



Crossing borders of political governance and democracy

Olivier Kramtsch & Virginie Mamadouh

To cite this article: Olivier Kramtsch & Virginie Mamadouh (2003) Crossing borders of political governance and democracy, Journal of Borderlands Studies, 18:1, 39-50, DOI: [10.1080/08865655.2003.9695600](https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2003.9695600)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2003.9695600>



Published online: 21 Nov 2011.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 160



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 7 View citing articles [↗](#)

Crossing Borders of Political Governance and Democracy

Olivier Kramtsch and Virginie Mamadouh*

Introduction

Political governance and democracy are associated so closely with the modern nation-state that it is difficult to imagine them in any other political setting. As a consequence of globalization, the alleged passing or “unbundling” of the nation-state (at the very least its transformation) therefore poses a severe challenge to these two founding concepts, requiring a new language of politics and rule which can at least partially transcend traditional state-centric territorialities (Ruggie 1993; Held 1995; Linklater 1998). The field of human geography, in particular, has been challenged to think beyond the “territorial trap” of perceiving culture, identity and politics as isomorphic with national space (Agnew 1999).

Scholars working in the field of border studies are perforce joined to this debate. Indeed, during the early 1990s, a stream of scientific research has begun to address emergent forms of subnational decision-making operating at the transboundary, regional scale, notably in Europe (Church and Reid 1995; Häkli 1998; Kicker et al. 1998; Scott 1999; Perkmann 1999; Kramtsch 2001; Telò 2001; O’Dowd 2002; Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson 2002). In devising new institutional mechanisms of cross-border governance, European member states are said to engage in a “negotiated suspension of sovereignty” (Scott 1999: 607) in exchange for the creation of a more flexible, networked and “multi-level” European polity capable of engaging successfully the demands of market-driven globalization (Kohler-Koch and Eising 1999; Hooghe and Marks 2001). Scholars drawing on materialist-inspired accounts of state restructuring have tended to grasp the underlying logic of the transformation of borders and border regions in terms of capital-centered “spatial fixes” furthering new rounds of accumulation within a largely unregulated neoliberal regime (Sparke 2000; Jessop 2002; Perkmann and Sum 2002). In these narratives, the particular scale represented by borders and

*Kramtsch is Senior Research Fellow at the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research and lecturer in the Department of Human Geography at the University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands, Mamadouh is a researcher at the Amsterdam Study Centre for the Metropolitan Environment (AME) and lecturer in the Department of Geography and Planning at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

This article is based on discussions at two sessions held at the University of Nijmegen (The Netherlands) in Fall 2002 as part of the “Communicating Borders” workshop, co-sponsored by the Association of Borderlands Studies and the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research. The two sessions were organized under the title “Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy” and were labeled “Do we need scale?” and “People and Power.” The first session started with brief statements by Luis Alberto di Martino, Tom Edwards, Ann Kennard and Olivier Kramtsch. Olivier Clochard, Virginie Mamadouh, Gabriël Popesco and Dennis Soden, together with Christine Brenner and Janet Conary, started off the second session. References to participants in the bibliography indicate comments and statements made at one of these two sessions rather than a published source. Additional participants joined in the subsequent dialogue. The authors want to thank the scholars who participated in these sessions. The authors are responsible for the content of this contribution. Whenever references are made to comments and statements by the participants, they concern the interpretation of the authors.

border regions would appear to be eviscerated of theoretical or conceptual agency, viewed largely as the outcomes of decisions taken at higher spatial levels. Viewed through this lens, the ultimate frame for politics remains the nation-state, its historical subject grounded in diverse working-class alliances (Harvey 1989; Brenner 1998).

An additional aspect of transboundary governance pertains to issues of transnational democracy, legitimacy and accountability. The democratic deficit of emerging forms of transnational governance (either supranational or cross-border cooperation) has been widely acknowledged. International organizations and non-governmental organizations alike generally lack democratic legitimacy, democratic norms being based on the national community of the modern, territorial state. "Are there alternative spaces for the demos?" Taylor (2002) asks. In this sphere of debate, academic discussion focuses mainly on the global arena, dealing with citizenship, globalization and migration (Abu-Laban 2000; Anderson, Brook and Cochrane 1995; Anderson 2002; Archibugi Held and Köhler 1998; Barber 1995; Benhabib 2002; Castles 2000; Faist 2000; Falk 2000; Halliday 2000; Isin 2000; Ong 1999; Painter and Philo 1995; Sassen 1996; Soysal 1997, 2000; Turner 2000; Vandenberg 2000) and the emerging global civil society (Appadurai 2000; Clark, Friedman and Hochstetle 1998; DeFilippis 2001; Heins 2000; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Lipschutz 1992, 1999, 2000; McInture-Mills 2000; Routledge 2000; Soyez 2000; Tsaliki 2003; Waterman 2002). More territorialized experiences with transnational governance, such as European integration, are widely acknowledged (Faist 2001; Kofman 1995, 2002; Schmitter 2000; Shore 2000; Wiener 1997; Painter 2002).

In light of the foregoing, during the conference "Communicating Borders," the theme of cross-border governance was addressed through two issues: the notion of "scale" and "democratic politics." It was proposed that appreciating both these terms *from* the border (both as object of study and as a particular epistemological frame) might offer alternative narratives of nation-state restructuring than those underpinned by capital- and state-centered logics, while providing the conditions for a politics equally attuned to cultural variables rendered explicit by the border proper. Towards this goal, a deliberately comparative and trans-Atlantic perspective was maintained.

Do We Need Scale?

The first theme set out to advance a recent discussion in the borderlands literature on the particular dynamics of para- and non-state institutions in the *governance* of cross-border space, with special attention trained on the varied spatial *scales* through which governmental decision-making capacity is increasingly shifting above and below that of the territorial scale of the nation-state. At the heart of the discussion is the question whether the emergent theater of cross-border regions in Europe and North America should be grasped as merely one more scale through which the nation-state currently attempts to restructure itself at the sub-national level (together with cities and regions), or whether it should be accorded its own status enjoying partial autonomy from that of the nation-state, and thus requiring a reconceptualization of the territorial basis for an authentic democratic politics.

In order to appropriately frame the issues of governance and scale we positioned the discussion within a wider debate in Anglophone human and economic geography addressing a broadly defined "politics of scale."¹ The literature under this rubric attempts to theorize the territorial impact of globalization in terms of the "relativization"

and “de-territorialization” of the “national scale” of government, whereby key regulatory capacities once entrusted exclusively to the nation-state are pushed “upwards” to that of supra-national bodies (EU, WTO, IMF, World Bank), and “downwards” to cities, regions, NGOs, cross-border regions and diverse networks of public-private partnerships operating within the interstices of the inter-state system. As a result of this dynamic, European space is no longer exclusively perceived in inter-state theory terms, but as a “multi-level polity” driven by governance networks operating at local, regional, national, and transnational scales, arenas which are becoming increasingly articulated in fluid and often unpredictable ways. In coming to terms with these complex processes of “state re-scaling” and their consequences for border regions in Europe and North America, several issues were addressed. In the rest of this section four specific topics are illustrated that have been put forward in discussing this theme. Of course this list is not meant to be exhaustive.

Scalar Dimension of Cross-Border Cooperation²

Despite the creation in 1983 of a “Working Committee of the Regions,” the much vaunted “jumping of scales” does not always apply in the cross-border context. In the Spanish context, for instance, central and regional government linkages are largely transnational in scope, rather than cross-border. As a result, INTERREG funds are heavily relied upon for cross-border initiatives along the Franco-Catalan border; nevertheless funds devoted to cross-border projects are perceived to enter into a zero-sum competitive game with respect to more traditional EU financing sources, such as Objective 1 and 2 funds devoted to the development of Europe’s “backward” regions. Irrespective of which funds are utilized for this border area of Spain, problems of democratic deficit abound: in the Franco-Catalan borderlands, “no one talks about people participation.” This seems to confirm the fact that, at least for the case of Southern Europe, discussion of the scalar dynamics of cross-border governance cannot be divorced from regional development agendas defined at national levels, often closely tied to the overcoming of persistent economic asymmetries across long-standing European north-south divides.

The World According to Microsoft³

Governance issues are not exclusively governmental issues. In this respect the practices of Microsoft offer a tantalizing glimpse of the inner workings of a multinational corporate behemoth engaged in “governance across non-traditional space.” For Microsoft, “non-traditional space” is shaped by the need for “neutral and standardized” forms of cartographic representation permitting the worldwide sales of its electronic atlases. Borders and border regions thus find their points of entry in this “perception of space” through the geopolitical lens of a “global thought process” and “global information context” which attempts to “re-territorialize the world its own way.” Particularly as regards the delicate negotiations between Microsoft and national governments in mapping disputed borderland territory, questions of “information sovereignty” become paramount. Engaging in such forms of cyber-diplomacy requires an ethical appreciation of issues closely linked to the “diplomatic immunity of information” and the acquisition of “digital rights” ensuring the accurate representation of geopolitical space. It becomes clear that in the World-According-to-Microsoft the only scale that

matters is the global one, the fraught nature of scales at lower geographical levels (particularly in the cross-border context) to be finessed away in time to be shrink-wrapped and placed on the next UPS delivery plane. This example would certainly provide argumentative fuel for those who call upon the scales of national regulation to rein in the geographic reshaping of space by globalized neoliberalism.

“The Return of History”⁴

In shaping cross-border regional trajectories history plays an important role in East-Central Europe. In so doing an intriguing paradox is that as EC-European border regions become “re-territorialized” as freshly minted members of the EU, they are confronted with age-old European anxieties about contamination from “the East.” Here, and most acutely, Europe’s desire for “deepening and widening” sealed under the Schengen framework collides with its internal security fears. In this charged geopolitical climate, EU-driven eastward expansion plans can be labeled as a form of “soft imperialism,” whereby cross-border aid programs lead to the creation of “new divisions” between European accession countries, and between the future enlarged Europe and its contiguous non-European neighbors like Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Turkey. In the current world-in-waiting that is Central and East Europe, it would appear that a “politics of scale” is intricately woven against the backcloth of memories of territorial loss and domination, now overlaid with wary hopes of membership in a European co-prosperity sphere. The long-term political consequences of this “paradox” for the governance of cross-border regions on the central European land mass will require careful scrutiny in the years to come.

Underpinning Scale

An important “overarching” theme in discussing the scale issue is the normative and causal underpinnings fueling the development of cross-border regions as a specific scale of sub-national governance. In light of the ongoing ravages of transnational neoliberalism, the very need for cross-border integration can be productively interrogated, given the apparent reinforcement of socio-economic inequalities manifest in the Spanish and Central European case-studies.⁵ Here, the issue of the potential democratic legitimacy grounding scales of cross-border governance becomes a contested subject, one whose stakes take on a trans-Atlantic dimension to the extent that the full measure of the distance from the Microsoft-example is absorbed. It was concluded that rather than think through the issue of geographical scale in functional, state-centric terms, one should “come up with a language” that inverts taken-for-granted geopolitical cause-effect relations. Such an alternative view would see borders as active shapers of key political categories: demos, democracy, citizenship.⁶ In such a way, borders and border regions would not be merely the passive objects of forces operating at higher spatial scales, but would themselves become active sites for the re-theorization of fundamental aspects of political life, bearing value in turn across a range of geographical spaces. By re-infusing borders and border regions with an agency denied them within a broader materialist literature, borderland scholars would thus appear to constructively upset the apple-cart in debates on the necessary nature and direction of current rounds of state restructuring, including the scales at which new governance institutions are being constructed across the face of Europe today. From this it must be concluded

that the scales of cross-border governance cannot be so easily accommodated within the formalist logic of state-centered “spatial fixes.” It will remain to be seen how our colleagues working on more traditional urban and regional topics will respond to this productive inversion.

People and Power

The second theme moves the focus of discussion from the issue of scales to that of people and power in cross-border settings. Inhabitants of border areas are frequently far removed from centers of political power, both in a geographical but also in a very real sense, as they occupy spaces that are socio-economically marginal to the national “project.” Moreover, cross-border arenas themselves are often marked by heightened economic asymmetries, as sub-national areas of economically vibrant nation-states now lap up against those of economically weaker partners (a fact that will be made acute with Europe’s eastward enlargement and the formation of a stark new *lime* along the EU-Russia border). This reality poses the urgent issue of political power and “voice” in cross-border space, currently defined by the lack of effective mechanisms of representative democracy at the cross-border level that would allow its members to make claims against respective member states and macro-regional institutions. Within a policy context largely shaped by global corporate neoliberalism, the session explored the possibilities for nurturing new forms of political governance, citizenship and democracy at the cross-border urban/regional scale so as to empower a new category of citizen.

Cultural Legitimacy⁷

One of the issues discussed when regarding the potential for a transboundary politics is the issue of political culture. In this respect it was argued that the Mexican-American border might better be studied in segments, considering both its size (compared to borders in Europe) and the political differences separating U.S. states. For the sake of comparison, the U.S.-Mexico border in El Paso County, Texas is itself longer than the Dutch-German border. A future research agenda for North American border researchers should therefore focus on the study of commonalities and differences between distinct sections of the border. Citizens of two places (the U.S. and Mexico) come together and interact in the international border region, but what do they know about the other side, especially about political processes? Does one need to know much about the other side? How important is trust in building a border community?

Researchers have repeatedly pointed out that the U.S.-Mexico border is affected by its lower than average socio-economic conditions, remoteness from political and economic cores, and cultural differences. Added to these, the fact that the border is shared by a developing nation and a highly developed nation, we are led to inquire if there is evidence of a civic culture that is shared by citizens of each border nation. A preliminary survey conducted at the U.S.-Mexican border at El Paso shows significant differences in both countries regarding how knowledgeable border residents are and how they feel about government as well as the given intent of their border partners. The impact of September 11th, the closing of the border on that day and the longer queues due to enforced control since then, reinforced the feeling that the border is controlled by a remote power that is largely unconcerned with the interest of those inhabiting the border region.

Also within the EU, border control is of main concern. Evidence from three locations: Sangatte, an asylum centrally located at the entrance to the Channel Tunnel, where asylum seekers attempting to enter the UK are accommodated; a “waiting zone” created in 1992 at Charles de Gaulle international airport (Paris); and asylum seekers in Paris reveals the new shape of these borders in terms of “time inscribed in concrete space” (Clochard 2002). These emergent border spaces have become privileged sites for observing asylum policies in France and other EU countries, while offering stark vantage points from which to view the making of “Fortress Europe.”

Euregional Legitimacy⁸

The borders of Fortress Europe are soon due to move eastward. In this respect the issue of transborder relationships in the context of the re-territorialization of Europe in the East can be addressed. Since the removal of the Iron Curtain, Central and Eastern European countries are moving ‘back to Europe’, but they have discovered that Europeanization should not be taken for granted. A requirement of EU-accession (the European ‘Us’) is the establishment of transborder regions. The main dilemma confronting the states recently recovered from Soviet control is that they must achieve new modes of cross-border governance without giving up their sovereignty. Previously, most national governments demonized cross-border regionalism, but had to change their policies as a result of EU pressure. Countries such as Romania have even begun to embrace the notion and have actively promoted cross-border initiatives. Nevertheless, and for obvious reasons, their experience is much different than that of the original Euroregions they try to imitate. As a result, in Eastern Europe transborder regions are often top-down creations, and a real devolution of power has yet to take place. This can be illustrated with some details from Romanian border regions, especially the Carpathian region, where states often maintain complete control over decision-making processes in transborder regions, reducing them to the mere political tools of international politics. In short, these border regions lack legitimacy.

Virtual Legitimacy⁹

A third issue to be addressed is the ways in which people communicate within border regions. Borderlands, like other regions, need to be imagined and represented. They need a name, as well as a territorial and institutional shape that acknowledges, fosters and legitimates the increasing web of cross-border relations. This is especially true when we deal with formal cross-border cooperation between larger regions, in which a considerable portion of the population does not have a daily experience of the border. New media such as the Internet play a key role in stimulating, facilitating and constructing interactions between people across physical and political barriers such as state borders. In addition, these media circulate representations of regions and states, the borders between them and their respective borderlands.

Geographers (and regional actors) should pay more attention to the (potential) role of new media in the representation of borderlands, as they offer technological tools capable of dealing with multilingualism (a common ‘predicament’ in borderlands); connecting representations flexibly and dynamically among different individual and collective actors, including regional entities on both sides of borders; and allowing for individual customization. Samples of official (and less official) web sites of cross-

border regions in the European Union and the rest of Europe show how web sites convey representations of these regions through the use of names, maps and symbols.

Comparing Legitimacy

Differences between American and European cross-border scenarios may be re-assessed via the following issue areas: size of the border, disparities between the two sides of the border, type and density of cross-border interaction, types and density of cross-border institutional collaboration, as well as the embeddedness of cross-border relations in different supranational integration processes (i.e., EU versus NAFTA). In such a way, it can be revealed that cross-border integration stimulated by the European Union seeks to avoid the kinds of relations that exist at the U.S.-Mexico border, where relative advantages created at the border are exploited economically by the North American side (such as with the maquiladora system). What appears more likely in Europe is “empathy at a distance,” solidarity and redistribution, including the scaling up of the Keynesian welfare state. There appears to be no such vision at work in the Northern American context. In Europe, the political importance of cross-border cooperation extends beyond the realm of economics.

A final pressing issue concerns the awakening of political participation in cross-border regions. For cross-border regions not only lack political legitimacy, they also lack a mobilizing power. How to generate political passions in such contexts? How to “mobilize the mob” for transnational democracy? In this context, Anderson reflects on arrangements made in 1998 in Ireland leading up to an agreement for a North-South Council.¹⁰ He also points out the importance of encouraging political participation in a cross-border civic forum which created an arena for grass-roots movements, NGOs and other societal actors. Here, actions fostering participatory democracy did not necessarily mean that border problems and cross-border interactions should be the only issues discussed in that forum. For Anderson, changing the set of references is what matters in creating a new political community.

Nevertheless, one may question the interests of European political elites. While they may support and stimulate cross-border institutions in calling for more political participation in transnational forums, they also strongly condemned the multitudes gathering at the many recent global and European summits. It seems the latter forms of political passion and involvement are not of the kind they seek in the stimulation of transboundary democratic norms.

Conclusion

As the saying goes in Brussels, border regions in North America and Europe today are the putative “laboratories” for a post-national politics. Notwithstanding this hype, it may not be an exaggeration to claim that Europe’s *euregios* indeed offer the sites for a potential re-negotiation and re-working of basic categories of political life normally tied exclusively to the nation-state. It is precisely because of the *thereness* of border regions, their existence as “facts on the ground,” straddling multiple spatial scales from the local to the supra-national, that they consistently “surprise” taken-for-granted assumptions about the properly bounded territorial basis for democratic participation and rule, state sovereignty, citizenship and national political cultures broadly defined. In this respect, and despite their often perceived functional uses for neoliberalism or

strategic statecraft, like modern day pirates, border regions may be considered *agents provocateurs par excellence* of the early 21st century political imagination. Against the recent arguments of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000), however, we would argue that the politics abiding latently at the cross-border regional scale are not immanent to the workings of an increasingly European, global or “cosmopolitical” civil society. In this respect, we could say that the particular spatial scale of the border does not automatically confer political meaning onto the actions of day-to-day borderlanders, but must be explored on a case by case basis.

Indeed, and as we believe the individual studies mentioned here demonstrate, political “meaning” at Europe’s borders can be subverted all too neatly by technological means, as illustrated in Microsoft’s marketing tactics, or wind up inhabiting a perfectly utopian but virtual space in the minds of Internet users. Concomitantly, cross-border politics can just as easily be co-opted by broader spatio-temporal regimes grounded (literally) in the *Realpolitik* of member states (Kramsch and Hooper, forthcoming). Here, as revealed by the case of Franco-Catalan cross-border relations, border cooperation is subsumed under the wider imperative of national development agendas rooted in older patterns of North-South asymmetry. Similarly, despite the clean “break from history” offered the countries of East Central Europe, opportunities for genuine cross-border political *praxis* on Europe’s eastern fringes would seem to be increasingly conditioned by East-West security fears operating at wider macro-institutional scales, including at-home anxieties related to the presence of “strangers in-the-midst.”

For Central and Eastern Europe, the erosion of capacities for building relations of “trust” and “knowledge” at the cross-border scale appear to be exacerbated by the political sensitivities of individual member states who risk losing bounded sovereignty in an ever widening and inaccessible Union. In this fraught geopolitical context, issues of democratic legitimacy and accountability become more important than that of cross-border identity-building. It may thus no longer appear paradoxical, given the purportedly culturalizing logic undergirding the European integration project, that questions of culture and identity appear more salient in the eyes of North American, not European, researchers. Such fruitfully provocative observations cry out for more comparative (and collaborative) work between European and North American border researchers. We hope that these reflections will serve to stimulate such undertakings in the very near future.

Endnotes

¹ This paragraph is based on the introductory statement by Olivier Kramsch (University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands).

² This section is based on the introductory statement by Luis Alberto di Martino (Hagoromo University, Osaka Japan) “*Cross-border Regional Economies and Governance*” (di Martino 2002).

³ This section is based on the on the introductory statement by Tom Edwards. Edwards is drawing on his current practice as geographer-in-residence for Microsoft.

⁴ This section draws on the introductory statement by Ann Kennard (University of the West of England, Bristol, UK) “*Factors Influencing Change on the Future Eastern Borders of the European Union*” (Kennard 2002).

⁵ Based on comments by Jay Singh, University of Washington, Seattle, USA.

⁶ Based on comments by David Newman, Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheva, Israel.

⁷ This section is based on the introductory statement by Dennis Soden, Christine Brenner and Janet Conary (University of Texas, El Paso, USA) “*Civic Culture as a Factor in Communicating Borders*” (Soden et al. 2002) and by Olivier Clochard (University of Poitiers, France) “*When the Borders Do System in the Access at the Asylum*” (Clochard 2002). Clochard’s field work focuses on attempts to control asylum seeker flows in France, and seeks to examine how borders pose fundamental questions for democracies.

⁸ This section draws on the introductory statement of Gabriel Popescu (Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA) “*State-Transborder Regions Relationship in Eastern Europe in the Context of European Reterritorialization: The Romanian Case*” (Popescu 2002)

⁹ This section is based on the introductory statement by Virginie Mamadouh (University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands) “*Communicating Borderlands: Online Networking and Representing Border Regions*” (Mamadouh 2002).

¹⁰ Based on comments by James Anderson (Queen’s University Belfast, UK)

References

- Abu-Laban, Y. 2000. “Reconstructing an Inclusive Citizenship for a New Millennium: Globalization, Migration and Difference.” *International Politics* 37: 509-526.
- Agnew, J. 1999. “Mapping Political Power Beyond State Boundaries: Territory, Identity and Movement in World Politics.” *Millennium* 28(3): 499-521.
- Anderson, J., ed. 2002. *Transnational Democracy: Political Spaces and Border Crossings*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, J., Brook, C. and Cochrane, A., eds., 1995. *A Global World? Re-ordering Political Space*. Oxford: The Open University.
- Anderson, J., O’Dowd, L. and Wilson, T. M., eds., 2002. *New Borders for a Changing Europe: Crossborder Cooperation and Governance*. London: Frank Cass.
- Appadurai, A. 2000. “Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination.” *Public Culture* 12(1): 1-19.
- Archibugi, D., Held, D. and Köhler, M., eds., 1998. *Re-Imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Barber, B. R., 1995. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barnett, C. 2001. “Culture, Policy, and Subsidiarity in the European Union: from Symbolic Identity to the Governmentalisation of Culture.” *Political Geography* 20: 405-426.
- Benhabib, S. 2002. “Political Geographies in a Global World: Arendtian Reflections.” *Social Research* 69(2): 539-566.
- Brenner, N. 1998. “Between Fixity and Motion: Accumulation, Territorial Organization and the Historical Geography of Spatial Scales.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16(4): 459-482.
- Castles, S. 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization: From Migrant Worker to Transnational Citizen*. London: Sage.
- Church, A., and P. Reid. 1995. “Transfrontier Co-operation, Spatial Development Strategies and the Emergence of a New Scale of Regulation: the Anglo-French border.” *Regional Studies* 29(3): 297-316.
- Clark, A. M., Friedman, E. J., and Hochstetler, K. 1998. “The Sovereign Limits of Global Civil Society: a Comparison of NGO Participation in UN World Conferences on the Environment, Human Rights and Women.” *World Politics* 51(1): 1-35.

- Clochard, O. 2002. "When the Borders Do System in the Access at the Asylum." (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published
- DeFilippis, J. 2001. "Our Resistance Must be as Local as Capitalism: Place, Scale and the Anti-Globalization Protest Movement." *City* 5(3): 363-373.
- di Martino, L.A. 2002. *Cross-border Regional Economies and Governance* (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published
- Faist, T. 2000. "Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23(2): 189-222.
- Faist, T. 2001. "Social Citizenship in the European Union: Nested Membership." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(1): 37-58.
- Falk, R. 2000. "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization." *Citizenship Studies* 4(2): 5-17.
- Häkli, J. 1998. "Cross-Border Regionalisation in the 'New Europe': Theoretical Reflection with Two Illustrative Examples." *Geopolitics* 3: 83-103.
- Halliday, F. 2000. "Global Governance: Prospects and Problems." *Citizenship Studies* 4(1): 19-33.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. 1989. "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: the Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism." *Geografiska Annaler* 3(1): 455-472.
- Heins, V. 2000. "From New Political Organizations to Changing Moral Geographies: Unpacking Global Civil Society." *GeoJournal* 52: 37-44.
- Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: from the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hooghe, E., and G. Marks. 2001. *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Inin, E. F. ed., 2000. *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London: Routledge.
- Jessop, B. 2002. "The Political Economy of Scale." Pp. 25-49 in *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions*, M. Perkmann and N.-L. Sum, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keck, M. E., and Sikkink, K. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kennard, A. 2002. "Factors Influencing Change on the Future Eastern Borders of the European Union" (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published.
- Kicker, R., Marko, J., and Steiner, M. eds. 1998. *Changing Borders: Legal and Economic Aspects of European Enlargement*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Kofman, E. 1995. "Citizenship for Some but Not for Others: Spaces of Citizenship in Contemporary Europe." *Political Geography* 14(2): 121-137.
- Kofman, E. 2002. "Contemporary European Migrations, Civic Stratification and Citizenship." *Political Geography* 21: 1035-1054.
- Kohler-Koch, B., and R. Eising, eds., 1999. *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kramsch, O. 2001. "Navigating the Spaces of Kantian Reason: Notes on Cosmopolitical Governance Within the Cross-Border *Euregios* of the European Union." *Geopolitics* 6(2): 27-50.
- Kramsch, O. and B. Hooper forthcoming. *Cross-Border Governance in the European Union*. London: Routledge.

- Linklater, A. 1998. *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lipschutz, R. D. 1992. "Reconstructing World Politics: the Emergence of Global Civil Society." *Millennium* 21(3): 389-421.
- Lipschutz, R. D. 1999. "Members Only? Citizenship and Civic Virtue in a Time of Globalization." *International Politics* 36: 203-233.
- Lipschutz, R. D. 2000. "Crossing Borders: Global Civil Society and the Reconfiguration of Transnational Political Space." *GeoJournal* 52: 17-23.
- Mamadouh, V. 2002. "Communicating Borderlands: Online Networking and Representing Border Regions" (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published
- McIntyre-Mills, J. J. 2000. *Global Citizenship and Social Movements: Creating Transcultural Webs of Meaning for the New millennium*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Ong, A., ed. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: the Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham/London: Duke University Press.
- Painter, J. and Philo, C. 1995. "Spaces of Citizenship: An Introduction." *Political Geography* 14(2): 107-120.
- Painter, J. 2002. "Multi-Level Citizenship, Identity and Regions in Contemporary Europe." Pp. 93-110 in *Transnational Democracy*, J. Anderson, ed. London: Routledge.
- Perkmann, M., and N.-L. Sum, eds. 2002. *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Popescu, G. 2002, "State - Transborder Regions Relationship in Eastern Europe in the Context of European Reterritorialization: The Romanian Case" (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published
- Routledge, P. 2000. "'Our Resistance will be as Transnational as Capital': Convergence, Space and Strategy in Globalising Resistance." *GeoJournal* 52: 25-33.
- Ruggie, J.G. 1993. "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations." *International Organization* 47(1): 139-152.
- Sassen, S. 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scott, J.W. 1999. "European and North American Contexts for Cross-Border Regionalism." *Regional Studies* 33(7): 605-617.
- Schmitter, P. C. 2000. *How to Democratize the European Union... and Why Bother?* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shore, C. 2000. *Building Europe: the Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Soden, D., Brenner, C. and Conary, J. 2002. "Civic Culture as a Factor in Communicating Borders" (Statement in the discussion-meeting Communicating Borders: session Crossing borders of and bordering political governance and democracy). Not published
- Soyez, D. 2000. "Anchored Locally-Linked Globally: Transnational Social Movement Organizations in a (Seemingly) Borderless World." *GeoJournal* 52: 7-16.
- Soysal, Y. N. 1997. "Changing Parameters of Citizenship and Claims-Making: Organised Islam in European Public Spheres." *Theory and Society* 26: 509-527.
- Soysal, Y. N. 2000. "Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas in Post-War Europe?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23(1): 1-15.
- Sparke, M. 2000. "'Chunnel Visions': Unpacking the Anticipatory Geographies of an Anglo-European Borderland." *Journal of Borderland Studies* 15: 187-219.

- Taylor, P. J. 2002. "Relocating the Demos?" Pp. 236-244 in *Transnational Democracy*, J. Anderson, ed. London: Routledge.
- Telò, M., ed. 2001. *European Union and New Regionalism: Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post-Hegemonic Era*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Tsaliki, L. 2003. "Electronic Citizenship and Global Social Movements." *FirstMonday* 8(2): 8-34.
- Turner, B. S. 2000. "Review Essay: Citizenship and Political Globalization." *Citizenship Studies* 4(1): 81-86.
- Vandenberg, A., ed. 2000. *Citizenship and Democracy in a Global Era*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Waterman, P. 2002. "The 'Call of Social Movements' of the Second World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, Brazil, 31 January - 5 February, 2002." *Antipode* 34(4): 625-632.
- Wiener, A. 1997. "Making Sense of the New Geography of Citizenship: Fragmented Citizenship in the European Union." *Theory and Society* 26: 529-560.