

INTRODUCTION

Walls, Borders, Boundaries

MARC SILBERMAN, KAREN E. TILL, AND JANET WARD

Walls are built and then fall, borders are fortified and then shift, boundaries are demarcated and then transgressed. And then they are constructed all over again. As (post)moderns living in an age of globalization, we weary of our seemingly old-fashioned political and market-oriented boundaries: walls and fences are a nuisance to build and maintain, they invite vandalism and intrusion (rather than guarantee privacy or protection), and public surveys often reveal disapproval of national boundaries for moral, aesthetic, and economic reasons.¹ Indeed, recently erected walls and borders intended to sever communities or fortify political and economic boundaries between neighboring countries rarely solve the underlying political problems; more often they result in increased criminal activity, violence, and alienation.²

The contradictory yet simultaneous functions of walls, borders, and boundaries—to divide and connect, to exclude and include, to shield and constrain—are fundamental to all cultures. Expressed in primitive man's first utterance, "this is mine" (*ceci est à moi*) is, as Jean-Jacques Rousseau perceived, an innately territorial and tragic instinct.³ While mutable borders are a sign of life, closed borders signify ethnic or political division and often literally cause death. During World War I, for example, the trenches of the Allied Western Front became a fixed and deadly no man's land for years, an absurd "system in depth" of paralyzed offense, defense, and supply.⁴ Even in peacetime, borders have often been perceived as dead zones, as peripheral regions separated from the nation's "core"—its wealth, its power, and the independence of its capital city. When the wall, border, or boundary is closed or remote, these zones usually function as conquered, relatively empty second-class areas.⁵ This was certainly true of the western edge of the Iron Curtain: where capitalism ran right up against communism, it was more difficult to make either work. Hardened lines of demarcation also undercut border peoples' ability to coexist. Our territorializing tendencies offer a sense of stability by marking off a space through which to establish relational systems of identity, yet even as territoriality differentiates

Self from Other, it paradoxically provokes us to look across, through, or even over those very boundaries. As G. W. F. Hegel made clear in his *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* (1821), our identities are founded on boundary-based differentiation and co-constitutive social relations, a metaphor he extended from individuals to nations, which are, he states, at times necessarily engaged against one another. Spaces and social structures thus are constantly forged, just as they are negotiated and challenged.⁶

Walls, borders, and boundaries—their function as a crucial asset in individual and nation-based identity formation notwithstanding—also are traced far beyond and deeply within the obvious edges of nation-states. We have increasingly seen over the last century that internal borders dividing countries against themselves, no matter how artificial, only cement social differences on each side the longer they remain in place. When walls, borders, and boundaries become completely sealed off, they cause hardened social “edges” to emerge: groups essentially split in two and different communities develop on each side.⁷ Two Germanys evolved during the Cold War, when the world itself became defined by reified borders between the superpowers of communism and capitalism, Eastern Bloc and Western Bloc. This can also be witnessed in the dangerous, half-century-old division on the thirty-eighth parallel between North and South Korea, a line more closed than the Iron Curtain ever was. Only in the late 1980s did the geopolitical map of Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe become increasingly destabilized, its substance changing in tandem with the evolving (and, as it turned out, imploding) pressures of the Cold War. That map’s most famous edge, the Berlin Wall, finally gave way, and the East Germans’ “Peaceful Revolution” ended on 9 November 1989 without bloodshed.

In the globalized final decade of the twentieth century, many were optimistic that the Internet and other innovative communications technologies would offer opportunities to create new forms of democratic and transnational public spaces—in short, that we might start to move beyond the physical restrictions of borders and bodies to enjoy global, universal access to events, networks, social groups, and other resources. But instead of heralding a new boundary-free era, more than twenty years after the demise of Berlin’s Wall we confront the harsh realities of the Israeli-Palestinian and US-Mexico barriers that divide worlds and generate conflict and violence, walls that some scholars interpret as symbolic responses to our post-Westphalian age of waning sovereignty.⁸ Moreover, if 1989 reminded us that walls fall and iron curtains open, then earthquakes, acid rain, ozone holes, radioactive emissions, water wars, marine oil spills, tsunamis, and global warming have already demonstrated the futility of modernist techno-rational attempts to contain “our environment” within abstract, linear political boundaries.

New strategies of surveillance and intelligence data collection, including artificial drones, geographic information systems (GIS), geospatial positioning

systems (GPS), biodata-based border security checks, and proposed virtual fences (networks of cameras, sensors, and radar) run through and alongside more traditional forms of monitoring, such as barbed wire, fences, walls, military and police obstacles, filters, depth barriers, extraterritorial legal spaces, and zoning, as well as the increasing use of paramilitary privatized troops.⁹ Far from ushering in a new age of connections without walls, borders, and boundaries, these promising technological developments seem only to intensify differences and hostilities between states and peoples through spatially reductive imaginaries. As the refortification of border technologies and policing in the wake of 11 September 2001 have made only too clear, “the extraordinary power and performative force of colonial modernity” remain very much part of our present-day experience.¹⁰

Nonetheless, geopolitical and geo-economic state strategies are far from coherent or unidirectional in intent, execution, or effects and should be considered “a field or network of policy designs whose exercise over space is far from orderly.”¹¹ Meanwhile, local groups use the borderless technologies of the Internet to advance their own tactics of survival and protest, including virtual sit-ins inspired by the Zapatista movement, mass protests such as those in the Middle East catalyzed by micro-blogging with SMS-texting and tweets, Internet resource libraries, and YouTube video postings documenting state repression. Ricardo Dominguez, with colleagues Brett Stabaum, Micha Cárdenas, and Amy Sara Carroll of the Electronic Disturbance Theater/b.a.n.g. lab (an artist-based research group located at the University of California, San Diego and the University of Michigan), for example, recently developed the Transborder Immigrant Tool (TBT), a humanitarian safety-net device housed in GPS-enabled cellphones and intended to help individuals navigate to water caches on the US side of the border.¹² The artists hope to reduce the death toll of immigrants crossing from Mexico into the US, which they describe as a “humanitarian crisis,” by distributing the TBT to churches and nongovernment organizations. The project received a great deal of media attention in December 2009 and was both praised by the international community and accused of criminal activity within the US.

Even the very materiality of walls and barriers can be refashioned to achieve unexpected cultural and political practices. In the Irish Nationalist area of West Belfast, peace line barriers, which have grown in size and number in recent years to separate Protestant and Catholic areas of the city, were used to physically frame a local festival. In direct response to the local media’s designation of the area as a “terrorist community,” residents, feeling this portrayal was far more restrictive than the physical walls that cordoned them off, organized to celebrate their community’s creativity, energy, and passion for the arts. Beginning in 1998, Féile an Phobail, known locally as “the people’s festival,” has now

become one of the largest community festivals in Europe, providing a new form of political expression and community-driven postwar reconciliation.¹³

Creative uses of new globalizing technologies, then, cannot overcome walls, borders, and boundaries, but they can certainly subvert and rechannel their materialities and functions. Despite humankind's perennial attempts to barricade, separate, and define, the work of activists and artists shows that barrier lines are neither merely passive stages upon which tales of human greed unfold through history, nor simply abstract containers that those in power mark off, map out, or fill with meaning.

Spatial and Cultural Practices

Michel de Certeau's concepts of *strategy* and *tactic* offer a useful way to understand how such spatial and cultural practices and productions of power accompany the making and remaking of walls, borders, and boundaries. He defines a strategy as the creation of an "exterior" space, defined by threats and enemies, to delineate one's "own" territory and locus of power vis-à-vis the "Other." De Certeau describes three effects of strategies made commonplace since René Descartes first mapped the cogito in bodily and perspectival terms: marking the triumph of space over time, mastering places through vision and a system of surveillance, and transforming the "uncertainties of history into readable spaces." Spatial strategies are inherently relational, even as those strategies produce spaces that appear to be concrete, readable, and absolute: "A Cartesian attitude, if you wish: it is an effort to delimit one's own place in a world bewitched by the invisible powers of the Other. It is also the typical attitude of modern science, politics, and military strategy."¹⁴ The "attitude" de Certeau refers to here is associated with modern scopic regimes, whereby the godlike, disembodied, and disciplining bird's-eye "view from nowhere"—be it of the scientist, surveyor, explorer, planner, or political authority—seemingly renders space (and the peoples, relations, and networks coursing through and constitutive of those spaces) transparent.¹⁵ The spatial strategy of drawing lines therefore is not only a political process that delineates internal/external spaces of Self/Other: strategies also *naturalize* territorial practices, the disciplining of subjects, and the separation of space-times. As de Certeau concludes, once a locus of power is established, strategies expand and build upon theoretical and representational sites, including "systems and totalizing discourses" that articulate "an ensemble of physical places in which forces are distributed."¹⁶

Just as the authors in our volume acknowledge the ways that territorial border thinking and strategies of surveillance remain structured by traditional political and Cartesian imaginaries, they also pay attention to spatial and cultural practices that navigate architectures of division and exclusion beyond apparent

intransigencies. We refer to de Certeau's discussion of *tactics* as an alternative to hegemonic Western forms of territorial space, even though it is but an "art of the weak":

The space of a tactic is the space of the other. Thus it must play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power. It does not have the means to *keep to itself*, at a distance, in a position of withdrawal, foresight, and self-collection: it is a maneuver "within the enemy's field of vision," as von Bülow put it, and within enemy territory.... It must vigilantly make use of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers. It poaches in them. It creates surprises in them. It can be where it is least expected. It is a guileful ruse.¹⁷

Following this "guileful ruse," then, the following chapters reveal that walls, borders, and boundaries are far from fixed, static entities; barrier sites and barrier processes do not solely offer tales of domination and separation. They are much more than just histories of *surveiller et punir* (control and punish); rather, they offer narratives of Foucauldian "anti-discipline" as well as possibilities of identity formation.¹⁸ Walls, borders, and boundaries are dynamic spaces of inhabitation that exceed those of the nation-state; they offer possibilities of survival and adaptation and the hope of self-transformation. They may be also understood as activist markers that encourage people to assume "political responsibility for pursuit of a decent life" extending "beyond the borders" of individual countries.¹⁹

The work of Henri Lefebvre, a defining influence on de Certeau, is also helpful in establishing how walls, borders, and boundaries inform spatial and cultural practices.²⁰ In *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre analyzed how modern spaces are conceived, enacted, and made. He introduced a historical analysis of modern space according to three interrelated concepts: *representations of space*, *spaces of representation*, and *spatial practice*.²¹ This intersecting "trialectical" approach (to borrow a term from Edward W. Soja) means that there is always a tension between these three components of space, whereby each affects and is shaped by the other two.²² While space must be always understood according to all of these aspects simultaneously, distinguishing between them is nonetheless a crucial analytical device for examining complex intersections of space-time.

Representations of space are those dominant knowledge systems in a society produced by modern professionals who conceptualize, depict, and implicitly evaluate space. These strategic representations are produced (in a Marxian sense) by managers and professionals who work in bureaucratic institutions and have a distanced, "expert," but often non-experiential understanding of space as absolute, bounded, and measurable; they also often promote the interests of capital. Planners, engineers, architects, surveyors, policy makers, and state officials not only have the power to conceive of and represent space through maps,

flow charts, or information systems, but they also use those representations to legitimate their understanding of the world (sometimes projecting these spatial concepts onto the “reality” of others). Gerard Toal uses the term “geo-power” to discuss the representational practices and discourses used by these power elites to assert claims to “truth” about how political space is ordered and administered.²³ Furthermore, these dominant representations of space have other material effects; standing for reality, they are used to make and remake built and natural environments.

Consider the Berlin Wall.²⁴ Once it was erected in 1961, it was not just a real physical object but a metaphor for the Cold War’s division of the world’s two major geopolitical systems, generating symbolic confrontations and grand narratives of systemic struggle on both sides. Yet it was a system that demanded ideological mirroring. For someone unfamiliar with the topography or history of the city, it was not immediately clear from a bird’s-eye view which side was fortified against the other, in which direction the wall was actually “facing,” and against whom it was aligned. In an abstract sense, the Other (whether the West’s Cold War Other or the East’s, depending on one’s situational perspective) became a necessary condition for the common line of separation. Without the Other there is no sense of identity and no concept of home (*Heimat*).

One reason, then, for the sheer power and continued aura of walls, borders, and boundaries has much to do with their ability to signify and symbolize on a scale far greater than their literal ability to separate, defend, or guard. The human need to draw lines has a more benign import and functions as a cultural practice in its own right, for example, in designing and constructing the physical walls of a house. Lefebvre was particularly interested in distinctions between and overlays of dominant representations of space and their lived counterparts. For this reason he introduced the concept of spaces of representation to refer to the intimate knowledge that individuals have of the spaces they move through, inhabit, and make. Spaces of representation “tend towards more or less coherent systems of non-verbal symbols and signs” and include psychological attachments and memories, as well as the physical qualities of a social space. For Lefebvre the space of representation is “directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence [it is] the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’... This is the dominated—and hence passively experienced—space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate.”²⁵

Lefebvre’s category of everyday spatial practice is associated with a given area or locale. Spatial practice is evaluated according to place, individual performance, and individual and collective relationships to that social space—all of which interact in complex ways. Thus any number of identities imploded along with the Wall when it “fell” in November 1989. Sociologically the loss of the Wall resulted in multiple instances of German-German alienation. As German author Peter Schneider predicted, when the physical Wall fell, a “wall

in the head” would replace it. Remember the joke in the mid 1990s? “So this East German says to a West German: We are one people! And the West German answers: So are we!” (“Sagt ein Ossi zu einem Wessi: wir sind ein Volk! Antwortet der Wessi: wir auch!”) Despite this potential for disequilibrium and change, spatial practice ensures for Lefebvre at least some degree of social cohesion and continuity, a cohesion that “implies a guaranteed level of *competence* and a specific level of *performance*.”²⁶ Useful in this regard are Paul Ricoeur’s reflections on the significance of how we interact with the “constructed space” of cities.²⁷ As urban dwellers we bring together the subjective spatial experiences of our bodies and the detached configurations of geometric space. Our ability to localize our environment grants us the gift of creating a recognizable sense of place out of space.²⁸ Individuals growing up in various social settings learn how to “read” a landscape (which includes bodies and social cues) and intuitively know what activities are appropriate and expected in a locale. Such mutations in cultural practice are both diachronic and synchronic: even if one is the same person, being an East German during the German Democratic Republic is not the same as being an Eastern German in today’s reunified Germany, just as being Jewish in New York is not the same as being Jewish in Berlin, and being Mexican in El Paso is not the same as being Mexican in Ciudad Juárez.

De Certeau’s tactics thus are similar to Lefebvorean spatial practice insofar as both include transgressions that challenge dominant norms about appropriate ways to act, dress, or move in a social and political space, and thus may create new spatial imaginaries for the future. As Lefebvre makes clear, “[t]he body, at the very heart of space and of the discourse of Power, is irreducible and subversive.”²⁹ Such spatial practices are even at work against what is often referred to as today’s iconographic Berlin Wall: namely, the Israeli security barrier. On 9 November 2009, a group of Palestinian activists in Qalandiya staged a symbolic felling of a section of the West Bank wall that encircles them in direct reference to the liberation of the East Germans that night twenty years earlier. First charted out in 2000 along the former boundary of the Green Line to protect Israelis against Palestinian terrorist attacks, the barrier is becoming a fortification of spatial segregation and apartheid. It encompasses Palestinian communities in an insanely complex, circuitous route in the West Bank. Eventually it will wrap itself around all Palestinian areas in the occupied territories, surrounding them “lest they expand” and making the Palestinians into demoted outsiders who live in “landlocked” archipelagos within the state—as walled in and controlled, ironically, as the first ghettoized Jews of Renaissance Venice once were.³⁰

Although Palestinians avoid using the term white intifada, nonviolent, multilateral protest actions against Israel have not received the same mainstream media attention as Palestinian suicide bombers, Israeli military incursions, or Hamas’s stealth bombings, yet they offer alternative strategies of survival. Ac-

tivist Ayed Morrar, together with local residents, Hamas and Fatah members, Israeli activists, and other international activists, prevented the path of the Israeli security fence from running through the center of his home village Budrus, sparing 95 percent of the village's olive trees and arable farmland and preventing the village's local cemetery from being defaced. Stories such as these—of nonviolent protest actions by Israelis and Palestinians working together and told through documentary films shown in international circuits and through an Internet network and resource library—are an important part of the work pursued by the activist nonprofit organization Just Vision.³¹

Sometimes a border-crossing act of transgression can counteract the negative imagery of, say, the fence/wall being built along the US-Mexico border. A Tijuana house in which a drug-smuggling border tunnel had been uncovered became the site of a poetry event in 2007 where Mexican and American poets literally read their work across the border with the help of bullhorns. As the mayor of Tijuana insisted: "We're connected, border or no border."³² Further, the performance collective Border Art Workshop/Taller de Arte Fronterizo, based in San Diego, California, conducted a month-long journey in 1990 along the border in a zigzag fashion during which artists, residents, migrant workers, border patrol officers, the Pacific Ocean, deserts, and the border itself formed a variety of "staples" as crossing points "to heal the wound of the border," a terrain considered to be both a "great tragedy and a place where social upheaval also produces the possibility of constructive transformation of both Mexican and American cultures."³³ Such spatial practices as cultural practices can be thought of as mappings that, to borrow from Derek Gregory, are "not of replication, reflection, or reproduction—the usual codings—but of *interference*, in which boundaries [whether in the personal body or in the body politic] take provisional, never fixed, never finished shape and in which all sorts of fusions become possible."³⁴

Despite debates resulting from Arizona's Senate Bill 1070 (a controversial, stringent anti-immigration law), the ability of the US-Mexican borderlands to counteract the US border fence aligns this barrier with the fate of the Iron Curtain and also points to a possible future end to the Israeli security infrastructure of barriers, roads, and settlement occupation. We know that during the last fifteen years, over 5,000 border crossers have died at *la linea* (what Lefebvre would call a representation of space). Nonetheless, people are forging cultural and infrastructural connections in *la frontera* (what Lefebvre would term a lived space of representation that includes creative spatial practice).³⁵ *La frontera* refers to "on-the-ground" micro-geographies of the ten million inhabitants whose daily cultural and economic interactions confirm productive border fusions and frictions in the two thousand-mile zone. A borderland should ideally demonstrate interaction between both sides of the permeable line, which in the case of Mexico and the US makes social and economic sense. Fortress

America may not like it, but transboundary, collective identities emerging from what would otherwise remain harsh asymmetries have changed the hegemonic identity of American urban life.³⁶

Recognizing this, historian Oscar J. Martínez has advocated the “border integration” of a regionally cohesive, ethnically mixed society on each side of the line, one in which models of “coexistent,” “interdependent,” and ultimately “integrated” borderlands would replace the earlier closed, “alienated” stage of national boundaries.³⁷ Significantly, this permeability should be understood as functioning through time as well as through space, an indication that this border in particular is now reaching an end phase and moving beyond the historical weight of colonialism that it has traditionally borne, including that of the American frontier.³⁸ In other words, when walls, borders, and boundaries are understood as spaces of representation and spatial practices *as well as* dominant representations of space, we are asked to pay scholarly attention to the polysemous possibilities of multicultural zones and to consider how our own analyses may have contributed to border thinking according to the historically inevitable, politically closed, or culturally immutable.³⁹

European Case Studies

The contributors to this volume—engaging the spatial and cultural practices of walls, borders, and boundaries that we have outlined above—present case studies from the social sciences and humanities that draw upon a range of places, states, and regions in Europe. They employ multiple disciplinary, theoretical, and scalar approaches to (re)reading walls, borders, and boundaries according to their spatial strategies, physical presences, racial impacts, symbolic functions, or geopolitical effects. Moreover, the range of concepts and topics raised within and across the volume’s three overlapping sections—City Walls, Border Zones, and Migrating Boundaries—will challenge those interested in border studies from various perspectives. At least one essay in each section focuses on the city of Berlin as an enduring touchstone for considering European social borders or for addressing topics of ongoing relevance, such as memory and commemoration (chapters 2, 3, 6, and 10). At the same time, each section offers fresh perspectives beyond Berlin on the fortification of European cities in France, Ireland, Italy, Spain, and Cyprus (chapters 1, 4, and 11), as well as on the porosity of Europe’s boundaries at the shifting borderlands of what we used to consider Eastern Europe (chapters 5 and 7). Significantly, our authors also examine transnational and translocal processes, including migration, citizenship and human rights, and ethnic conflict, all-too-human issues that call for alternative understandings of national borders (chapters 4, 8, and 9).

Part I (City Walls) considers how throughout history city walls have served not only to protect from without but also to separate from within. Renaissance Venice was the first city to segregate Jews into two ghettos, closed-in communities considered inner islands in the city. In the US the twentieth century's trend toward spatial residential segregation, suburbanization, and ex-urbanization reflects a similar drive that now is spreading globally: Cape Town, the Côte d'Azur, São Paulo. Particularly in these purified, exclusive communities (now often gated, master-planned, and securitized), the physical markers of social segregation, including gates, walls, highways, blocks of buildings or natural features, and land use zoning restrictions, communicate widening income and social gaps. While our urban condition, then as now, has remained consistently dependent on multiple acts of inner walling, medieval perimeter walls have, of course, long since disappeared from the maps. In chapter 1, "The Dialectics of Urban Form in Absolutist France," Yair Mintzker offers a new reading of a key moment in modern urban history: the defortification of European cities. He demonstrates that the Crown consciously aligned the loss of urban walls in seventeenth-century France with a renewed focus on exterior state borders. Thus a closing (refortification) of the French state was the dialectical companion piece of the opening (defortification) of the French city; urban walls were transformed to—and in the emphasis on the *glacis* (embankment) had to some degree a transformative impact upon—the level of the nation-state. This change had an impact on selfhood as well as statehood: henceforth, one's rights and identity came increasingly from the territorially defined state rather than the locality into which one was born. Yet as Benjamin K. Barber has noted, the newly refortified modern nation-state gained new "vulnerabilities" and became "surrounded by frontiers that serve[d] the same purposes as the fallen walls of medieval towns."⁴⁰

Like Mintzker's reading of the epistemic shift in urban fortifications in the seventeenth century, Olaf Briesse argues that Berlin's walled history is in fact far more extensive than the infamous Cold War Wall that divided the city. In chapter 2, "The Camp in the City, the City as Camp: Berlin's Other Guarded Walls," he proposes a contextualized urban historical take on Giorgio Agamben's linkage of the camp and modernity. Drawing on Primo Levi, Agamben sees the camp everywhere. As Levi wrote, we are all in a sense walled in: "[W]e are all in the ghetto ... the ghetto is walled in ... outside the ghetto reign the lords of death, and ... close by the train is waiting."⁴¹ Briesse's focus here is threefold. First, he points to Berlin's role as the capital city Germania and as capital of the camp cosmos, directing the Third Reich's concentration camp universe both across Germany and in Central and Eastern Europe. Second, he reveals the city's own concomitant de-formation as a leading "barracks" city of forced labor, participating fully in the Nazis' production system of slave labor and death; containment walls were at the core of this universe's design. His third focus

is on the often shameful, less well recognized continuities in location, design, and surveillance techniques between Berlin as a city of Nazi camp walls and its subsequent postwar re-formation as a center for refugee and prison camps both in the immediate postwar period and beyond into the Cold War.

Not all of Berlin's walls have been imprisoning ones, preventing access to or obscuring attempts at knowledge about the other side. Some have been designed with an opposite message, inviting public engagement and even provoking reflection on the nature of government and state legitimacy. In chapter 3, "‘Threshold Resistance’: Dani Karavan's Berlin Installation *Grundgesetz 49*," Eric Jarosinski proposes a critical interpretation of a glass wall designed by Israeli artist Dani Karavan for the renewed German capital city. Celebrated in official and popular discourse as a symbol of postwar (West) Germany's strong foundation as a liberal, democratic society, this wall elicits other, more ambiguous readings of transparency. Similar to Mintzker's analysis of the dialectics of defortification at the beginning of the modern era, Jarosinski highlights how Karavan's installation and its surroundings tend to undermine the officially encouraged democratic transparency motif and point instead to methods of viewing more aligned with the consumerist "threshold" gaze of window shopping. Placed symbolically near the Reichstag in the government quarter at Spree River Bend (Spreebogen)—a new area marked by a growing number of nation-based statements and memorials—the installation on nineteen glass slabs offers a contemporary interpretation of and interaction with Germany's Basic Law (the 1949 text inscribed upon the wall's sections). Karavan has delivered here an ironically apt recrafting of a much earlier set of (stone) tablet inscriptions, namely the law for the Jewish people received by Moses in Exodus 34. Because of these deviations from its intended representational function, Karavan's wall is neither a block nor a hindrance to German memory and identity but a space of representation that invites critical reflection. Insisting on how material walls are haunted by the past, Jarosinski shows that they can be highly imaginative representational tools in the practice of urban memory.

Other urban walls that both suture and mirror, bridge and separate, are presented in chapter 4 by Daniela Vicherat Mattar, "Did the Walls Really Come Down? Contemporary B/ordering Walls in Europe." She reconsiders the impact of the fall of the Berlin Wall in the context of recent European national strategies of containment toward unwanted urban pockets of religious strife or ethnic difference. The democratic project itself is put into question in today's Europe, where certain groups of people are expected to disappear from the inner as well as outer urban map behind newly constructed barriers. Vicherat Mattar explores three examples of post-Wall European urban walls: a recent wall built to block off a housing project of overcrowded immigrants in Padua, the encircling walls of the Spanish autonomous city of Ceuta that serve as part of the Schengenized EU's anti-immigration external border with Morocco,

and the “Peace Lines” in Belfast that separate residential areas for Catholics and Protestants. Drawing upon Henk van Houtum, Olivier Kramsch, and Wolfgang Zierhofer’s concept of b/orderd spaces, she describes how these walls function as borders and political orders, while acknowledging how they may work against themselves as borderlands that sustain urban cohesion over fragmentation and occasionally even democratic and minority rights.⁴²

Part II (Border Zones) addresses sociocultural transformations in three distinct border communities separated for decades as a result of the political divisions of the Cold War. Mapping these communities today reveals palimpsests, multiple historical layers (both Cold War and post-Cold War) that obscure and erase geopolitical experiences but also reveal traces of past habits in the present. Muriel Blaive and Thomas Lindenberger’s coauthored chapter 5 on “Border Guarding as Social Practice: A Case Study of Czech Communist Governance and Hidden Transcripts” narrows in on the Cold War frontier between the former Czechoslovakia and Austria, where a Soviet-inspired, fortified border was constructed to stop hostile interventions from the other side. Designed as an impenetrable space in a permanent state of emergency, this section of the Iron Curtain between East and West was typified in the town of České Velenice. Based on oral interviews conducted there in 2008, the authors reconstruct the impact of communist practices of border regimentation such as territorial administration, the militarization of everyday life, and the homogenization of the population. Their micro-historical approach yields insights that go beyond the conventional wisdom of fear and repression as the driving forces behind the inhabitants’ participation in border guarding and denunciation, revealing material advantage and patriotic convictions as equally powerful motivations. Moreover, the interviewees provide evidence for the layering effect of historical experience, concealing shame but also disclosing motivations. Blaive and Lindenberger demonstrate how the instrumentalization of history also creates spaces of representation, specifically in the appeal to anti-German feelings among the Czech residents in the border town that can be traced from the Beneš decrees of 1945 that led to the expulsion of the German residents, adapted by the communist regime through 1989, and still functional today in the Czech Republic.

David E. Barclay brings us back to Cold War Berlin as a space of representation, asking in chapter 6, “A ‘Complicated Contrivance’: West Berlin behind the Wall, 1971–1989,” why the separated, “outpost” life caused by the Wall had come to seem “normal” to West Berliners by the time it was ready to fall. Like Vicherat Mattar’s image of enclosed urban communities creating a sense of urban cohesion, Barclay provides a case study of insularity behind a protective wall. With twenty years’ hindsight and access to previously unavailable archive sources, he shows how the Four Power Agreement of 1971 and the accompanying inter-German agreements that recognized the sovereignty of

two German states marked a major caesura between the generational experience of those who experienced the “heroic” years of the Cold War stand-off along the inner-German border and those who became accustomed to West Berlin’s insularity in the wake of détente and *Ostpolitik*. As Barclay suggests, not only West Berliners but also the Western Allies themselves began to take for granted the Allied presence in the walled-in city of the 1970s and 1980s. Its increasingly hollowed-out demographic of young people and retirees with their diverse alternative cultures and subsidized provincialism mirrored, in an odd way, the growth of what has been called a niche culture (*Nischengesellschaft*) in East Germany, referring to the emergence of private spaces as protection from state surveillance and supervision. Barclay’s characterization of West Berlin’s artificial normalcy suggests a more general paradigm for assessing the last two decades of Cold War division and its legacy in the post-communist era.

Steffi Marung’s essay shifts attention to the eastern border of post-communist Europe as a historically inflected representational space. In chapter 7, “Moving Borders and Competing Civilizing Missions: Germany, Poland, and Ukraine in the Context of the EU’s Eastern Enlargement,” she takes as the point of departure Poland’s pivotal position between Germany and Ukraine. Poland’s historical and often traumatic experience with shifting borders, as well as its long-standing tradition as both subject and object of “civilizational” discourse, helped to shape the new border regimes on the EU’s eastern fringe. In particular Marung considers two key moments: Poland’s exclusion from the EU following the collapse of the communist states, and the development of an “Eastern Policy” toward Ukraine on Poland’s part after its accession to the EU in 2004. Recognizing the unusual pace and unpredictability of changes in the continent’s political and symbolic order, she attends to the spatial hierarchies of social self-description in Poland’s public discourse and foreign policy initiatives, showing how the telos of the nation and normative coherence gave way to new patterns of affiliation and membership. Just as Blaive and Lindenberger’s conclusions about personal identification and motivation vis-à-vis a repressive regime relate micro- to macro-historical issues, Marung too confirms how local, regional, national, and transnational practices come into play as strategic and constantly renegotiable modes of self-definition.

Part III (Migrating Boundaries) moves from the spatial and cultural practices located on the East-West divide to examine how communities negotiate the boundaries of established Western European democracies in the wake of transborder processes such as racism, migration, and diaspora. Each contributor explores larger questions of belonging and citizenship, negotiated Otherness, and tactics of surviving exclusion and violence. Whereas new theories of multiculturalism and citizenship have facilitated a better understanding of these realities of globalization and boundary crossings, governments and residents of receiving countries have responded to their migrants with heightened

surveillance and differentiated expectations of citizenship in an age of “the war on terrorism.” The chapters in this section offer historical comparisons to recent anti-immigrant declarations by European leaders, showing continuity with the ways that populist, xenophobic anxiety adapts metaphors of violence during a period of economic uncertainty.

In chapter 8, “Migrants, Mosques, and Minarets: Reworking the Boundaries of Liberal Democracy in Switzerland and Germany,” Patricia Ehrkamp examines expressions of Islamophobia in recent debates about immigration, citizenship, and democratic participation in Western Europe. Echoing the “civilizational” discourse Marung identifies as underpinning the policy formulations on the EU’s eastern fringe, Ehrkamp points to examples of Othering (Muslims) in Switzerland and Germany—voter support of bans on minarets, debates about German *Leitkultur* (“guiding” culture), anti-Islamic citizens’ initiatives, and resistance to the construction of prestigious mosques—that provide insights into the real-world problems with assimilationist expectations for migrants. In so doing, she raises key questions about the construction of democratic political subjectivities in immigrant-receiving societies. In contrast to the traditional assumption that immigrants should integrate into the host culture and belief systems, most migrants today maintain transnational ties across political borders. For Ehrkamp, when secularism becomes a means to govern difference or when democratic values such as tolerance and equality are used to justify exclusion, prejudices about the “acceptability” of newcomers also affect longer-term residents. Rereading claims to secularism and democratic values in the context of debates about immigration thus interrogates the very meaning of belonging to a polity: citizens’ basic rights, freedoms, and responsibilities. Assimilationist demands and expectations of secularism in the name of democracy reveal assumptions about community homogeneity underlying the self-understanding of democratic participation. The author calls for a rethinking of liberal democracy from a representation of space that naturalizes state borders to a space of representation that both is “emergent and emerging” and includes symbolic and lived boundary crossings of transnational immigration and cultural difference.

While Blaive and Lindenberger reference anti-German sentiment as a crucial component of the spatial imaginary of the Czech-Austrian border since 1945, in chapter 9 Isa Blumi focuses on the invisibility that West German policy makers assigned to Kosovar Albanian men from the 1960s to the present as a paradigm of managing migrant labor for the postwar economic recovery. Their blanket (mis)classification as “Turks,” “Greeks,” or “Yugoslavs” had negative effects for migrant families, their children, and the larger society. In “Not Our Kind: Generational Barriers Dividing Postwar Albanian Migrant Communities,” Blumi examines how a bureaucratic migrant classification system created a “secondary boundary” of Cold War division, a process of marginalization that

is still producing social and spatial distances between Self and Other, West and East. By imposing a singular label, such as “Yugoslav,” onto a range of migrants as diverse as the Albanians, Alevi, and Kurds who were fleeing state and social persecution within their own supposed home countries, individuals were defined as an ethnically and culturally homogenous group upon their arrival and were hence never legally recognized in their difference. Migrants who arrived in Europe from a transit country, such as Turkey, were labeled “Turks” because the country of last departure was assumed to be the “country of origin.”

Not only did the classification system conceal the domestic agendas of some sending countries, including ethno-national strategies of homogenization within their own political boundaries, but upon arrival in the host society this rather arbitrary label also sustained hierarchies of exclusion, empowering some migrants while marginalizing and victimizing others. Based on informal interviews, Blumi examines some of the distancing effects this secondary boundary had on multiple generations of immigrants and host-society citizens living in German cities, including problems with illegitimate “ethnic community” spokespersons, unintended consequences of zoning restrictions for heterogeneous and sometimes adversarial ethnic enclaves, and the social pathologies resulting from forced ethnic mis-identities. Many of his interview partners blamed their “host” neighbors, coworkers, policemen, and classmates for their individual and collective traumas. Blumi insists that future migration studies must take into account these defining boundaries among and between immigrant groups.

Chapter 10 adds a different dimension of migrant invisibility and voicelessness to Blumi’s example of faulty classification in the preceding chapter. Jeffrey Jurgens’s “Invisible Migrants: Memory and German Nationhood in the Shadow of the Berlin Wall” focuses on Turkish immigrants whose presence has remained largely hidden in narratives about Berlin’s division and subsequent reunification. Turkish migrants—the object of West Germany’s most extensive labor recruitment efforts—lived in disproportionate numbers in the traditional working-class districts that abutted the western face of the Berlin Wall, and thus in contrast to many non-immigrant West Berliners who tended to forget about the Wall in their insularity, as Barclay describes in chapter 6, these residents were confronted on a daily basis with its reality. In a case study of a five-year-old Turkish boy who in 1975 drowned in the canal separating East and West in Berlin’s Kreuzberg district, Jurgens considers the public reactions to the event at the time, which quickly elevated the local tragedy to the level of a Cold War ideological struggle defining border sovereignty. Symptomatic of the discourse of Wall victims and related commemorative practices since unification, the invisible victim without a voice in Jurgens’s ethnographic presentation speaks more generally of the marginalized minority voices in the dominant culture’s postwar practice of constructing national memories, suggesting that a fuller retrieval of these stories is a process that has yet to be realized.

One such minority voice makes itself heard in chapter 11, “Crossing Boundaries in Cyprus: Landscapes of Memory in the Demilitarized Zone,” in which artist and migrant-refugee Gülgün Kayim exposes the cultural practice of repressing experiences of violence, war, and migration that she inherited as a second-generation Turkish Cypriot growing up in London. She thus personalizes the b/ordered space concept discussed by Vicherat Mattar in chapter 4. Asking what happens to the subjectivity of someone dislocated by migration and having connections only to an officially maintained no-man’s-land, Kayim formulates a rather different kind of response than the memories of Blaive and Lindenberger’s interviewees about the Czech fortified border. Our volume closes with her deeply personal journey, which reflects upon the use of performance art as a strategy of survival. Since art is the artist’s home, she shares her transgressing of those “secondary boundaries” of Cold War division, including her search for belonging. Kayim describes the difficulties of inheriting divided national histories of violence, learning about one’s family through others’ stories and photographs (or post-memories), and struggling with nostalgic yearnings for a lost ancestral home. She layers and juxtaposes stories, sounds, objects, and scenes from others’ plays to create a performance vocabulary that communicates the challenge of narrating family trauma a generation and country removed. Indeed, her plays are also installations: located in abandoned industrial buildings at historic sites in foreign countries, these places as theater sets become symbolic spaces of representation that invite the viewer to consider the legacy of trauma related to the complicity of war and violence. Returning home, moving across the lines of the demilitarized zone as she prepares her current work in progress, Kayim ends on an optimistic note that resonates with all the contributions in this volume: ruptures and breaks can lead to new and different ways of thinking about boundaries in the future.

Writing across the Lines

The myriad topographical, material, and conceptual contexts of walls, borders, and boundaries that the essays here elaborate suggest the rich fusions and frictions of the now-burgeoning field of border studies.⁴³ Border studies first emerged in the 1970s and 1980s through postmodern and postcolonial interrogations in historical and cultural studies and artistic practice, resulting in groundbreaking work since then at and beyond the US-Mexican-Native American borderlands.⁴⁴ The “spatial turn” in the social sciences and humanities ushered in similar interventions and new models of scholarly inquiry in which border theory played a formative role.⁴⁵ With the radical, post-Iron Curtain shifts in European national boundaries in the 1990s, the closed territory of the nation-state is increasingly being put into question.⁴⁶ Newly opened

archives have resulted in historical and historiographical studies of borders and boundaries, and ethnographic micro-histories have undone myths about Cold War border communities.⁴⁷ Influenced by the epistemic break of the fall of the Berlin Wall, border topics have also emerged as a dominant trope in contemporary German literature and film.⁴⁸ Border research in European cultural studies increasingly focuses on the shifts in European identity.⁴⁹ A major focus of border studies is advocacy of new opportunities for migrant communities.⁵⁰

Yet inevitably—and intriguingly—even in a volume such as ours, we sense how disciplinary training still holds firm and helps shape arguments. The essays presented here bear these traces of the authors' disciplinary biases and habits, even as we strove in this introduction to write “across the lines” that separate us, seeking words and concepts that help frame the volume, ground productive communication, and preserve intellectual rigor. Our editing enterprise confirmed that a shift in focus to peripheral zones certainly has implications for our knowledge culture, because they mark spaces of vulnerability and interdependence that generate contact and encounters. Indeed, the risk at the project's outset was the chain of unpredictable access to the unfamiliar; the gain was to discover unexpected connections, breaking down precisely those barriers that motivated our critical engagement from the outset. The scholars in this volume may use different approaches, yet they encounter overlapping issues, terminology, and perspectives in their research. Readers will notice that while we and our contributors employ our respective but different vocabularies and expectations as defined by our disciplines, we have also sought to identify key patterns of design and behavior across the disciplines and in response to bordered spaces that extend through different historical and geographical contexts.

Taken together, therefore, we hope that the essays of this volume will cross existing (disciplinary) lines to chart the new territory of transdisciplinary border studies. At the same time we aim to engage a twofold dialogue, among the essays and with our readers, whom we challenge to become active participants. We invite our readers to reconsider, with the help of these essays, how borders are invested with meaning and by whom; the political inevitability, psychological necessity, and creative challenges of such spaces and places; and alternative mappings of the frailties of the human de- and re-territorializing imagination.

Notes

1. John Brinckerhoff Jackson, *Discovering the Vernacular Landscape* (New Haven, 1984), 16.
2. Joseph Nevins, *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Remaking of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary* (New York, 2002); Michael Sorkin, ed., *Against the Wall: Israel's Barrier to Peace* (New York, 2005).
3. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts; discours sur l'origine et le fondement de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* [1754], ed. Jacques Roger (Paris, 1971), 205.
4. George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford, UK, 1990), 4.
5. Stein Rokkan and Derek W. Urwin, *Economy, Territory, Identity: Politics of West European Peripheries* (London, 1983); Richard Muir, *Political Geography: A New Introduction* (New York, 1997), 121–23.
6. G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, trans. S. W. Dyde (Kitchener, ON, 2001), §360; Chris Brown, "Borders and Identity in International Political Theory," in *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, ed. Mathias Albert, David Jacobson, and Yosef Lapid (Minneapolis, 2001), 129.
7. David Newman, "Boundaries," in John A. Agnew, Katharyne Mitchell, and Gearóid Ó Tuathail (aka Gerard Toal), eds., *A Companion to Political Geography* (Malden, MA, 2003), 127 and 130.
8. Wendy Brown, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* (New York, 2010).
9. Matthew Sparke, "A Neoliberal Nexus: Economy, Security, and the Biopolitics of Citizenship of the Border," *Political Geography* 25, no. 2 (2006): 151–80; Eyal Weizman, *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation* (London and New York, 2007).
10. Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq* (Cambridge, MA, 2004), 4.
11. Matthew Coleman, "U.S. Statecraft and the U.S.-Mexico Border as Security/Economic Nexus," *Political Geography* 24, no. 2 (2005): 189.
12. Micha Cárdenas, Amy Sara Carroll, Ricardo Dominguez, and Brett Stalbaum, "Commentary: Academics Make Statement with Project," *San Diego Union Tribune*, 7 March 2010, <http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2010/mar/07/tooling-around-the-border/> (accessed 24 June 2010); Ricardo Dominguez and Brett Stalbaum (Principal Investigators), "Transborder Immigrants Tool: A Mexico/U.S. Border Disturbance Art Project," Funded by Arts and Humanities as Transborder Grant 2007–8, University of California, San Diego: [http://humctr.ucsd.edu/awards/awards.shtml#Transborder](http://humctr.ucsd.edu/awards/awards.shtml#Transborder;); see also <http://post.thing.net/node/1642> (both accessed 24 June 2010).
13. Lorraine Dowler, "In the Shadow of the Berlin Wall: The Peace-Lines of Belfast, Northern Ireland," *Political Geography* 31 (forthcoming 2012).
14. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* [1980], trans. Stephen Rendall (Berkeley, 1984), 36. Rendall's translation uses "place" in referring to specific spatial concepts, including location, site, territory, and space. To avoid confusion with Anglophone theoretical discussions about these spatial concepts, we indicate our understanding of de Certeau accordingly. See Derek Gregory, "Geography and the Cartographic Anxiety," in *Geographical Imaginations* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), 70–205. See also the critique of Cartesian perspectivalism by Gearóid Ó Tuathail (aka Gerard Toal) in *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space* (New York, 1996), 23–24. On Descartes's

- theory of corporeally filled space-extension, see Edward S. Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1997), chap. 7.
15. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* [1975], trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, 1977); Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988): 575–99; and Thomas Nagel, *The View from Nowhere* (New York, 1989).
 16. De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, 38.
 17. *Ibid.*, 37. Emphasis in the original.
 18. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*.
 19. John A. Agnew, "Borders on the Mind: Re-Framing Border Thinking," *Ethics and Global Politics* 1, no. 4 (2008): 176; Agnew's use of the phrase "decent life" is from Jonathan Seglow, "The Ethics of Immigration," *Political Studies Review* 3, no. 3 (2005): 329.
 20. On the direct influence of Lefebvre on de Certeau, see Michel Trebitsch, "Preface: The Moment of Radical Critique," trans. Gregory Elliott, in Lefebvre, *Critique of Everyday Life*, vol. 2, *Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday* [1961], trans. John Moore (New York, 2002), xxiv–xxv; and Stuart Elden, *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible* (London, 2004), 120.
 21. Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* [1974], trans. Donald Nicolson-Smith (Cambridge, MA, 1991). Here we follow Rob Shields's translation of Lefebvre's concept "espaces de la représentation" as "spaces of representation" rather than Nicolson-Smith's "representational spaces." See Shields, *Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics* (New York, 1999).
 22. Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (New York, 1996).
 23. Ó Tuathail (aka Toal), "Introduction," *Critical Geopolitics*, 1–20.
 24. On Berlin's relationship to its former Wall, see Marc Silberman, ed., *The German Wall: Fallout in Europe* (New York, 2011); and Janet Ward, *Post-Wall Berlin: Borders, Space, and Identity* (New York and Basingstoke, UK, 2011). On the history and culture of the Wall and German-German division, see e.g., Philip Broadbent and Sabine Hake, eds., *Berlin, Divided City 1945–1989* (New York, 2010) and Patrick Major, *Behind the Berlin Wall: East Germany and the Frontiers of Power* (New York, 2010).
 25. Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 39. Emphasis in the original.
 26. *Ibid.*, 33.
 27. Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago, 2004), 150.
 28. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis, 2007).
 29. Henri Lefebvre, *The Survival of Capitalism: Reproduction of the Relations of Production*, trans. Frank Bryant (New York, 1976), 89; cited in Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations*, 159.
 30. Eyal Weizman, "Strategic Points, Flexible Lines, Tense Surfaces, and Political Volumes: Ariel Sharon and the Geometry of Occupation," in *Cities, War, and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*, ed. Stephen Graham (Malden, MA, 2004), 187 and 188. See also *idem*, *Hollow Land*; and Michael Sorkin, ed., *The Next Jerusalem: Sharing the Divided City* (New York, 2002).
 31. Just Vision won honorable mention at Documenta Madrid 10 for the film *Budrus* (Julia Bacha, 2010), which tells the story of activist Ayed Morrar. See <http://www.justvision.org/budrus> (accessed 30 June 2010).

32. Marc Lacey, "Cities Mesh Across Blurry Border, Despite Physical Barrier," *New York Times*, 5 March 2007, A4.
33. Border Art Workshop/Taller de Arte Fronterizo webpage: <http://www.borderart-workshop.com/index.html> (accessed 1 July 2010); Susan Leibovitz Steinman, "Border Sutures 1990," in *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy (Seattle, 1995), 206–7.
34. Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations*, 163. Gregory refers here to Donna Haraway's use of the concept "inappropriate/d" from Trin T. Minh-Ha, *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism* (Bloomington, IN, 1989). See Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York, 1991).
35. We borrow the distinction between *la linea* and *la frontera* from Mike Davis, *Magical Urbanism: Latinos Reinvent the U.S. City* (New York, 2000). On the militarization of the border, see Peter Andreas, "Introduction: The Wall after the Wall," in *The Wall around the West: State Borders and Immigration Controls in North America and Europe*, ed. Peter Andreas and Timothy Snyder (Lanham, MD, 2000), 4; and Joseph Nevins, *Operation Gatekeeper*.
36. Alan K. Henrikson, "Facing Across Borders: The Diplomacy of Bon Voisinage," *International Political Science Review* 21, no. 2 (2000): 121–47.
37. Oscar J. Martínez, "The Dynamics of Border Integration: New Approaches to Border Analysis," in *Global Boundaries*, ed. C.H. Schofield (London, 1994), 1–15; idem, *Border People: Life and Society in U.S.-Mexico Borderlands* (Tucson, 1994), 6.
38. Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North American History," *American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (June 1999), 815–16. Sankaran Krishna also argues for postcolonial (not postmodern) reimagining of boundaries, sensitive to "critical aspects of a Third-World reality that often escapes the metropolitan eye"; see Krishna, "Boundaries in Question," in *A Companion to Political Geography*, ed. Agnew, Mitchell, and Ó Tuathail, 310.
39. David Sibley, *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West* (New York, 1995), 50–51 and 116.
40. Benjamin K. Barber, "Epilogue. An Architecture of Liberty? The City as Democracy's Forge," in *Out of Ground Zero: Case Studies in Urban Reinvention*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York, 2002), 189.
41. Primo Levi, *The Drowned and the Saved*, trans. Raymond Rosenthal (New York, 1988), 69.
42. Henk van Houtum, Olivier Kramsch, and Wolfgang Zierhofer, eds., *B/ordering Space* (Aldershot, UK, 2005).
43. For a historiographical essay charting the trajectories of border studies, see Vladimir Kolossov, "Theorizing Borders: Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches," *Geopolitics* 10 (2005): 606–32. Useful recent reflections on the field can be found in Corey Johnson, Reece Jones, Anssi Paasi, Louise Amoore, Alison Mountz, Mark Salter, and Chris Rumford, "Interventions on Rethinking 'the Border' in Border Studies," *Political Geography* 30 (2011): 61–69.
44. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera* (San Francisco, 1987); and Nancy A. Naples, "Borderlands Studies and Border Theory: Linking Activism and Scholarship for Social Justice," *Sociology Compass* 4, no. 7 (July 2010): 505–18. See also works by artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña, such as *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems and Loqueras for the End of the Century* (San Francisco, 1996), *Dangerous*

- Border Crossers* (New York, 2000), *Homo Fronterizus* (a collection of collaborations with cinematographer Gustavo Vazquez, 2008), as well as the Hemisphere Institute of Performance and Politics, established by performance studies theorist Diana Taylor, <http://hemisphericinstitute.org/hemi/> (accessed 16 July 2010).
45. The seminal text for the shift in the humanities is Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC, 1991). On the spatial turn, see Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London, 1989). On the intersections of border theory with postmodernity and the endurance of borders in a globalized world, see, e.g., David Newman, "The Lines that Continue to Separate Us: Borders in Our 'Borderless' World," *Progress in Human Geography* 30, no. 2 (2006): 143–61; idem, "Boundaries, Territory and Postmodernity: Towards Shared or Separate Spaces?" in *Borderlands under Stress*, ed. Martin Pratt and Janet Allison Brown (London, 2000), 17–34. Newman's political geographical approach can be compared with that of sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty* (Cambridge, UK, 2007).
 46. On the impact of transborder interactions on the nation-state, see, e.g., Brown, *Walled States*; Alexander C. Diener and Joshua Hagen, eds., *Borderlines and Borderlands: Political Oddities at the Edge of the Nation-State* (Lanham, MD, 2010); Sterling Evans, ed., *The Borderlands of the American and Canadian Wests: Essays on Regional History of the Forty-Ninth Parallel* (Lincoln, NE, 2006); Vera Pavlakovich-Kochi, Barbara J. Morehouse, and Doris Wastl-Walter, eds., *Challenged Borderlands: Transcending Political and Cultural Boundaries* (Aldershot, UK, 2004); Anssi Paasi, "Europe as a Social Process of Discourse: Considerations of Place, Boundaries and Identity," *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8, no. 1 (2001): 7–28; and Annemarie H. Sarmartino, *The Impossible Border: Germany and the East, 1914–1922* (Ithaca, 2010).
 47. Daphne Berdahl, *Where the World Ended: Re-Unification and Identity in the German Borderland* (Berkeley, 1999); Astrid M. Eckert, "Greetings from the Zonal Border": Tourism to the Iron Curtain in West Germany," *Zeithistorische Forschungen* 1 (2011): 9–36; and Edith Sheffer, *Burned Bridge: How East and West Germans Made the Iron Curtain*, foreword by Peter Schneider (New York, 2011).
 48. Elke Brüns, *Nach dem Mauerfall. Eine Literaturgeschichte der Entgrenzung* (Munich, 2006); Katharina Gerstenberger, *Writing the New Berlin: The German Capital in Post-Wall Literature* (Rochester, NY, 2008); Helmut Schmitz, ed., *Von der nationalen zur internationalen Literatur: Transkulturelle deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur im Zeitalter globaler Migration* (Amsterdam, 2009); and Jaimey Fisher and Barbara Mennel, eds., *Spatial Turns: Space, Place, and Mobility in German Literary and Visual Culture* (Amsterdam, 2010).
 49. Cosmopolitan cultural studies form the focus of Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins, eds., *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation* (Minneapolis, 1998). On New European identities, see Ruben Zaiotti, *Cultures of Border Control: Schengen and the Evolution of European Frontiers* (Chicago, 2011); Noel Parker, ed., *The Geopolitics of Europe's Identity: Centers, Boundaries and Margins* (Basingstoke, UK, 2008); Michael Heffernan, *The European Geographical Imagination* (Stuttgart, 2007); Ulrike Hanna Meinhof and Anna Triandafyllidou, eds., *Transcultural Europe: Cultural Policy in a Changing Europe* (Basingstoke, UK, 2006); Ulrich Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge, UK, 2006); and Etienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, trans. James Swenson (Princeton, 2004).

50. On European migration, see Ray Taras, *Europe Old and New: Transnationalism, Belonging, Xenophobia* (Lanham, MD, 2009); Ruth Mandel, *Cosmopolitan Anxieties: Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany* (Durham, NC, 2008); Deniz Gök-türk, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes, eds., *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955–2005* (Berkeley, 2007); Riva Kastoryano, *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*, trans. Barbara Harshav (Princeton, 2002); and Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal, *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe* (Chicago, 1995).