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BorderScapes: redesigning the borderland
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Introduction: borders as scapes

When looking at the border regions of the European Union a striking observation can be made. After about two decades of experimenting with cross-border cooperation within the framework of Interreg in the European Union, it can be ascertained that there is a general lack of power, courage or will to really make an integral design of the border regions siding next to each other. For many local and regional planners and governors the border is still seen as the end of a national planning zone and hence only simply understood as a barrier for European integration. But an integral spatial vision and visualisation for European border landscapes, within a common framework for cross-border spatial planning, is still missing. The ambiguity, the ambivalence, the interplay between here and there, the quietness, the interesting contrast is hardly seen as the beginning of a plan. Usually, the paradigm of the ‘80s that the border is an obstacle, a barrier that impedes cross-border interaction, dominates. The conceptual richness that has been developed in most parts of the fields of border studies over the last decades or so (Paasi, 2005; Van Houtum et al., 2005; Wilson and Donnan, 2012) has not found its way into concrete regional planning and design. Also for the country where we live and work, the Netherlands, despite having one of the oldest cross-border regions in its domains, the Euregion, this observation holds. The Dutch have a long-standing tradition when it comes to landscape planning and design. But for the case of border regions, there is a remarkable lack of interest. That is a missed opportunity. For the regions themselves, but also for the further development of the debate in border studies. We argue here that there is need and a chance to take the term border landscape literally in the case of border regions. With this we mean, it is interesting to go back to what scape originally means, namely to shape, to create. As it was explained in a special issue of Agorà (Van Houtum and Spierings, 2012), entitled ‘Borderscapes’, scapes comes from the Dutch term ‘Scheppen (to create)’ and the past tense of ‘Scheppen’ which is ‘geschapen’ (was created), and the Dutch term ‘Landschap’, which means something like a created land. This term was picked up in English and later was turned into landscape. Interestingly, recently, the Italian researcher Brambilla picked this up as well in her assessment of the critical potential of borderscapes (2014) and by Buol (2014). And earlier, used and interpreted differently, Kumar Rajaram, and Grundy-Warr in 2007 also hinted at the potential of the hidden geographies of borderscapes. If

Le frontiere interne dell’Unione Europea sono aperte da più di venti anni. Tuttavia, una visione spaziale coordinata per i paesaggi di frontiera europei è ancora da comporre. Le attuali procedure burocratiche di cooperazione e l’emergere di nuovi sentimenti nazionalistici sembrano essere oggi d’ostacolo a un’efficace cooperazione transfrontaliera. In questo saggio evidenziamo la necessità di un nuovo progetto per i paesaggi di frontiera. Riteniamo, infatti, che studiosi, artisti, architetti e film-makers potrebbero proporre insieme nuovi modi, più inclusivi, immaginativi e criticamente impegnati per ri-disegnare le frontiere. Tali argomentazioni sono basate su una nostra recente pubblicazione ‘Borderland’ in cui, partendo da un’analisi approfondita del confine tra Olanda, Belgio e Germania, è stato sviluppato un nuovo approccio progettuale e cartografico al paesaggio di frontiera.

Parole chiave: borderscapes; progetto per i paesaggi di frontiera; scenari
we accept the idea that a border is a construct, a social design, which is common knowledge now in border studies, it means that there is also room to redesign a border and hence there is a possibility to tell another, more liberating narrative of the same border, one that goes beyond the existing narrative of the border being the end of a national planning zone.

**Division as an opportunity**

With the idea in mind to go back to the origins of the word Scapes, to see borders as a scapes, as land to be developed and designed, we recently published the book «Borderland: atlas, essays and design» (Eker and Van Houtum, 2013). The main question was: what are the possibilities for a reinterpretation of borders as spaces to redesign and architecturally reshape, or in short, to see borders as spaces to create, as ‘scapes’? The start of our research was to distinguish a strip of land 20 km on either side of the border with Germany and Belgium – the area referred to as the ‘borderland’. The Dutch border landscape covers about 28% of the land area of the Netherlands. It has 5.8 million inhabitants, and with an average of 494 inhabitants per square kilometre it is more densely populated than the rest of the country (385 inhabitants per square kilometre). The boundary we drew around the border landscape, to define our field of research, is an arbitrary one: it is just as much of a ‘construct’ or design as the national borders themselves.

Its purpose is simply to allow one to think and talk about the area as a whole, to make it manageable as a subject for investigation. The common characteristic shared by all the places in this zone is their location in relation to the centre of the Netherlands: as far away as possible. In this respect, this makes this part of the country peripheral, whereas in other respects some parts of it could be considered to be very central indeed. This makes the ‘land border landscape’ somewhat different from the ‘sea border landscape’, which is more uniform and which generally conjures up just one type of image. The border with the sea is a geomorphological border; it is not a result of agreements or conflicts with others. From a historical, social and spatial perspective, the land border is a multidimensional and complex construct. We interpret the ambiguity, two-sidedness and division that characterise the border zone as an opportunity to plan and design the area in a different way. The appreciation of border landscapes as landscapes of difference is growing worldwide, while the national traditions and practices underlying these differences at least in the EU are meant to slowly converge in a EU wide planning. And so national orientations are giving way to international ones and the EU is harmonising its legislation on numerous topics and seeks to eliminate regional disparities. The Borders as Scapes project is hence also a design study to investigate the development possibilities of the current Dutch border landscape in the context of this on-going European integration.

**Borderers**

Right from the very early experimental phases of this long project, already in 2004, the aspiration was to make a link between thinking and doing – translating the morphological presence of the border landscape into a meaningful new design – and it was the reason that brought together various disciplines in the research project. During the first excursion involving landscape architects, town planners, social geographers, artists and art historians, it became immediately apparent that these disciplines looked at the landscape in different ways. The social geographers and art historians, who can roughly be described as observers, took the landscape to be a result of constructs, processes and events, as an area where different groups of people live and work. The designers, the landscape architects and town planners, did that as well, but they perceived the landscape primarily as something that could be remodelled. They constantly thought in terms of relocating rows of trees and dikes, and restructuring areas. The realisation of such differences between disciplines fuelled a fruitful discourse in which the border and its landscape was continually reconsidered and recast. Interestingly, all the researchers involved in our research were initially clearly affected by a strong reflex, a hesitancy or diffidence about entering the imaginary space of the other and daring to think about it and reshape it. Perhaps this is key to the lack of inspiring border designs. We have arguably become too disciplined tied too tied to our own national space and too conditioned in thinking that there is only one design for a border, namely the current dominant one represented by fences or lines on maps. So, in the spirit of the philosopher Jacques Rancière, we worked towards becoming true ‘borderers’ (in German: Grenzgänger), writers and thinkers between and beyond disciplines and internal disciplination (De Boer, 2007). The figure of the Grenzgänger allows us to focus our attention on the role of interdisciplinary geopolitical narratives and practices, so essential when studying borderscapes. The Grenzgänger typically could be understood as an itinerant of the in-between spaces, a goer who trains his eye on the hidden or latent geographies and does not allow him/herself to be constrained by (urban) borders and monolithic interpretations of spaces (Brambilla and Van Houtum, 2012, p. 28).

**Cultural heritage and design**

The border landscape is considered as a landscape with a certain cultural heritage value – because of the presence of the border as a tangible and abstract fact, because of the activities and characteristics of the area inherent to its location, and because of the 150 years during which the current situation along the Dutch border was able to evolve. However, the term ‘cultural heritage’ may lead one to think that our intent was to encapsulate the ‘unique and specific characteristics’ of this landscape as a sort of museum piece to be conserved – to designate the border landscape with the purpose of fencing it off for preservation. If the border landscape, or parts of it, could be identified as unequivocally and precisely, we believe that only focusing on a strategy conserving it would not be a good idea. Rather, the border landscape is something that ‘evolved’ because for one reason or another it has been ignored, because the border was the ‘limit of the plan area’ or because it was where passage to the rest of the world had to be facilitated. Seldom has the border landscape been planned or designed in any meaningful way with the idea of making it a landscape itself. The question of how to do this and what interesting possibilities this opens up is what our study set out to investigate.
The border landscape of the Netherlands Belgium Germany
Source: Eker and Van Houtum, 2013
**Transition space**

Although we investigated the cultural heritage of the border landscape, we looked at it just as much as a non-landscape: as a transition space, a place that has been largely unnoticed. A place which, if you really wanted to preserve it, you would have to ask yourself whether it would not actually be better if it remained unnoticed. In this sense, this study can be seen as part of a wider growing interest in forgotten corners, no-man's lands, transitional zones, hidden landscapes, white areas and deregulation – born of a realisation that the Netherlands has been planned to a great detail and that a lack of planning and leaving things alone may just provide some much needed freedom and room for manoeuvre. Discussion on this aspect within the working group led to the coining of the term 'de-designing', or 'non-designing', and the inevitable question of whether this is actually possible, and how.

**Border as Janus**

In our final book we first described the present situation. The form, diversity and qualities of the border landscape were surveyed, and where possible visualised. Then, in the second part of the study, assuming that the border is a political construct, a design, we study the historical, existing and expected political interest in the border landscape. After this the book focused on the possibility of redesigning the borderland. Can one step out of the conventional way of thinking, can we steer a different course, and can we re-design? To inspire the search for new designs, we made use of the theoretical concept of the Janus face (Van Houtum, 2010a), implying a continuum of two different kinds of desires or, their reverse, fears. We explored these two opposite desires as tools for imaging two alternative future configurations for the border landscape. On the one hand there is a tendency to retreat behind the border, to close the door and hide away for the world outside. This tendency is what Deleuze and Guattari (1972, 1980) called ‘paranoid’ desire or what Nietzsche termed ‘Apollian desire’ (1872). Within this desire to retreat, there is a tendency to long for a here and we, a process of what was described earlier as ‘Bordering, Ordering and Othering’ (Van Houtum, 2002, 2010b). That is, the demarcation of Borders in space, often is co-incided with the making of an internal Order and is co-constituted with the making of Others. On the other side of the continuum there is what Deleuze and Guattari framed as ‘psychoid desire’, or what Nietzsche termed ‘Dionysus’. Within this desire, there is longing for the Other side, the there. To actively want to escape the homogenising tendencies within the own B/Order and engage with and dwell in the differences across and outside the border. We argue that this epistemological two-sidedness of a border, this intrinsic ambivalence and ambiguity, renders a fertile ground for a thinking of design scenarios.

**Border as a mise-en-scene**

We developed three design strategies for designing the border-scape. Besides ‘doing nothing’, the study examined a ‘radical dissolution of the border’ option (Community scenario) and a ‘strengthen the border in a theatrical manner’ option (Desire scenario). These scenarios allow the border to be not only the cause of the present landscape, but also to set the imagination in motion and underpin visions of what the landscape might look like. For example, how can wishes or desires be given spatial expression? How can you design for the friction between the various interests in the area? These are questions and exercises that have relevance not only for the border landscape, but also for all forms of designing for borders.

**Autonomous development scenario**

A first option is no development of the border landscape. This non-development and non-design implies allowing room for endogenous development in the border landscape and the borderland. The advantage of this is that the border is truly opened up for a new appreciation, a new vision and new interpretations. A possible disadvantage is that the agoraphobia, the fear of the emptiness, and fear of lack of control, which is an important motivation for closing the border, may persist. As a consequence, the open space of such a non-development could become a no man's land. This could be liberating, but it could also drive a wedge between those on either side of the border.

So this scenario sketches what the border landscape would look like if national policies and the EU funded cross-border cooperation programme remain more or less the same. The original intermediaries – the Euregions – gradually evolve into institutions with an interest in maintaining the status quo. The consequence of this is that while parties on both sides of the border apply jointly for subsidies, they then use them for their own purposes. If the current situation continues, there will continue to be no cross-border integrated spatial plans. Cooperation will remain limited to sectoral issues such as recreational infrastructure, regional promotion, education, healthcare, culture, water management and the construction and upgrading of infrastructure. At the national level, us/them thinking will persist and an area’s importance will be measured against national criteria. The differences in planning culture will also remain.

**Community scenario**

In this design scenario, which is inspired on the Apollonian desire of European homogeneity, the importance of national borders become less relevant. The borders continue to exist, but the differences between the two sides have increasingly little to do with national characteristics, interests and policies. The regions themselves decide what is good for them. Allocation inefficiencies (such as double infrastructure, hospitals on both sides of the border) are sorted out and network optimisation supports sustainable regional development. The housing and employment markets are the first to become fully integrated. Spatial planning also becomes increasingly coordinated and gradually converged in overlapping circles. National policies and plans are revised in line with common regional interests and there is a dialogue between national principles. The particular qualities of the border landscape are treated pragmatically – as part of the sectoral policies for culture, tourism, nature conservation and recreation. The Euregions are concerned primarily with optimising the natural
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and economic infrastructure, which thus becomes increasingly the same on both sides of the border. The border becomes a cultural-historical relic.

**Desire scenario**

In this scenario the European Union and the national governments have discovered the potential of border landscapes as landscape and cultural showpieces and have made the creation of spatial differentiation in the border zone a national policy objective. Following decades of Euregional experimentation it has become clear that real interaction in the border landscape does not come about through attempts to build a sense of collective identity, because the effect on the ground is almost always medioc...
choreography of the border, without the destructive or exclusive interpretation of the border. For, if we accept that policies for the border have landscape implications, we can then reason backwards: reshaping the landscape will in turn have implications for thinking about national policy. And if we accept the idea that the border can be interpreted differently, and borders can be imagined differently in our heads and projected differently on a map, as human design, this will create room for reinterpretation and re-imagination and redesign. Although the planning emptiness of the borderland may still have an important symbolic function, the lifting, negation and disappearance of the borders in the physical landscape of the European Union has created more room for reinterpretation. The mono-functional reality of the border is less forcefully dictated by its morphological manifestation, at least within the common physical space of the European Union, and this creates more room for overwriting or recoding that reality and constructing and representing other realities. The result is a fabrication of space, a new theatrum, or fabrica mundi. As opposed to the traditional notion of borders as the end of the open space, the end of the poles, the design notion of the border implies the initiation of an open space, a space that is open to reconstruction and revision. Or to play with Heidegger’s famous term dasein, the new Dasein of borderlands is Design! And this is not a task for policy makers or rulers of our territories alone. What we need is co-makership and a sense of co-ownership in redesigning our borders. For, it is primarily up to us people ourselves, as social constructors and designers of our political space, be in it the form of academics, entrepreneurs, citizens, artists or planners, to come up with new representations and imaginaries and semiotic meanings of borderscapes.
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Notes

1. Interreg initiative provides funding for interregional cooperation across Europe. It is implemented under the European Community’s territorial co-operation objective and financed through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). Source: www.interreg4e.eu/programme/.
3. In Heidegger’s thinking the manifold notion of Dasein (Da-sein: there-being) indicates the distinctive mode of Being realized by human beings in time and space - i.e. a way of living shared by the members of a community (cfr. Heidegger, 1962).
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