

## 7 Beyond the “lettered border”

### Towards a comparative horizon in European and Latin American border studies

*Olivier Thomas Kramsch*

On crossing the imaginary line drawn from Punta Mala to Azuera the ships from Europe bound to Sulaco lose at once the strong breezes of the ocean. They become the prey of capricious airs that play with them for thirty hours at a stretch sometimes.

(Conrad, 1947 [1904 1st ed.]: 5)

La cuestión es que, desde la incomodidad que produce un cierto escepticismo hacia las divisiones regionales en particular, y hacia la Transitología en general, me parecía más imaginativo proponer, desde el mismo contexto de producción, una visión algo desenfocada, proyectada desde una minúscula incisión dentro de las miradas preferentes.

(Lois, 2014: 240)<sup>1</sup>

#### **A productive malaise**

This chapter begins with a productive sense of *malaise*, both personal and disciplinary. The affective state I refer to has its temporal origins in the decades of the 1990s and early 2000s when and from a diversity of locations – Oulu (Finland), Belfast (Ireland), Nijmegen (The Netherlands) and other sites – an attempt was made to generate a “b/ordering turn” within the extant field of boundary studies. Traditionally conceived as fixed “lines in the sand”, as physical, and quasi-natural features of the landscape existing in a static and atemporal condition, borders were suddenly reconceptualized as something more fluid and mobile, as an inherently social and socializing product, comprised of areas that, if they indeed marked and were expressive of socio-spatial differences, were at the same time susceptible to unpredictable dynamics, uncontrolled subjective perception and divergent symbolic as well as institutional interpretations, ultimately the result of a complex “social spatialization”, not without tension and contestation (Paasi, 1996, 2001; Newman and Paasi, 1998; Anderson and O’Dowd, 1999; Wastl-Walter, Varadi and Veider, 2002).

An important geopolitical context undergirding the “b/ordering turn” in boundary studies was the recognition that, instead of producing a “world

without borders”, globalization had contributed to a resurgence of territories and borders in all parts of the planet (Kolossoff and O’Loughlin, 1998; Anderson, 2002; Newman, 2006). More than just reflecting a quantitative phenomenon, however, postmodern social theory would play a decisive role in the *fin de siècle* resignification of the traditional object of border studies (Newman, 1999). These links to social theory promised to open border studies to new vistas, freer from structuralist constraints and determinations emanating from the classical, modernist era. In *B/ordering space* (2005), Wolfgang Zierhofer, Henk van Houtum and I helped consolidate the “bordering turn”; by rendering borders as a verb, we deployed a social constructivist reading of borders that foregrounded the role of the imagination as a key component of the bordering dynamic and its attendant Us/Them relational binaries. But nearly a decade and a half on from *B/ordering space*, I argue we are stranded at a conceptual as well as political impasse, the resolution of which will require us to embark on new travel to as-yet-unknown destinations. My concern can best be captured in the following question:

if bordering – defined principally as the creation of an Us and a Them – is a ceaseless process producing an reproducing difference in space, how to distinguish progressive and emancipatory elements in bordering practices from those that end in a politics of exclusion, marginalization, violence and death?

The field of border studies – even in its most cosmopolitan variants – remains silent on the subject. It is as if the very posing of this question would threaten the very *raison d’être* of the discipline.

The normative vacillation in border studies becomes dangerous to the extent that the most cited and applauded texts reproduce the exclusionary, oppressive and deadly nature of contemporary geopolitical bordering, expressed most vividly by the European Union (EU)’s practice of migration policy in the Mediterranean. Here, what the Catalan geographer Xavier Ferrer-Gallardo and I have called the “spectacular borders” of the EU are made manifest in academic writing on the operations of European multilateral security organizations such as FRONTEX, whereby emphasis is placed on the thousands of deaths which have converted the Mare Nostrum into an aquatic cemetery (Ferrer-Gallardo and Kramsch, 2016). In spite of noble intentions and capacity for moral denunciation, such academic work, in addition to veering dangerously close to populist discourses on the rise across Europe, only serve to reinscribe geopolitical hierarchies between the EU and the rest of the world. At the end of the day, as disciplinary objects – in both senses of the word – borders here only have a regressive function, unable to propose a politics that transcend the incessant compartmentalization of the planet (see Chambers, 2012). As a result, border writing in/from Europe remains caught in a “labyrinth of (fear and) loneliness” at a moment when it can least afford it (Paz, 2015). Against this backdrop of danger – as

much for Europe as its surrounding neighbourhood – an open question imposes itself: *what kind of borders do we produce through our thinking?* And with what theoretical and political effects?

### Taking the “road less travelled”

In an article that appeared in the Anglo-saxon journal *Geopolitics*, the British geographer James Sidaway proposes two possible paths for the future of what he calls “critical border studies” (Sidaway, 2011): (1) to keep training attention on the “spectacular” borders of the EU (i.e. FRONTEX) so as to maintain the moral denunciation of the exclusionary practices of EU migration policy-making; (2) to analyse the “global” frontiers of civilizational and cultural interaction, where the lineaments of a shared and co-produced modernity may be apprehended between Europe and those regions of the world in which Europe has geo-historically intervened (Africa, Asia, Latin America). To be sure, the two proposed agendas are not mutually exclusive; but I claim that border studies’ predilection for the former has more to do with the imperatives of “spectacular” visibility and popularity among so-called “top” international (but mostly English language) scientific journals – measured by bibliometrics such as International Scientific Indexing (ISI) – than in any well-grounded theoretical strategy. Ultimately, this path is closely connected not to conceptual developments internal to a particular field but rather to neoliberal practices governing contemporary academic knowledge production (see Paasi, 2011).

But what if we took the “road less travelled”, and allow ourselves to think together the bordering of Europe according to the second model, as the co-production of a modernity that is not “European” but global? Regarding the relation between Europe and Latin America, this line of thought – grasped in its geo-historic plenitude – would invite us to consider Europe’s expanding “coloniality of power” in the New World, tracing the expansion and development of different European frontiers from their geo-historical origins, according to the different logics and modalities of governance associated with each European colonial metropolitan power (Spain, Portugal, Great Britain, France, The Netherlands), in their divergent contexts, including policies of racial pacification and the formation of local elites, with their diverse urban nuclei. In an effort that is equally genealogical as it is comparative, a point of reference in Latin American thought might be Angel Rama’s *La Ciudad Letrada* (1984).<sup>2</sup> A comparative genealogy *par excellence* of Spanish urbanism in the Americas, in this classic text Rama presents Latin American urban development as the product of a dialectical and intergenerational struggle between, on the one hand, a written culture emanating from the Spanish courts and projected onto its colonial peripheries – after independence subsequently appropriated by local criollo elites – and, on the other, the oral cultures of subaltern classes located at the margins of established colonial power.

In this context, I propose we could in similar fashion trace the origins and evolution of a “lettered border” – running parallel to the lettered city of Rama – beginning with the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494) between the representatives of Isabel and Fernando, Kings of Castille and Aragón and those of King Juan II of Portugal, as a result of which the navigable zones of the Atlantic were demarcated, as well as strategies planned for the conquest of the New World. In the same way that the hieratic utopias of sacred European writing found themselves challenged as they penetrated into the rebellious urban spaces of the new continent canvassed by Rama, we could observe how the delirious cartographic visions embedded in the notorious *Planisferio de Cantino* (1502), designating the meridian of the Treaty of Tordesillas, enter almost immediately into difficulties in trying to establish the exact position of the line. This occurred because the treaty only specified the line of demarcation 370 leagues from the islands of Cape Verde, without either first having identified the line in Meridian degrees nor the island from which the leagues should have been measured, nor the longitude of a league; as if from a fable of Italo Calvino’s, the treaty declared that these issues would be resolved by a joint expedition that never took place. At each step in the development of the hispano-portuguese frontiers legitimized by Tordesillas, we could then determine the shifts and points of rupture, the unconscious border rendered by the aphorism “I act but do not obey”<sup>3</sup> that would subvert every effort to apply straight cartographic lines from European centres onto its so-called colonial peripheries. In the end, those very centralized European powers did not obey the treaty: Portugal gradually advanced from Brazil towards the West of South America, and, in similar fashion Spain colonized the Philippines, which were located within Portugal’s sphere of influence.

The historiographical and political-geographic treatment of the Americas emanating from the Anglo-Saxon world has tended to pass over these confused origins of borders in the Americas, leaving us with a limpid centre-periphery model which has predominated until our present day. In this respect, the influence of the sociologist Edward Shils has been notable (1975); his work on the establishment of inter-social “centres” and “peripheries” has been foundational for historians as well as geographers of the European colonization of the Americas. The dense work of the North American geographer Donald Meinig is also an important reference point, permitting the observation of the contradictory and capillary processes of the frontier development of the continent into its most remote interstices (Meinig, 1986). Historian Jack P. Greene, for his part, confronting the spatial as well as economic determinism of Immanuel Wallerstein, proposed the influential argument that imperial power was not imposed by the Spanish metropolis but was “negotiated” in the Americas (Greene, 1994; see also Daniels and Kennedy, 2002). Greene’s thesis, questioning the unidirectional nature of power (i.e. centre-periphery, Europe-Latin America), recuperated the agency of local Latin American creole elites, and in this way preserved for a future moment “sideways perspectives” on the metropole-colony relation.

These rich historiographical and political-geographic works could nourish our comparative genealogical project, except for the fact that they only cover the classical period: most end in the decade of the 1840s; they focus only on the external frontiers of European colonization, and assume an ever-dwindling preponderance of “Europe” as an economic and territorial power as the nineteenth-century advances, until only the United States remains as a hegemonic power in the region. This, I argue, poses an unresolved problem in the study of the role of imperialism in Latin America. As Barbara Hooper and I asserted more than a decade ago (Hooper and Kramsch, 2007), a curious silence prevails today even among the anti-imperialist European Left in taking full responsibility for the European “colonial present” in the contemporary political imagination (see Gregory, 2010; Anderson, 2013). Some years ago now, early geographical critiques of this posture emerging from the margins of the Anglo-Saxon academy had placed their finger on the wound caused by the absence of debate on the contemporary coloniality of European power, in which, for Anglo-Saxon geographers Continental Europe only figured as a picturesque colonial past, to be studied in the literature of colonial travel writing, whereas imperial *Realpolitik* was situated exclusively in a hegemonic and all-powerful United States (Gregson, Simonsen and Vaiou, 2003). These academic practices, so Gregson and her colleagues – in a way similarly perceived long ago by Fanon (1967/1994) – only serve to mask the continued hegemony of Anglo-Saxon geography with respect to different continental European geographies, which are placed in the role of providing picturesque empirical case studies for consumption by the centres of the discipline: the United States and Great Britain.

Countering this *lacunae* is precisely the challenge taken up recently by the field of “transatlantic post-colonial studies” in the Spanish language (Rodríguez and Martínez, 2010), as well as the critical geography of European borders (Ferrer-Gallardo, 2008; Kramsch, 2010, 2012a; Kuus, 2011; Bialasiewicz, 2012; Casas-Cortés, Cobarrubias and Pickles, 2012; Espiñeira, 2013; Moisió *et al.*, 2013). But whereas transatlantic post-colonial studies would appear to embrace a post-national or even post-theoretical moment in the relation Europe-Latin America, I would like to embark on something more modest, which could be grasped in an observation that would remain to be explored in its empirical richness and theoretical-political consequences. This observation may start from the proposition that there was and continues to be a close relationship between bordering dynamics within and outside Europe; between the internal borders binding European member states and the ancient colonial frontiers, now state borders, belonging to the countries of the Latin American continent. We know from the many studies of European colonialism, such as those carried out by Fredric Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (1997), in addition to historical analyses of imperial frontiers (Maier, 2006) and Edward W. Said’s strategies of “contrapuntal reading” (1993) that there has always existed a mutual

influence between European metropolises and colonies which do not cease to resonate in our present time. In these readings of Europe's "imagined geographies" (Said, 1993), European frontiers took on the role of "laboratories of modernity", whose innovations were reimported into the imperial metropolises, across a range of sectors, including health, educational reform and urban planning (Viswanathan, 1989; Wright, 1991).

But the possibility of an inter-border, transatlantic *rhythmanalysis* would appear to be excluded from contemporary English-language border studies that compare "Europe" and "America" (Canada/EEUU/Mexico) (Scott, 1999; Brunet-Jailly, 2004). Whether in the form of NAFTA or the EU, each geopolitical context shines in splendid ideographic isolation. The dense linkages that once united and continue to weave these two macro-blocs remain hidden from view. In what follows I tap out the discursive geopolitical rhythms suturing two sets of interdependent Euro-Latin American borders, thereby triangulating two old European ex-colonial powers – Spain and Great Britain – and two post-colonial peripheries, Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands.

### **Chronicle of a border foretold: rock of Gibraltar/Falkland Islands**

On 12 August 2013, under the pretext that the authorities of Gibraltar had thrown blocs of cement into the sea and in this manner hindered the work of Andalusian fishermen in the area, the Spanish government announced a series of revindications before international agencies. A week later Spanish foreign minister Margallo prepared an alliance with Argentina so as to bring their claims collectively to the United Nations. The foreign ministry announced there could be a meeting between Margallo and his Argentine counterpart Hector Timerman, taking advantage of elections for the 2020 Olympics site, which would take place in Buenos Aires. In the face of the attempt by Spain to link the "decolonization" of Gibraltar with that of the Falkland Islands, the retort of the British foreign ministry is blunt: referring himself to that "great ally of Great Britain", subsecretary Alistair Burt defended Gibraltar and her rights, ending his speech with the phrase "always judge friends by the company they keep" (cited in Gómez, 2013). The laconic words of subsecretary Burt, I suggest, re-inscribe an old geopolitical and imperial border, under whose rubric European metropolitan powers unite on the side of those who inhabit "civilized" borders, confronting together the "abyssal line" of an external, wild and *gaucho*-infested exterior (Santos, 2010). On a diplomatic level, the impact of such discursive bordering is immediate, to the extent that from then on minister Margallo ceases mentioning Gibraltar and the Falklands as comparable "residual colonial situations".

As a consequence of this diplomatic *fracas*, a spokesperson for the government of Gibraltar asserted that "regarding British public opinion, the cases

of Gibraltar and Falklands are not comparable. [In the Falklands] there was recently a war and British soldiers died there” (quoted in Gómez, 2013). In the face of this reply, we could well ask, “what geopolitical unconscious animates this alleged incomparability between Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands?” Towards the end of the 1990s, Benedict Anderson used the phrase “the demon of comparisons” (in original: “*el demonio de las comparaciones*”) to describe the experience of the young Philippine nationalist José Rizal, who compared the gardens of Manila with those of Europe (Anderson, 1998). For the young anti-colonial thinker, the gardens of Manila were seen as mere pale reflections of the “authentic” gardens of Versailles or Berlin, and, for this reason, always located “behind”, running at the tail end of a vanguard Europe, situated at the head of historical developments. In a similar vein, but now inverted, how could we not identify an equally demonic and post-colonial comparison in the words of the representative of Gibraltar? The ghost of Lord Curzon hovers over these rhythms of transatlantic bordering. More than a century ago, in a classic geopolitical lecture, Curzon referred to the Afghan Northwest frontier as a “forge” of British masculine character (Curzon, 1907). More than a century later, we may perceive in the words of the representative of Gibraltar before his Spanish counterpart a decidedly Curzon-like formulation through the implication that Gibraltar is only a pale reflection of an island located across the Atlantic, where real “men” died.

This “archaic” dialectic between the internal/external borders of Europe today brings us to a second observation. To the degree that the term “decolonization” continues to be mobilized to describe the problematic of Gibraltar and the Falklands, thus resurrecting phantasms of national-territorial and demographic unity, I argue that *the very nature of frontiers is undergoing unforeseen shifts*, rendering the “centre-periphery” models of old increasingly obsolete. This is because both sets of borders – internal to the EU as well as Latin America – are now being subject to “more diffuse appropriations”, inscribed in flows that exceed and transcend the frame “Europe/Latin America”, and, as a result require “surprising cartographies” capable of re-contextualizing them according to vaster and more multidimensional criteria (Chambers, 2012). Such a frame would need to embrace a macro-context defined by the diffusion of neoliberal political-economic as well as “security” principles, under a logic meant to destabilize and weaken the sovereignties of Latin American states. These strategies, emanating from military sources in the United States as well as the EU, are concentrated in the borderlands of the South American continent, reimagined as “grey zones” and “ungovernable areas”, the axes of “failed states” or spaces for new erupting conflicts related to the flow of legalized (oil, gas, water, minerals) and/or clandestine goods (drugs, contraband, human trafficking). These border conflicts, both legal and para-legal, are perceived as facilitating significant autonomous irredentist movements, as in the region of Zulia in Venezuela, the Bolivarian Oriente, the province of Tarija in Argentina or that of the Pando in Peru (Manero, 2007).

Under this more expansive, transatlantic optic, Gibraltar could be apprehended no longer as “last-corner-to-be-reunited-with-Spain” but as an important node in a burgeoning archipelago of privatized “fiscal paradises” which would include Luxembourg and The Netherlands within, as well as the Bahamas and Cayman Islands, outside of “Europe”. In the same vein, the so-called “Triple Border” between Brazil, Paraguay and Argentina would have to be reconceptualized beyond their respective national territories, taking into account the supposed presence of Hezbollah and transcontinental political Islam (Manero, 2007); the riverine border between French Guyana and Brazil could be illuminated as a strategic space for France and the EU to project themselves into “their” European and Amazon border region so as to intervene in global debates on sustainable development (Boudoux d’Hautefeuille, 2010; Kramsch, 2016); and one would have to re-situate the northern border between Mexico and the United States by way of a branch-plant industry ever more connected to China and Southeast Asia (Alegría Olazábal, 2009). In each context, the border regions of Latin America could be grasped as “laboratories” for the testing of neoliberal and securitarian strategies that can then be exported to other parts of the world (Manero, 2007).

But simply to assert the ever more transnational (and global) nature of Latin American borders is not adequate to capture their contemporary specificity and theoretical-political interest. We should place equal attention on the socio-spatial practices of those who inhabit these borderlands, not losing sight of how local actors actively participate in the renegotiation and re-territorialization of place and meaning in the so-called “globalized” borderlands so that they secrete an infinitely more interesting and complex habitat than those produced by abstract strategic-military or geopolitical representations. In the border area between México and the United States, for instance, such a lens would open up an analytical space that would allow us to see the urbanized border as more than a postmodern trans-frontier unity in which the border plays only an epiphenomenal role in everyday life (Dear and Lucero, 2005), or as two cities living apart in an unmixed state (Alegría Olazábal, 2009). In this vision of the borderland, we need to recuperate the notion of the “everydayness” (“*cotidianeidad*”) of the border (Bustamante, 1981), something that does not erase the reality of the border but preserves a space of autonomy and freedom in the renegotiation of its meaning (Aparna, 2013; Aponte Motta, 2017; Iglesias-Prieto, 2017).

### **Towards Euro-Latin American horizon**

Given the foregoing, I propose another way of “seeing” European and Latin American borders in their entangled relation, not as lines that mark the ends of separated worlds but rather as a series of interlinked socio-spatial *horizons* (see Lois, 2014). The study of the horizons of a properly Euro-Latin American modernity would reveal spaces that gesture towards “other spaces”, largely



hidden from sight of the European metropolis and other so-called centres of power. Addressed both scientifically and across the canvas of world literature, horizons have typically denoted a space located between earth and sky, at a point where human sight “trembles”. In the words of Didier Maleuvre, a horizon “marks not the factual edge of the world, but the shifting line where perception trails off” (Maleuvre, 2011: xiii). In so doing, it would reveal a specific historical truth in the geo-historical context of Euro-Latin American relations: for being located “far away”, since the time of the Treaty of Tordesillas and its failed cartographic utopias, European and post-independent Latin American nation-states never fully controlled the actions of subjects occupying the spaces of their respective Latin American frontiers (Zárate Botía, 2008). It is in this way that we may speak of the fundamental “hiddenness” of borders located at the margins of a global, colonial modernity, both within and outside “Europe” (Kramsch, 2012b). At this juncture, we could take inspiration from poet-*flâneur* Louis Aragon, who, almost a century ago, in his vagabondage “from below” across the urban landscape of Paris under fully destructive Hausmannization, proposed: “*C’est l’heure du frisson, qui ressemble à crier à un trait d’encre noire. Nous nous réjouissons d’être des encriers*” (1926: 179).<sup>4</sup> Let us therefore be ink pots!

To the degree that they limit perception and themselves embody the notion of *limit*, horizons interpolate subjects immanently dwelling *within*, rather than external to, a landscape (Maleuvre, 2011, drawing on Casey, 1998). Horizons are therefore phenomenologically *inhabited*. According to María Lois Barrio, they:

Establish and mark reference points, spatialize geohistorical contexts for the representation of space and collective time, and in so doing produce and reproduce the social order, influencing not only material practices but *communities of destiny*, the spaces of everyday imagination, from where we build the symbolic horizons of socio-political practices and representations.

(Lois, 2014: 242; translated from Spanish by author; emphasis in original)

Rather than reduced to a sharply bounded locality, however, in their very imperceptibility horizons also gesture to a “beyond”, an unfulfilled elsewhere that provokes subjects to a radically destabilizing view of the “Self” and the “Other”, as occurs to Count Bezúkhov, who, standing on a hill on the Franco-Russian front at the battle of Borodino (1812), looks down onto a “living landscape, and try as he might ... could not make out any military positioning ... [or] even tell our troops from theirs” (Tolstoy, 1868/2016: 844–845); or as experienced by Lawrence, who, on finally taking Akaba – “the horizon of our minds” – in 1917 together with several hundred Howeitat warriors, claims that in “the blank light of victory we could scarcely identify ourselves ... though my site was sharp, I never saw men’s features: always

I peered beyond, imagining for myself a spirit-reality of this or that ...” (Lawrence, 1926/2008: 322). The spatial concept of horizon would also immediately flag a fundamental attribute: “vanishing points”, from where unknown actors emerge within the interstices of modern global architectures. Here precisely, we would need to re-appropriate strategic-military border syllogisms such as “grey areas”, but rather than considering them as areas of contagion or danger, re-animate and inhabit them both theoretically and methodologically.

In addition to having their own “space”, horizons also contain an important temporal dimension, given that they produce a futurity (or “virtuality”), and in this manner point to a yet-to-be imagined condition that is distinct from the oppressive national utopias that preoccupied Rama. Social theorist Rheinhardt Kosellek once famously defined European modernity as riven by a fundamental tension between the “space of experience” (*Raum der Erfahrung*) and a “horizon of expectation” (*Horizont der Erwartung*); the former referred to the spaces of everyday life of locally rooted populations sedimented in small-scale rural settings, villages and land; the latter signalled modernist, urban-based utopian imaginaries embedded in large-scale fantasies of social change and societal improvement, including radical architectural interventions to transform the social order (Kosellek, 1979). If our abovementioned intuition of the “dailiness” (*cotidianidad*) of Latin-American borders is even minimally correct, we may productively de-centre and “entangle” the European location of Kosellek’s framework so that Euro-Latin American “horizons” today are secreted within the experiential spaces of borderlands either side of the Atlantic in a mutual call and response. In this sense, and in the wake of the much celebrated “reassertion of space in critical social theory” (Soja, 1989; Jameson, 1991), we reinsert a dynamic temporality to the idea of a Euro-Latin American horizon so as to emphasize the expansive and multidirectional character of the collective memories that cross-pollinate the construction of borders on both continents. In this way, Euro-Latin American horizons can be productively conceptualized as spaces deeply infused with a political, parabolic and inextinguishable *desire* that is irreducible to identitarian essentialisms, highlighting both difference and interdependence.

Whereas in the era of Lord Curzon imperial frontiers were seen as peripheral places, forges producing the best, most virile, homogenous and virtuous British character, generative of that “imperial race” so beloved by Sir Halford Mackinder, today socio-spatial horizons are spaces in whose shadows pulse subaltern energies that secrete “the Other”, the stranger, “otherness”, a dynamic which resituates them at the centre of struggles over political modernity today. In order to adequately *see* these horizons, in all their theoretical as well as political potential, we need to recuperate the ex-centric and comparative gaze of an Ángel Rama. But we would need to recuperate Rama not as some quintessence of Latin American intellectuality, but as an exile, an Uruguayan in “difficult” circumstances, a foreign professor in a foreign

country, a man “out of place”, with an expired passport, struggling with the US immigration authorities as much as with the House Subcommittee for Un-American Activities, while attempting to finish a book, that would later be called, *The Lettered City*.

## Acknowledgements

An original version of this essay was first given as a lecture before a large and receptive Ibero/Latin American audience at the Universidad Complutense, Madrid (*Seminario Internacional: Reconfiguraciones Geopolíticas y Modernidad Global: América Latina y Europa en Perspectiva Comparada*, 16–17 December 2013). I thank Heriberto Cairo and Breno Bringel for their careful and generous editorial guidance in preparing the book chapter for this volume. A special *agradecimiento* goes to Breno Bringel for pointing me in the direction of Reinhart Kosellek’s work.

## Notes

- 1 English translation: “The question is, from the irritation that produces a certain skepticism towards regional divisions in particular, and Transistology in general, I thought it more imaginative to propose, from the same context of production, a somewhat more blurred vision, projected from a minute incision within conventional perspectives.” Translated and used with permission by Maria Lois.
- 2 English translation: “The Lettered City”.
- 3 Spanish original: “*Acato pero no obedezco*”.
- 4 English translation: “It is the hour of the shudder, which resembles like a shout a vial of dark ink. We rejoice in being ink pots.” Translated by the author.

## References

- Alegría Olazábal, Tito (2009) *Metrópolis transfronteriza: revisión de la hipótesis y evidencias de Tijuana, México y San Diego, Estados Unidos*. Tijuana: El Colegio de la Frontera Norte.
- Anderson, Benedict (1998) *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World*. London and New York: Verso.
- Anderson, James (2002) “Borders after 11 September 2001.” *Space and Polity*, vol. 6, no. 2, 227–232.
- Anderson, James, and O’Dowd, Liam (1999) “Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance.” *Regional Studies*, vol. 33, no. 7, 593–604.
- Anderson, Perry (2013) “Imperium.” *New Left Review*, no. 83 (special issue), 5–111.
- Aparna, Kolar (2013) *Re-mapping the U.S.-Mexico Border: High Agency, Everyday Region-making, and Lived Spaces of the U.S.-Mexico Border in Tijuana*. MA thesis, Department of Human Geography, Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
- Aponte Motta, Jorge Mario (2017) *Leticia y Tabatinga: construcción de un espacio urbano fronterizo: hacia una geohistoria urbana de la Amazonía*. PhD thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

- Aragon, Louis (1926) *Le paysan de Paris*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bialasiewicz, Luiza (2012) "Off-shoring and Out-sourcing the Borders of Europe: Libya and EU Border Work in the Mediterranean." *Geopolitics*, vol. 17, no. 4, 843–867.
- Boudoux d'Hautefeuille, Madeleine (2010) "La frontier et ses échelles: les enjeux d'un pont transfrontalier entre la Guyane française et le Brésil." *Cybergéo: European Journal of Geography*, 514 [Online. Available at: <http://cybergeog.revues.org/23405>. Accessed on: 12 May 2011].
- Brunet-Jailly, Emanuel (2004) "Comparing Local Cross-border Relations under EU and NAFTA." *Canadian American Public Policy (CAPP)*, vol. 58, 1–59.
- Bustamante, Jorge (1981) "La interacción social en la frontera México-Estados Unidos: un marco conceptual para la investigación", en R. Gonzalez (ed.) *La frontera norte: integración y desarrollo*. México D.F.: El Colegio de México, 17–33.
- Casas-Cortes, Maribel; Cobarrubias, Sebastián, and Pickles, John (2012) "Rebordering the Neighbourhood: Europe's Emerging Geographies of Non-accession Integration." *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, 37–58.
- Casey, Edward (1998) *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chambers, Ian (2012) "Foreword: A Line in the Sand." In J. Kun and F. Montezemolo (eds.) *Tijuana Dreaming: Life and Art at the Global Border*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 11–27.
- Conrad, Joseph (1947 [1904 1st ed.]) *Nostromo: A Tale of the Seaboard*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Stoler, Ann Laura (1997) *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Curzon, Lord (1907) *The Romans Lecture: Frontiers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daniels, Christine, and Kennedy, Michael V. (eds.) (2002) *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500–1820*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Dear, Michael, and Lucero, Hector Manuel (2005) "Guest Editorial: Postborder Cities, Postborder World: The Rise of Baja California." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 23, no. 3, 317–321.
- Espiñeira, Keina (2013) "Colonialidad en la frontera ceuti: sebta mashi Schengen." *Ecléctica: Revista de Estudios Culturales*, no. 2, 5–18.
- Fanon, Frantz (1967/1994) "On National Culture." In P. Williams and L. Chrisman (eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 36–52 [original edition in French, 1963].
- Ferrer-Gallardo, Xavier (2008) "The Spanish-Moroccan Border Complex: Processes of Geopolitical, Functional and Symbolic Rebordering." *Political Geography*, vol. 27, no. 3, 301–322.
- Ferrer-Gallardo, Xavier, and Kramsch, Olivier (2016) "Revisiting Al-Idrissi: the EU and the (Euro) Mediterranean Archipelago Frontier." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol. 107, no. 2, 162–176.
- Gómez, Luis (2013) "Foreign Office: 'Siempre juzgas a los amigos por las compañías que tienen.'" *El País*, 27 September.
- Greene, Jack P. (1994) *Negotiated Authorities: Essays in Colonial Political and Constitutional History*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

- Gregory, Derek (2010) “War and Peace.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, vol. 35, no. 2, 154–186.
- Gregson, Nicky; Simonsen, Kirsten, and Vaiou, Dina (2003) “Writing (across) Europe: On Writing Spaces and Writing Practices.” *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 5–22.
- Hooper, Barbara, and Kramsch, Olivier (2007) “Postcolonizing Europe: The Geopolitics of Globalisation, Empire, and Borders: Here and There, Now and Then.” *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie (TESG)*, vol. 98, no. 4, 526–534.
- Houtum, Henk van; Kramsch, Olivier, and Zierhofer, Wolfgang (2005) *Blordering Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Iglesias-Prieto, Norma (2017) “Transborderisms: Practices that Tear Down Walls”. In R. Rael (ed.) *Borderwall as Architecture: A Manifesto for the US-Mexico Boundary*. Oakland: University of California Press, 22–25.
- Jameson, Fredric (1991) *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kolossov, Vladimir, and O’Loughlin, John (1998) “New Borders for New World Orders: Territorialities at the fin de siècle.” *Geojournal*, vol. 44, no. 3, 259–273.
- Kosellek, Reinhart (1979) *Vergangene Zukunft: zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kramsch, Olivier (2010) “The Rabelaisian Border.” *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space*, vol. 28, no. 6, 1000–1014.
- Kramsch, Olivier (2012a) “Re-conociendo la frontera UE-MERCOSUR: espacio, visión e imaginación ‘dreyfusard’ sobre el puente del Río Oyapock.” In C. G. Zárate Botín (ed.) *Espacios urbanos y sociedades transfronterizas en la Amazonia*. Leticia-Amazonas: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Amazonía, 127–153.
- Kramsch, Olivier (2012b) “‘Swarming’ at the Frontiers of France, 1870–1885.” In T. Wilson and H. Donnan (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Border Studies*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 230–248.
- Kramsch, Olivier (2016) “‘Spatial Play’ at the Ends of Europe: Oyapock Bridge, Amazonia.” *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol. 107, no. 2, 209–213.
- Kuus, Merje (2011) “Policy and Geopolitics: Bounding Europe in Europe.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 101, no. 5, 1140–1156.
- Lawrence, Thomas Edward (1926/2008) *Seven Pillars of Wisdom: A Triumph*. London: Vintage Books.
- Lois, María (2014) “Apuntes sobre los márgenes: fronteras, fronterizaciones, órdenes socioterritoriales.” In S. A. Colognese y E. Cardin (eds.) *As ciências sociais nas fronteiras: teorias e metodologias de pesquisa*. Cascavel: Editora JB, 239–261.
- Maier, Charles S. (2006) *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maleuvre, Didier (2011) *The Horizon: A History of Our Infinite Longing*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Manero, Edgardo A. (2007) “Strategic Representations, Territory and Border Areas: Latin America and Global Disorder.” *Geopolitics*, vol. 12, no. 1, 19–56.
- Meinig, Donald W. (1986) *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Moisio, Sami; Bachmann, Veit; Białasiewicz, Luiza; dell’Agnese, Elena; Dittmer, Jason, and Mamadouh, Virginie (2013) “Mapping the Political Geographies of

- Europeanization: National Discourses, External Perceptions and the Question of Popular Culture.” *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 37, no. 6, 737–761.
- Newman, David (1999) *Boundaries, Territory and Postmodernity*. London: Frank Cass.
- Newman, David (2006) “The Lines that Continue to Separate Us: Borders in our ‘Borderless’ World.” *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 30, no. 2, 143–161.
- Newman, David, and Paasi, Anssi (1998) “Fences and Neighbours in the Post-modern World: Boundary Narratives in Political Geography.” *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 22, no. 2, 186–207.
- Paasi, Anssi (1996) *Territories, Boundaries, and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Boundary*. Chichester and New York: John Wiley & sons.
- Paasi, Anssi (2001) “Europe as a Social Process and Discourse: Considerations of Place, Boundaries and Identity.” *European Urban and Regional Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 7–28.
- Paasi, Anssi (2011) “A *Border Theory*: An Unattainable Dream or a Realistic Aim for Border Scholars?” In D. Wastl-Walter (ed.) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 11–31.
- Paz, Octavio (2015) *El laberinto de la soledad*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Rama, Ángel (1984) *La ciudad letrada*. Hanover, NJ: Ediciones del Norte.
- Rodríguez, Ileana, and Martínez, Josebe (eds.) (2010) *Estudios transatlánticos postcoloniales I. narrativas comandosistemas mundos: colonialidad/modernidad*. Barcelona: Anthropos Editorial.
- Said, Edward W. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: A. Knopf.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2010) *Para descolonizar Occidente: más allá del pensamiento abismal*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Scott, James (1999) “European and North American Contexts for Cross-border Regionalism.” *Regional Studies*, vol. 33, no. 7, 605–617.
- Shils, Edward (1975) *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sidaway, James (2011) “The Return and Eclipse of Border Studies? Charting Agendas.” *Geopolitics*, vol. 16, no. 4, 969–977.
- Soja, Edward W. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.
- Tolstoy, Leo (1868/2016) *War and Peace*. London: Penguin.
- Viswanathan, Gauri (1989) *Masks of Conquest*. London: Faber.
- Wastl-Walter, Doris; Varadi, Monika M., and Veider, Friedrich (2002) “Bordering Silence: Border Narratives from the Austro-Hungarian Border.” In U. H. Meinhof (ed.) *Living (with) Border: Identity Discourses on East-west Borders in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 75–94.
- Wright, Gwendolyn (1991) *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Zárate Botía, Carlos G. (2008) *Silvícolas, siringueros y agentes estatales: el surgimiento de una sociedad transfronteriza en la amazonía de Brasil, Perú y Colombia, 1880–1932*. Leticia: Universidad Nacional de Colombia – Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones (IMANI).