Globalisation and the Study of Borders

James W. Scott

University of Eastern Finland, Karelian Institute
james.scott@uef.fi

Introduction

The phenomenon of globalization is characterized by a multitude of definitions that emphasize the increasingly international nature of human societies, whereby much attention has been directed to flows, networked global infrastructures and cultural hybridization. In terms of the study of borders, however, it is perhaps understandings of globalization as *interpenetration* and *transformation* that are most salient. Interpenetration relates to transformations of everyday life and of social and economic practices by processes that operate across national boundaries (see Cochrane and Pain 2000). The transformational nature of globalization is, furthermore, evidenced by iterative processes of wide-scale diffusion and a simultaneous domestication of forces, social, economic and cultual practices and ideas circulating at cross-border and global scales (see Held 2000).

Importantly for this discussion, globalization has made the notion of a world without borders possible in the sense that socio-economic, financial, resource-based and, ultimately, environmental interdependencies increasingly lay bare the limits of state territoriality and sovereignty (Ceglowski 2000). Taken to its most extreme expression, in fact, globalization sometime even implies an end to borders in any politically and economically significant way − a scenario echoed by post-Cold War prophesies of a much less bordered future driven by global technologies, cyberspace, capital flows, political convergence and interstate integration (Ohmae 1995, Scholte 1997). Coupled with an equally extreme model of neoliberalism in which the state would no longer have an appreciable regulatory role, these processes might end the need for border studies altogether, except as footnotes in conceptual history. What we instead find is that the study of borders has enjoyed something of a renaissance since the new Millennium, reanimating debates about their social, political, economic and environmental significance

Scott, James W. (ed.) (2017): *Cross-Border Review,* European Institute of Cross-Border Studies - Central European Service for Cross-border Initiatives (CESCI), Budapest, pp. 5-30. / ISSN 2064-6704

(Newman 2011). In fact, the renaissance of border studies can also be attributed to the emergence of counter-narratives to globalization discourses of the late 1980's and early 1990's, indicating that the 1990s fad of 'borderlessness' was too shallow to be sustained. As will be elaborated in more detail below, globalization has increased border sensitivities and the propensity to engage in border politics for a number of reasons, security and the maintenance of control figuring among the most critical. Given the real and imagined impacts of globalization, and the frequent spectre of threat to ontological and physical security, borders have attained increased significance as a defensive mechanism and guarantor of local stability.

Moreover, as Claude Raffestin (1992) has claimed, political boundaries are bio-ethno-social constants that make societies possible; borders are institutions without which it would be impossible to neogatiate an 'inside' and 'outside' of any socially constituted space. Border scholars remind us that there are no inherent contradictions between political, social, cultural borders and globalization for the simple reason that borders fulfill a very basic social need, namely to create and manage recognizable spaces in which everyday life can be conducted. Moreover, globalization has proved a boon for border studies by multiplying the potential socio-spatial contexts within which political, economic, social and cultural processes unfold. According to Chris Rumford (2006: 163):

> *"A globalizing world is a world of networks, flows and mobility; it is also a world of borders. It can be argued that cosmopolitanism is best understood as an orientation to the world which entails the constant negotiation and crossing of borders (…) Borders connect the 'inner mobility' of our lives with both the multiplicity of communities we may elect to become members of and the cross-cutting tendencies of polities to impose their border regimes on us in ways which compromise our mobilities, freedoms, rights, and even identities."*

How then, do border studies interact with globalization, both as a concept as well as a process? Spurred on by globalization, border studies reflect continuity and change in scientific thought and thus innumerable contributions to the conceptualization of social space and its workings (Scott 2012). Thanks to processes of globalization, the study of borders has moved from a dominant concern with formal state frontiers and ethno-cultural areas to the investigation of *border-making in diverse socio-spatial contexts and geographical scales*. This has elicited a shift to multifacted processes of border-making and their social consequences. Globalization has also contributed to the breaking down of separations between discrete disciplinary approaches within border research. As a research field, bor-

der studies now encompass, a wide range of disciplines besides social geography: political science, sociology, anthropology, history, international law as well as the humanities - notably art, media studies and philosophy. One only need to browse through recent collections and compendia of border studies research in order to appreciate its post-disciplinary thrust (Donnan and Wilson 2012, Andersen et. al. 2012, Brambilla et. al. 2015).

Another important consideration is the fact that globalization has opened up possibilities for investigating in greater depth the rationales behind everyday border-making by understanding borders as institutions, processes and symbols that not only reflect but condition societal change (see Popescu 2012). Going beyond exclusively state-centred and territorial paradigms, the present state of debate emphasizes that borders are not given, they emerge through socio-political and cultural border-making or *bordering* that takes place within society (Newman 2006). Material borders, for example, do not emerge exclusively as a product of wars, agreement or high politics but are also made and maintained by cultural, economic, political and social activities. Bordering encompasses formal as well as everyday forms of border construction and is accomplished with the help of ideology, discursive and performative practices, and different forms of agency. Furthermore, everyday 'bordering and ordering' practices create and recreate social-cultural boundaries that are spatial in nature at the same time that they can also open up new spaces that reflect intersections, encounters and new affinities which emerge as a part of social life.

What this in fact indicates, is the globalization has challenged traditional disciplinary assumptions and certainties regarding borders. Talking about globalization has induced us to take seriously the interrelatedness of all previous thinking about studying and interpreting borders. In the contemporary practice of border studies, literature and art tell us as much about borders, borderlands and border crossings as do ethnographic or historical investigations. It is precisely the disruptive force of globalization – whether real or imagined – that drives home the main argument of border studies: that borders are in a constant process of confirmation, contestation, transformation and re-confirmation.

Consequences of Globalization: Border Studies and the Bordering Paradigm

To begin with, globalization must be understood to be a non-teleological but transformative process that involves continuity and change. Moreover, in order to properly elaborate the interaction between globalization and the study of borders, a focus on borders as mediators, regulators and representations of processes associated with globalization is needed. In other words, in the context of globalization, border studies, in very broad terms, investigate processes of socio-spatial accommodation and adaptation to change that reflect non-finalizable makings and re-makings of borders. Consequently, one major border studies paradigm with regard to globalization is that of *bordering*, or the more fundamental process of creating socio-spatial distinctions at various scales by multiple actors (Van Houtum and Van Naerssen 2002, Scott 2012). Bordering is the everyday construction of borders, among others through ideology, cultural mediation, discourses, political institutions, attitudes and agency. The bordering paradigm thus brings diverse forms of social, cultural and economic globalization into a single frame of analysis. Moreover, the concept of bordering suggests that borders are not only semi-permanent, formal institutions but are also non-finalizable processes.

In terms of approaches and methodologies, globalization and its consequences are a major reason why border studies have largely abandoned descriptive, functional and positivistic approaches and instead developed highly critical perspectives, questioning, for example, the logics of border-making statecraft and focusing attention to the negative impacts of borders on individuals. Globalization has also challenged border scholars to more directly engage with bordering dilemmas and the ethical consequences of borders (Hing 2010). Many of these dilemmas pertain to the contradictions between state territoriality and sovereignty and the heightened significance of mobility, the global reach of financial flows, information and ideas as well as environmental challenges and threats. At the same time, limited ability and willingness to come to terms with global interdependencies has also elicited a process of vigorous re-bordering, fencing and securitization of national spaces. (see Rosière and Jones 2012).

The bordering paradigm does not ignore the structuring power of state borders and formal border regimes. Although interdependence and processes of globalization have complicated the picture, the continuous (re)construction of borders based on forms of social-political organization and processes of nation-building remains a central problem in border studies. One criticism of contemporary bor-

der studies is its propensity to privilege agency at the expense of the wider social contexts and the structuring effect of state borders. Liam O'Dowd (2010) has been particularly blunt in his claims that recent post-national theorizing indicates a lack of historical reflexivity and careless 'epochal thinking'. On the contrary, states, state borders and their impacts are very much in evidence. As Paasi argues (2012, p. 2307) understanding borders remains inherently an issue of understanding how states function and thus: "(…) how borders can be exploited to both mobilize and fix territory, security, identities, emotions and memories, and various forms of national socialization". Furthermore, according to Paasi, "this conceptualization of borders suggests that, while it is continually vital to examine how borders and bordering practices come about, it is also critical to reflect on the political rationalities and state-based ideologies embedded in these practices." Looking at borders also forces us to take national and local experiences – and historical processes in general – seriously. State borders have a 'time print' - they symbolically reflect historical memories and can, in the sense of Megoran (2012) 'rematerialize' within changing national political trajectories. Similarly, the Finnish geographer Jussi Laine (2016, 467) writes that:

> *"The global primacy of state borders endures, but they are now commonly understood as multifaceted social institutions rather than as solely formal political markers of sovereignty. Borders are products of a social and political negotiation of space: they frame social and political action; help condition how societies and individuals shape their strategies and identities; and are re- and deconstructed through various institutional and discursive practices at different levels and by different actors. However, border-making also proceeds through cognitive processes of creating space though which individual self-identifications with certain territories, cultures and political systems".*

Taking these observations into consideration, we can argue that bordering serves to satisfy at least two basic needs, that of protection from external and internal threat and that of defining the territoriality, integrity and identity of groups and individuals. In a more traditional sense borders help determine both internal and external identities of territories, especially the states recognized by the international community: their right to maintain different relations, to create unions and associations, and to be represented in different unions, i.e. to be 'legal' political actors. At a more subtle level, bordering is about a politics of difference, played out in different contexts and by different actors. The inculcation of political and social borders as a part of everyday life takes place through processes of socialization, for example in the family, at school and through the media. Border narratives, for example, have always, consciously and sub-consciously, thrown

up the notion of difference which exists on both sides of a given (or supposed) socio-cultural border (Andrén et. al. 2017).

If we accept the above, the bordering paradigm is in many ways a counterpart to the real and imagined impacts of globalization. Bordering indicates how globalization is 'domesticated' and incorporated, bordered, so to speak, within existing, practices, conventions, cognitive spaces and lived places, not always in harmonious ways. Henk van Houtum (2005) uses the term 'b/ordering' to refer to the interplay between the ordering (of chaos) and border-making. Physical borders are not there only by tradition, wars, agreements and high politics but also made and maintained by other cultural, economic political and social activities which accommodate the impacts of globalization. At the same time, everyday bordering and ordering practices connive to create and recreate new social-cultural boundaries and divisions which are also spatial in nature. Everyday lived experiences are also impacted by globalization, this results in intersections, differentiations and, under the most favourable circumstances, new convivialities in which gender, age and ethnicity meet and mutually constitute each other.

Table 1 captures some of the complexity of the bordering paradigm and indicates how globalization has affected border studies conceptually. The impacts have been profound. However, rather than challenge or question the centrality of borders as organizing elements of social life and human territoriality, globalization has confirmed their salience, while, at the same time, revolutionizing the ways in which we understand and interpret borders.

Table 1: Globalization's Conceptual Influence on Border Studies as Reflected in the Bordering Paradigm

1.	from state-centred to socially embedded perspectives
2.	from bounded territoriality to multilocal and relational spaces
3.	from normative assumptions to the questioning of border-making rationales
4.	from 'objective' political rationality to the articulation of ethical concerns (violence and discrimination at borders)

Conceptual Elaborations of Bordering

In its basic understanding, the bordering paradigm is quite general and can be rather abstract in terms of guiding empirical research. It is therefore undergoing constant development and refinement in order to accommodate different socio-spatial contexts as well as respond to the consequences of globalizing forces. In this section, some elaborations of the bordering paradigm that have linked bordering to other socio-spatial ideas will be provided. Power, ontological issues, the representational and symbolic nature of borders and the social ramifications of political borderings practices are some of the areas that will be briefly dealt with here.

Globalization and 'Post-National' Borders

Globalization is often conceptualized in terms of the transformation of state borders within the international economy and in response to global flows, environmental issues (e.g. global climate change and health issues), human rights and international terrorism, etc. These issues have opened up space for scholarly work on the 'production' of borders, more specifically processes of bordering, de-bordering and re-bordering. Furthermore, border studies interrogates the control of mobility within the world system. Globalization has thus provided impetus for thinking of bordering in terms of a 'post-national' perspective. This could signify a new form of territorial sovereignty based on shared political responsibilities between states and/or the emergence of new territorial and cultural identities (Laine 2016). With respect to Europe, post-national bordering approaches investigate the different ways in which national and European elements co-exist in the construction of borders within and between different political cultures and how these elements continue to shape opinions and attitudes on borders in different European countries (Scott 2015).

Another important strand of post-national theorization is that of the emergence of new political and economic units that partly incorporate but also beyond the context of the nation-state. The development of multinational (and geographically contiguous) zones of economic and political co-operation, such as the case of cross-border cooperation and transnational regionalism (see below), are one expression of the global forces that are restructuring the world system of individual states (Church and Reid 1996, Goodwin, Jones and Jones 2012). The concept of post-national borders can to an extent also be applied to new forms of territorial sovereignty that reproduce 'stateness' without traditional forms of external recognition. Examples of this are politically contested areas of the former Soviet Union such as Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Transnistria (Bahceli, Bartmann and Srbrenik 2004).

Conceptualizations of post-national borders in no way suggest a disappearance of states or the decline of state territoriality per se. They instead suggest the potential emergence of new borders, new border functions and/or new methods of territorial control that go beyond traditional notions of state territoriality. Post-national borders might thus follow either sub- or supranational logics of political interaction. Such borders are post-national because they create new political functions of integration and interaction across state borders. Understood in these terms, post-national borders might define polities that transcend the jurisdictional and conceptual limits of state-centred orientations, for example as a community of states, as networks of cities or cross-border regions.

Borders and Place

Border studies represents an area of investigation that tempers emphasis of space-time convergence as a globally operating structuring force. It confronts 'spaces of flows' and 'power geometries' with ontological questions and the significance of place. The work, for example, of major urban theorists such as Castells (1997), Harvey (1996) and Massey (1993) has emphasized the socially constructed nature of place which increasingly reflects globally networked economic and social relations. On this view, places are interpenetrated by relational flows but, at the same time, locality is the space of bounded cultural formations and potential resistance to mobile capital. As Michael P. Smith (2001) has argued, emphasizing the global can result in a misreading of the significance of locale and place: rather than merely representing containers where global flows and networks become evident, cities are sites of localization, community and drivers of social and political innovation. Cresswell (2004) has also warned against theoretical rigidity in conceptualizing place as something either defined from within or determined by external (global) forces – places are characterised by adaptation to change and continuity. Bordering thus establishes a conceptual nexus between everyday practices of differentiating social space, the instrumentality of place-making, for example, as economic projects, and the ontological need for a sense of rootedness in place (Keresztély, Scott and Virág 2017).

Along similar lines, Malpas (2012) has criticized what he sees as human geography's neglect of the ideational connections between space and place. Malpas (2012: 228) is particularly critical of sweeping aside ontological questions in favour of political commitments that include the 'theorization of spatial rhetoric and of spatial imagining as this forms the core of spatial politics'. In his development of the concept of place, Cresswell (2004) has voiced similar concerns,

drawing attention to unproductive antagonisms between Place as something essential to existence ('Being in the World') and Place as a product of negotiating spatial relationships ('Social Construct') when in fact both mutually contribute to place construction. In terms of its social operation, this interpretation of bordering draws attention to relationships between globalization therefore, territoriality *and* cognition. All three processes interact in creating a sense of socio-spatial difference and reinforcing a sense of groups and individual identity in space. This perspective addresses the shortcomings of dichotomous rather than complementary understandings of relational and territorial borders have been enumerated by a number of scholars, including Martin and Secor (2014), MacLeod and Jones (2007), and Paasi (2012). These authors suggest that the process of bounding space maintains its more general everyday significance despite the networked (and globalized) nature of life.

Border Walls and Bordering through Teichopolitics

Border studies increasingly deal with questions of border security and more general securitization polices that have proliferated during the new Millennium (Hall 2012, Rosas 2012, Weber and Pickering 2011). Bordering is therefore also conceptualized in very concrete, physical terms as part of more general logics of control, security and border management. Globalization has, for example, engendered a politics of border closure that has been conceptualized as 'teichopolitics' (Ballif and Rosière 2009) - the politics of building walls and barriers for security and economic reasons. Rosière and Jones (2012) in fact argue that 'teichopolitics' is best understood as the antithesis of the borderless world of globalisation. As they suggest, new barriers are being built at asymmetric borders in the world where different spaces of economic, cultural, or political privilege converge. While the study of border walls and their evolution is an important agenda of practical borders research - this will elaborated in more detail below – there are other important conceptual aspects involved as well. Despite its highly technical and legalistic nature border management is also a socio-political and cultural process: the basis for securitized differentiation is in fact generally a question of identity as well (see Van Houtum 2011). Fabrizio Eva (2012) considers this form of physical bordering part of a process of 'self-caging' that is driven by interactions between iconographies of pyramidal (state) power and individual subjectivities regarding security and identity. Furthermore, Eva's notion of 'self-caging' reflects how discourses of threat and insecurity are internalized at the level of everyday life, creating more demand for physical, political bordering.

The Concept of the 'Border Multiple'

Others have developed the bordering paradigm by emphasising the inherently multifarious nature of borders (Andersen, Klatt and Sandberg 2012). As 'multiple' processes, borders are not autonomous phenomena with their own unique ontology above and beyond their legal and institutional identities. Borders come to exist socially in the practices of different actors and the contested meanings attributed to them. Security borders, for example, are constructed by the performance of internal regulatory practices which challenge and constrain mobility across borders. The same borders, however, can have a very different significance, practically and symbolically, to other actors, for example as economic strategies or places of worship. The heteronomy of border practices, symbolisms, border-related identities and imaginations means that borders are both abstract and at the same time very concrete. The 'border multiple' is composed of Janus-faced, contested and contradictory narratives at different levels of practice, be it in the realm of memory and as imagined borders, in the realm of the political discourse and geopolitics or in practices enacting borders in the functional realm of administration.

In specific border zones, the geographic state border itself becomes embedded in everyday life and in the meanings attached to the local, as well as national, cultural environment, traditions, social habits and emotions. While it can be easy for individuals to cross the actual border, the border largely defines the spatial understanding of the local context. People make sense of their border-related social world in highly contextual and specific ways. The construction of meanings of borders can range from a desired barrier against a demonized 'other' and, as a means of exclusion, to its conception as an institution in potential need of reform but yet essential to economic survival. Border narratives should be read through their historicity and relationality. Understood in 'multiple' terms, bordering practices and social divisions affect one another, are constantly changing and can include as well as exclude. The 'border' and the divisions stemming from it are fluid, contextual and spatially manifested in the community and its relations with the state.

The Concept of Mobile Borders

Balibar's (1998) famous 'borders are everywhere' (BAE) proclamation has been criticized as a glib generality inspired by globalization and 'post-national' thinking (O'Dowd 2010). However, with the bordering paradigm, BAE takes on a very concrete significance. As Paasi and Prokkola (2008) argue, borders are not

'located' merely in border areas, but are everywhere in societies, for example in various forms of 'banal flagging' of the national in everyday life. Emotional bordering is loaded in national flag days and other national iconographies and practices – and this is also the 'location' of borders. Active 'borderwork' (Rumford 2008) may deconstruct established and existing forms and codes of national socialization in some locations.

Moreover, the idea that borders exist everywhere where bordering takes places has given rise the concept of mobile borders. It is more or less accepted that traditional dividing lines between the domestic and the international and between what it is 'inside' and 'outside' of specific socio-spatial realms have been blurred as is strikingly depicted in the Moebius strip analogy of Bigo and Walker (2007). This has given way to understandings of borders embedded in new spatialities that challenge dichotomies typical to the territorial world of nation-states. Mobile borders are thus part of a security complex that goes beyond the level of physical walls and fences (Popescu 2015). It includes a highly flexible system of delocalized and generalized border control mechanisms that differentiation between people their specific mobilities. Contemporary mobile borders can be created, shifted, and deconstructed by a range of actors (Amilhat Szary and Giraud 2015). Luiza Bialasiewicz (2012) has documented that the mobility of political bordering mechanism also comprises 'off-shoring and out-sourcing', particularly in the case of the European Union, where extraterritorial security perimeters have been set up in neighbouring regions far from the EU's physical external borders (Casas Cortes, Cobarrubias and Pickels 2016).

Borderscapes

According to Jessop (2012: 74):

> *"an imaginary is a semiotic ensemble (without tightly defined boundaries) that frames individual subjects' lived experience of an inordinately complex world and/or guides collective calculation about that world. There are many such imaginaries and they are involved in complex and tangled relations at different sites and scales of action."*

Following the logic that geographical imaginations matter (see Gregory, 1994; Howie and Lewis, 2014), the bordering paradigm has appropriated the heuristic of imaginaries as a means of approaching complex socio-spatial processes (Brambilla, 2014; Bürkner, 2017; Vaughan Williams, 2012). Moreover, border scholars such as Brambilla (2015a), Dell' Agnese and Amilaht Szary (2015), Grundy-Warr

and Rajaram (2007) and Laine and Tervonen (2015), have suggested that the concept of bordering can be expanded to encompass 'borderscapes' - social/political panoramas that emerge around border contexts and that connect the realm of high politics with that of communities and individuals who are affected by and negotiate borders. As borderscapes, borders in fact cannot be reduced to instruments of terms of inclusion/exclusion as conveyed by biopolitical interpretations or metaphors such as 'Fortress Europe'. Instead, borders must be expanded to include what is happening in terms of everyday life at borders as reflected, for example in the agency of migrants. As borderscapes borders emerge as fields in which processes of traversing and crossing meet those of reinforcement and blocking and in which borders are produced by social institutions and migration as a social force.

According to Brambilla (2015b, p. 111) borderscapes express "the (geo)political and epistemic multidimensionality of the border, enabling a productive understanding of the processual, de-territorialized and dispersed nature of borders and their ensuing regimes in the era of globalization and transnational flows". Much in accord with the 'border multiple' concept described above, the use of borderscapes as an epistemological tool involves connecting border experiences and border-making practices. Moreover, borderscapes involve an inclusive perspective on the political in which everyday practices, representations and border imaginaries as well as formal political processes are closely linked. The borderscapes concept also breaks down sharp divisions between territorial and relational understandings of borders. Moreover, the term borderscape expresses the representation of borders as well as individual and collective practices of border-making highlighting the ways in which the borderscapes concept affords certain sets of reproductive practices and shapes political subjectivities in a particular manner. These bordering perspectives come together, among other ways, in the present geopolitical climate where, in stark contrast to the 1990s when discourses of 'de-bordering' Europe enjoyed substantial currency, Europe's (also worldwide) borders appear to have become formidable barriers symbolizing civilizational difference between East and West.

Selected Research Perspectives

The impact of globalization on research agendas in border studies is also evidenced by the increase in international comparative research and networks that have created a vibrant border studies community. The border studies community, which is now clearly global in scope, is represented by the *Journal of Border Studies*, the Association of Borderlands Studies (ABS) and informal groups such as the *Border Regions in Transition* network *(BRIT*), which by 2018 has held 16 international conferences, the last of these located in Nigeria and Benin. In addition, large projects have received funding in order to pursue investigation on the global roles of borders such as the aptly named Borders in Globlization (BIG) project, financed by the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. This project, inaugurated in 2014 seeks to '...build excellence in the knowledge and understanding of borders, (...) create new policy and foster knowledge transfer in order to address such globalization forces as security, trade and migration flows, and also to understand the forces of technology, self-determination and regionalization that are affecting borders and borderlands in regions around the world'.[1]

In addition, the EU-funded EUBORDERSCAPES project (full title: Bordering, Political Landscapes and Social Arenas: Potentials and Challenges of Evolving Border Concepts in a post-Cold War World), scrutinized conceptual change in understandings of borders in relation to transformations associated with globalization. Recognizing the close interrelationships between social change and paradigm shifts, the EUBORDERSCAPES project analyzed evolving concepts of borders in terms of their wider societal significance, critically interrogating 'objective' categories of state territoriality. This approach involves comparing and contrasting the ways in which different and often contested conceptualizations of state borders (in terms of their political, social, cultural and symbolic significance) resonate in concrete contexts at the level of everyday life.[2]

In this section, globalization will be related to border studies via discussion that indicates considerable thematic, theoretical and empirical diversity. We will specifically focus on: 1) borders, transnational spaces and cross-border cooperation, 2) the issue of borders as social and political resources and 3) key thematic areas that involve migration, mobility, securitization, state territoriality and 3).

---

1 The website address is: www.biglobalization.org. Last access 30 September 2017.

2 EUBORDERSCAPES, which ended in 2016, was funded by the EU's 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (Contract 290775). The website is accessible at www.euborderscapes.eu,

Transnational Spaces: Cross-Border Cooperation

Globalization has led to the increasing importance of cross-border regions (Scott 2017, Zimmerbauer 2012). Cross-border co-operation between states has been the subject of interdisciplinary and comparative study for almost three decades. This research has been driven by at least one general core concern: i.e. transformations of nation-states and their consequences for economic, political, social and cultural life. Originally, research focused on urban and regional forms of 'subsovereign paradiplomacy' Duchacek (1986), and by the early 1990s the study of rapid cross-border urbanization on the US-Mexican border had also raised the question of local transnational planning and development responses (Herzog 1990). This work has been subsequently developed in international comparisons of cross-border and transnational strategic alliances between cities, regions and other subnational (Amen et.al. 2011, Goodwin, Jones and Jones 2012, Setzer 2015).

Partly spurred on by globalization – and in the guise of European Union - the focus of research shifted during the 1990s from empirical research on transnational urban networks and their co-operation mechanisms to the study of local and regional forms of policy relevant cross-border interaction. Within this context, theories of state space rescaling and neoliberal governance have considerable influence (Brenner 2004, Gualini 2003). With specific regard to borders, a particular European characteristic of this research focus has been a more contextually sensitive understanding of the socio-political nature of cross-border cooperation. More directly, cross-border cooperation is defined by political projects carried out by private, state and, to an extent, third sector actors with the express goal of extracting benefit from joint initiatives in various economic, social, environmental and political fields (Perkmann 2007, Svensson 2014). Through new forms of political and economic interaction - both institutional and informal - it has been suggested that greater cost-effectiveness in public investment can be achieved, economic complementarities exploited, the scope for strategic planning widened and environmental problems more directly and effectively addressed. For these reasons, Cross-border cooperation (CBC) is seen to promote the wider goals of European Cohesion.

Building upon the conceptual foundations of subnational paradiplomacy, border studies, particularly in the European case, developed during the 1990s and early 2000s a specific focus on cross-border policy integration as a form of "multilevel governance" (Perkmann 1999, Lepik 2009). This focus remains an important on in terms of CBC policy within the EU. However, if the former approach positio-

ned CBC within a context of globalisation and transnational networks, the European perspective has been largely influenced by formal, structural understandings of transnational governance (see Blatter 1997, 2004). For example, in order to overcome traditional forms of intergovernmentalism, institutionalisation at the local and regional levels was seen as a necessary element for successful CBC (Scott 2000). Prospects for transboundary regionalisation have been thus defined by the outcomes of a gradual and complex process of institutional innovation and capacity-building at national, state and local levels. At the same time, the emergence of new planning forms across borders were prophesised in terms of regional dialogue. Dialogue, together with adequate strategies with which to reconcile and co-ordinate diverse interests, were seen to offer considerable promise for developing transboundary alliances between cities and their regions (Van Geenhuizen et. al. 1996, Leibenath et.al. 2008).

Borders as Resources

Although state borders are often discussed as 'necessary evils' or formidable institutions of state control and sovereignty, border studies has for quite some time pursued the idea that, given the impacts and consequences of globalization, state borders also represent considerable resources, not just in economic terms but politically and culturally. The discussions briefly presented above regarding cross-border cooperation provides clear evidence of the importance of resource-oriented arguments in border studies. The economic potential of the border, expressed in wage and price differentials or economic complementarities is not a new story. Observers of cross-border trade on the US-Mexican border, for example, have developed a large body of work analyzing border effects in terms of economic integration and growth (Barajas et. al. 2014, Hanson 1996, 2001). However, globalization has also provided incentives for exploiting state borders as resources for economic, political and cultural co-operation. As discussed above, cross-border co-operation is premised on the idea that borders can represent 'bridges' between communities and regions in the pursuit of solutions to common challenges. Christophe Sohn (2014) has demonstrated that cross-border metropolitan regions have been able to use borders to achieve political recognition, exploit cost differentials, take advantage of cost-effective divisions of labour and promote themselves as international, global and multicultural places (at the same time, Sohn also mentions that the exploitation of border potentials can also exacerbate social inequalities, as in the case in US-Mexican metropolitan areas such as El Paso-Juárez). Eker and Van Houtum (2013) develop the ideas of borders as resources in a more cultural sense, as a place of common history,

landscape formation, discovery and cooperation. In Europe's 'underused' border spaces, such as the Dutch-German borderland, the lack of controls and physical barriers is an invitation to jointly map, conceptualize and design common landscapes that invite exploration.

Mobility, Borders and Security

Mobility is about the ability to transcend borders whereas forced or self-imposed immobility strengthens the dividing power of borders. Mobility is thus a freedom, but it is not a freedom shared by all; in the neoliberal economy the hypermobility of the economically privileged can be contrasted with the marginalization of those with limited access to mobility networks. At another level, mobility is understood as conditioned by larger economic forces and the geopolitics that support their functioning. Vogt (2013, 764-765), for example, positions human mobility "at the intersection between local and global economies" and "embedded within logics of global capitalism and state militarism." On this view, mobility is inherently subject to manipulation, control and punitive regulation. It is within this context that the positive characteristics of mobility has been questioned and subject to a highly politicized interpretation. On the other hand, as Doreen Massey (1993) has argued, mobility, such as that originally promoted by the EU, is a central element of a progressive sense of being that is at once robust due to its openness to the outside world and ability to connect with other cultures and other areas of the world.

Borders are at the core of discussions on security and the control of mobility at the national, European and global level: in terms of received understandings of security, borders represent an interface between domestic concerns and wider interstate and intercultural contexts. At the most basic level, borders serve to protect national societies from external threats while maintaining conditions for their economic sustainability. Beyond this, however, the functions and social significance of borders not only reflect the means in which security risks and challenges can be articulated and acted upon but also ethical questions of considerable importance. In tandem with the securitizing discourses that stigmatize mobility and migration, political pressure has increased for more formidable and militarized borders in order to defend national cultures, even at the risk of reducing cross-border mobility for everyday citizens and curtailing democratic rights (Reece Jones 2016). Border studies research has taken up ethical debate by questioning the Realpolitik of selective and restrictive mobility and interrogating the dilemma of bordering liberal societies (Jones and Johnson 2016, Elden 2009).

Despite the European Union's visions of open borders, Europe's external boundaries are in many ways markers of inequality, exclusion and, as such, symbols of unfairness.

The European Union engages, for example, in humanitarian aid and conflict resolution in order to promote conditions for more equitable development on a global scale. But it at the same time it has markedly restricted the possibility of asylum while invoking police powers and state violence in order to prevent, at a very high human cost, irregular entry into its territory. Through visa regimes and border politics the EU defines the ground rules of access for different groups depending on origin, citizenship, material situation and socio-professional background (Mau et. al. 2012). In highly critical readings of the increasingly selective nature of EU external borders, the EU's practices have been compared with legalized apartheid: with the "law of birth" determining an individual's degree of mobility across, and even occasionally within, state borders (Van Houtum 2010). Furthermore, the violence of liberal states is not limited to their own territorial borders but is often extended to areas far beyond, such as in the case of the EU's security perimeter in the Southern Mediterranean (Casas-Cortes et. al. 2016).

In de- and re-bordering processes, borders are mobile and territorially displaced. Border controls are, in principle, being carried out by anyone anywhere – by loyal inhabitants who inform police if they suspect the presence of 'illegals'. They also involve all-encompassing surveillance technologies and the compliance of private businesses, public agencies and social services (Popescu 2015). Hence, borders as institutions are also ideal candidates for analyses of biopolitics and biopower, understood in their minimalist form: the control of population (Demetriou 2013, Topak 2014). The control of mobility takes place in rather mundane and unspectacular ways, such as through the use of biometrics and body scans at borders and airports. At the same time, borders can be seen as sophisticated techniques for the exercise of biopower and biopolitics and for the creation – discursively and physically – of spaces that are set outside everyday social contexts. These Agambenean (2003) exceptional spaces, such as the Guantánamo detention camp and refugee retention centres not only control mobility; they serve to externalize perceived societal threats and neutralize political resistance to security policies. In similar terms, limboscapes (detention centres), as portrayed by Gallardo and Abet-Más (2016), characterize the Moroccan-Spanish borderland at the exclave city of Ceuta, an iconic result of the EU's bordering practices.

Conclusions and a Future Research Agenda

Through the investigation of borders, we realize that there can be no hegemonic dominance of any specific social theory, whether critical or not, in the understanding of space and its social significance. And whereas space is abstract and absolute, we now understand that it is borders that make space intelligible, for example as everyday social places. Borders not only have different meanings for different actors but are also manifestations of power relations in society at different scales. By the same token, the present state of border studies indicates that processes associated with globalization have deeply changed the power of borders, modifying the dialectical relation between their fixed institutional nature and constantly changing, fluid processes of bordering within and between societies.

The progress made by border studies in terms of interdisciplinary and complex understandings of borders and their significance is unquestionable. Here, globalization has played a major role. The question is: where to now? What might be possible future research agendas that maintain the innovative and integrating momentum as well as social relevance of border studies? One good place to develop research is in the ongoing ethical debate regarding the 'why' and 'how' of borders. An important target of these deliberations could be 'bordering dilemmas' within the context of globalization – a situation in which exclusion is often seen as result of creating or maintaining inclusive and open societies (Elden 2009, Jones and Johnson 2016). For example, despite the European Union's visions of open borders, Europe's boundaries are in many ways markers of inequality, exclusion and, as such, symbols of unfairness. Through visa regimes and border politics the EU thus defines the ground rules of access for different groups depending on origin, citizenship, material situation and socio-professional background (Mau et. al. 2012). Nevertheless, at least in the 'Western' case, there exist few feasible alternatives to liberal notions of an 'inclusive' but self-defined and thus bounded community as a necessary precondition of democracy (Batt 2002). It can be therefore argued that without a sense of closure and boundedness, the development and nurture of community and place identities is virtually impossible.

How then, can borders be 'de-securitized'? Bauder (2014) proposes that instead of regulating mobility with borders and arbitrary politics of inclusion and exclusion, a constructive alternative would be to link mobility (and migration) to the possibility of acquiring certain rights, including domicile-based citizenship, thus avoiding a future of uncertainty, statelessness and increasing social tensions. While such scenarios seem distant from political reality, at least at this point in time, desecuritization would be an important first stop in opening up notions of

community, belonging and citizenship to include ever larger cross-section of humanity. It is also here where the concept of borderscapes can provide constructive impetus. Thinking in terms of borderscapes has direct ethical implications, adding to a rich social sciences and humanities engagement with borders that takes inspiration from the realm of philosophy. A potential way forward is offered, for example, by the political philosophy of Hannah Arendt, the reappraisal of which is indicative of the ethical issues involved in the securitization of mobility. Arendt (1968) has warned of world alienation and 'losing a sense of being in the world' and with it, identity. Identity is disclosed in the public sphere, the exclusion from which results in a loss of identification with the political system. Alienation also gives rise to the deterioration of the public sphere itself (d'Entreves 1994). Making persons visible or invisible in the public realm is about bordering, about creating distinction. This idea resonates with Arendt's (1968) notion of the politics of appearance or the making evident of positions, interests and actors that represent them. Borren (2008) has suggested that Arendt's political philosophy can be adapted to criticize European policies that disenfranchize non-citizens through exposing them (as threats) and/or obscuring their claims, problems and motivations. Conversely, thinking of borders as borderscapes that reveal human conditions might stimulate positive agency and a politics of visibility could signify an expression of social acceptance and integration.

References

Agamben, G. (2003): *Stato di eccezione (Homo sacer II.1)*. Bollati Boringhieri, Torino

Amen, M., Toly, N.J., McCarney, P.L., Segbers, K. (eds.) (2011): *Cities and Global Governance: New Sites for International Relations*. Ashgate, Farnham

Amilhat Szary, A.L. — Giraud, F. (2015): *Borderities and the Politics of Contemporary Mobile Borders*. Palgrave Macmillan, London

Andersen, D. J., Klatt, M., Sandberg, M. (eds.) (2012): *The Border Multiple: The Practicing of Borders Between Public Policy and Everyday Life in a Re-Scaling Europe*. Ashgate, Aldershot

Andrén, M., Lindkvist, T., Söhrman, I., Vajta, K. (eds.) (2017): *Cultural Borders of Europe: Narratives, Concepts and Practices in the Present and the Past*. Berghahn, New York

Arendt, H. (1968): *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Ballif, F. — Rosière, S. (2009): Le défi des teichopolitiques. Analyser la fermeture contemporaine des territories. *L'Espace Géographique*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 193–206.

Balibar, E. (1998): The Borders of Europe. In: Cheah, P. – Robbins, B. (eds.): *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Bahcheli, T., Bartmann, B., Srebrnik, H. (eds.) (2004): *De Facto States. The Quest for Sovereignty*. Routledge, London and New York

Barajas, I., Sisto, N., Gaytán, E., Cantú, J., López, B. (2014): Trade Flows Between the United States and Mexico: NAFTA and the Border Region, *Articulo Journal of Urban Studies*, 10/2014, https://articulo.revues.org/2567

Batt, J. (2002): 'Introduction: Region, State and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe. In: Batt, J. – Wolczuk, K. (eds.): *Region, State and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe*. Frank Cass and Co., London, pp. 1-14.

Bauder, H. (2014): Possibilities of Open Borders and No Border. *Social Justice*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 76–96.

Bialasiewicz, L. (2012): Off-shoring and Out-sourcing the Borders of EUrope: Libya and EU Border Work in the Mediterranean. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 843-866.

Bigo, D. — Walker, R. J. B. (2007): Political Sociology and the Problem of the International.

Millenium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 725-739

Blatter, J. (1997): Explaining Crossborder Cooperation: a Border-Focused and Border-External Approach. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 1-2, pp. 151-175.

Blatter, J. (2004): From Spaces of Places' to 'Spaces of Flows'? Territorial and Functional

Governance in Cross-Border Regions in Europe and North America. *International*

Journal of Urban and Regional Research, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 530–48.

Borren, M. (2008): Towards an Arendtian politics of in/visibility. On stateless refugees and undocumented aliens. *Ethical Perspectives: Journal of European Ethics Network*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 213–237.

Brambilla, C. (2015a): Exploring the critical potential of the Borderscapes concept. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 14-34.

Brambilla, C. (2015b): Navigating the Euro/African and Migration Nexus through the Borderscapes Lens: Insights from the LampedusaInFestival. In: Brambilla, C., Laine, J., Scott, J.W., Bocchi, G. (eds.): *Borderscaping: Imaginations and practices of border making*. Ashgate, Farnham, pp. 111-121.

Brambilla, C. (2014): Shifting Italy/Libya borderscapes at the interface of EU/Africa borderland: A "genealogical" outlook from the colonial era to post-colonial Scenarios. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 220-245.

Brambilla, C., Laine, J., Scott, J.W., Bocchi, G. (eds.) (2015): *Borderscaping: Imaginations and Practices of Border-Making*. Ashgate, Farnham

Brenner, N. (2004): Urban Governance and the Production of New State Spaces in Western Europe, 1960–2000. *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 11, pp. 447-488.

Casas-Cortes, M., Covarrubias, S., Pickles, J. (2016): Good neighbours make good fences: Seahorse operations, border externalization and extra-territoriality. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 231-251.

Castells, M. (1997): *The Power of Identity*. Mass: Blackwell Publishers, Oxford and Malden

Ceglowski, J. (2000): Has Globalization Created a Borderless World? In: Patrick, O'. M., Mehlinger, H. D., Krain, M. (eds.): *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century*.

Indiana University Press, Indianapolis, pp. 101-109.

Chernobrov, D. (2016): Ontological Security and Public (Mis)recognition of International Crises: Uncertainty, Political Imagining and the Self. *Political Psychology*, Vol. 37, pp. 581-596.

Church, A. — Reid, P. (1996): Urban Power, International Networks and Competition: The Example of Cross-Border Co-operation. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 8, pp. 1279-1318.

Cresswell, T. (2004): *Place. An Introduction*. Blackwell, London

Dell'Agnese, E. — Amilhat Szary, A. L. (2015): Introduction. Borderscapes: From Border Landscapes to Border Aesthetics. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 4-13.

Demetriou, O. (2013): *Capricious Borders: Minority, Population, and Counter-Conduct between Greece and Turkey*. Berghahn, Oxford and New York

Donnan, H. — Wilson, T. (eds.) (2012): *A Companion to Border Studies*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden and Oxford

Duchacek, I. (1986): International Competence of Subnational Governments: Borderlands and Beyond. In: Martínez, J. O. (eds.): *Across Boundaries. Transborder Interaction in Comparative Perspective*. Texas Western Press, El Paso, pp. 11-28.

Eker, M. — van Houtum, H. (2013): *Grensland. Borderland. Atlas, Essays and Design. History and Future of the Border Landscape*. Blauwdruk, Eindhoven

Eva, F. (2012): Caging, Self-Caging, Materiality, Pyramids and Memes as Better Tools for Geopolitical Analysis - An Epistemological Anarchist Approach. *Human Geography*, Vol. 5, No. 3, https://hugeog.com/eva-53/.

Hall, A. (2012): *Border Watch: Cultures of Immigration, Detention and Control*. Pluto, London

Held, D. (eds.) (2000): *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. Routledge, London and New York

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

Ferrer-Gallardo, X. — Albet-Mas, A. (2016): EU-limboscapes: Ceuta and the proliferation of migrant detention spaces across the European Union. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 527 –530.

Goodwin, M., Jones, M., Jones, R. (2012): *Rescaling the State: Devolution and the Geographies of Economic Governance*. Manchester University Press, Manchester

Grundy-Warr, C. — Rajaram, P. K. (eds.) (2007): *Borderscapes. Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London

Gualini. E. (2003): Cross-border Governance: Inventing Regions in a Trans-national Multi-level Polity. *DISP,* Vol. 39, No. 152, pp. 43-52.

Hanson, G. (1996): Economic integration, intra-industry trade, and frontier regions. *European Economic Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3-5, pp. 941-949.

Hanson, G. (2001): U.S.-Mexico integration and regional economies: Evidence from border-city pairs. *Journal of Urban Economics*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 259-287.

Harvey, D. (1996): *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Blackwell, Oxford

Herzog, L. A. (1990): *Where North meets South. Cities, Space and Politics on the US–Mexico Border*. University of Texas, Austin

Hing, B. (2010): *Ethical Borders: NAFTA, Globalization, and Mexican Migration*. Temple University Press, Philadelphia

Houtum, H. van (2005): The Geopolitics of Borders and Boundaries. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 672-79.

Houtum, H. van – Naerssen, T. van (2002): Bordering, Ordering, and Othering. *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, Vol. 93. No. 2, pp. 125-136.

Houtum, H. van (2005): The Geopolitics of Borders and Boundaries. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 672-79.

Jessop, B. (2012): Social Imaginaries, Structuration, Learning, and Collibration: Their Role and Limitations in Governing Complexity. *Zarządzanie Publiczne*, (19), pp. 71-83.

Jones, R. — Johnson, C. (2016): Border Militarization and the Re-articulation of Sovereignty. *Transactions of Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 187-200.

Kallis, A. (2013): Breaking the taboos and "mainstreaming" the extreme: the debates on restricting Islamic symbols in Europe. In: Mral, B., Wodak, R., Khosravinik. M. (eds.): *Right-wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*. Bloomsbury Academic, London, pp. 55-70.

Keresztély, K., Scott, J.W., Virág, T. (2017): Roma Communities, Urban Development and Social Bordering in the Inner City of Budapest. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 40, No.7, pp. 1077-1095.

Laine, J. (2016): European Civic Neighbourhood: Towards a Bottom-Up Agenda Across Borders. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 108, No.l 2, pp. 220-233.

Laine, J. — Tervonen, M. (2015): Remaking the Border: Post-Soviet Borderscapes in the Finnish Media. In: Brambilla, C., Laine, J., Scott, J. W., Bocchi, G. (eds.): *Borderscaping: Imaginations and Practices of Border Making*. Ashgate, London, pp. 65-76.

Lamont, M. — Molnár, V. (2002): The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 28, pp. 167-195.

Leibenath, M., Korcelli-Olejniczak, E., Knippschild, R. (eds.) (2008): *Cross-border Governance and Sustainable Spatial Development*. Springer, Berlin

Lepik, K. (2009): Euroregions as Mechanisms for Strengthening of Cross-border Cooperation in the Baltic Sea Region. *TRAMES*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 265–284.

Macleod, G. — Jones, M. (2007): Territorial, Scalar, Networked, Connected: In What Sense a 'Regional World'? *Regional Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 9, pp. 1177-1191.

Malpas, J. (2012): Putting Space in Place: Philosophical Topography and Relational Geography. *Environment and Planning D: Society in Space*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 226-242.

Massey, D. (1993): Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In: Bird, J., Curtis, B., Putnam, T., Robertson, G., Tickner, L. (eds.): Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change. Routledge, London, pp. 59-69.

Martin, L. — Secor. A. J. (2014): Towards a Post-Mathematical Topology. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 420–438.

Mau, S., Brabandt, H., Laube, L., Roos, C. (2012): *Liberal States and the Freedom of Movement. Selective Borders, Unequal Mobility*. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndsmills

Megoran, N. (2012): Rethinking the Study of International Boundaries: A Biography of the Kyrgyzstan-Uzbekistan Boundary. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 102, No. 2, pp. 464-481.

Newman, D. (2011): Contemporary Research Agendas in Border Studies: An Overview. In: Wastl-Walter, D. (eds.): *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies*. Ashgate, Farnham, pp 33–47.

Newman, D. (2006): The Lines that Continue to Separate us: Borders in our `Borderless' World. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 143-161.

Ohmae, K. (1995): *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*. The Free Press, New York

Paasi, A. (2012): Commentary. Border Studies Reanimated. Going beyond the Territorial/Relational Divide. *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 44, No. 10, pp. 2303-09.

Paasi, A. — Prokkola, E. K. (2008): Territorial Dynamics, Cross-border Work and Everyday Life in the Finnish–Swedish Border Area. *Space and Polity*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 13-29.

Pataki, F. (2013): *Hosszú menetelés (A Fidesz-jelenség)*. Noran Libro, Budapest

Popescu G. (2015): Controlling Mobility: Embodying Borders. In: Amilhat-Szary, A. — Giraut, F. (eds.): *Borderities and the Politics of Contemporary Mobile Borders*. Palgrave Macmillan: London, pp. 100-115.

Popescu, G. (2012): Bordering and Ordering the Twenty-first Century: Understanding Borders. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham

Perkmann, M. (2007): Policy entrepreneurship and multilevel governance: a comparative study of European cross-border regions. *Environment and Planning C*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 861-879.

Perkmann, M. (1999): Building Governance Institutions across European Borders. *Regional Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 657-66.

Raffestin, C. (1992): Autour de la fonction sociale de la frontière. *Espaces et sociétés*, Vol. 70/71, pp. 157–164.

Rosas, G. (2012): *Barrio Libre: Criminalizing States and Delinquent Refusals of the New Frontier*. Duke Univ. Press, London, Durham, 2012.

Rosière, S. — Jones, R. (2012): Teichopolitics: Re-considering Globalisation through the Role of Walls and Fences. *Geopolitics*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 217-234.

Rumford, C. (2006): Theorizing Borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 9, pp. 155-170.

Rumford, C. (2008): *Introduction*: *Citizens* and *Borderwork* in *Europe*. *Space and Polity*, Vol. *12, No. 1, pp.* 1-12.

Scholte, J. (1997): Global Capitalism and the State. *International Affairs*, Vol. 73, No. 3, pp. 427-452.

Scott, J. W. (2017): Cross-border, transnational, and interregional cooperation. In: Richardson, D. (eds.): *The International Encyclopedia of Geography. People, the Earth, Environment and Technology*. AAG-Wiley, Washington D.C.

Scott, J. W. (2015): Bordering, Border Politics and Cross-Border Cooperation in Europe. In: Celata, F. — Coletti, R. (eds.): *Neighbourhood Policy and the Construction of the External European Borders*. Springer, Cham, pp. 27-44.

Scott, J. W. (2012): European Politics of Borders, Border Symbolism and Cross-Border Cooperation. In: Wilson, T. — Donnan, H. (eds.): *A Companion to Border Studies*. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, pp. 83-99.

Scott, J. W. (2000): Transboundary Co-operation on Germany's Borders: Strategic Regionalism through Multilevel Governance. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 143-167.

Setzer, J. (2015): Testing the Boundaries of Subnational Diplomacy: The International Climate Action of Local and Regional Governments. *Transnational Environmental Law*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 319-337.

Sohn, C. (2014): The Border as a Resource in the Global Urban Space: A Contribution to the Cross-Border Metropolis Hypothesis. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 38, pp. 1697-1711.

Smith, M.P. (2001): *Transnational Urbanism*. Blackwell, London

Svensson, S. (2014): Forget the Policy Gap: Why Local Governments Really Decide to Take

Part in Cross-Border Cooperation Initiatives in Europe. *Eurasian Geography and Economics,* Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 409-22.

Topak, Ö. E. (2014): The biopolitical border in practice: Surveillance and death at the Greece–Turkey borderzones. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Spac*e, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 815-833.

Vertovec, S. (2011): The Cultural Politics of Nation and Migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 40, pp. 241-256.

Vogt, W. A. (2013): Crossing Mexico: Structural violence and the Commodification of Undocumented Central American Migrants. *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 40, pp. 764–780.

Weber, L. — Pickering, S. (2011): *Globalization and Borders, Death at the Global Frontier*. Palgrave, Hampshire

Zimmerbauer, K. (2012): Conceptualizing Borders in Cross-Border Regions: Case Studies of the Barents and Ireland–Wales Supranational Region. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 211-229.