

Volume 19 No. 1
Spring 2004

Special Issue
*The Canadian-American Border:
Toward a Transparent Border?*

Journal of
Borderlands
Studies

Borderlands

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 19 No. 1

Spring 2004

Journal of Borderlands Studies

ISSN: 0886-5655

Editors

J. Michael Patrick

Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and
Enterprise Development
Laredo, Texas

Henk van Houtum

and

Martin van der Velde

University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
The Netherlands

Production Editor: Baldomero G. García, Jr. (Texas A&M International University)

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Special Issue

'The Canadian-American Border: Toward a Transparent Border?' Volume 19 • No. 1 • Spring 2004

Contents

Toward a Model of Border Studies: What Do We Learn from the Study of the Canadian-American Border? Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly	1
Imposing the Border: The Detroit River from 1786 to 1807 Lisa Philips Valentine and Allan K. McDougall	13
Sovereign Survival: Borders as Issues Allan K. McDougall and Lisa Philips Valentine	23
Economic Integration and Cross-Border Policy Convergence: Social and Environmental Policy in Canadian Provinces and American States Debra L. VanNijnatten and Gerard W. Boychuk	37
Cascadia: The (Re)Construction of a Bi-National Space and Its Residents Signe Marie Cold-Ravnkilde, Jaidev Singh and Robert G. Lee ..	59
Emerging Collaborative Frameworks for Environmental Governance in the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Ecosystem Donald K. Alper	79
Transborder Cascadia: Opportunities and Obstacles Patrick J. Smith	99
NAFTA, Economic Integration, and the Canadian-American Security Regime in the Post-September 11, 2001 Era: Multi-Level Governance and Transparent Border? Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly	123
The North American Border Cooperation Model: Local Challenges for a Security Agenda Manuel Chavez	143
Instructions for Authors	163

Editorial and Advisory Boards

Editorial Board

C. Richard Bath
The University of Texas at El Paso

James Peach
New Mexico State University

Gary S. Elbow
Texas Tech University

James Pick
University of Redlands

Niles Hansen
The University of Texas at Austin

Harry Polkinhorn
San Diego State University

David Lorey
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Refugio Rochin
The Smithsonian Institution

Oscar J. Martinez
The University of Arizona

Ellwyn R. Stoddard
The University of Texas at El Paso

Stephen Mumme
Colorado State University

Randy Willoughby
University of San Diego

International Advisory Board

Donald Alper
Center for Canadian-American Studies
Western Washington University

Pertti Joenniemi
Copenhagen Peace Research Institute
Denmark

Anthony I. Asiwaju
University of Lagos
Nigeria

James Scott
Institute for Regional and Structural Studies
Germany

Jorge Carrillo
El Colegio de la Frontera Norte–Tijuana
Mexico

Edgar Ortiz Calisto
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Mexico

Carl Grundy-Warr
National University of Singapore
Singapore

Sidney Weintraub
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Washington, D.C.

Board of Directors and Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies

Board of Directors

Terms for 2001-2004

Joan B. Anderson, University of San Diego, San Diego, California
Christopher Brown, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Martin van der Velde, University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, Netherlands

Terms for 2002-2005

Jorge Eduardo Mendoza, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana, México
Thomas Fullerton, Jr., University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas
Tamar Diana Wilson, University of Missouri-St. Louis, San José del Cabo, México

Terms for 2003-2006

Guillermo Alvarez de la Torre, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexicali, México
Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada
Olivier T. Kramsch, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies (2003-2004)

President:	Anthony V. Popp New Mexico State University
President Elect:	David Stea Southwest Texas State University
Executive Secretary:	Stephen R. Elliott University of San Diego
Immediate Past President:	James B. Pick University of Redlands

For a current listing of ABS Board of Directors and Officers, go to:
www.absborderlands.org

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Submission of Manuscripts

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* (JBS) is the primary publication of the Association for Borderlands Studies. Published semi-annually, it has for more than a decade and a half distinguished itself as a leading forum for borderlands research. The JBS is widely consulted by educators, practitioners, policy-makers, and researchers.

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* welcomes manuscript submissions from all social science, humanities, and business disciplines focusing on borderlands issues. The border emphasis is global. Work from any discipline that illuminates border problems, characteristics, issues, and realities in any part of the world is acceptable for manuscript review. **It is important that the manuscript deals in a substantive way with the border-related aspect of the topic.** Manuscripts should not just be the results of a study in a region near a border without significant consideration of border or trans-border influences and characteristics.

Manuscripts are blind reviewed by at least two qualified readers.

Manuscripts or inquiries should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

or

Henk van Houtum (h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde (M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Manuscripts with a clear geographical focus on the Americas should be sent to J. Michael Patrick, whereas the ones with a European or Near Eastern focus (including North Africa) should be sent to Henk van Houtum and Martin van der Velde. Other manuscripts can be sent to either address.

See "Instructions to Authors" for additional information.

Statement of Editorial Policy

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* is a refereed multidisciplinary journal focusing on borderlands issues and research. The views and opinions expressed in published articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the editors or officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies. Data and computer software used in published articles should be clearly and precisely documented and readily available to any researcher for replication purposes. If this condition cannot be met, the editors should be notified at the time of submission. Detailed instructions for authors are available on the Association for Borderlands Studies's web site at:

www.absborderlands.org/jbs/jbsmanscriptstyle.htm

From the Guest Editor

The Canadian-American border is well known to be the longest undefended border in the world. Canada and the United States began collaborating on security and military matters as early as in the 1940s, and formalized their relationship in the 1957 North American Defense Agreement. Also, both central governments embraced free trade in the late 1980s and signed the North American Free Trade Agreement on December 17, 1992.

Today, each country is the other's prime trading partner, and, with 10 of the Canadian provinces contiguous with 12 of the American States, about 90% of Canadians and 18% of all Americans live within 250 kilometers of the border. Yet, this long, narrow, densely peopled and commercially busy border remains understudied. This special issue of *The Journal of Borderland Studies* aims to contribute to this deficit in the scholarship on borders. The authors of this issue were invited to reflect on several critical theoretical and empirical issues relevant to the field of borderland studies and pertinent to the Canadian-American border, including the processes and effects of continental integration on Canadian-American border regions, and the interactive effects on these borderlands of structure, culture, and agency.

Initially, two groups of scholars from varied social science disciplines presented their works at the 2003 meetings of the Canadian Political Science Association in Halifax and of the Association of Borderland Studies, in Las Vegas. It is at those meetings that the possibility of this special number emerged. This project would not have been possible without the editorial mastery of Martin van der Velde and J. Michael Patrick, co-editors of the *JBS*, and the invaluable and generous comments of all anonymous referees, may they all be thanked here.

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Guest Editor
Journal of Borderlands Studies
University of Victoria, Canada

Authors' Contact Information

Toward a Model of Border Studies: What Do We Learn from the Study of the Canadian-American Border?

NAFTA, Economic Integration, and the Canadian-American Security Regime in the Post-September 11, 2001 Era: Multi-Level Governance and Transparent Border?

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly
University of Victoria
Canada
e-mail: ebrunetj@uvic.ca

Imposing the Border: The Detroit River from 1786 to 1807

Sovereign Survival: Borders as Issues

Allan K. McDougall
University of Western Ontario
Canada
e-mail: akmcddl@uwo.ca

Lisa Philips Valentine
University of Western Ontario
Canada
e-mail: valentin@uwo.ca

Economic Integration and Cross-Border Policy Convergence: Social and Environmental Policy in Canadian Provinces and American States

Debora L. VanNijnatten
University of Western Ontario
Canada
e-mail: dvannijn@wlu.ca

Gerard W. Boychuk
University of Waterloo
Canada
e-mail: gboychuk@uwaterloo.ca

Cascadia: The (Re)Construction of a Bi-National Space and Its Residents

Signe Marie Cold-Ravnkilde
Roskilde University Center
Denmark
e-mail: coldravnkilde@yahoo.com

Jaidev Singh
University of Washington
USA
e-mail: jsingh@u.washington.edu

Robert G. Lee
University of Washington
USA
e-mail: bobleee@u.washington.edu

Emerging Collaborative Frameworks for Environmental Governance in the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Ecosystem

Donald K. Alper
Western Washington University
USA
e-mail: donald.alper@wwu.edu

Authors' Contact Information

Transborder Cascadia: Opportunities and Obstacles
Patrick J. Smith
Simon Fraser University
Canada
e-mail: psmith@sfu.ca

The North American Border Cooperation Model: Local Challenges for a Security Agenda
Manuel Chavez M.
Michigan State University
USA
e-mail: chavezm1@msu.edu

Toward a Model of Border Studies: What Do We Learn from the Study of the Canadian-American Border?

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly*

Introduction

Until the mid 1980s, the study of borders¹ could be dismissed as a “sophisticated provocation” (Friedmann 1996). This is no longer the case as the study of frontiers, boundaries, borderlands, and borders has expanded beyond the circle of a few geographers and historians to include anthropologists, economists, ethnologists, political scientists, lawyers, psychologists, sociologists, and a number of other social scientists.² Yet, the study of borders has not reached the status of a unified scientific subfield, perhaps because there may be too many different types of borders or too many epistemologies of borders (Knippenberg & Markusse 1999; Paasi 1999, in Eskelinen, Liikanen, & Oksa 1999; Perkmann & Sum 2002). As well, despite a few disciplinary excursions the theoretical works on borders remain mostly tentative.

In this introduction, I argue that the study of borders is now ready for a broader interdisciplinary border model, a model that includes the range of disciplinary perspectives that examine borders. Such a theory should be inclusive of structural considerations, while placing human agency at its core. This is because both structure and agency are central to understanding the past and present state of borderlands and to suggesting alternative futures. I support this claim through an examination of the Canadian-American borderland, arguing that its primary characteristic is that it divides two increasingly interdependent national economies. My aim is to clarify the theoretical complexity associated with the analysis and description of borders. This borderland is not a single Westphalian line delineating two national sovereign states, their people and their economies, but rather a territory where market forces (flows of goods, money, and people) interact with the complexity of multi-layered, sometimes overlapping, government activities and functions. Such a complexity has a formative power over the culture, and bargaining potential of borderland communities.³

Research on borderlands is expanding due to a renewed interest in the changes that have been affecting states, their sovereignty, and their borders. The last two decades are testimony to this revival (Duchacek 1988; Knippenberg & Markusse 1999; Perkmann & Sum 2002). Economic globalization, political integration in Europe, and free trade integration in North America, along with the rise of the information-communication revolution, are perceived as fundamentally transforming the economics and politics of borders worldwide (Ohmae 1995; Castells 1997; Knippenberg & Markusse 1999; Shulz 1999; Van Houtum 2000; Blatter & Clement 2000; Perkmann & Sum

*Brunet-Jailly is Co-Director of the Local Government Institute, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Imposing the Border: The Detroit River from 1786 to 1807

Lisa Philips Valentine and Allan K. McDougall*

Abstract: In 1783, a border was imposed across the Old Northwest by the newly-formed United States and Great Britain through the Treaty of Paris. That division down the center of the southern Great Lakes waterway was reconfirmed by the Jay Treaty of 1794. Despite these treaties, control of the borderland region remained in contention. This paper addresses the impact that the imposition of the border had on life in this region as a step on the way to understanding the impact of borders more generally. This historical case study focuses on aspects of social and political transformation in the contested borderlands of the Old Northwest, highlighting both the macrolevel strategy of states, which moved to conclude treaties with the indigenous population in order to control the territory and to deploy settlement, and the microlevel accommodations of settlers, traders, corporations and Native American communities. This paper traces the transformation of the Detroit hinterlands, the specific events around the imposition of the border, and the interdependence of community, commerce and the state. This brief historical overview illustrates immediate outcomes of the creation of a border and outlines some of its social, political, economic and legal consequences in the period.

The borderland considered in this paper was known historically as the “Northwest” and later as the “Old Northwest.” The region is bounded on the south by the Ohio River and on the east by Pennsylvania; it stretches north of Lake Erie to Lake Huron and west to the southern portions of Lake Michigan and to the northern reaches of the Mississippi River. Just prior to the imposition of the border in this area, Aboriginal peoples (“First Nations” using the currently standard Canadian term or “Indians” using U.S. terminology¹) led the fight against the extension of settlement into the region from the 13 colonies. The regional Indigenous communities are renowned for the Pontiac rebellion of the early 1760s and for their successful resistance of American military advances into the region during the 1780s and early 1790s.

In 1783, through the Treaty of Paris, a border was imposed across the region by the newly-formed United States and by the British. That division, which was drawn down the center of the Great Lakes waterway, was reconfirmed in the Jay Treaty of 1794. Despite these treaties, control of the borderland region remained in contention for quite some time. Although formally under the control of the U.S., the British held the region hostage pending the settlement of United Empire Loyalists claims against the United States for losses incurred during the Revolutionary War. Throughout this period, neither the British nor the Americans consulted the Native American inhabitants of the region about the imposition of the border, even though the First Nations retained the military capacity to defend their homeland.

*Philips Valentine is Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada. McDougall is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario, Canada.

Sovereign Survival: Borders as Issues

Allan K. McDougall and Lisa Philips Valentine*

***Abstract:** Revisiting the relevance of state borders in a changing world, this paper focuses on the complexities of the intersection of the hegemonic character of the state and its manifestations in issues at the border. Three types of border conflict are presented in this case study: trade and the construction of issues across the Canada-U.S. border, the indirect impact of that state border on social services and social life in the area, and the decreasing significance of statist standards as one approaches its borders. The study uses a typical decision of a quasi judicial agency, the National Transportation Agency, to illustrate the hegemonic practice embedded in the normal practice of statist structures. It concludes with the paradox that the rule of law is crucial to control the exercise of public power and yet the application of legal principles reinforces the ascendancy of hegemonic forces. The border as the hinterland of the state is a liminal zone where these dynamics are especially visible.*

Many authors argue that the state is in decline today and that borders will disappear. This paper offers a reminder of the pervasiveness of state power which is reflected in the significance of its borders. In this study we address two facets of state power, its impact on social life and its structural capacity to perpetuate entrenched interests.¹ A case study of the impact of centrally-created public policy on the hinterlands will place the current discussion of the state border in context as it provides a view of the limits of assumptions by those making policy to order affairs in social contexts which deviate from the assumed norm. Then a detailed review of a typical decision of a regulatory agency will be analyzed to highlight the hegemonic² constructions assumed by agencies in the legal system as they apply that central policy through normal doctrines of interpretation to social and economic situations. Both show that the exercise of statist³ power, although rarely consciously considered by actors in the statist system, is a dynamic process steering society and privileging ascendant interests. The purpose of this paper is to show how agencies performing their normal duties fulfill a hegemonic function and entrench state borders as they do.

Borders are pervasive. Physical borders are those seen as physically dividing one state from another. They are the limit of state jurisdiction. But borders can also circumscribe areas of ecological concern such as the health of the Great Lakes system which spans the Canada-United States border. Or, borders can divide fields of knowledge. The paradigmatic form of technical knowledge has an analogy in cultural contrasts between groups in society as manifested in differing constructions of meaning and values. The gulf between the agendas of First Nations and the majoritarian views of the liberal democratic order in Canada offers one such example. We treat the limits to states, communities or environmental zones as borders. In fields of knowledge, borders are seen as liminal zones where knowledges—or domains of power in a Foucauldian

*McDougall is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario, Canada. Philips Valentine is Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

Economic Integration and Cross-Border Policy Convergence: Social and Environmental Policy in Canadian Provinces and American States

Debora L. VanNijnatten and Gerard W. Boychuk*

***Abstract:** Focusing on social and environmental policy, this paper examines the hypothesis that policy convergence generated by continental economic integration will be greater among specific pairs of tightly-linked American states and Canadian provinces than is evident in national-level comparisons. First, the paper outlines a number of important reasons to expect that provincial governments in Canada are more susceptible than the federal government to pressures for cross-border policy convergence. Second, the paper outlines a methodology for identifying tightly-linked pairs of American states and Canadian provinces based on various measures of geographical proximity and levels of state-province economic integration. Finally, the paper examines patterns of similarity and difference over time in matching state-province pairs with respect to specific aspects of social policy (levels of social protection and income redistribution) and environmental policy (pollution abatement and control). In terms of these indicators, national patterns of convergence/divergence are not fundamentally challenged by sub-national patterns of convergence and divergence. At the same time, patterns of similarity and difference over time for various subsets of matching state and province pairs generally differ in degree, if not in direction, from national-level patterns. However, after 1995, there are some indications of a pattern that fits with the contention that convergence may be occurring at the state-province level which is not evident in national-level patterns.*

The degree to which economic integration constrains the policy latitude of governments to adopt distinctive, domestic policy choices has become an issue of central concern for governments and citizens alike.¹ In Canada, increasing economic integration with the United States over the past two decades has made the relationship between economic integration and policy convergence a pressing issue. While initial analyses tended to link economic integration and policy convergence, the newly emergent conventional wisdom, based on a substantial body of literature, is sceptical of the proposition that deepening economic integration is generating policy convergence across western industrialized countries. (For an overview, see Boychuk and Banting 2003) Existing research examining social and environmental policy in Canada and the United States tends to echo these findings. (Banting 1997a, 1997b; Hoberg, Banting and Simeon 1999; Boychuk 1997, 2000; VanNijnatten 1999.) However, a second more sophisticated wave of convergence arguments is now emerging. (See especially Howlett 2000.)

*VanNijnatten is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. Gerard W. Boychuk is Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

Cascadia: The (Re)Construction of a Bi-National Space and Its Residents

Signe Marie Cold-Ravnkilde, Jaidev Singh and Robert G. Lee*

***Abstract:** This paper aims to demonstrate how globalization and discourses on regional/national identities cannot only create cross-border/regional social spaces but also the criteria to select a transnational elite to occupy the cross-border space reified by interplay of myths and logic. Using the case of Cascadia, we observe a construction of regional social space, taking place along the Pacific Northwest border of U.S. and Canada, through the process of globalization. In this socially constructed region of Cascadia, two often-antagonistic groups are mutually benefiting from each other by creating a unique bi-national space. On one hand, the neo-liberal business community is redefining borders in terms of free trade while on the other hand the environmentalists are redefining borders in terms of eco-systems. However, to create and maintain this regional identity and redefinition of transnational space an effective transportation conduit is required. Because transnational travel requires a high level of governmentality to control the flow of goods and people, the construction of Cascadia and its concomitant transportation corridor, the groups involved simultaneously are creating an “othering” process. Hence, this reconstruction of bi-national space essentially shows how discourses on nationalism and internationalization co-exist, reinforce each other, and are often sub-processes of globalization.*

Introduction

The age of globalization is also the age of nationalist resurgence, expressed both in the challenge to established nation-states and in the widespread (re)construction of identity on the basis of nationality, always affirmed against the alien (Castells 1997: 27).

The concept of globalization has an inherent two-fold definition. On one hand, it refers to an increasing level of global interdependence between national systems by way of trade, military alliances and domination, and the universality of a large shared culture brought about by electronic media, education, literacy, urbanization and modernization. In this sense, globalization has led to an increased level of “global consciousness” (Robertson 1995: 40) and largely the current discourse on globalization has questioned nationalism and the sociological sense of belonging to the nation-state (Robertson 1995: 42). However, this discourse on globalization belongs to the world of the cosmopolitans/the tourists or transnationals (Bauman 1998: 26). For “the others” globalization and the disruption of old established institutions become a threat to their sense of identity and ontological security represented by traditional nation-states (Giddens 1991). The disruption of the former order creates an empty space of meaning

*Cold-Ravnkilde is a graduate student at the Roskilde University Center, Roskilde, Denmark. Singh is Affiliate Assistant Professor at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Robert G. Lee is Professor at the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Emerging Collaborative Frameworks for Environmental Governance in the Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Ecosystem

Donald K. Alper*

***Abstract:** Much of the research on transboundary environmental relations between Canada and the United States has focused on formal institutional arrangements. Yet, recent research on transnational environmental governance points to the vital role played by collective action arrangements centered around ideas, identities and democratic discourse in facilitating progress in cross-border environmental governance. This article argues that environmental governance in the Georgia Basin/Puget Sound ecosystem is best examined utilizing an analytical framework based on three modes of interaction that characterize cross-border environmental activity. The first two modes of interaction—"crisis/reactive" and "state-centered"—are agency centered perspectives emphasizing instrumental behavior. These modes are consistent with the rational choice paradigm. The third mode of interaction—"normative/constructivist"—focuses on norm creation and binational institutionalization processes. This mode emphasizes insights that social constructivism brings to the study of international institutions. The conclusion is that the evolving framework of governance in the Georgia Basin/Puget Sound is increasingly influenced by processes best analyzed by the latter mode, where the actions of non-governmental actors in cooperation with cross-border institutions provide affective and normative orientation to spur collective environmental action and shape transboundary perspectives on current and future issues.*

Introduction and Approach

In recent years, Canadian and U.S. governments and stakeholders have developed numerous partnership mechanisms for dealing with environmental problems in the shared Georgia Basin/Puget Sound bioregion (GB/PS). These arrangements exist at many levels of government—national, supranational, state/provincial and local—and they involve a network of officials, experts and non-governmental actors. The impetus for joint action is the perceived need to improve and maintain both human and ecological well being in a magnificent transboundary ecosystem that is experiencing rapid population growth, urban sprawl and accompanying degradation in water and air quality, destruction of farm land and depletion of fish and wildlife. Specifically, stakeholders of all kinds are committed to identifying and implementing sustainable scenarios for the GB/PS. If the objective facts of environmental deterioration have provided the logic for greater cross-border cooperative efforts, ecological advocates also point to the region as a place that, if managed properly, could point the way for international

*Alper is Director of the Center of Canadian-American Studies and Professor in the Department of Political Science at Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington.

Transborder Cascadia: Opportunities and Obstacles

Patrick J. Smith*

The issue of the continuing significance of borders *within* North America provides a good basis for analysis of changes in—and our understanding of—the nature and impact of national boundaries early in the 21st century. The recent literature on borders runs a gamut from the emergence of “a borderless world” and the end of the nation state (Ohmae 1990/1, 1999) to polycentric redefinitions (Blatter 2001, 2003); from the ‘creeping constitutionalism’ of trade agreements and the weakening of national boundaries by globalization and its neo-liberal non-state bias (McBride 2003; Dittgen 2000; Sharpe 2002; Anderson 2002) to ‘denationalization’ and the need to distinguish ‘territory from territoriality’ (Sassen 2000; Anderson 2003) and to ‘transnationalism’ (O’Dowd 2002); and from ‘borders under stress’ (Martin and Brown 2000; Newman 2000; Blake 2000) and ‘glocalism’ (Harmsworth 2001) to ‘border flexibility’ (O’Dowd 2003) and the (still) continuing significance of nation-state-centric borders (Dittgen 2000).

As many of these recent authors note (for example, Anderson, O’Dowd and Wilson 2002; Blake 2000), one of the best approaches to understanding the potential for shifts in border significance is with case studies. Apart from the ‘re-territorialization’ within the EU and the creation of new national borders over the past decades since the collapse of the Soviet Union and breakup of Yugoslavia, Anderson and colleagues note the “intrinsic value” of borders in their ability to “tell us more about the way the world system is evolving.”¹ This article involves an assessment of the possibility of development of a bi-national, sub-national region, and the significance of—and changes to—pre-existing boundaries between Canada and the United States. Cascadia—in the Pacific Northwest of the continent—offers a real opportunity for such an assessment: it has a long history and it has developed a variety of institutional forms. The question is “What does this Cascadia experience contribute to our understanding of the malleability/rigidity of borders and the continuing significance of nation-state sovereignty and boundaries?”

Border Literature and Cascadia: Recent Queries

The issue of borders has taken on new meaning and importance over the past several decades. Van Houtum has identified “three dominant and influential debates within the studies of borders and border regions:

*Smith is Director of the Institute of Governance Studies and Professor in the Department of Political Science at Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

The author is grateful to the editors and to the two anonymous reviewers of JBS and acknowledges the research assistance of Wendi Postnikoff.

NAFTA, Economic Integration, and the Canadian-American Security Regime in the Post-September 11, 2001 Era: Multi-Level Governance and Transparent Border?

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly*

Abstract: *Did the traumatic event of September 11, 2001 lead the central governments of Canada and the United States to “re-center policy” because their executive roles had to be reaffirmed in matter of security? Or, did free trade and economic integration, in particular, frame the process of functional interdependency to determine the current security regime spanning the Canadian-American border?*

Despite the security threat, functionalist theories imply that cross-border co-operation stems from economic integration. In contrast, the urban political economy literature suggests that intra-regional competition is the key factor, but the security agenda may transform this functional nature of the Canadian-American border. Neo-functionalists might qualify the general functionalist argument by pointing to the importance of supranational institutions and policy spillover suggesting that federal governments would increase co-operation and expand the role of supranational security agencies. The intergovernmentalist approach in international relations, on the contrary, suggests that states protect their frontiers and their monopoly over international links, and thus, enhance border control policies. Finally, because of economic integration and a bicentennial tradition of discreet diplomacy, the security threat may lead to the implementation of a North American multi-level governance border security regime; such a security regime spans the border involving a multitude of agencies of both nations. It comprises the vertical federal intergovernmental networks, but also, the horizontal networks across the international border. The evidence presented in this paper suggests that economic interdependency frames the post 9/11 Canadian-American border security regime, which multi-level governance explains best.

The September 2001 terrorist acts on the United States had tremendous consequences for security policy across North America. One immediate outcome was the closure of the Canadian-American territorial border; the 49th parallel, often called the longest undefended border in the world, was shut down completely. Trucks and cars formed lines, sometimes 25 kilometres long, on either side of the cross-border gates.

As a result of the attacks, a large number of scholars, public commentators, and elected officials, particularly in the United States, argued that a new security policy was needed. Some even suggested the creation of an institutionalized security perimeter that would surround the North American continent. However, when both countries

*Brunet-Jailly is Co-Director of the Local Government Institute, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

The North American Border Cooperation Model: Local Challenges for a Security Agenda

Manuel Chavez*

***Abstract:** The economic integration of North America has deepened with the creation of NAFTA. Border interdependence has created mechanisms that are cementing the mutual interaction that border cities have with each other. Yet, the emerging new policies of U.S. homeland security will require important adjustments in border areas and in the interaction with Mexico and Canada. This essay examines the challenges of border towns in coping with demands related to security and how these issues are presented by their news media. Security policies represent a paradigm shift of border interaction that illustrates that the relationship between the U.S. with Mexico and Canada is entering a new stage of complex interdependence. To ensure proper implementation, Mexico will need to make significant structural adjustments and lessons from the Canada-U.S. relation that may serve as templates are explored.*

Introduction

Borders have always been a critical piece of the national interest of nations. Sharing a frontier is a challenge and an opportunity to build advanced economic, social and political systems. Countries managing active borders recognize that nothing could be more important to their policy making than the understanding of the intricacies of sharing and managing common resources. With this complex matrix, countries that share borders and their management acknowledge the presence and importance of three factors: a) the role and weight of their domestic or national agendas, b) the dynamics of local needs and interests, and c) the weight of international agreements and treaties. At any given time, not all three factors have the same influence on policy making. In fact, border policies in one country may respond to the three factors at a particular moment while the other country may respond to one or two. The difficulty is to ensure that those policies are compatible with the other neighbor's remedies.

Most of the time, international formulations precede federal and local interests, which are contested on a field that is uneven. Usually, the international and the national subordinate the local. Until the first days of September of 2001, that was the format each country in North America operated upon with some degree of similarity. Variations were based on specific federal policies of trade, investment, migration and drug enforcement. Yet, the local is now taking a more prominent role based on the new regulations of homeland security, which in turn will shape the future relationship of border interaction in the years to come. The incorporation of state and local security

*Chavez is Associate Director of the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and Assistant Professor in the School of Journalism at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Instructions for Authors

Submission of Manuscripts

The *JBS* welcomes manuscript submissions from all social science and business disciplines, as well as border-specific manuscripts from other disciplines. The border emphasis is global. Work from any discipline that illuminates border problems, characteristics, issues, and realities in any part of the world is acceptable for manuscript review. It is important that the manuscript deals in a substantive way with the border-related aspects of the topic. It should not just be the results of a study in a border region without significant consideration of transboundary influences and characteristics.

Manuscripts are blind reviewed by at least two qualified readers. Inquiries and manuscripts should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

or

Henk van Houtum (h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde (M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Please submit four (4) copies of the manuscript and a cover letter identifying the author(s), his/her institutional affiliation and academic rank, and the name, address, telephone, fax, and e-mail of the contact person with respect to the submitted manuscript.

The Editors will assume that submission of an article to the *JBS* indicates that the manuscript has not been published elsewhere. If manuscripts are accepted and published, all rights, including subsidiary rights, are assigned to the *JBS*. The author retains the right to use his or her article after it has appeared in the *JBS* without charge for any book or anthology of which she or he is author or editor, and to reproduce copies for classroom or for other noncommercial use.

Notes and comments concerning articles previously published in the *JBS* are also welcome.

Preparation of Copy

All copies must be typed (including indented material, endnotes, and references), double-spaced, and printed on white paper. Number all pages consecutively, including those with tables and endnotes. A separate page clearly identifying and defining all mathematical symbols must be attached. All tables, graphs, and illustrations should be on separate pages. Finished copies of graphs and illustrations should be submitted, both in hard copy and on diskette. Indicate clearly where illustrations should appear in the text. A note in the text in brackets will be sufficient, as in the following example:

[Table 1 about here]

The *JBS* prefers the use of references in parentheses within the text and the use of footnotes and endnotes is discouraged. If necessary, endnotes may be used, but they must appear separately at the end of the text. For word processing programs, the endnotes must not be embedded in the text. *JBS*-preferred styles for references and footnotes are indicated below. For additional questions of style not covered in these *JBS* instructions, authors should consult *The Chicago Manual of Style*, fourteenth edition.

Italicize all foreign words and provide their translation into English. When using acronyms, provide their definitions on the first use in the manuscript, and if in a foreign language, provide the translation.

Authors of articles accepted for publication must provide an electronic version of the work on diskette. WordPerfect is the preferred format, but Microsoft Word and other widely-used software programs are acceptable. The diskette must be clearly marked with the author's name, word processing program and version, as well as the operating system (Mac or IBM compatible).

Please do not use fancy fonts or formatting for manuscripts submitted to the *JBS*. Formatting complexities cause problems with the typesetting software used by the *JBS*. For the body of the text, use Times or Times New Roman, 10 point font. Headings should be in all capitals and bold. Subheadings should be in initial capitals and lower-case. Margins should not exceed 4.75 inches (12.065 centimeters) wide by 8.00 inches (20.320 centimeters) high. All other elements, such as, maps, illustrations, charts and tables should follow the prescribed formats.

Format of Text

All references to monographs, articles, and statistical sources are to be identified at an appropriate point in the text by last name of author, year of publication, and pagination when appropriate—all within parentheses. Be sure that the year and the spelling of the author's name within the parentheses exactly match those in the reference list. Frequently, manuscripts have to be returned a second time to authors because the reference list and the references in the text (including endnotes) do not agree. Frequent problems include the item referenced in the text not appearing in the list of references at the end of the chapter, the year of the citation within the text not agreeing with the year listed in the reference section, inconsistent spelling for authors' names, and failure to include accents and other diacriticals for foreign-language references.

Footnotes are not acceptable, and endnotes are to be used only for substantive observations, not for the purpose of citation. There is no need to use *ibid.*, *op. cit.*, *loc.*

cit., and so forth. Each reference to the same source should appear in exactly the same format with the possible exception of different page numbers indicated.

If the author of a source referred to appears in the text, follow it with the year of the publication in parentheses [according to the work by Peach (1986), the data are inaccurate]. If the author's name does not appear in the text, insert the author's name, year, and pagination (if appropriate) in the text in parentheses [according to some works (Peach 1986: 14–15), the data are inaccurate].

For more than one work published by the same author in the same year, distinguish these by the use of a letter attached to the year of publication in the reference in the text and in the list of references at the end of the article [Peach 1984a, 1984b].

With triple authorship, give the three last names; for more than three, use the last name of the first author and “et al.” For institutional authorship, supply minimum but adequate identification from the beginning of the complete citation that appears in the list of references [occupational data (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1985: 473–75) revealed that]. When several references appear in the same location in the text, enclose in parentheses and separate by semicolons [(Peach 1995a: 41; Smith 1981; García 1996: 14–15) . . .].

Format of References

At the end of the text, after the endnotes (if any), the full listing of all items included as references within parentheses in the text should appear in a section titled References. While the references in the text used only the first author and “et al.,” for works with more than three authors, the reference section should list all authors.

The *JBS* prefers that the full names of authors be used, not just last name and first initial(s). Only book and journal titles should be italicized. For references in foreign languages, please translate parts of the reference such as month, volume, city of publication, and so forth.

Following are some examples of reference formats:

Journal Article—one author

Custred, Glynn. 1995. “Language Boundaries in South America.” *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 10 (Spring): 69–88.

If no issue number, month, or season is used for the journal, use the number of the volume, if available.

Journal Article—two authors

Maillat, Denis, and Gilles Lécho. 1995. “The Franco-Swiss Jura Arc: From Cut-Off to Seam.” *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 10 (Spring): 1–18.

Book

Williams, Edward J., and John T. Passé-Smith. 1992. *The Unionization of the Maquiladora Industry: The Tamaulipan Case in National Context*. San Diego: Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias, San Diego State University.

Article in Edited Book

Simmons, Marc. 1983. "New Mexico-Colorado History." Pp. 42–45 in *Borderlands Sourcebook*, Ellwyn R. Stoddard et al., eds. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Newspaper Article—no author

New York Times. 1990. "The Iron Curtain Rises." (17 February): A3.

Newspaper Article—author

Norman, Michael. 1990. 1990. "The Iron Curtain Rises." *New York Times* (17 February): A3.

Paper Presented at Meetings, Seminars, or Conferences

Author. Year. "Title of Paper." Paper presented at annual meeting of the Association for Borderlands Studies, 21–22 April, City, State.

Unpublished Paper or Manuscript

Marciniak, Edward, and Nancy Jefferson. 1985. "CHA Advisory Committee appointed by Judge Marvin E. Aspin: Final Report" (December). Chicago. Unpublished.

Organization as Author

Task Force for Regional Development in Poland (TFRDP). 1996. *Outline of a Regional Development Strategy for Poland: Final Report*. Warsaw: Task Force Secretariat.

Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development (TCBEED). 1995. *Survey of Border Retailers*. Laredo: Texas A&M International University.

U.S. Government Document

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1986. *Household Net Wealth and Asset Ownership*. Current Population Reports, Series P-70, No. 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1986. *Toxicology Handbook*. Rockville, MD: Government Institutes.

Thesis or Dissertation

Author. Year. "Title of Work." Ph.D. diss., Name of Department, Name of University, City, State, Country.

Author. Year. "Title of Work." Master's thesis, Name of Department, Name of University, City, State, Country.

Internet Document

When referencing sources of information found on the internet, please include sufficient information so that other researchers can easily locate the materials.

For example:

Kameras, David. 1996. "NAFTA Hearing Exposes Sprint." AFL-CIO News (cited 8 March), www.aflcio.org/newsonline.

Interview by Author

When referencing interviews conducted by the author that are not published or broadcast, the following format should be used: Last name of interviewee, first name. Year. Interview by author. Tape (video) recording [if applicable]. City, State (Day Month).

For example:

Alexander, Robin. 1966. Telephone interview by author. San Bernardino, Cal. (12 February).

Personal Communications

Personal communications to the author should be formatted as follows: Last name of person with whom author communicated, first name. Year. Telephone conversation, conversation, or letter with/to author. City, State (Day Month).

For example:

Nickey, Laurence N. 1991. Conversation with author. El Paso, Texas (21 June).

Format of Tables, Graphs, Charts, Maps, and Other Illustrations

Authors may include illustrations in non-standardized format with initial manuscript submissions to the *JBS*. Once a manuscript is accepted by the editors for publication, it is the responsibility of authors to submit all illustrations in the proper format and in electronic form. Authors may wish to provide illustrations to *JBS* specifications at the time of original submission of the manuscript in order to avoid later revisions and delays. Provide a printed sample for verification.

If authors do not or cannot provide camera-ready illustrations, the *JBS* will have these prepared and will bill the author for the cost of their production. The cost of a fairly simple full-page map, for example, would be approximately US\$40.00; a full-page table would be approximately US\$50.00.

Size

All illustrations, including legends and notes, must fit within a frame that is 4.75 inches (12.065 centimeters) wide by 7.75 inches (19.685 centimeters) high. Tables that are wide or long (landscape format) must be restricted to 7.75 maximum width. Tables that are longer than 4.75 inches will carry over to the following page(s).

Fonts

The preferred font for illustrations is Helvetica and 8 point. Arial is a fairly close equivalent. Legends should be in Helvetica and 8 point.

Frames

Illustrations should not be enclosed frames. Any need for framing will be determined by the production editor.

Titles and Legends

Tables should be titled and numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. The titles or legends should be in Helvetica, 8 point, bold, and in initial capitals and lowercase.

Punctuation should be as in the following example:

Table 1. Per Capita Income in Border Counties

All other illustrations (maps, diagrams, charts, and graphs) should be labeled as “Figure” and numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals.

For example:

Figure 1. The Russian-Finnish Border Region

The legend or title should be located at the top of the illustration and centered. The legend typeface should be Helvetica, 8 point, and bold.

Hard Copies and Electronic Copies

Authors should submit hard copies of illustrations printed on separate sheets of white paper and not integrated into the text. In addition, an electronic file on diskette must be provided for the illustration and clearly marked with author, manuscript title, software and version, and operating system. Occasionally the *JBS* staff is able to make

minor corrections to illustrations without returning the material to the author for revisions.

For More Information Regarding Illustrations

For more information with regard to illustration requirements and format, contact *JBS* Production Editor Baldomero Garcia (baldogarcia@tamiu.edu). Please review illustrations in recent issues of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies* for examples.

Spelling

Our spelling authority is Webster's Third New International Dictionary. The Editors assume that all manuscripts have been proofed for errors, spelling accuracy, and consistency prior to submission. In addition, it is important that authors determine the proper use of accents and diacriticals and use these consistently in their manuscripts.

Languages

The *JBS* accepts manuscripts in English only.

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* (*JBS*) is sponsored by the Association for Borderlands Studies. The *JBS* is published in the spring and fall of each year.

Individual annual membership dues for the Association for Borderlands Studies are \$35. Student membership dues are \$20. Dues include a subscription to the *JBS*. Membership dues should be sent to:

Stephen R. Elliott
Executive Secretary, Association for Borderlands Studies
TransBorder Institute
University of San Diego
5998 Alcala Park
San Diego, CA 92110

www.absborderlands.org

Library subscriptions to the *JBS* are \$25. Library subscriptions should be sent to:

Journal of Borderlands Studies
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78040-1900

Manuscripts submitted for consideration are welcome. For manuscript preparation, please consult "Instructions for Authors" at:

www.absborderlands.org/jbs/jbsmascriptstyle.htm

Manuscripts or inquiries should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

or

Henk van Houtum (h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde (M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Manuscripts with a clear geographical focus on the Americas should be sent to J. Michael Patrick, whereas the ones with a European or Near Eastern focus (including North Africa) should be sent to Henk van Houtum and Martin van der Velde. Other manuscripts can be sent to either address.

Borderlands