity' can become intrinsically connected to increased risk, to which end traditional nation-state borders are deemed, or more accurately perceived, to be struggling, and indeed failing, to stem the tide of illegal immigrants, terrorists and, so on. No longer prepared to trust traditional state borders, citizens are striving to create their own borders within their own communities. These borders emphasise the categorisation aspect of the border, allowing quick and easy mobility/access to those deemed desirable, while preventing entry to those deemed undesirable.

The second aspect of 'borderwork' is put forward as an expression of 'people power' (Rumford, 2008, p.7). This borderwork alludes to the empowerment and growing importance of individuals within global politics, through the conceptualisation of 'globalization from below' stemming from notions of global civil society. Here, certain global civil society actors seek to reinforce borders or create new ones, while other actors seek to abolish (state) borders altogether. Rumford (2008, p.8) points out that while many global civil society movements and networks stretch across borders most are indifferent to them, although their very presence may act to undermine the borders across which global civil society actors may operate.

Borderwork, however, can take many guises involving the construction of 'new', non-traditional state borders, or alternatively utilizing more traditional borders in different and empowering ways. Crucially Rumford argues that there is no longer a unified consensus as to where the 'important' borders are to be found, which opens the possibility of (different) borders being experienced differently, that is, certain borders will be important to some and not to others. Indeed, many will not even notice the presence of a border at all, or, for that matter, if a border has actually been crossed.

Rumford's theory of borderwork is particularly useful in relation to theorising ways of bottom-up political empowerment in relation to border/ing, as well as the ways in which people experience borders. Conventionally the idea that borders are everywhere – that borders are present in multiple locations away from state territorial peripheries and other common locations such as airports – can be separated into two overlapping approaches. On the one hand notions of borders and bordering form an integral aspect and outcome of our everyday life practices rooted in social practices and discourse, while on the other hand, as particularly espoused in the securitisation literature, borders become locatable wherever the movement of people is controlled and manipulated. While the former approach centres on border processes in and around the experience and representation (see Struver, 2004) and constant but often viscous narration of monuments, literature and architecture (see Paasi, 1996), and so on; the latter approach places border processes in surveillance practices enacted by non-state actors – often citizens themselves (Vaughan-Williams, 2008) – at non-traditional places such as major transport routes and city centres.

However, borderwork moves away from 'state mobility relations' framed in terms of securitisation, focusing instead on bottom-up border construction and maintenance at taking place at multiple locations throughout society. What perhaps remains under theorised, however, are the power relations inherent to different ways of doing borderwork. And, moreover, what constitutes an act of borderwork, and what does not. To this end, Cooper and Perkins (2011, p.3) have built upon the concept of borderwork, producing a working definition as being "an analytical sensitivity to the practices of multiple actors within the bordering process, including but not limited to states and state objectives and the concrete methods by which people draw upon, contest and create borders". Doing borderwork, on this definition, and the power play inherent to it, amounts to ways in which background linguistic rule structures can be drawn upon to logically label something - or the wider processes within which it positioned - a border. It is not therefore solely the state that, by definition, defines what a border is, but also other non-state actors that are able to utilise or contest background rule structures for there own ends, manifest through border/ing.

Conceptualising opportunity, possibility and empowerment in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection

While ‘division’ may well be an aspect of borders, and people are always inevitably ‘bordered out’, debates concerning power/empowerment do not take into account the opportunity producing and empowering potential of borders to connect beyond what is proximate. Empowerment on this logic is considered to be a continual outcome of connection. This section will discuss how the border/connection nexus – whereby the border becomes a mechanism of connection – provides and produces bottom-up and horizontal social and political opportunities for empowerment. By way of illustration, the section will introduce two examples that not only highlight the connection on offer throughout this thesis, but also, of course, highlights how connection theorised in this way becomes empowering.

To reiterate some key points from the previous chapter in particular – concerning as it did connection as an outcome of marking some difference – it was argued that, rather than trying to necessarily overcome logics of inside/outside, us/them and so on, looking at the ways in which borders connect to ‘distant localities’ incorporates both division and connection. Although it must be said that studies that seek to problematise inside/outside dichotomies at the state level are useful. In terms of connection and division, however, the question should not be when or under what circumstances do borders either connect or divide, but under what circumstances are the two intrinsically linked. Rather than ‘promote’, or, for that matter, privilege division as fundamental ontological truism of border/ing, therefore, the purpose is to redefine the terms, meanings and outcomes of division in relation to border/ing in order to better locate borders as a site of, or means to, encountering and experiencing the world.

White’s notion of ‘interfaces’ provided the theoretical basis upon which circumstances of connection could rest. It also helps to conceptualise borders as sites or mechanisms that make possible connection to the world writ large. Interfaces define identities, but do so in a way that does not, by definition, posit an identity as a starting (ontological) subject. Rather, it is the emergence of an interface that constitutes, maintains and shapes identities, with emphasis accordingly placed on operative acts of distinguishing and thus controlling ‘distinction’. The interface, for White, provides the social terms in which people can act, often deemed as being

external; it is an envelope of action within which people from different ‘sides’ act in relation to one another. The interface, on this logic, is context and observer dependent, embedded within social power relations taking place across local and macro scales of interaction. Within the interface, localities on different sides need not be proximate and while interfaces can operate as a vector for confrontation, they can equally and simultaneously provide the means for ‘interpenetration’ or, more pertinently, connection.

In terms of power, and therefore notions of possibility, opportunity and empowerment, what is being argued moves away from certain current trends in border/ing thinking. Contrary to Vaughan-Williams’s (2009) shift in political prefixes from ‘geo’ to ‘bio’, it is not biopolitics that is of particular interest or importance here, but a *new* form of geopolitics that moves away from institutionalised dichotomous relations rooted in state territorial centrality. Utilising and building upon White’s concept of interface in particular, division and connection need not, by definition, polar opposites. Borders shore up identity by not simply bordering out others, but also connecting identities to wider networks and scales.

Not all borders connect in clear or tangible terms but their ability to do so depends on the ability of different actors to utilise the simultaneous interface and marking potential of borders, which can be done in particular ways, and for particular ends. Borders thus become resources – in not too dissimilar fashion to Papadopoulos Stephenson, Tsianos (2008) – but in ways that depend on constructing and maintaining (identity expression) in order to project beyond what is proximate. This can be gauged by returning to the two examples introduced in the previous chapter – the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and the town of Melton Mowbray – of which the former constitutes an example of a ‘national’ border, and the latter constitutes an example of a new, non-state, border. Again, it is worth repeating that the examples are not in depth case studies but are rather devices to help highlight the specific ways in which different borders can facilitate particular types of ‘bottom-up’ connection.

Returning to Berwick-upon-Tweed, then, it has already been mentioned in the previous chapter how the town had been, for a short time at least, embroiled in national (border) politics. Here residents seemingly took national ‘sides’ in the form of championing to either have the border remain in situ, or to have it redrawn to the south, thus making the town Scottish. Interestingly, this debate in itself drew European wide attention. However, on closer inspection, and again as shown in the

previous chapter, the town uses the border to construct a sense of uniqueness, rendering it neither English nor Scottish, which in turn constitutes, but is also at the same time constituted by, non-proximate connection opportunities.

The particular focus of this chapter, however, rests on the construction of this uniqueness. In other words, the pragmatic choices that are made to construct a contemporary identity of Berwick that, while mining (regional) resources from both sides of the English/Scottish border, invariably involves the ‘bordering out’ of both England and Scotland, in that, on this logic, the identity of the town does not wholly belong to either side. Berwick is, of course, located on the north bank of the river Tweed that once constituted the ‘natural’ borderline between England and Scotland. This location affords Berwick many opportunities and social (identity constructing) recourses, which the town seems to be actively exploiting. At the time the preliminary study was conducted (2009), Berwick was actively marketing itself as the ‘gateway to Scotland’, joining the ‘undiscovered Scotland’ tourist guide, rejecting inclusion to the English region of Northumberland’s own tourist guide for the first time in many years and, also for the first time, developing its own individual tourist guide⁴. On the other hand, Berwick is very much connected to Northumberland. In 2008 the Berwick international film festival took place in conjunction with ‘Northumberland Lights’, an annual cultural event designed to promote the English region.

Furthermore, much of the way in which Berwick constructs its sense of unique identity – that is, being neither English nor Scottish, is rooted in a particular sense of local history. Again, an example of this came from the promotional rhetoric of the 2008 Berwick international film festival titled ‘Inner States’, of which the website at the time stated:

INNER STATES, likewise echoes the geographical and historic status of Berwick as the most disputed town across two British nations, a unique state of inter-dependence at the root of much destruction, pride and confusion over the centuries. The focus of the programme will be on works that explore states of independence, turmoil and peace: visionary directors, haunted heroes,

⁴ ‘Councillors go it alone with own tourism guide’, Berwick Advertiser, February 2008.

beleaguered nations, maverick spirits, all mapping the confused geography of the human psyche, pushing boundaries – and drawing new borders⁵.

Berwick, therefore, pragmatically locates itself in both England and Scotland without recourse to being in either. The town uses its geographical and historical proximity to the English/Scottish border in order to mine resources around its locality. This in turn creates a unique identity that forms a foundation upon which non-proximate projection, and the opportunities this affords, can take place. In terms of the bordering, both England and Scotland, and the various regional bodies around the area, are being constantly and pragmatically bordered out and embraced, and it is Berwick's location to the border that makes these opportunities possible.

While the consequences of England/Scotland being 'bordered out' are somewhat mute, the next example brings exclusion into sharper relief. To reiterate, the example of the English town of Melton Mowbray concerns what can be called a non-traditional border, in the sense that it is a EU warranted PGI food border. This effectively prevents porkpies from being branded 'Melton Mowbray' within the border. The principle focus for this chapter concerns the drawing of the PGI borderline itself, again the point being that the connective potential and capacity of the border is rooted in local geography, history and politics. The period from original idea to the actual implementation of the border lasted roughly ten years. The PGI border was the result of a small number of producers in and around the town – all situated within the border – who fought a long and arduous campaign to bring the border to fruition.

The idea of the border was heavily contested, particularly concerning the location of the line. To this end, the legitimacy behind the border rested upon notions of memory and place: the original application to the EU, described the foundation of drawing the borderline thus:

Extensive research by a local historian has demonstrated that during the early and middle 19th century when the pies were first being produced on a commercial basis geographical and economic barriers would have limited

⁵ Berwick-upon-Tweed Film and Media Arts Festival Website. (Accessed on: 16th September 2009). Available at: <http://www.berwickfilm-artsfest.com/>

production of the Melton Mowbray Pork Pie to the town of Melton Mowbray and its surrounding district⁶

That said, of course, the final location of the border rested upon more contemporary economic concerns with modern producers located further away from the town itself managing to fall within the designation.

The geographical area described above is larger than the original area of production. This takes account of the fact that over time those barriers became less significant and recognises that production of the Melton Mowbray Pork Pie in accordance with the method of production described below has taken place for 100 years in the wider area surrounding Melton Mowbray⁷

As a result, the border was bitterly contested over several years between those advocating (and thus falling within the border demarcation), arguing that the quality and the history of the food should be protected, and other producers who argued that they would stand to lose extremely large revenue streams through being effectively ‘bordered out’, while still producing a quality product.

The Melton border, therefore, and indeed the Berwick example, provides an example of a seemingly unimportant and in many ways invisible local border – located within traditional state borders – that are heavily contested. They also provide examples of non-state actors utilising, as is the case with Melton, non-state borders. It shows how the creation and maintenance of borders as mechanisms of connection can advantage (and empower in connective ways) some, while at the same time disadvantage others. Likewise, both examples, as progressed in this chapter, shows how connections to the world writ large can be very much rooted in pragmatic choices and contestations at the local level. Taken together, and across both chapters, the examples highlight forms of mobility that do not amount to proximate crossing from one side to the other, but are rather constructed from a particular sense of place. It is a mobility that is forged out of local contestation on the one hand, but can also be

⁶ Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs, in the Official Journal of the European Union (April, 2008).

⁷ (Ibid).

considered a form of resistance on the other hand, because it makes possible resistance to the imposition of frameworks that presuppose the state or national level as the natural scale for global, geo, and border politics.

Concluding remarks: Borders, connection and empowerment

Up until this chapter the relations of power inherent to the border/connection nexus had been implied without being rigorously dealt with. In previous chapters more emphasis was perhaps placed on the specific and conceptual ‘mechanisms’ that allow borders to connect in new and novel ways – i.e. via scaling and division – without due regard to the nuanced empowering and disempowering struggles and politics out of which such connection is often produced. Likewise the outcomes – or rewards – of connecting globally in the manner described up until this chapter also demanded more specific attention. Focusing on empowerment and opportunity in relation to border/ing (and also taking into account the findings of other chapters) shows how such processes are very much an integral part of globalization, where globalization can be seen “both as an outcome and as a context for human activity” (Holton, 2005, p.2), producing both opportunity and constraint in equal if also uneven measures. It has shown how connection, theorised in relation to borders, can become a tangible avenue to political empowerment, providing possibility and opportunity to do so.

The chapter began with a contextual ‘step backwards’ by looking at the power of borders/bordering conventionally understood. It was argued that power in relation to borders was generally formulated by the ability to border out (which manifests in different guises and different places) and, likewise, was equally defined by the ability to resist or exploit this imposition. By extracting the logic of ‘borders as barriers’ and positioning it as a ‘lowest common denominator’ starting and/or framing point, two overlapping aspects were further noted. Firstly, that border ‘construction’ is seen to be initiated, institutionalised and maintained to manage the terms upon which containment, crossing and contact take place, while the ability to resist such construction, containment (and associated maintenance) is often and equally theorised in terms of unmediated and proximate ‘crossing’ and ‘contact’. And, secondly, that border construction, containment and maintenance are predominantly taken to be the job of the state (even in terms of supposedly ‘bottom-up’ everyday practices taking

place away from clearly defined edges). Whereas ‘resistance’ and associated opportunity –again broadly put at this stage – is often ‘bottom-up’, manifesting as (potentially) border traversing ‘things’ and ‘bodies’ narrated by the state to be threatening (although, again, crossing and contact should not be reduced to the peripheral edge of the state territorially defined).

The second part of the chapter considered how connection in relation to borders, particularly in relation to notions of division, offers a different way of observing the power of border/ing. Understanding how the border/connection nexus produces ‘bottom-up’ and ‘non-state’ political opportunities and routes to political empowerment (and for others disempowerment), not only complements ongoing debates concerned with borders and power generally, but it also provides a far better understanding of what it can mean to engage and connect ‘globally’ and, crucially, what is at stake enacting such connection. Focusing on empowerment and opportunity further develops our understanding of the border/connection nexus by expanding upon who is doing the connecting, for what reason and at what cost. But it also helps to explain how ‘connecting globally’ – to ‘distant localities’ – is often rooted in constant and often contradictory border construction, maintenance and contestation, performed by a variety of actors in a variety of places and across a variety of scales. Borders are thus restrictive and facilitative (see Giddens, 1984) and simultaneously concrete and brittle (Newman, 2003b, p.16). They function as limits but, at the same time, and far more importantly, they also create *conditions* of possibility, opportunity and empowerment.

Chapter Six

Concluding Thoughts: Borders as Mechanisms of Connection

Less than ever is the contemporary world a world without borders.

(Balibar, 1998, p.220)

At the time of writing (May 2012) reports of ‘unacceptable’ queues at many of the UK’s airport passport controls are rife throughout the British media. According to an independent inspection, the reported root cause of the delays is supposedly a lack of organisation, as well as too few border agency staff employed particularly at peak times¹. Looking to reduce the problem, rank and file UK border officials have led calls to bring in far more ‘risk-based analysis’ whereby border officials at passport control can discriminate in terms of who they check based upon daily information, rather than a blanket screening of everyone². At the same time it has also been reported that these efficiency/staffing problems have been accompanied by union criticism of a new (time consuming) policy requiring ‘beleaguered’ border staff to have their appearance checked at the start of each day³. Going back one month to April, the UK ‘home office affairs committee’ accused the UK border agency of

¹ BBC News, 10 May 2012. Heathrow Queues Criticised in Report. Available from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18015163>

² A. Palmer (05 May 2012) Our Border Staff Must be Allowed to Discriminate over which Travellers they Check. *The Telegraph*, Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/9246719/Our-border-staff-must-be-allowed-to-discriminate-over-which-travellers-they-check.html>

³ D. Millward (07 May 2012) Beleaguered Border Force Staff Face Appearance Checks. *The Telegraph*, Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/aviation/9250246/Beleaguered-Border-Force-staff-face-appearance-checks.html>

‘failing on the basics’, with the committee chair, Keith Vaz MP, branding the agency ‘not fit for purpose’. This was in reference to wide ranging criticism covering ongoing delivery and operational problems concerning the UK’s new e-borders systems, to a generally perceived failure by the agency to either prevent illegal immigrants from entering the UK or expel them. The list of criticism aimed at the UK border agency and indeed the UK government, as well as their respective rebuttals to the criticism, goes on and on.

It seems that the business of borders remains a highly prominent and contentious issue in the 21st century, reflected not only in the general media, but also in the current high degree of interest in border research. Indeed, the brief examples above provide yet another, albeit small, remainder that borders are not withering away under conditions of contemporary (economic) globalization like some commentators have previously mentioned. Acknowledging that borders are very much part and parcel of contemporary globalization, research on borders has tended to converge around the complex and dynamic processes of so-called re-bordering, particularly post 9/11⁴. This has led researchers to study the increasing interconnect between borders and surveillance, whereby biometrics and ‘virtual’ borders become pertinent, timely as well as case study orientated objects of border research. Elsewhere, in what has been a major staple of research in border studies, emphasis is placed on how people construct, resist and reconstruct narratives of and via the border particularly in the context of, but not limited to, borderlands.

Some key overlapping points were extracted that sum up borders in relation to contemporary globalization processes: (1) There has been a shift from nouning to verbing whereby bordering has become the main focus of study rather borders observed as geopolitical lines; (2) following on from the first point, borders are not solely situated around the periphery of or limits of states; (3) focusing on the importance of border experiences, borders mean different things to different people; (4) in line with studies elsewhere which concentrate on, or take into account, the transformation of state territoriality, border construction and maintenance does not, by definition, need to be solely the job of the state. Yet, while contemporary border research, in all its disciplinary guises, continues to provide rich insights that are valid and useful, I argued that connection in relation to borders requires far more

⁴ The study of borders ‘post 9/11 evokes a ‘meta-border’ between what went before and the situation now, between the here and now.

consideration. In other words, while the idea of ‘global interconnectedness’ as a central facet of globalization remains almost a truism, the role that borders play in this connection requires far greater development. The main argument that I progressed throughout this thesis, therefore, is that borders can function as mechanisms of connection.

More specifically the main point of departure has been the ways in which borders connect beyond what is proximate. Notions of connection are indeed present throughout the current border studies and surrounding literatures. At a simple level borders connect an inside to an outside, yet such connection can manifest in different ways. For example, framed in the context of borderlands, and under specific conditions, notions of connection are usually observed as, or in terms of, transnational contact, cooperation and even contestation. Alternatively, connection is also present in the ways in which borders channel flows and mobilities, contacting some across the border, while at the same time blocking others, a process captured by the metaphor of the membrane. However, as will be summarised below, the thesis argued that borders can be mechanisms of connection but in ways that do not simply amount to crossing, mobility or proximate contact.

In terms of the specific connection being advanced throughout this thesis, two points were made. First, borders as mechanisms of connection can be located away from traditional border sites. This in turn implies that connection can take place via non-traditional borders located in non-traditional border sites. Second, and very much overlapping, the idea of borders as mechanisms of connection being advanced here are not framed in terms of channelling and facilitating mobility. Rather, it envisages alternative forms of global mobility. Indeed, indicative of the previous point, this envisages the mobility of the borders themselves rather than simply the mobilities across them, acknowledging that they can shift location in numerous ways. Overall, it is hoped that arguing in this way deepens our understanding of the relationship between borders and globalization. On this logic, borders as mechanisms of connection, as they have been conceptualised across this thesis, form an integral and fundamental aspect of our contemporary interconnected world.

To this end, approaching border/ing through the lens of connection is relevant for the following overlapping reasons: First, I take border/ing to be a prominent driver of global connectivity. This idea is relevant because it deviates somewhat from the commonly theorised role and function of borders in the general border studies and

global studies (globalization) literatures. It therefore offers a new and alternative way of looking at borders which doesn't subsume them, in general terms, to markers of an impenetrable and wholly divisionary difference. The markers of difference on offer here are not the antithesis of connectivity but rather mechanisms in and of its production. This in turn also keys into the wider debates concerning cosmopolitanism, globalization or ideas of the 'global'. The ideas put forward present and theorise borders as being part and parcel of globalization and cosmopolitanism whereby the function of any given border takes place both locally and globally. The second relevant aspect worth noting is that I considered various 'border types' and not simply borders in a traditional or strictly state sense, again in terms of location and function. For me, the ways in which borders are transforming, as well as the ability of scholars across multiple disciplines to increasingly observe this transformation, offers a particularly interesting measure of contemporary globalization that can be studied accordingly. A significant aspect of this approach is that it takes into account borders that could, at first glance, be deemed insignificant.

To this end, the first two points key into a need, particularly in global studies, to move away from ontological observations of the global as being a limitless space of opportunity, fluidity (freedom) and deterritorialization. What appeals to many scholars, in other words, are more grounded ideas of the global that factor in the local or place such as the 'home comer' (Bude and Durschmit, 2010), a re-appropriation of territory, and the need to understand the everyday – situated – lives of ordinary people (see Kennedy, 2007). The study of borders, therefore, studied through a lens of connectivity, can offer critical insights into contemporary global processes that span numerous disciplines.

Incorporating the previous two points, the third relevant aspect of my study concerns border studies in general. My thesis offers a much needed theoretical enquiry of borders that many scholars have argued is lacking from the field. It offers a review of border theory – outlining the ways in which borders have previously been theoretically considered – before adding new conceptual approaches that can hopefully aid current and future scholars in border research. This specifically involved advancing research concerning the relationships between borders, difference and Otherness (which keys into my definition of borders), as well as the relationships between borders and geographical scale.

The study is also necessarily multidisciplinary which builds upon numerous approaches not commonly employed in (geographical) border studies. Again, this is particularly relevant because, like the need for more theory based approaches, it heeds a call from certain border scholars that the study of borders benefits from a wider disciplinary gaze. However, I would also add to this the benefit of employing numerous disciplinary tools within a single study, something I hope has been demonstrate throughout.

In order flesh out the main points just made, this final chapter brings together the core arguments made throughout this thesis, arguments that highlight, address and advance particular aspects of the border studies and surrounding literatures. It will begin by summarising the key findings of each chapter presented thus far, with particular attention given to Chapters Three, Four and Five. The final part of the chapter will evaluate the extent to which these aims have been achieved, in terms of how they were set out in the introduction, with particular emphasis on the limitations of the findings. As well as consider what is required for further research.

Identifying and locating borders as mechanisms of connection: globalization, interfaces, scale and power

In a very general sense the aim of this thesis was to better locate borders in relation to globalization, where globalization is broadly defined in terms of increasing connectivity (Tomlinson, 2001), and an increased awareness of the world as single place (Robertson, 1992). Avoiding the now defunct borders/no borders debate, or reproducing conventional thinking on state geopolitical divisionary practices, however nuanced such thinking may be, I sought ways of contributing differently to the general debate on borders and their function within a contemporary globalized world. In order to do this I proceeded by highlighting the importance of the need to theorise connection in relation to borders, as well as the ways in which borders are conventionally understood in relation to connection. To this end it was important to move away from an understanding of borders as being wholly barrier (or membrane) like, state centric, or defined in terms of proximity – that is, defined in terms of contact or connection taking place on either side of the border.

With this research agenda set, Chapter Two, acting in the first instance as a more in-depth literature review, looked at the border studies literature and placed it in relation to some specific global studies literature. In turn this also meant utilising the relevant literatures from global studies in order to theorise borders. First, the chapter detailed the progression of border studies, from the study of objects, or fixed territorial lines, to the study of processes. To this end the chapter focused on prominent (contemporary) thinkers across the literature. The key point that I made here was that, while borders are considered to be an integral part of our contemporary global condition, some traditional border thinking remains. First, in relation to connection the state, more often than not, remains the dominant border in question. Second, the divisionary and barrier-like function of borders remains prominent. It was noted that emphasis on the state, limited the ways in which borders are commonly theorised in relation to connection, namely in terms of, but not limited to, proximate contact and experience in the context of borderlands and border spaces. It was also noted that the ways in which borders are theorised in relation globalization, tend to reduce it to flows, mobilities, and networks that traverse borders.

Considering a different to approach to borders and connection, I argued that global studies provided a valuable resource. To this end, many approaches to theorising the global do not posit globalization to be predominantly about notions of fluidity and de-de-territorialisation. Taking issue with a globalization without limits (Bude and Durrschmidt, 2010), the point here was to focus on other connections within the gamut of global interconnection. Focus is therefore given to the work of Robertson (1996) and his idea of 'glocalization' (as well as his assertion that an awareness of the world as a single place has become a part of everyday reality), Rosenau (2003) and his concept of 'distant proximities', and Gidden's (1996) idea of 'distant localities'. Indicative of all these approaches, globalization processes become very much a networking of localities. Here, emphasis is placed on the ways in which locality is shaped by events happening great distances away, whereby variations taking place at one locality (or level) impact upon other levels (or localities). Put differently, rather than considering globalization to be somehow 'out there' to be tamed, or for that matter a limitless multitude of possibilities, these debates are concerned with complex, dynamic and overlapping relationships between the local and the global. These discussions would provide the foundation upon which the preceding chapters would rest. They provided the conceptual tools to build an

alternative way in which borders can become mechanisms of connection. Yet the main area of research arising from these debates would be the location and the role of the border within these local/global relationships.

To this end the chapter finished with a discussion of some aspects of Ulrich Beck's work concerning globalization. Beck makes the following key points: First, that state borders no longer constitute the all-defining border, alluding instead to 'a globalization from within', which I take to mean that globalization, and encounters with the global, can be experienced locally. Second, Beck argues that, under conditions of contemporary globalization, borders are mobile patterns that facilitate overlapping loyalties. These are extremely useful ways of looking at border in relation to connection.

Chapter Three began by looking at the ways in which borders can logically be conceptualised as mechanisms of connection in more detail. It was, in many ways, a chapter concerning terminology. It was principally argued that borders as mechanisms of connection are best framed within, and thought of as, interfaces. However, in arguing this, I also pointed out the inadequacy of the ways in which the term is commonly employed and utilised in relation to borders. Two points were ascertained: First, the term interface, as commonly employed, evokes a sense of connection and is, of course, used as such. However, it tends to become a 'catchall' term for some kind of connection in general. To this end, there seems to be several other terms that are commonly used across the literature that each, in their own way, also capture some form of connection. For example, 'membrane', 'channelling' and 'carving' capture a sense of movement, given direction and form by the border. These 'border terms', it was shown, are usually framed in relation to securitised borders and the institutionalised governance of mobilities. Elsewhere, terms like 'scape' and 'milieu' are employed to capture notions of contact with others and negotiations of difference, particularly within the context of borderlands and border spaces. In one way or another all these terms, it was argued, were indicative of an interface.

Second, insofar as the term interface – as defined in terms of connecting things – has been employed to describe borders, some key points were brought to the fore. First, the idea of the interface function of a border is usually seen as being the opposite of its barrier function. For example, it was discussed how borders are seen to be both interfaces and barriers, that is, having the ability to be both. However the

point I wanted to make here is that the borders as mechanisms of connection being pursued are interfaces because they are also markers, and can be even interfaces if they are in some way barriers. Second, indicative of the ways in which borders are commonly considered in relation to connection, I argued that the common usage of the term interface tends to envisage proximate connection within a distinct setting, context or framework. Third, the common deployment the 'border as interface' assumes a visible and recognisable (state) border. Fourth, it was argued that term interface tends to envisage actual and physical movement across the border. In other words, the interface on this logic becomes something that allows and facilitates movement across itself. To conclude the opening section of this chapter, I made the point that interfaces are often framed in terms of neo-liberal bordering and as such are less defined as markers and more observed as economic resources to be utilised through opening and closing (Nelles and Walther, 2011).

In light of these points, and in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection, I then argued that the terms generally employed to capture connection, including at this stage the notion of interface, were insufficient. That is, as suggested in Chapter Two, terms such as 'membrane', 'conduits' and 'channels' (and the processes captured by them) reify hydraulic metaphors of globalization that are unhelpful when theorising borders as mechanisms of connection. Likewise, it was equally argued that terms such as 'scape' and 'milieu' (and the processes they capture) are also not adequate to contextualise borders as mechanisms of connection, given their tendency to envisage proximate forms of connection. However, returning to the central theme of the chapter, the concept of interface was useful and therefore required more focused discussion as a concept in and of itself.

The latter half the chapter first focused on the work of Harrison C. White and his conceptualisation of the interface in particular. White was chosen partly because he presents a sociological account of the concept of interface, rather than more technical and general descriptions found across numerous other disciplines. But he was chosen also because his concept of interface could be usefully extracted from his general sociological schematic and subsequently used a framing device for borders as mechanisms of connection. For White, therefore, the interface was crucial in the production of identity because it functioned to bring competing differences into contact with each other. Crucially White's interface could be both embedded in but separate from the locality in which it was situated. While White did not envisage his

interface to form part of the identity structures it facilitated, I argued that it was too big a logical progression for White's interfaces to be borders and act as markers on the one hand, but also connect to multiple 'outsides' on the other. Thinking about borders as mechanisms of connection in this way offers an explanatory imaginary of how they not only connect identities that would not normally communicate, but also how this connection need not be limited to specific places.

Given that White does not posit interfaces as being visible markers of difference – merely acting as a catalyst bringing about and facilitating their multiple connections – the final part of the chapter focused on the idea of borders as markers. Here, building upon Whites (extracted) interface I argued that borders as markers of difference was an integral aspect of borders as mechanisms of connection. I argued that, in relation to borders as mechanisms of connection, difference need not, by definition, amount to fixity and division, and subsequent constructions of the vilified and/or subordinate Other. Rather, having reviewed the useful and productive ways in which borders have been theorised in relation to difference, I was able to argue that borders as markers of difference lend themselves to outward looking processes. Borders as mechanisms of connection form meeting spaces and navigation points but for identities and differences that are not proximate, that is, our relationship with 'others' does not necessarily have to take place in the immediate locality, but rather connection through bordering also allows difference to be experienced and negotiated from afar and at a distance.

In terms of the interface – moving from general term to useful concept provided a foundation for Chapter Four, in which I put forward a particular way in which borders as mechanisms of connection, connect. The chapter was primarily interested in scale in relation to connection. I argued that borders as mechanisms of connection can 'flatten out', 'warp' and 'bend' seemingly vertical and traditional impositions of scale, in order to create powerful horizontal networking opportunities. As a corollary to this it was further argued that the very nature of borders of mechanisms of connection offers connection through a 'disconnect' from the dominant framing mechanisms of the state – and for that matter other vertically imposed framing mechanisms – as well as the creation of, and creating access to, powerful networking opportunities made possible because of borders. Taken cumulatively, it was argued that the flattening out of social spatial relations has the effect of making the non-proximate, proximate.

The chapter began by looking at the ways in which borders have been conventionally understood. To this end, the work of Newman and Paasi (1998) was specifically considered, who, as alluded in Chapter Two, have discussed scale as an important aspect in locating borders (and the study of them) in a post-modern world. They argue that borders and territoriality are contextual when placed in relation to scale, but place importance on the scale of everyday life. This is the level, they point out, at which aspects of identity and meaning construction becomes complex and challenging for border studies. In other words, while the state border provides the basic framework for discussing borders, at local scales the experience of the border can vary. Deep within the state the border (or border narratives) is experienced in school textbooks, in town centres, and in the mainstream media. Yet for people living in borderlands, in and around a recognisable border, the border can become much more immediate and important in defining peoples lives. While very useful in understanding scale in relation to borders, I made the point that the state border remains privileged and overarching in Newman and Paasi's work on scale, to the point that it provides a median point used to measure and determine scale. The scale invoked by borders as mechanisms of connection, is able to problematise the often-privileged level of the state.

Still looking at scale in relation to borders, the chapter then shifted attention to the work of van Schendel concerning borderlands. In the first instance it was argued that van Schendel's work provides an important foundation when looking at borders as mechanisms of connection. van Schendel (2005b, p.44) argues that "borders not only join what is different but also divide what is similar" meaning there is no easy correlation between state, territory, society and nationhood, as highlighted by the spatiality of the borderland. More specifically van Schendel posits the importance of international borders as crucial sites at which to observe and study restructuring processes – they become localities of importance. To this end, van Schendel's work showed how the supposed dominance of the state level/scale can never achieve or hold complete hegemony because, in the context of borderlands, it is always being contested through the restructuring practices afforded to borderland dwellers.

I argued that this has important ramifications for theorising borders as mechanisms of connection. van Schendel asserts that borderlanders can effectively use the border to jump scale – what he calls "every day transnationality" – whereby borderlanders are able to construct 'cognitive maps' that enable them to consider

multiple scales simultaneously with the state level being only one. In relation to the discussion on van Schendel's work some key points were made. First, borders are defined as being much more than simply barriers and limits. Second, state borders/scale represents only one, albeit important, scale amongst others. Third, the state border does not operate as an all-defining framework, which encompasses 'lower' scales such as the 'local' or the 'community' and so on. Fourth, van Schendel's work on borderlands envisages a looser hierarchy of levels, whereby scale is constructed and reconstructed simultaneously, whether the state is compliant or not.

A subtle appraisal of van Schendel's work provided a means of theorising the ways in which borders as mechanisms of connection can connect in relation to scale. This was mainly where I argued that 'jumping scale' for van Schendel is still framed in terms of a visibly recognised (international) border. The border defines the space in which, and makes possible, the rescaling practices and production of mental maps. Therefore, in order to understand how border can distort scale in general terms, the chapter focused on wider debates concerning the politics of scale with particular reference to the social construction of scale. Here I extracted some useful key research agendas from the literature. First, focusing on the work of Leitner, the connective spatiality of networks was brought to the fore, but a horizontal spatiality that is not separate from scale politics. Networks cut across and seemingly defy scale, yet importantly for Leitner, horizontal networks must not be privileged. It therefore must be recognised that such networks are inherently linked to a vertical politics of scale. The second research agenda focused on Smith's (2004) notion of 'scale bending'. In many ways indicative of van Schendel's 'scale jumping', 'scale bending' for Smith captures the ways in which events are challenging the traditional imaginary of scale and the role and place of private individuals, city governments, global corporations and even national governments within this imaginary.

In the final section of the chapter I introduced two short examples in order to illustrate how borders as mechanisms of connection invoke scale as a form of connection. The examples incorporated and captured much of the theory discussed thus far. The first example concerned the English town of Berwick-upon-Tweed on the English/Scottish border. In the first instance the example showed how the residents of Berwick in general experienced, interacted with, and ultimately utilised the border to their own ends. The point of interest for this chapter was the ways in which the town was using the English/Scottish border to create a sense of uniqueness

that was neither English nor Scottish. This allowed the residents of Berwick to use the border as a resource for networking opportunities, networking opportunities that in turn helped to create a sense of uniqueness.

The second example concerned the English town of Melton Mowbray and involved a completely different border. The border in question concerned the implementation of a protective geographic Indication (PGI) for the town's famous brand of porkpies that essentially bans pies that are produced outside of a 25-mile radius of the town to be labelled 'Melton Mowbray'. Again, like Berwick, this was an invisible border to most but extremely visible and significant to some. Like Berwick, the border served as a marker to create a sense of distinction and separateness from its immediate geographical neighbours, and it also created opportunities that were outward looking. This example showed how the Melton border was effectively a EU border in the heart of England, connecting Melton with other food producing localities across the European Union. However it was shown how the Melton border connects globally and allows the town to become part of the 'global food map.

Both examples showed how the border creates networking opportunities for the 'borderers', opportunities that connect both towns to other localities well beyond their own respective localities. Yet it was clear that these networking opportunities were also rooted in some form of local detachment, that is, rooted in the social construction of subtle yet important differences that makes possible regional and global orientations. The examples illustrated how the borders became a resource for the creation of 'mental maps' that reconfigured and resisted conventional scale politics. Therefore, using the examples, and thus putting forward ways in which borders can be mechanisms of connection, I argued that connection to place does not, by definition, exclude connection to the world writ large. Far from it, both Berwick and Melton show how connection to other non-proximate places can actually enhance and empower local places.

In Chapter Five I considered power in relation to borders, and argued that borders as mechanisms of connection constitute tangible avenues for 'grass roots' political (and also economic and social) opportunity and empowerment. As a corollary to this it was argued that connecting globally through border construction, maintenance and/or narration can be reasonably conceptualised as a new form of 'tangible' mobility that does not amount to or require conventional forms of

movement. That is, conventional forms of movement that are commonly observed to have a capacity or potential to resist or, alternatively, be defined by borders. The chapter began by focusing on territory and looking at how territory has become a site of control and resistance in terms of them being bounded geographical spaces. This aspect of the discussion revolved around the ways in which the state maintains its territorial identity, in the sense that it appears free standing and able to regulate the ‘ideological effect’ of its territorial inside/outside binary. State power thus becomes the “production, re-production and policing of a boundary which is portrayed as being distinct when [...] it is anything but” (Gainsborough, 2009, p.4). The logic of this discussion was to provide a starting point framework within which to locate processes of power in relation to the production and reproduction of state borders. Particularly noting that territory is thus always in a continual process of being contested and re-contested, made and remade.

Having already touched upon processes of territorial resistance and restructuring in relation to van Schendel’s work on scale in Chapter Three, I then considered notions of opportunity, possibility and empowerment in relation to borders. Two approaches to the ways in which borders empower were discussed. The first approach considered the resistive and transformative capacity of mobility upon institutional technologies of control surrounding and including the border. Here Newman (2006) posited that the ability of elites (or the state) to determine the filtering (bridge/door) function can be quantified in relation to the ability of others to challenge this specific function. Further pointing out that, while this may indeed be the case, borders are also there to be crossed (Newman, 2003). Likewise, Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008) highlighted the power of the ‘constructed’ institutionalised state in classifying and controlling society, whereby resistance is characterised by the capacity to alter and transform the very regimes of control that are being resisted. To this end, for Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos (2008, p.163), (border) transformation is not the result of state centralised power, but rather the power of mobilities in their “fluid, streamlined, clandestine, multidirectional, multipositional and context-dependent” form. On this logic, forms of mobility on the one hand, and institutionalised mobility control regimes on the other, find themselves locked in a complex and antagonistic relationship.

A further point here concerns the border as a resource. Refusing to become subjects of institutionalised state politics, Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos

(2008) showed how the border is not necessarily an enemy of the migrant, but rather something that enriches understanding, providing as many opportunity structures than are 'closed off'. While these debates are useful, I argued that power and resistance are still defined by institutionalised power on the one hand, and more nomadic and fluid forms of agency/power on the other, in which both are engaged in a constant dialectic. Furthermore, I argued that connection – and notions of engaging with the world – is based upon conventional movement, when this chapter aimed to put forward other forms of resistance and 'movement' that require greater reliance upon forms of 'rootedness'.

The second approach focused on Rumford's idea of 'borderwork'. Succinctly put, Rumford (2006; 2008) argues that citizens and indeed non-citizens can be commonly observed to be able to utilize borders to their own advantage. On this logic, citizens and non-citizens, and not just states, can have the ability to construct and maintain borders. Moreover, borderwork can take place throughout society and away from territorial peripheries, and it can take many guises involving the construction of 'new', non-traditional state borders, or alternatively utilizing more traditional borders in different and empowering ways. To this end, Rumford argues here that there is no longer a unified consensus as to where the 'important' borders are to be found. Here I argued that Rumford's idea of borderwork is particularly useful when theorising ways of bottom-up political empowerment in relation to border/ing, because it moves away from 'state mobility relations' framed in terms of securitisation, focusing instead on bottom-up border construction and maintenance at taking place at multiple locations throughout society.

Finally the chapter returned to the two examples put forward in the previous chapter. The purpose here was to show how connection to what is non-proximate is rooted in local contestation and processes of empowerment and disempowerment. This I argued was a form of border politics that does not amount to conventional forms of mobility on the one hand, and the state's desire to control mobility on the other. Returning to Berwick-upon-Tweed, therefore, showed how the town pragmatically chooses local 'identity constructing' resources in order to create the sense of uniqueness upon which it is able to connect to what is non-proximate, as shown in the previous chapter. These resources included tourist, cultural and general planning strategies. Returning to the example of Melton Mowbray, but this time framed in terms politics and empowerment, particularly highlighted processes of

exclusion that can occur within the context of borders as mechanisms of connection. The example showed that, while the border created connection opportunities for the town (and those producers located within the border demarcation), many producers were effectively ‘bordered out’, and no longer able to brand their pies ‘Melton Mowbray’, consequently amounting to significant financial losses. In doing so, what is effectively an invisible (non-border) to most, was rendered very visible and tangible to some.

Limitations and future prospects

The aim of this thesis was to conceptualise how borders can be mechanisms of connection in ways that do not amount to conventional thinking, namely connection theorised in terms of borderlands or mobility facilitation. Doing so better locates not only borders, but also their changing roles, with a contemporary globalized world. While I put forward two examples, spanning Chapters Four and Five, the thesis is predominantly theoretical, conceptual and contextual in its approach. This is both a strength and a weakness. As previously alluded, Harrison C. White, whose work on the interface I extracted and transplanted into my own work, warns against social approaches which claim to represent some reality, which in fact have shaped society too their own theoretical ends. Therefore, while it is easy to observe empirically borders as barriers, my focus in this thesis, however, has been to intervene in the border studies and surrounding literatures in order to state the case for the importance of studying borders as mechanisms of connection. That, rather than being secondary to other aspects of border study, or discussed in passing, the (non-conventional) ways in which borders connect should be brought to the fore. To this end, this thesis has been an attempt to do so.

The conceptual purpose of this thesis, therefore, was to provide a starting point for future research. To this end future directions of research must be empirically informed and, in terms of connection, analysis must rest on people doing their borderwork. The two examples provided a brief insight into these processes – the examples functioned as ‘archaeological test pits’ – but more extensive study is now needed – that is, a more wider sociological excavation. Moreover, in relation to any connective bordering in question, further studies should seek to understand how

connection to what is non-proximate affects what is proximate. That is, more attention needs to be given to the impact on the locality doing the connective borderwork.

To this end, in terms of any given border/ing situation, and framed in terms of connection, attention needs to be given to what could be termed the tripartite relationship between the border, bordered, and borderers. Likewise, particular attention needs to focus more on the specific drivers and factors underpinning connection in relation to borders. Specific factors (and what could be termed ‘micro-drivers’) involved in the connection process undoubtedly vary and more (empirical) research needs to be carried out here. However, it seems that significant drivers of connection through bordering, in which connection is deemed positive and beneficial, are economic and cultural, rooted in the politics and possibility of individual/group empowerment and subsequently encompassing and involving many different actors. Again, as was shown in the case of the two examples put forward in Chapter Five, the actors particularly involved in driving the border/ing process tend to be local elites who have economic and/or cultural interests and investments in the b/orderd – bordering – area. Likewise, the way the border is made visible either through the economic implications of its existence, or through cultural opportunities made possible by the border such as art installations, festivals – even monuments (see Cooper and Rumford, forthcoming 2013) – all drive connective potential.

Concluding remarks

Much of the contemporary debates in contemporary border studies have left behind the supposedly sterile debate concerning whether borders either connect or divide – whether they are either barriers or interfaces (see Chapter Three). This is broadly true, of course, but there is a tendency here for the debate to reaffirm the border being ‘either or’, that depending on institutionalised governance regimes and contexts border either connects (some), prevents (others) and/or divides (all). However, one of the key strands that can be taken away from this thesis is that connection should be taken as more fundamentally defining feature of borders as opposed to division and so on. It has been tacitly argued throughout this thesis that such logic should hold more importance in the study of borders generally.

Indeed, this thesis has been designed to move away from a particular kind of border studies that wholly focuses on state territorial borders. That said it did not seek to assert the idea that borders are either everywhere or nowhere. Border/ing is indeed always somewhere, but bordering processes need not manifest in, or amount to, the creation of a specific border in the traditional sense, as if a dominant teleology were at play. Important border/ing, rather, can be said to be somewhere and everywhere. Therefore, what this study has envisaged is the idea that borders crisscross and overlap each other in a way that distorts the traditional and heavily state centric imaginary of a single dominant territory that purifies the inside. It is a case of the constant production and reproduction of borders within and across borders (within and across borders). Looking at borders through the lens of connection – as mechanisms of connection (as interfaces) – make visible many important borders that would be otherwise ignored. This is further amplified in the sense that the thesis is particularly interested in bottom-up grass roots bordering whereby non-state actors (individual, citizens and groups) are doing important borderwork in the world.

The idea that important and meaningful borders are being constructed and maintained (and challenged) by state and non-state actors somewhere and everywhere impacts upon the traditional geopolitical role of territorial states, as well as the imaginary dominance of state sovereignty. As van Houtum (2005, p.674) has pointed out, the recent sustained thrust of (geo)political border studies involves “a turn from a focus on boundaries, as political limits of states, to borders as socio-territorial constructs”. And here we return to the opening sentence of Chapter One which states that “this thesis is predominantly interested in (geo)political bordering”. But not quite. Somewhat emotively it is perhaps now better to talk in terms of a ‘new geopolitics’ in which non-state actors, in their everyday life practices, take part important and meaningful border politics via non-state borders (or borders in non-traditional geopolitical locations). On this logic, and in other words, distinct state spaces become blurred, as different borders (and border locations) are rendered equally important and meaningful as state borders. While, on the other hand, (some) state-borders become less meaningful in relation to non-traditional borders. In terms of connection, the illusion of state spaces neatly and naturally tessellating like the completed pieces of a geopolitical jigsaw puzzle diminishes, replaced instead by a messy ontology consisting of interlinking (connected) but non-proximate and overlapping non-state borders. In turn such thinking should also inform, and key

into, approaches to the study of globalisation. If nothing else, however, such thinking determines and informs my future direction of research within border studies.

Bibliography

- Ackleson, J. (2003) Directions in border security research. *The Social Science Journal*, 40(4), pp. 573-581.
- Agnew, J. A. (1994). The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of International Political Economy*, 1(1), pp. 53-80.
- Amoore, L. (2006) Biometric Borders. *Political Geography*, 25(3), pp. 336-351.
- Albert, M. Jacobson, D. Lapid, Y. (Eds) (2001) *Identities Borders Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Anderson, M. (1996) *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*. Oxford: Polity.
- Anderson, M. (2004) 'New Borders. The Sea and Outer Space'. In *Borders and border politics in a globalizing world*. Ganster, P. Lorey, D. (Eds) Wilmington: Scholarly Resources.
- Anderson, M. Bort, E. (2001) *The Frontiers of the European Union*. Basinstoke: Palgrave.
- Anderson, J. O'Dowd, L. (1999) Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings and Changing Significance. *Regional Studies*, 33, pp.593-604.
- Anderson, J. O'Dowd, L. Wilson, T. (2002) Introduction: Why Study Borders Now? *Regional & Federal Studies*, 12(4), pp. 1-12.

- Andreas, P. (2003) Redrawing the line: borders and security in the twenty-first century. *International Security*, 28(2), pp. 78-111.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2006) *Fear of Small Numbers*. London: Duke University Press.
- Axford, B. (2006). The Dialectic of Borders and Networks in Europe: Reviewing 'topological presuppositions'. *Comparative European politics*, 4(2/3), pp. 160-182.
- Azarian, G. R. (2005) *The General Sociology of Harrison C. White: Chaos and Order in Networks*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baecker, D. (1997) Interfaces – A View from Social Systems Theory. Paper presented at: Social Embeddedness of Economic Transactions, Paris. Available at: www.dirkbaecker.com/Interfaces.pdf (Accessed on: April 2011).
- Balibar, E. (1998) 'The Borders of Europe'. In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Cheah, P. Robbins, B. (Eds) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Balibar, E. (2002) *Politics and the Other Scene*. London: Verso.
- Balibar, E. (2004) *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship* Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press. Translated by Swenson, J.
- Balibar, E. (2006) Strangers as Enemies: Further Reflections on the Aporias of Transnational Citizenship. Available at: http://www.globalautonomy.ca/global1/servlet/Xml2pdf?fn=RA_Balibar_Strangers (Accessed on: May 2008).

- Balibar, E. (2010) At the Borders of Citizenship: A Democracy in Translation? *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(3) pp. 315-322.
- Barth, F. (Ed.) (1969) *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Bauder, B. (2011) Toward a Critical Geography of the Border: Engaging the Dialectic of Practice and Meaning. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 101(5), pp. 1126-1139.
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- BBC News (2009). *13, 500 fewer colleges for visas* [Online] Available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/8046341.stm> [Accessed on: May 2009].
- BBC News (2012) *Heathrow Queues Criticised in Report* [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18015163> [Accessed on: May 2012].
- Beck, U. (2000) *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2002) The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies. *Theory, Culture and Society*. (19), pp.17-44.
- Beck, U. (2007) Cosmopolitanism: a critical theory for the twenty-first century. In *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, Ritzer. G. (Ed.) Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 162–176.
- Beck, U. Bonss, W. Lau, C. (2003) The Theory of Reflexive Modernization Problematic, Hypotheses and Research Programme. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(2), pp. 1–33.
- Berwick-upon-Tweed Film and Media Arts Festival. [Online] Available at: <http://www.berwickfilm-artsfest.com/> [Accessed 17 September 2009].

Berwick Advertiser (2007) 'Councillors go it alone with own tourism guide', *Berwick Advertiser*, [Internet] 1 August. Available at: <http://www.berwick-advertiser.co.uk/news/local-headlines/councillors-go-it-alone-with-own-tourism-guide-1-227959>. [Accessed 17 March 2009].

Berwick Film & Media Arts Festival. 'About Us'. [Online] Available at: <http://www.berwickfilm-artsfest.com/about-us> [Accessed 17 September 2009]

Best, U. (2003) Gnawing at the Edges of the State: Deleuze and Guattari and Border Studies. In *Routing Borders Between Territories, Discourses, and Practices*. Berg, E. van Houtum, H. (Eds) Aldershot: Ashgate.

Bigo, D. (2001) 'The Mobius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)'. In *Identities, Borders, Orders. Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Albert, M. Jacobson, D & Lapid, Y. (Eds.) Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.

Bigo, D. Guild, E. (Eds.) (2005) *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement Into And Within Europe*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.

Boer, I. E. (2006) *Uncertain Territories: Boundaries in Cultural Analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Bosniak, L. (2006) *The Citizen and the Alien*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brenner, N. (1998) Between fixity and motion: accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 16, pp. 459–481

Brenner, N. (1998) The limits to scale? Methodological Reflections on Scalar Structuration, *Progress in Human Geography*, 15, pp. 525–548

Brenner, N. (1999) Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies*, 36(3), pp. 431–451

- Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bude, H. Durrschmidt, J. (2010) What's Wrong with Globalization?: Contra 'Flow Speak' – Towards an Existential Turn in the Theory of Globalization. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 13(4), pp. 481–500
- Cabinet Office. (2007). Security in a Global Hub: Establishing the UK's New Border Arrangements. HMSO, London.
- Campbell, D. (1996) Political Prosaics, Transversal Politics, and the Anarchical World. In *Challenging Boundaries*. Shapiro, J. Alker, H. (Eds.) Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Castells, M. Hall, P. Hall, P.G (Eds.) (1994) *Technopoles of the World: The Making of Twenty-First-Century Industrial Complexes*. Abingdon: Routledge,
- Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, vol. II*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1998). *End of Millenium: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, vol. III*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2000) *The End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (Ed) (2004) *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Castells, M. (2010) *End of Millenium: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, vol. III*. Second Edition. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

- Claval, P. (2006) The scale of political geography: An historic introduction. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 97(3) pp. 209 -221
- Connolly, W. E. (1991) *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Connolly, W. E. (1995) *The Ethos of Pluralization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Connolly, W. E. (2002) *Neuropolitics: Thinking, Culture, Speed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Connolly, W. E. (2004) [1995] *The Ethos of Pluralization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cooper, A. Rumford, C. (2011) 'Cosmopolitan Borders: Bordering as Connectivity'. In *Ashgate Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. M. Nowicka and M. Rovisco (Eds.) Farnham: Ashgate
- Cooper, A. Perkins, C. (2012) Borders and Status Functions: An Institutional Approach to the Study of Borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 15(1) pp.55-57
- Cooper, A. Rumford, C. (2013) Monumentalizing the Border: Bordering as Connectivity. *Mobilities*, Forthcoming.
- Cunningham, H (2002) Transnational social movements and sovereignties in transition: charting new interfaces of power at the U.S.-Mexico border. *Anthropologica*, 44(2), pp. 185-196.
- Davidson, G. (Ed.) (1996) *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*. Chambers: Edinburgh
- Delaney, D. Leitner, H. (1997) The Political Construction of Scale. *Political Geography*, 16, pp. 93-7

Delanty, G. (2007) 'Peripheries and Borders in Western Europe', *Eurozine*. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2007-08-29-delanty-en.html>
[Accessed 17 November 2011].

Deleuze, G. (2004) [1968] *Difference and Repetition*. London and New York:
Continuum. Translated by Patton, P.

Deleuze, G. Guattari, F. (1986). *Nomadology: The War Machine*. New York:
Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. Guattari, F. (2004) [1987] *A Thousand Plateaus*. London and New York:
Continuum.

Delsordi, N. Jacobson, D. 'Borders' in Scholte, J. Robertson, R. (Eds) (2007)
Encyclopaedia of Globalization: Volume 1. New York: Routledge.

Donnan, H. Wilson, T. M. (Eds.) (1998) *Border Identities: Nation and State at
International Frontiers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Donnan, H. Wilson, T. M. (1999) *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State*.
Oxford: Berg.

Durrschmidt, J. (2006) So Near Yet So Far: Blocked Networks, Global Links and
Multiple Exclusion in the German–Polish Borderlands. *Global Networks*, 6(3),
pp.245-263.

Durrschmidt, J. and Taylor, G. (2007) *Globalization, Modernity and Social Change*.
Houndmills: Palgrave.

Dwinell, S. (2009) 'Fuck the Border'? Music Gender and Globalisation. *Journal of
Critical Globalisation Studies*, 1, pp. 89-110

Easterling, W. and Polsky, C (2004) Crossing the Divide: Linking Global and Local Scales in Human- Environment Systems. In *Scale and Geographic Inquiry: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.

Elden, S. (2009) *Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Elden, S. (2011) Territory without Borders. Harvard International Review. Available at: <http://hir.harvard.edu/territory-without-borders> (Accessed on: January 2012)

Escobar, A. (2001) Culture Sits in Places: Reflections on Globalism and Subaltern Strategies of Localization. *Political Geography*, 20, pp. 139-174

Epstein, C. (2007) Guilty Bodies, Productive Bodies, Destructive Bodies: Crossing the Biometric Borders. *International Political Sociology*, 1, pp. 149-164.

Ernste, E. van Houtum, H. Zoomers, A. 2009. 'Trans-World: Debating the Place and Borders of Places in the Age of Transnationalism'. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 100(5), pp. 577-586.

Foucault, M. (1984) 'What is Enlightenment?' In *The Foucault Reader*. Rabinow, P. (Ed.) New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (2007) The Meshes of Power. Translated by Moore, G. In *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Crampton, J. W. Elden, S. (Eds.) Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate.

Friedman, J. (1986) 'The World City Hypothesis' *Development and Change*, 17, pp. 69 – 83

Friedman, T. (2005) *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Gainsborough, M. (2009) *On the Borders of State Power: Frontiers in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region*. Oxon: Routledge.

Ganster, P. Lorey, D. E. (2005) *Borders and Border Politics in a Globalizing World*. Oxford: SR Books.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1996) *In Defence of Sociology: Essays, Interpretations, and Rejoinders*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1996) *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. London: Blackwell.

Hartshorne, R. (1950) The Functional Approach in Political Geography. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 40(2), pp. 94-130.

Hedetoft, U. (2003) *The Global Turn: National Encounters with the World*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Holton, R. (2005) *Making Globalization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Home Office. *Start-up phase*. [Online]

Available at: <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/business-sponsors/transportindustry/ebordersrequires/aviation/commercialcarriers/startupphase/> [Accessed 20 June 2011]

Home Office. (2002). *Secure Borders, Safe Haven: Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain*. HMSO, London.

Home Office. (2007). *Securing the UK Border: Our vision and strategy for the future*. HMSO, London.

Home Office. (2008). *A Strong New Force at the Border*. HMSO, London.

van Houtum, H. (2002) 'Borders of Comfort: Spatial Economic Bordering Processes in the European Union'. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 12(4), pp. 39-59.

van Houtum, H. (2005) The geopolitics of borders and boundaries. *Geopolitics*, 10, pp. 672-679

van Houtum, H. (2010a) Waiting Before the Law: Kafka on the Border. *Social & Legal Studies*, 19(3), pp. 285-297.

van Houtum, H. (2010b) Human blacklisting: the global apartheid of the EU's external border regime. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(6), pp. 957-976

van Houtum, H. Kramsch, O. Zierhofer, W. (Eds) (2005) *B/ordering Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

van Houtum, H. Naerssen, T. (2002) Bordering, Ordering and Othering. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 93(2), pp.125 – 136.

van Houtum, H. Pijpers, R. (2007). The European Union as a Gated Community: The Two-faced Border and Immigration Regime of the EU. *Antipode*, 39(2), pp. 291-309.

van Houtum, H. Struver, A. (2002) 'Borders, Strangers, Doors and Bridges', *Space and Polity*, 6(2), pp. 141 – 146.

Howitt, R. (1998) 'Scale as Relation: Musical Metaphors of Geographical Scale'. *Area*, 30(1), pp. 49-58.

Irigaray, L. (1985). *Speculum of the Other Woman*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Johnson C. et al. (2011) Interventions on rethinking 'the border' in border studies. *Political Geography*, 30(6), pp. 311–19.

Jones, R. (2009) 'Categories, borders and boundaries'. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(2), pp. 174-189.

Karafillidis, A. (2008) 'Networks and Boundaries'. Paper presented at: International Symposium: Relational Sociology: Transatlantic Impulses for the Social Sciences, Berlin. Available at: www.relational-sociology.de/karafillidis.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2011].

Kennedy, P. (2007) Global Transformations but Local, 'Bubble' Lives: Taking a Reality Check on Some Globalization Concepts. *Globalizations*, 4(2), pp. 267-282.

Kiely, R. McCrone, D. Bechhofer, F. Stewart, R. (2000) Debatable Land: National and Local Identity in a Border Town. *Sociological Research Online*, 5(2). [Online] Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/5/2/kiely.html> [Accessed 12 June 2009].

Kolossov, V. (2005) Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches. *Geopolitics*, 10 (4), pp. 606-632.

Konrad, V. and Nicol, H. (2008) *Beyond walls: Re-Inventing The Canada-United States Borderlands*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kramsch, O. T. (2010) 'The Rabelaisian Border', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, (28), pp. 1000-1014.

Laclau, E. (1996) *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.

Lahav, G. Guiraudon, V. (2000) Comparative Perspectives on Border Control: Away from the Border and Outside the State. In *The Wall Around the West: State Borders and Immigration Controls in North America and Europe*. Andreas, P. Snyder, T. (Eds.) London and Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Lam, N. (2004) Fractals and Scale in Environmental Assessment and Monitoring. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.

Lapid, Y. (2001) Introduction, Identities, Borders, Orders: Nudging International Relations Theory in a New Direction. In *Identities Borders Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Albert, M. Jacobson, D. Lapid, Y. (Eds) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefèbvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*. London: Blackwell

Ley, D. (2004) Transnational spaces and everyday lives. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29, pp. 151–64

Lietner, H. (2004) The Politics of Scale and Networks of Spatial Connectivity: Transnational Interurban Networks and the Rescaling of Political Governance in Europe. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.

Leitner, H. Miller, B. (2007) ‘Scale and the Limitations of Ontological Debate: A Commentary on Marston, Jones and Woodward’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32 (1), pp. 116 - 125.

Lint, W, D. (2008) The Security Double Take: The Political, Simulation and the Border. *Surveillance & Society*, 5(2), pp. 166-187.

Mamadouh, V. Kramsch, O. van der Velde, M. (2004) Articulating Local and Global Scales. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 95(5), pp 455–466

Marden, P. (1997) Geographies of Dissent: Globalization, Identity and the Nation. *Political Geography*, 16(1), pp. 37-64

Marston, S. A. (2000) The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, pp. 219–42

Marston, S. (2004) A Long way from Home: Domesticating the Social Production of Scale. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.

Marston, S. A. Jones, J. P. Woodward, K. (2005) Human Geography Without Scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(4) pp. 416 -432

Martinez, O. J. (1994) 'The Dynamics of Border Interaction: New Approaches to Border Analysis'. In Schofield, C. H. (Ed.) *Global Boundaries: World Boundaries Volume One*. London: Routledge.

Massumi, B. (Eds) (1993) *The Politics of Everyday Fear*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

McCrone, K. R. Bechhofer, D. Stewart, F. R. (2000) Debatable Land: National and Local Identity in a Border Town. *Sociological Research Online*, 5(2), Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/5/2/kiely.html> (Accessed on: February 2009).

Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2003). 'Ne' qui, ne' altrove—migration, detention, desertion: a dialogue'. *Borderlands e-journal*, 2(1). [Online] Available at: http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol2no1_2003/mezzadra_neilson.html [Accessed 10 March 2009].

Millward D. (May 2012) 'Beleaguered Border Force Staff Face Appearance Checks'. *The Telegraph*. [Online] Available form: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/aviation/9250246/Beleaguered-Border-Force-staff-face-appearance-checks.html> [Accessed 12 May 2012]

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2001) Hybridity, So What?: The Anti-Hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18, pp. 219-245

- Nelles, J. Walther, O. (2011). 'Changing European Borders: From Separation to Interface? An Introduction'. *Journal of Urban Research*. (6) Available from: <http://articulo.revues.org/1658> [Accessed 15 January 2012]
- Nevins, J. (2002) *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Remaking of the US-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge.
- Newman, D. (2003). Boundary Geopolitics: Towards a Theory of Territorial Lines? In *Routing Borders Between Territories, Discourses and Practices*. Berg, E. van Houtum, H (Eds.) Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Newman, D. Paasi, A. (1998) Fences and Neighbours in the Postmodern World: Boundary Narratives in Political Geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(2), pp. 186-207.
- Newman, D. (2001) Boundaries, Borders, and Barriers: Changing Geographic Perspectives on Territorial Lines'. In Albert, M. Jacobson, D. Lapid, Y. (Eds). *Identities, Borders, Orders. Rethinking International Relations Theory*. Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.
- Newman, D. (2003a). Boundary Geopolitics: Towards a Theory of Territorial Lines? In Berg, E & van Houtum, H. (Eds). *Routing Borders Between Territories, Discourses and Practices*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Newman, D. (2003b) On borders and Power: A Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Borderland Studies*, 18(1), pp.13-25.
- Newman, D. (2006) The Lines that Continue to Separate Us: Borders in our Borderless World. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(2), pp.143-161.
- Michaud, R. Michaud, S. Jan, M. (2001) *The Great Wall of China*. New York: Abbeville Press.

Nield, S. (2006) On the Border as Theatrical Space: appearance, dis-location and the production of the refugee. In *Contemporary Theatres in Europe*. Kelleher, J. Ridout, N. (Eds.) London: Routledge

Nield, S. (2008) The Proteus Cabinet, or, 'Here but Not Here'. In *Research in Drama Education: Performance and Asylum*. Gilbert, H. & Nield, S. (Eds.) London: Routledge

O'Dowd, L. (2002) Transnational Integration: "Cross-border Regions" in the European Union. In *Transnational Democracy: Political Spaces and Border Crossings*. Anderson, J. (Ed.) London: Routledge.

O'Dowd, L. (2010). From a 'borderless world' to a 'world of borders': 'bringing history back in'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28, pp.1031-1050.

Official Journal of the European Union. (June 2008) Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations. [Online] Available at: www.ec.europa.eu/translation/romanian/.../geographical_indications_en.pdf [7 June 2009].

Ohmae, K. (1995) *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*. London: HarperCollins.

Oxford Dictionaries . 'Difference'. [Online] Available at: <http://oxforddictionaries.com>. [Accesses 20 May 2010].

Paasi, A. (1996a) *Territories, Boundaries, and Consciousness: the changing geographies of the Finnish-Russian boundary*. Chichester: Wiley.

Paasi, A. (1996b) Inclusion, Exclusion and Territorial Identities: The Meanings of Boundaries in the Globalizing Geopolitical Landscape. *Nordisk, Samhallsgeografisk, Tidskrift*, 23, pp. 3-16.

- Paasi, A. (2002) Regional Transformation in the European Context: Notes on Regions, Boundaries and Identity. *Space and Polity* 6(2), pp.197-201.
- Paasi, A. (2005) 'The Changing Discourses on Political Boundaries'. In van Houtum, H. Kramsch, O. Zierhofer, W. (Eds.) (2005) *B/Ordering Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Paasi, A. (2009) Bounded Spaces in a 'Borderless World': Border Studies, Power and the Anatomy of Territory. *Journal of Power*, 2(2), pp.213-234
- Paasi, A. (2011) A Border Theory: An Unattainable Dream or a Realistic Aim for Border Studies. In *A Research Companion to Border Studies*. Wastl-Walter, D. (Ed.). London: Ashgate.
- Palmer, A. (May 2012) 'Our Border Staff Must be Allowed to Discriminate over which Travellers they Check'. *The Telegraph*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/9246719/Our-border-staff-must-be-allowed-to-discriminate-over-which-travellers-they-check.html> [Accessed 10 May 2009]
- Papadopoulos, D. Stephenson, N. Tsianos, V. (2008) *Escape Routes*. London: Pluto Press.
- Parker, N. (Ed.) (2008) *The Geopolitics of Europe's Identity: Centres, Boundaries, and Margins*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prescott, J. R. V. (1965) *The Geography of Frontiers and Boundaries*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Qian, S. (2007) [86 B.C.] *The First Emperor: Selections from the Historical Records*. New York: Oxford University Press. Translated by Dawson, R.
- Rajaram, P. K. Grundy-Warr, C. (2007) *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Ritzer, G. The Globalization of Nothing, *SAIS Review*, XXIII(2), pp.189-200
- Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalisation, Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Robertson, Roland. (1994) Globalisation or Glocalisation? *Journal of International Communication*, 1(1), pp. 33-52.
- Romero, F. (2008) *Hyper-border: The Contemporary U.S.-Mexico Border and its Future*. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2003) *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rovisco, M. (2010) Reframing Europe and the Global: Conceptualizing the border in Cultural Encounters. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28, pp. 1015-1030
- Rumford, C. (2006) Theorizing borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 9(2) pp. 155–69.
- Rumford, C. (2008a) *Cosmopolitan Spaces: Europe, Globalization, Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Rumford, C. (2008b) Introduction: Citizen and Borderwork in Europe. *Space & Polity. Special Issue: Citizens and Borderwork in Contemporary Europe*, 12(1), pp.1-13
- Rumford, C. (2010) Global Borders: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28, pp. 951-956
- Rumley, D. Minghi, J.V. (Eds) (1991) *The Geography of Border Landscapes*. London: Routledge.

- Salter, M. (Ed.) (2008) *Politics at the Airport*. Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.
- Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2002) 'Is this the way to go? Handling immigration in a global era'. *Eurozine*. [Online] Available at: <http://eurozine.com/pdf/2002-09-17-sassen-en.pdf> [Accessed 23 November 2011].
- Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Searle, J. (1995) *The Construction of Social Reality*. London: Penguin.
- van Schendel, W. (2005a) *The Bengal Borderland: Beyond State and Nation in South Asia Anthem South Asian Studies*. London: Anthem Press.
- van Schendel, W. (2005b) 'How Borderlands, Illicit Flows, and Territorial States Interlock'. In W. van Schendel and I. Abraham (Eds) (2005) *Illicit Flows and Criminal Things: States, Borders, and the Other Side of Globalization*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Scholte, J. A. (2005) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, Second edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (2004) Introduction: Scale and Geographic Inquiry. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.
- Simmel, G. (1994) 'Bridge and Door'. *Theory Culture Society*, (11), pp. 5-10
- Smith, N. (2004) Scale Bending and the Fate of the Nation. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.

- Struver, A. (2004) Everyone Creates One's Own Borders: the Dutch-German Borderland as Representation. *Geopolitics* 9(3), pp. 627–48.
- Tatum, C. (2000) On the Border: From the Abstract to the Specific. *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies*. (4), pp. 93-103.
- Taylor, P. (1982) A Materialist Framework for Political Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS*, 7, pp. 15–34
- Taylor, P. J. (2004) Is There a Europe of Cities? World Cities and the Limitations of Geographical Scale Analyses. In *Scale and Geographic Inquire: Nature, Society, and Method*. Sheppard, E. McMaster, R. B. (Eds.) Malden: Blackwell publishing.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tsing, A. L. (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Urban Realm. (July 2011) 'Star of Caledonia' to Adorn Border with England'. [Online] Available at:
www.urbanrealm.com/news/2996/_%E2%80%98Star_of_Caledonia%E2%80%99_to_adorn_border_with_England.html [Accessed 18 July 2011]
- Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty First Century*. New York: Routledge.
- Urry, J. (2002) *The Tourist Gaze*. Second Edition. London: Sage
- Vaughan-Williams, N. (2008) Borderwork beyond Inside/Outside? Frontex, the Citizen-Detective and the War on Terror. *Space and Polity*, 12(1), pp.63-79.

Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010) The UK Border Security Continuum: Virtual Biopolitics and the Simulation of the Sovereign Ban. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28, pp.1071-1083

Vaughan-Williams, N. (2009b) *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Walker, R. B. J. (1993) *Inside/outside: international relations as political theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walters, W (2004) 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Demopolitics'. *Citizenship Studies*. 8(3), pp.237-260.

Walters, W. (2006) Border/Control. *Europe Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2), pp.187-203.

Waltz, K. (2001) *Man, the State, and War*. Columbia: Columbia University Press

Weber, M. (2004) 'Politics as Vocation'. In Max Weber *The Vocation Lectures*. Owen, D. Tracy, S. B. (Eds.) Indiana: Hackett.

White, H. C. (1982) Interfaces. *Connections* 5(1), pp.11-20

White, H. C. (1992) *Identity and Control: A Structural Theory of Social Action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Widder, N. (2005) 'Two Routes from Hegel'. In Tonder, L. Thomassen, L. (Eds) (2005) *Radical Democracy: Politics Between Abundance and Lack*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.