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Bounded spaces in a ‘borderless world’: border studies, power and the anatomy of territory

Anssi Paasi*
Department of Geography, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

The roles and future of bounded territories have become important themes in research. Scholars have in particular theorized new forms of spatialities that have emerged along with the geopolitical and geo-economic upheavals that followed the Cold War. Many scholars, dazzled by the supposed power of globalization and the related rise of a world characterized by ‘flows’ and networks, have suggested that we are moving towards a ‘borderless world’ and a retreat of the nation-state. At the same time, partly as a reaction to globalization and partly as a response to emerging regionalism and ethno-regionalist movements, a number of states have set in motion a process of re-scaling in which they have devolved part of their power in governance to supra-state and sub-state regions. Concomitantly, new, increasingly technical forms of governance have been taken into use to control state territories. This paper will first scrutinize how academic scholars have by tradition interpreted and theorized the roles of ‘boundedness’, borders and territoriality. Some new conceptual perspectives will then be developed in order to understand the persistence of bounded territorial spaces. It will suggest that, in spite of the increasing interactions and networks, the state is still a crucial organizer of territorial spaces and creator of meaning for them, even though these spaces are becoming increasingly porous. The paper looks at how such meaning-making occurs in spatial socialization and in the governmental practices that perpetually aim at making territory calculable. It suggests that, instead of being mere neutral lines, borders are important institutions and ideological symbols that are used by various bodies and institutions in the perpetual process of reproducing territorial power.
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Introduction

The international system is less commanding, but it is still powerful. States are changing, but they are not disappearing. State sovereignty has been eroded, but it is still vigorously asserted. Governments are weaker, but they can still throw their weight around. At certain times publics are more demanding, but at other times they are more pliable. Borders still keep out intruders, but they are more porous. Landscapes are giving way to ethnoscapes, mediascapes, ideoscapes, technoscapes, and finanscapes, but territoriality is still a central preoccupation for many people. (Rosenau 1997, p. 4)

The current and future roles of ‘bounded territories’ have been a major issue in social and political science since the early 1990s. This issue has been related to the changing, historically contingent constellations of space and power and particularly to the
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transformations that have resulted from the processes of globalization and from the upheavals in the international system of states after the Cold War (Rosenau 1997, Agnew 2005, Kahler and Walter 2006, Paasi 2009). Many scholars, dazzled by the power of globalization, the supposed retreat or hollowing out of the state and the rise of all kinds of flows and an integrated economy, have suggested that we are moving to a borderless, post-national world (Ohmae 1995, Appadurai 1996, Strange 1996). At the same time the question of spatial scales has become crucial in debates on the relations between space and power. This has been related to the fact that, partly as a reaction to such global tendencies and partly as a ‘new regionalist’ response, many states have carried out a process of re-scaling where they have both formed international alliances (EU, NAFTA) and devolved part of their power to sub-state regions (Brenner 2004, Paasi 2009). The existence of such regions demonstrates that:

… regionality, the dynamics of place and space, the relationship between the local and the global, are all in flux, making the uneven geographical development of the physical, biotic, social, cultural and political-economic conditions of the globe a key pillar to all forms of geographical knowledge. (Harvey 2001, p. 226)

The debates on scale show how current spatialities are much more complex than the tradition of state-centric thinking or the mechanistic distinction of spatial scales such as local, national or global would suggest (Brenner 2004). This had also led researchers to reflect on the complexity of spatial power, and the new roles of networks (both as structures and agents, see Kahler 2009) and (other) political subjects on various spatial scales (Herod and Wright 2002, Brenner 2004, Agnew 2005, Jessop et al. 2008, Paasi 2008).

In parallel with reactions to previous social upheavals, academic border studies have emerged in two, rather opposing forms (Paasi, forthcoming). For some scholars, bounded spaces are something to be abandoned. Alongside the general belief in the power of economy in the annihilation of space, the justification of bounded territories was first questioned by the representatives of ‘dissident’ approaches in IR and geography, who strove to reveal the power relations hidden in the divisions between inside and outside that have characterized the action of states and the realist accounts presented in political science (Walker 1993, Agnew 1994, Rosenau 1997). Similarly, cultural researchers, often thinking that the hybridity of cultures that should result from immigration, displacement of people and the spread of cultural ideas, have questioned the supposed self-evident homologies between bounded state spaces and groups of people and the naturalized distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Gupta and Ferguson 1997). These debates have been paralleled by rather mixed claims on behalf of post-nationalism and cosmopolitanism (Appadurai 1996, Cheah and Robbins 1998).

Pushing this line of thought further, some scholars put forward more explicitly political claims by suggesting that bounded spaces are hindrances to normative, progressive politics (Amin 2004). They regard bounded spaces generally as regressive and, in a way, as ‘optical illusions’ associated with the power relations embedded in the cartographic legacy of measuring location on the basis of geographical distance and territorial jurisdiction (Amin 2007, p. 103). Actually this legacy has been familiar to political geographers and political scientists for some time, leading them to use such expressions as ‘methodological nationalism’ (Agnew 1998), ‘embedded statism’ (Taylor 1996), ‘territorial trap’ (Agnew 1994) or ‘cartographic anxiety’ (Krishna 1996) to characterize its persistence.
On the other hand, for a large interdisciplinary group of scholars, borders and boundedness are crucial, dynamic but persistent phenomena that are related to changing societal power relations and have to be analysed critically in context by theorizing and looking empirically at the production and reproduction of territories and territoriality on and through various spatial scales (for a summary of current research, see Paasi, forthcoming). This suggests that researchers should scrutinize the historically contingent and contested meanings associated with regional and state spaces. More recently, some scholars inspired especially by Foucaultian biopolitics have theorized the persistence of territory by looking at how ‘calculable territory’ – a ‘disorganized heterogeneity of situational projects’ (Hannah 2009) – is used in the production and reproduction of territorial power relations and in practising territoriality. A related theme is the question of ‘biometric borders’, i.e. how current post-11th September mobilities are governed (Amoore 2006). These scholars have, from different angles, related their arguments to the role of the territory and operation of the state, and thus to its power. Territoriality manifests itself in such state-level activities as the control of immigration, quotas and tariffs (Cox 2002), and is crucial for giving nationalism a territorial shape. Gated communities or green belts inside cities are examples of the practice of territoriality on a lower scale. Territoriality is also embedded in the daily lives of citizens in the forms of personal relations and property relationships (Sack 1986). Boundedness and territory are thus important processes embedded in the production and reproduction of social relations on various scales, i.e. they have to be studied critically rather than assuming or declaring them in normative terms to be passés.

This article will scrutinize three themes regarding the roles and anatomy of bordered territories. Firstly, the tradition of border studies and the contested role of theory in such studies will be analysed in order to evaluate how researchers in various academic fields have been involved in the production and deconstruction of narratives and knowledge regarding bounded territories. Secondly, the role of contextuality will be discussed in order to take some steps towards what Agnew (2005) labels as ‘the geosociology of political power’, i.e. towards an understanding of social–geographical and historical conditions in the creation and operation of power relations. The third aim is progress towards re-defining the idea of ‘border’, since much of the current ambiguity and either-or arguments regarding the disappearance of borders seem to emerge from a rather fixed idea of what borders are and where they are ‘located’. I will argue that in order to understand their persistence in the increasingly dynamic world, some new approaches are needed, i.e. borders should not be seen solely as phenomena located at the ‘edges’ of territories but rather ‘all over’ territories, in innumerable societal practices and discourses. Borders literally take place at, and bring together, diverging ‘historical scales’: events, episodes and institutional structures. Such approaches are highly topical in the current condition where the processes of globalization, rather than making borders vanish, seem to be making them differ qualitatively from each other so that the validity of general statements regarding the persistence or disappearance of borders and territoriality is becoming increasingly problematic.

This paper is organized as follows: I will first problematize the persistence of bounded spaces and then trace how scholars have approached the idea of boundedness in certain academic fields. I will then scrutinize borders as phenomena that mediate the universal and the particular, and look at how theory is understood in border studies and what theory as conceptualization could mean in such studies. I will next discuss
an idea of conceptual, relative ‘invariances’ that could help us to reflect on the relation between theory and context. It will then be possible to develop some new perspectives that will help to understand the roles and functions of borders more broadly as manifestations of territoriality. This can provide tools for conceptualizing the persistence of boundedness as a social practice and institution that still seems to be an ideal for some social communities. Finally, some conclusions will be drawn and some suggestions for future research will be outlined.

The persistence of bounded spaces

The post-11th September events in the USA and subsequent events in Iraq, Ossetia and many African states, together with the decades-long contest over space in the Middle East, have borne perpetual witness to the fact that the assumptions of a linear evolution of societies towards a borderless world were highly premature. Space and power are related today in asymmetric and rather unpredictable ways on all spatial scales, whether we are discussing the heavily criticized Huntingtonian ‘cultural realms’, local struggles in cities or regionalist social movements. Similarly, the increased surveillance of social communities and the development of new surveillance instruments for national security purposes appear to be making a mockery of the utopian images of a borderless world. These developments force us to consider the fact that the marriage between territories and borders is impregnated with societal power, so that it continues to be crucial to reflect on how these elements come together in the practice of territoriality.

While the forms and manifestations of spatialities are perpetually changing, the principle of territoriality appears to persist in such social practices as classification by area, communication of boundaries and control over access to areas and things within them (Sack 1986). Various forms of power become fused in the practice of territoriality, and this brings together the agency, meaning and institutional structures of society. Correspondingly, it forces us to recognize various forms of territorial attachments in diverging territorial contexts (Kahler and Walter 2006) which are often mediated by social and cultural distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Territory is a complex phenomenon with four experiential dimensions that fuel denser attachments than the purely technical components of territoriality – such as abstract borderlines – might suggest (Berezin 2003). Territory is social because people inhabit it collectively, and it is political because groups struggle to establish, maintain and at times enlarge their space. It is cultural since it enfolds collective memories, again a medium for ideological struggles, and it is cognitive because it has a capacity to subjectify cultural, political and social borders and place itself at the core of both public and private identity projects (Berezin 2003, p. 7). These elements vary in importance in a contextual manner, and in most border cases they are contested, so that reflection upon and understanding of their meanings require an analysis of the historically contingent societal processes involved in the production and reproduction of territoriality.

In spite of the fact that none of these categories, i.e. classification by area, communication or control, is by any means fixed, borders have been regarded for a long time as an almost self-evident component of the sovereignty and power associated with state territoriality. As Taylor (1993, p. 164) once suggested, ‘A world of sovereign states is a world divided by boundaries’, and he traced the rise of this situation to the beginning of the twentieth century. Similarly Giddens (1987, p. 49,
suggested that – contrary to feudal states separated by frontiers, which were essentially zones – a nation-state is ‘a bordered power-container’ and has the administrative monopoly over a territory with demarcated boundaries. While these statements superficially imply a rather static view of bounded spaces, the units of the global territorial system are and have always been historically contingent processes, and therefore in a perpetual state of becoming and being transformed (Paasi 1996). Such ideas of boundedness have certainly not emerged in vacuo: they have accumulated historically, as Anderson (1996, p. 12) suggests, from the notions of territoriality that prevailed in the Roman Empire to the doctrines of the Middle Ages, the development of the borders of France and ultimately the spread of the European notions of border to all continents as a consequence of colonization – and now the questioning of borders after Cold War period (1996, p. 12).

Territorial transformation on all spatial scales, from local gated communities and sub-state regionalizations to global geo-economic macro-regions, is impregnated with power and is both constituted by and constitutive of the practices and processes that separate territorial entities from each other (cf. Allen 2003, Fawn 2009). Such boundary-producing practices, discourses and performances characterize the everyday life of both states and citizens (O’Tuathail and Dalby 1998) and both constitute and are constituted by diverging elements of power, such as authority, coercion, domination, seduction and manipulation. Bordering, ordering and collective identity-building are now recognized as processual and relational categories, and new territorial models ‘sediment’ onto previous ones and mix with them (Albert et al. 2001, Agnew 2005). That diverging forms of power matter in complicated ways in the case of boundaries is well illustrated by Jenkins:

Imagine a contested border region. It might be anywhere in the world. There are a range of ways to settle the issue: violence, a referendum, international arbitration. Whatever means are adopted, or imposed, the outcome will have consequences for people on both sides, depending on who they are. While some will accept it, some may not. Populations may move, towns and regions may be ‘cleansed’, genealogies may be rewritten. The boundaries of the collectivity may be redrawn. (2004, p. 3)

The struggle over meaningful bounded spaces becomes evident not only in the perpetual rise in the number of nation-states and regionalist movements, but also in the emergence of sub-state and supra-state institutional economic and political arrangements and in the increasing cross-border activities that aim at deinstitutionalizing old borders while creating new ones (Paasi 2009, cf. Fawn 2009). The ideas of cross-border regionalization and networking have become a crucial strategy for the integration and re-scaling of the state system around the world, but particularly in the EU (Jessop 2002, Brenner 2003, Kahler 2009). Deas and Lord (2006) have identified more than 150 such regional arrangements in the EU area. Indeed, mobility is currently a crucial, constitutive dimension of territory-making, and it is closely related to borders (Cox 2002, Jensen and Richardson 2004). This reminds us of the fact that borders not only separate but also mediate contacts and constitute and symbolize institutional practices that ‘channel’ and order interactions between members of social groups. These practices are also based on societal power relations, since they provide rules for crossing (or not crossing) borders and for the exchange of people, goods or symbolic messages. Such practices also provide the ultimate grounds for the regional transformation and re-scaling of social and spatial relations.
Border studies: a fragmented research field

In spite of all the comments on their disappearance, it is thus clear that borders, territories and territoriality still matter as backgrounds for understanding societal and political changes and conflicts (Paasi 2003, Kahler and Walter 2006). While undoubtedly important, borders have nevertheless remained ambivalent research objects. They were for a long time taken for granted in much of state theory, theories of international relations and political geography. Borders were seen as peripheral, empirical–physical phenomena, lines that manifest the ‘end’ of a state’s territorial power and are located in specific contexts known as ‘borderlands’. Efforts to develop a theory or theories of political borders have been for a long time overshadowed by the ideas that were put forth by Prescott (1987, p. 8) and others. For him borders are unique, and it is very difficult to make generalizations about them. This idea had actually been challenged earlier by Minghi (1963), who suggested that border scholars should aim at such generalizations, with the idea that the theorizing would then concern categories and definitions that could be linked with respective empirical cases and existing facts. At the same time more explicit theoretical steps were being taken in fields such as anthropology, often so that the idea of border was reflected not merely as a given element of the state but rather in relation to social categories such as ethnicity (Barth 1969).

The ‘borders are unique’ thesis remained significant for a long time, especially in political geography, where boundaries were seen as empirical manifestations of state power and sovereignty. It may be argued that political geography had gradually lost the historical legacy of its father-figure Friedrich Ratzel, who had scrutinized the relations between territory and boundaries at the end of the nineteenth century, and had become rich in empirical border studies and typologies based on these works. The impact of boundaries upon landscapes marked a further step away from the simple description and categorization of borders, and border areas were seen as material and symbolic ends of state power that often have an important role in national iconographies (Paasi 1996). Studies on the functional roles of borders and trans-boundary interactions expanded these approaches, and much of the current work on international borders – especially in applied research – still follows this logic (Paasi, forthcoming). The cultural roles of borders received more attention around 1990, but scholars were still mostly concerned with concrete border landscapes, which also implied that the complex roles of borders in the constitution of the power relations sedimented in state territoriality were very much taken for granted. As an example of this, it may be argued that in spite of their sophisticated treatment of the state and nationalism, Taylor (1993) and Giddens (1987), for example, largely took the traditional border terminology for granted.

A wider international community of border scholars began to emerge in various fields during the 1990s, and they started to theorize the political, economic, social, psychological or cultural meanings of boundaries. Newman and Paasi (1998) identified four interdisciplinary themes in border studies. The first concerned the ‘post-modern’ and post-structuralist debates on de-territorialization and re-territorialization that had emerged in IR studies and critical geopolitics, and the second the role of borders in the construction of socio-spatial identities, while correspondingly, the distinctions between ‘Us’ and ‘the Other’ similarly attracted the attention of political scientists, political geographers and anthropologists. This discussion hence revived a classical theme that had emerged earlier in philosophy, sociology and post-colonial studies (Bachelard 1969, Said 1978, Elias 1994). Thirdly, the boundary narratives/discourses...
embodied in national socialization processes became significant objects of research; and fourthly, the roles of various spatial scales in the construction of borders received new attention, especially in political geography. These approaches serve to demonstrate that the attention paid to borders expanded considerably and the power relations hidden in boundary-producing practices were taken much more seriously than before. These approaches also expanded the scope of the discussion and looked critically at the assumptions made regarding the boundedness of the state, at the same time challenging the territorial trap and images of the familiar, taken-for-granted bordered world of nation-states and identities provided by the realist discourses of international relations, and trying to construct alternative concepts (Agnew 1994, Shapiro and Alker 1996).

In spite of this convergence, the four approaches implied different views of the role of borders. The first suggested that their role was diminishing, while the others implied that ‘the de-territorialized nature of post-modernity is only one possible interpretative slant on politics and power in the contemporary world’ (Wilson and Donnan 1998, p. 1), and that identities and border narratives still made a difference and had to be analysed critically. The latter has since become obvious in a number of case studies analysing borders in such diverse contexts as Finland (Paasi 1996), Portugal (Sidaway 2002), Kyrgyzstan (Megoran 2005) or Europe in general (Popescu 2008), for instance, or raising questions regarding the roles of borders in the spatially selective spaces of neo-liberal citizenship where business elites, for example, can cross borders and follow the principles of utopian cosmopolitanism whereas most people cannot (Sparke 2005). Although all these studies were theoretically informed, they did not suggest any universal theoretical perspective. Rather they were context-bound explications that mapped broader economic, cultural and political frameworks for understanding the existence and operation of borders.

In spite of the fact that border studies became important in many fields during the 1990s, it has been common for scholars to ignore the debates going on in other academic fields, which is one example of the power of academic territories to modify thinking and action in exclusive ways in the spirit of ‘disciplinary socialization’ (Becher and Trowler 2001, p. 47). A fitting example is the collection ‘Border theory’ (Michaelsen and Johnson 1997), in which the authors, representing literature studies and anthropology, mapped the multiple borders that define the USA or the Americas and theorized the borders of ‘culture’ and the borders of academic disciplines in the production of border narratives. Interestingly enough, the authors rarely postulated any links with the literature of political science or political geography but instead drew on cultural texts – even though such major categories as state and nation were discussed. This book also displays one more contextual feature linked with academic power relations and supports Vila’s (2003) observation that the ‘centre of gravity’ in US border studies had shifted gradually from sociology, anthropology and economics – with their emphasis on empirical research – to literary criticism and its emphasis on theory. This shift has led, Vila writes, to a situation where grand theoretical assertions are ‘too general’ for the political and economic environment of the border. This led Mexican scholars to complain that the new theoretical sophistication bears little resemblance to the border they experience (quite literally!) on the other side of the fence. Existing theories had also become very general and detached from context, in that many scholars had moved from themes related to the US-Mexican border to broader themes, so that the idea of a border became something of a metaphor. Vila concludes that ‘the metaphor of borders is now used to represent any situation where
limits are involved’, so that border studies take as their ‘own object of inquiry any physical or psychic space about which it is possible to address problems of boundaries: borders among countries, borders among ethnicities within the United States, borders between genders, borders among disciplines, and the like’ (pp. 307–308). He criticized this approach as not only homogenizing distinctive experiences but also homogenizing borders, and noted that the new theoretical approaches have shifted border studies so that the work of those operating in a more empirically oriented vein is marginalized and at times excluded from serious consideration. This criticism may be valid in cultural studies, and especially in the USA, where the US-Mexican border is inevitably a huge intellectual pit in the struggle over academic power and symbolic capital, and for conquering the doxa, the dominant narrative. But still a number of theoretically informed empirical case studies have appeared concerning this border (e.g. Andreas 2000, Nevins 2002).

In spite of the new interest in border studies and new influences, Newman (2003, p. 134) was worried some time ago about the lack of theory: ‘what is sorely lacking is a solid theoretical base that will allow us to understand the boundary phenomenon as it takes place within different social and spatial dimensions’. He was looking for a theory which will enable us to understand the processes of ‘bordering’ rather than simply the compartmentalized outcome of social and spatial processes. This theory should take three dimensions into account: spatial scale, boundaries other than territorial ones and the recognition of boundary concepts as multidisciplinary phenomena. The question of a theory of bounded spaces has also been topical in IR studies, where scholars have challenged the realist, state-centric approaches that take sovereignty, territory and boundaries for granted and have claimed that the field should re-think the ways in which to study relations between wholes and parts, or sameness and difference (Shapiro and Alker 1996, Inayatullah and Blaney 2004). Lapid (2001) speaks about a triad of identities, borders and orders, bringing together what he regards as key concepts in current social theory and practice which have by tradition been associated with different fields. He reminds us how ‘identity’ has traditionally been associated with psychology, ‘borders’ with geography and ‘order’ with political disciplines. Parodi (2002) was also searching for a ‘boundary theory of South-American states’ after analysing ‘national theories’ in individual states; he was partly following here the ideas of Anglophone scholars in this. One aspect of his work that is certainly important, however, is the fact that he follows Shapiro’s critical political perspective. This emphasizes two tenets: that a scholar must analyse the principles or unproblematic truths of theories, and he or she must problematize these principles by examining the institutions within which theory and power (à la Foucault) are linked. Indeed, border scholars have been inspired by the Foucauldian emphasis on power and his historical-genealogical approach for some time (Paasi 1996).

The problem of certitude and contingency in border studies
The earlier contradictory comments on the possibility of border theory are expressions of a more general tension between universalism and particularism, which seems to be a permanent problem in the social and cultural sciences – a theme that is also related to the issues of academic power and hegemony. This manifests itself in such questions as whether academic scholars should produce general theories, or general theoretical narratives in cultural studies, or whether they should develop contingent, context-bound interpretations of local border landscapes or symbolic worlds, i.e. local
knowledge (Geertz 1983). One background for this tension in border studies emerges from the fact that every political boundary is located in a material, ideological and historically contingent context.

Agnew (2006, p. 1) suggests that the greatest divide in the history of knowledge has been between the proponents of ‘universalistic certitude’ and those supporting historical-geographical contingency. The former believe that everything can be fully known through the correspondence of ‘the right theory to the appropriate facts’ and using common sense, while the latter point to a fundamental tension between ‘the indeterminacy of a fact-centred dialectic’ (= different theories look at different types of fact/history throws up different facts), and the ‘urge to convince others that some specific theoretical proposition is absolutely true’. According to the latter ‘nothing can be established as finally true or certain except rhetorically or by persuasion for a given audience’.

The above discussion shows how this tension is evident in the debates on the roles of borders. Nowhere has this been as explicit as in the highly general debates on the disappearance of bounded spaces and boundaries. The statement of Ohmae (1995, p. 11) that ‘Put simply, in terms of real flows of economic activity, nation states have already lost their role as meaningful units of participation in the global economy of today’s borderless world’, has become a famous example of such grand generalizations. The ‘borderless world’ was hardly a fact for him, but rather a loose metaphor for the emerging neo-liberal economy. It was not linked with any specific border and certainly not an ‘empirical generalization’ – even if ‘borders’ were replaced with ‘region-states’ located in border areas, which he also mentioned in his book (Baden-Wurttemberg, Silicon Valley, etc.). A number of border scholars proper were much more sensitive to the persistence of national–political contexts at that time, and their message on borders was often totally different: ‘Borders and boundaries, identities and difference construct and determine to a large extent the space of agency, the mode of participation in which we act as citizens in the multilayered polities to which we belong’, as suggested by the feminist scholar Yuval-Davis (1997, p. 17), for example. The major background for this ambivalence is that scholars from different fields often follow and scrutinize their own established themes and study established objects using established conceptual apparatuses and methods, and they may at times put forward grandiloquent but loose comments on categories and themes that are not actual topics of their research. These comments can nevertheless be very powerful on occasions and can end up by being circulated globally, as the case of Ohmae (1995) shows.

This results in dominant narratives on borders emerging from contested discourses and displaying the power geometries of academia. They are also rhetorical products reflecting diverging strategies of academic power and may well be fitting examples of cultural imperialism (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1999), in the sense that they may universalize the particular and impose it upon the whole planet in apparently de-historicized form – consider, for example, the above discussion of research into the US–Mexico border. Current border studies have also suffered from a tendency to universalize the arguments emerging from one sphere of social action (particularly economics) to the rest of the life of society.

This also raises the question of context in the production of academic knowledge. Given the existence of agency and the mediation of thought by language, societal knowledge is intrinsically time and space-dependent. As Bourdieu (2004) has suggested, language plays a crucial role in scientific practice, since scientific facts,
arguments and theories are normally constructed, communicated and evaluated in the form of written statements, i.e. scientific work is largely a literary and interpretative activity. This also has to do with rhetoric, through which many context-bound statements in the social and cultural sciences may be presented as universal truths, increasingly often via the ‘academic capitalism’ that leans strongly on Anglophone hegemony in the publication market and in the distribution of academic texts (Paasi 2005a).

What is ‘border theory’?
The tension between universal and particular/contingent is thus crucial when considering a ‘border theory’. If boundaries and borders are unique, on what grounds can we make sensible theoretical statements about them and on what grounds would these statements be valid everywhere? I have my doubts as to whether there can be any generally valid ‘border theory’ composed of universal statements that could be tested in cases of individual borders. Such claims would undermine the fact that knowledge in the social sciences is situated knowledge and is bound up with positionality (cf. Yuval-Davis 1997). These elements have their impact on scholarship and have an effect on where scholars do their research, where they publish it, and ultimately, whether their observations are regarded as relevant or marginal.

Another key issue is what is meant by theory. Theory is typically understood as consisting of a set of ideas that are or have been generated as a result of intellectual processes. ‘Theorizing’ is thus the use of the human intellect to explain or understand phenomena by rational means. Although the meaning of theory thus sounds rather straightforward, scholars seem to understand it in many ways in concrete research practice. Various philosophies provide ‘mental orientations’ for comprehending theory. Positivist laws and universalism are hardly what most border scholars mean by theory, even if it is normal scientific practice to search for regularities. Interpretative approaches might well inspire scholars interested in how citizens experience borders, an approach favoured by anthropologists and ethnologists. Pragmatism might motivate scholars who search for ‘temporary theories’ instead of fixed truths, whereas realism might inspire those interested in the relation between theory and ‘practice’ and in invisible relations of power that they want to expose by developing conceptual abstractions. These theoretical stances also provide material for thinking about the roles of context: should we be talking about the local observable, empirical world, human experiences or broader social structures and ideologies? There are also several methodological approaches in border studies that draw on diverging theoretical principles and which often operate at different levels of abstraction, so that they can be used in relation to diverging conceptual apparatuses (state theory, theories of nationalism, identity theory, etc.).

Sayer (1992) discusses three ways to understand the significance of theory. The first is to understand it as supplying an ordering framework that enables the observational data to be used for predicting and explaining empirical events. Theory can thus be thought of as a way of ordering relationships between observations (or data), whose meaning is often taken as given. Accordingly, concrete research is often a matter of testing existing, ready-made theories in new contexts with new data. Theory is thus, in fact, a more or less non-problematic framework, or background, for research. This often means that no new theoretical perspectives are developed, since performing a study does not even require any intervention in the content of the
‘theory’ – the given organizational framework for the empirical content of the research (Sayer 1992, pp. 49–56). Much recent boundary writing seems to be based more on reviews of the current ‘international’ discussion and the ever intensifying circulation of existing ideas rather than on active contextual theorization that draws on a variety of empirical sources. Secondly, theory can be equated with hypothesis or explanation – although this is more common in the natural sciences than in the social sciences and is rarely problematized by border scholars.

The third option is to see theory as conceptualization (Sayer 1992). The role of theory for the organization of facts and observations is now a secondary one and its aim is, in the spirit of realism, to conceptualize the directly or indirectly observable elements of the object(s) of the research. The challenge is to identify conceptually and make abstractions of those features, dimensions and relations of the object of study that are crucial for its production, reproduction and functioning in the wider social world. This approach in no way denies the significance of empirical observations. Rather, it accentuates the fact that observations are theory-laden. Theory is not a separate domain, but instead there is a crucially informing research practice that is shaping theory. Conceptualization forces the scholar into an active dialogue between theory-building and observations.

The idea of theory as conceptualization would mean that, rather than fixed ideas, our theorizations on boundaries should be flexible heuristic instruments that could be used and re-conceptualized further in various empirical settings. This approach challenges the abstract comments on the existence of a borderless world or other similar statements that have not much to do with concrete cases. It is important to challenge them not because of their naivety but because of their obvious power in shaping research practice. I will label this as the ‘power of the given’. Vila’s (2003) comment on the ongoing replacement of empirical observations by new theoretical approaches in cultural studies implies that rhetoric is not just an individual practice. ‘There are rhetorics of organizations, of social movements, of professions and scientific schools and disciplines’, as Simons (1989, p. 3) suggests.

Since borders are context-bound phenomena and are deeply rooted in social, cultural, political and economic practices and discourses, a general theory of borders would suggest that they are more or less separate objects of social research that can be universalized in the form of a theory that, contrary to the variegated contexts, would obviously then be more or less fixed (Paasi 2005b). A general theory of borders is thus problematic. This is not because the borders between states are unique but rather because borders can be theorized reasonably only as a part of a broader effort towards a social-cultural theory, and this theory would again be context-bound. This observation has also been made by Ackleson (2003, p. 579) in IR studies: the existing theorizations of borders lack immersion within any larger social theory – especially one that deals with change.

**Looking at borders differently: ‘borders are everywhere’**

There is now a consensus that borders should not be understood as mere physical lines that can be seen on maps and atlases or on the ground. They are not only areas where political geographers, ethnographers and anthropologists, for instance, can map border landscapes or the experiences of those living on the border. Rather, states and diverging social organizations also use powerful ideas of boundedness to create and maintain inclusions and exclusions, divisions between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and this is
the ideological basis for the ‘calculative territory’ (Hannah 2009). This simply means that a border study concentrating on borders themselves inevitably misses something, since – if we understand them as social practices and discourses that are impregnated with power and ordering – borders ‘are spread’ all over societies, not merely confined to the border areas, even though the social distinctions created by cultural, political and economic nationalism, for instance, seem to manifest themselves particularly in border areas. Hutchinson (2005, pp. 64–65) has shown how borderlands where identity is problematic or threatened may in particular be sources of nationalism. Border areas are also often landscapes of control and nationalist performance.

To open up the idea of ‘context’ a little more, scholars have emphasized the meanings of borders in the construction of the borders of citizenship and belonging, and the role of borders in the construction of identities (Zalevski and Enloe 1995, Shapiro and Alker 1996). There is an obvious need to theorize both boundary-producing and reproducing practices in context and the related relations of power. These practices are normally deeply institutionalized, involving both formal and informal institutions, and may be deeply symbolized. Also, they are rarely only local, but may have their origin and constitutive power some distance away on various ‘scales’ (which are not fixed) from local to global. Any valid theorization of boundaries should combine at least these processes, practices and discourses within the production and reproduction or institutionalization of territoriality/territory, state power, human agency and human experience (Paasi 1996). These ideas should provide theoretical inspiration for the analysis of unique case studies.

I suggest that we need to develop in border studies something that can be labelled ‘conceptual invariances’ and that these will help us to recognize how territoriality works in practice (Paasi 2005b). It is probably impossible to develop universal theories and laws (invariances) regarding state borders and other key categories of social science, partly due to the fact that social systems are open (Sayer 1992). Conceptual invariances can be seen as open categories that are general enough to be used in various contexts but which can be reflected and re-developed to study boundary-producing practices/discourses in different contexts. Such invariances inform researchers about the modalities of power, change, stability and human attitudes (knowing, believing, hoping, imagining, etc.) in these contexts. This reflection should take place in relation to concrete research contexts, which may then produce new theoretical insights to be further re-conceptualized by other researchers in other contexts. This could help us to understand the socio-spatial boundary-making processes that exist concomitantly on and through several spatial scales.

Concrete borders may be unique but there are a number of social, cultural and political features and processes that need to be theorized in a broader context. Now, as we expand traditional border area studies, a number of other relevant, theoretically challenging categories come into play: the functions and forms of state power, the ongoing tendencies of geo-economics and geopolitics, the roles of nationalism and national identity narratives, the forms of social and political control, national socialization, security, images of threats, the environment, etc., which are used effectively in boundary-producing practices and discourses. Many studies have mapped some of these processes in various contexts (and on different spatial scales), relying on differing theoretical and methodological perspectives (Paasi 1996, Ackleson 2000, 2005, Nevins 2002, Fall 2005, Purcell and Nevins 2005, Sparke 2005). All these works demonstrate that the key context for these categories is not only the border landscape itself but rather both the categories and the concrete phenomena studied in research.
become ‘topological’, ‘stretching’ in space, and become associated in complex ways 
with societal phenomena located on various scales. They show that besides empirical 
case studies on boundaries, researchers have to develop abstractions to make the 
process of territory and boundary-building ‘conceptually visible’ and the constitution 
of territory calculable.

Contrary to ideas of a boundary as a sort of skin or limit to a territory, ideas of the 
location of borders ‘everywhere’ have been presented in more recent debates. The 
‘borders are everywhere’ thesis actually means two things. Firstly, borders are part of 
the discursive landscape of social power that manifests itself both in national ideolo-
gies and in material landscapes. Consider, for example, how much ‘bordering’ and 
hidden elements of power exist in connection with national flag days, military ceme-
teries and other elements of national iconographies, such as ‘national landscapes’. In 
this first sense borders are ‘located’ in the perpetual nation-building process and 
nationalist practices, and their roots have to be traced in the histories of these 
national practices (Paasi 1996).

The ‘borders are everywhere’ thesis has also been understood in another way 
recently. The political scientist Rumford (2006), following the French philosopher 
Balibar (1998), suggests that boundaries (of control and surveillance) may be located 
in places such as airports (there is a sign in the arrivals hall of Heathrow Airport in the 
middle of the UK, for example, that read ‘U.K. Border’). Borders are thus indeed 
stretching ‘everywhere’ and ‘vacillating’ (Balibar 1998, Rumford 2006). The fact that 
borders are vacillating, Balibar suggests, does not mean that they are disappearing but 
rather that borders are being both multiplied and reduced in their localization and their 
function; they are being thinned out and doubled, becoming border zones, regions or 
countries where one can reside and live. This fusing of various forms of boundedness 
can also be seen in projects striving to create cross-border regionalization that have 
aimed to lower boundaries around the world, particularly in the EU (Paasi 2009).

Correspondingly, we may think of the ‘borders are everywhere’ thesis as having 
in fact two contexts that may function in the same direction and thus contribute to the 
strengthening of national communities rather than leading us in a more cosmopolitan 
direction and causing the disappearance of borders (Paasi and Prokkola 2008). In 
national(ist) contexts borders are a part of the discursive landscapes of social power/
control that are ultimately soft forms of symbolic and physical violence based on 
national socialization: we come to know borders because we are taught that they are 
the borders of ‘us’ and ‘our community’ on historical grounds. We can label these as 
emotional landscapes of control. On the other hand, in the international context of 
flows of people and goods, borders are elements of new control and surveillance 
infrastructures that may be labelled as technical landscapes of control.

How borders become part of territory-making and everyday life

The above discussion suggests that instead of general statements or information on 
purely empirical local facts, border studies should inform us about the contextual 
‘operation’ of methods, qualities of research materials and relevant (new) conceptual-
izations. This is an even more acute challenge now that border scholars are increasingly 
crossing disciplinary borders. Territorial boundaries, symbolisms and institutions are 
social constructs and processes that are impregnated with power and are in a perpetual 
process of becoming. It is useful to understand boundary-making as a part of a broader 
process of territory/region building or institutionalization (Paasi 1996, 2009). This
requires both conceptual analysis and a dense analysis of concrete cases, in which the
links between territoriality, border drawing practices and the roles of borders as
barriers, mediators of contacts and markers of identity, ideology and symbolism can
be traced to the level of institutions and local, everyday life. The process of the insti-
tutionalization of territories is one of consolidation of the institutional structures of a
territory, and at the same a set of practices and discourses in which calculable territory
is created.

The world harbours 300 or so land boundaries and some 40 maritime boundaries.
Their meanings vary contextually and we should try to ‘read’ these meanings from the
complicated practices and discourses taking place in such fields of social action as the
economy, politics, culture, governance and socialization, for instance. This implies
firstly that attention has to be paid on how specific spatial ideas about a territory and
its boundaries have been constructed and how they shape the images held by the soci-
ety concerned. This is what Shields (1991) has labelled as social spatialization. He
uses this term to designate the ongoing social construction of the spatial at the level of
a social imagery that comprises collective mythologies and presuppositions together
with interventions in the landscape, e.g. the built environment. This is related to the
fact discussed by Harvey (2001, p. 225) that ‘human populations frequently organize
themselves territorially, so regionality becomes as central to consciousness and iden-
tity formation and to political subjectivity as does the cartographic imagination and
the sense of space-time’. This tendency is most obvious in national state formation,
which continues to be the ideal for numerous social movements.

How can we use this perspective in border studies? One way forward would be
conceptualization of the idea of spatial socialization (Paasi 1996) – the process
through which individual actors and collectivities are socialized as members of
specific territorially bounded spatial entities, participate in their reproduction and
‘learn’ collective territorial identities, narratives of shared traditions and inherent
spatial images (e.g. visions regarding boundaries, regional divisions, regional identi-
ties, etc.), which may be, and often are, contested. This is part of the process of
‘symbolic violence’ (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990), through which territoriality is
practised. Spatial socialization implies that national education, especially in history
and geography, and the operations of media are among the most important practices
in the production and reproduction of state territoriality among citizens. While
nationalism has been widely theorized, the role of education in nationalism has been
a relatively neglected theme until recent times (Schleicher 1993). Shils (1981, p. 59)
has pointed out how national history was made into ‘an important part of the syllabus
in schools and legislators and civil servants were willing to spent public funds to train
and employ teachers of national history and to support academic research in the
field’. Whereas national history has been related to the territorialization of the past,
geography has been used to territorialize the present and the future. This often takes
place through maps (Paasi 1996, Gupta and Ferguson 1997). These general observa-
tions render it possible to understand the territorialization of society and memory and
give some guidelines for studying the practices and discourses of politics, govern-
ance, economics and foreign and security policy, i.e. the realm in which ‘calculable
territories’ (Hannah 2009) become realized.

The practice of spatial socialization accumulates in socio-spatial consciousness
(Paasi 1996), an abstraction that strives to make sense of the social construction of
spatial and social demarcations in the making of territories and also points to social-
ization into various territorial demarcations. It is a form of collective consciousness
that can be abstracted from social life for analytical purposes. Hence it is not a sum of individual ‘mental maps’ that can be revealed by surveys, for instance. This consciousness ‘stretches’ individual actors through various institutional practices and discourses as part of a continuity constituted by the bounded society and of how this society is represented in territorial ideologies. This normally brings together social practices occurring on or through different socio-spatial scales (e.g. regionalism and nationalism), and of course normally accentuates the importance of hegemonic practices while silencing others. This consciousness manifests itself simultaneously in various institutionalized social practices such as education, culture, politics, economics, administration and communication, through which actors reproduce themselves and the social structure and through which the power relations operate. Indeed, the anthropologist Cohen (1998, p. 22) has suggested that a boundary is ‘essentially’ a matter of consciousness and experience rather than of fact and law. I would not like to essentialize either the former or the latter idea, since the experiential, institutional and material dimensions are all crucial for the production and reproduction of bounded spaces.

Socio-spatial consciousness renders it possible to understand the relation between human action and social structures in the production and reproduction of collective meanings associated with borders (Paasi 1996). Structure refers in this context to the rules and resources which are recursively implicated in the reproduction of social systems (Giddens 1984). Structures are thus not something abstract that ‘floats above’ individuals, but rather, to follow the lead given by Anthony Giddens, they exist as memory traces and are instantiated in social action and discourse – mostly in the practical consciousness – and they are both enabling and constraining for human agents (Giddens 1984, cf. Haugaard 1997). The validity of socio-spatial consciousness as a theoretical abstraction is based on the fact that most human institutions and symbolizations, including boundaries, normally originate from tradition and the action of previous generations, which also holds good for material objects, beliefs, images, practices and institutions (cf. Shils 1981). Some generations will, of course, transform territorialities in concrete ways, and at times even boundaries, during wars and conflicts, for example, but it is the following generations that reproduce and selectively shape the memorized territoriality, whether in words, deeds or the material symbols used in the discursive landscape of social power (Paasi 1996). We can think of boundaries as manifesting themselves in multiple ways in social, cultural, political and administrative practices and in institutions such as religion (the system of churches), education (private and public schools), the family, jurisdictional systems, political institutions (the political system and political parties), communications (the media) and cultural institutions (literature, art, sport). The idea of a bounded national identity, particularly when it is generated and maintained by existing states, therefore comes very close to the concept of ideology and is related to the practice of governance in which territory is partly produced and reproduced.

Correspondingly, socio-spatial consciousness has a number of ‘material manifestations’ in each society: symbolic and material landscapes, memorials, books, maps, drawings, paintings, newspapers and statistics, for example, which reveal and strengthen the element of historical continuity in consciousness and in various institutional practices and discourses, and contribute to making the territory calculable. Thus, among the most interesting documents for studying spatial socialization, besides the analysis of existing and past institutional, legal, political and administrative practices and discourses, are school geography and history textbooks, atlases, novels and
newspapers, for instance, through which the processes of signification, legitimation and domination take place in ordinary life, and power relations and system integration (Giddens 1984) become realized. Similarly, to take one more example, committee reports and planning documents are crucial for analysing the forms and power relations that have sedimented in territorial meaning-making (Paasi 1996, 2009). Because socio-spatial consciousness is a theoretical concept, it cannot be fully reduced to these ‘manifestations’. There also exist non-material forms of socio-spatial consciousness (e.g. political and governmental rhetoric) and various forms of social action and control which do not inevitably have any explicit materialized form, or else receive this form only after a certain delay.

Using materials like these it was possible in a study of the construction of Finnish territory to show not only that socio-spatial consciousness is historically contingent and contextual, closely related to the construction of one specific border, i.e. the Finnish–Russian boundary, but also that this contingency was deeply sedimented in the broader international environment, so that the production and reproduction of the state, nation and civil society as bounded complexes is in a perpetual state of transformation, reflecting interpretations of security issues, existing international agreements and future geopolitical expectations (Paasi 1996). Socio-spatial consciousness is reproduced in everyday life, but it cannot be reduced to that alone. It is clear that the generations living at a specific period of time come to terms with a relatively small number of these elements in their daily lives, that most of them intervene in daily life through the mediation of institutional practices such as education and the media and that this takes place through a life-long process of spatial socialization.

Due to spatial socialization, state borders may be meaningful in general terms to most inhabitants but particularly important for people who have to face the border area in their everyday lives as border citizens, or as border crossers such as immigrants or refugees, who enter, adapt to or challenge the readymade worlds of practices and discourses regarding ‘Us’ and the ‘Other’. Here we can make use of another theoretical idea, that of social representation as put forward by Moscovici (1981), which is particularly useful for understanding how individual people come to terms with the more general idea of socio-spatial consciousness. Social representations are a set of concepts, statements and explanations emerging from daily life in the course of inter-individual communication. They thus provide a mediating category between a more general socio-spatial consciousness (and the role of borders in it) and the interpretations and representations of spatiality emerging from everyday life. In fact, such social representations have been scrutinized in many ethnographic studies of borders, and scholars have carried out in-depth interviews and used oral history, written life-stories and participant observations carried among border people and their visitors. One of the major observations, e.g. in the study of the Finnish–Russian border based on a combination of a variety of methods and empirical materials, was that different generations of Finns seemed to live in different ‘worlds’ as far as meanings attached to the border are concerned. This was clearly related to the fact that in this specific national context the content of spatial socialization has differed from one generation to another (Paasi 1996).

It is easy to understand that social representations – as well as socio-spatial consciousness – are constitutive of both practical and discursive actions in human life. They both render possible, guide and constrain social action. Socio-spatial consciousness represents a broader form of collective consciousness which reflects the ideological and hegemonic structures of the society and hence also the power
relations which emerge from the social division of labour. Socio-spatial consciousness is not understood here in a Durkheimian way in the sense that the social can be explained only by the social, but rather, I would suggest that the relation between social representations and socio-spatial consciousness (especially in the case of borders) is based on the fact that one significant distinction which people have to deal in most social communities concerns the representations of ‘Us’ and the ‘Other’, i.e. narratives that express the self-consciousness of communities existing on various spatial scales. Social classifications and identity narratives are often based on such distinctions (Somers 1994, Jenkins 2004). Social representations involve the amalgamation of personal (local) experiences with a more general socio-spatial consciousness, which is a tradition produced and reproduced in various institutional practices. These categories also help to shape the complex and contradictory identifications and identity narratives that immigrants and refugees, for example, may face in new spatial and social environments. Hegemonic socio-spatial consciousness may be in conflict with social representations at times, and people may actively resist this general consciousness. This may be the case in instances of (ethno-)regionalism, separationist nationalism or other identities of resistance, for instance. At its best, a critical study of the ‘interface’ between socio-spatial consciousness and social representations can reveal elements that are ‘invisible’ in common-sense thinking and thus may also reveal forms of symbolic violence that are often part of nationalist discourse. Of course they can at times be highly visible examples of identities of resistance. Think of the power of graffiti and murals, for example, in representing such identities.

Discussion and suggestions for future research

The aim of this article has been to scrutinize the relations of power hidden in the production and reproduction of bounded spaces, i.e. territories. The key motive for this paper have been recent, somewhat polarized debates in which some scholars have suggested that there is an acute general need to abandon such bounded spaces and put stress on networks, while others have emphasized that ‘boundedness’ is a significant, context-bound phenomenon that requires careful theorization and empirical research. The present paper has shown that this is not an ‘either–or’ question and suggests that what is important is actually the concept of theory that we follow in research. The solution suggested here is active conceptualization and the creation of abstractions that can be used to reveal the contextual forms of power that are involved in the construction of concrete territories and meaning-making within them.

This view also partly challenges the relevance of a general border theory as has been called for in some recent studies (Newman 2003). A general theory is problematic in border studies simply because of the complexity of borders. The borders between states are in a way unique, and each of them is related in different ways to local, regional, state-bound and supranational processes – the geosociologies of political power (Agnew 2005, p. 47). Some of them are open and almost insignificant, while some are closed at least with respect to certain social practices. In many cases increased interdependence and integration among national states has transformed the meanings of state borders and border landscapes, but this observation is again not a universal one. This harks back to the fact that the relations between a state and its borders are mediated in a complicated way by territoriality. As Taylor (1994) reminds us, in terms of territoriality the state is many things: it is a power container,
a wealth container and a cultural container, and each of these forms of territoriality may put a different emphasis on boundaries. Similarly, the emotional aspects of territoriality make this constellation even more complex. It has been suggested here that border studies can critically add to the existing theorization and empirical generalizations on current social complexity. It is the increasing complexity of the contexts of borders that forces scholars to reflect on their concepts of theory contextually as well. This can best be done in relation to key categories such as space, territory, region, place, agency and power, to social practices such as politics, governance and economics, and to cultural processes such as ethnicity and spatial (national) socialization. The real strength of contextual research becomes evident in comparative research. The rest of this paper will outline some potential themes for future research on borders.

A very important theme for comparative research on state borders could be an analysis of the existing hegemonic and competing narratives on boundaries, ideas of identity, citizenship, political and territorial loyalties or the territorialization of memory. This would doubtless benefit from cross-disciplinary approaches that could broaden the methodological perspectives. A similar sensitivity and expansion of the geographical imagination would be needed to broaden the scope of possible empirical materials that could help in studying the meanings of boundaries in identity-building on various spatial scales and in studying the relations/differences between state boundaries and other social and symbolic boundaries.

Recent efforts to develop the ‘borders are everywhere’ thesis (Paasi and Prokkola 2008) and the partly related issue of the production and reproduction of calculable territories (Hannah 2009) are other examples of potentially fruitful and very topical comparative themes. While boundaries are always located somewhere and have developed in context, this context is increasingly often located in the broader social world: we are not talking merely about boundary lines in ‘border regions’. As I have argued above, borders are not only to be found in border areas but are ‘located’ in broader social practice and discourse all around societies, and increasingly in relation to the global space. They are typically rooted in historically constructed structures of meanings that were labelled above as discursive landscapes of social power, although nowadays they are also manifesting themselves increasingly in the form of technical landscapes of social control. Both of these landscapes are being challenged in the increasingly mobile world, but we do not really know very much about how this takes place in different societies.

One more theme for comparative border studies could be an analysis of the contextual forms of socio-spatial consciousness and national–spatial socialization. This could reveal how the construction of the geography of ideological and hegemonic structures is organized in various states, to what extent boundary-producing practices are unique and whether there are some general features. This would mean in practice a historical analysis of the processes of signification and legitimation that have been crucial for the production and reproduction of socio-spatial consciousness. It would be particularly fruitful to study how the media, education, science, art, aesthetics, etc. have been involved in the production and reproduction of the meanings associated with territory and boundaries. Such an approach would of course fuse various spatial scales, so that the local, national and supranational processes involved in ‘bordering’ would be separable only analytically. This approach would also mean proceeding a step further from the ‘deconstructive’ approach provided by critical geopolitics and IR studies.
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