

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 21 No. 1
Spring 2006

Special Issue
Security and Borders

Volume 21 No. 1

Spring 2006

Journal of
Borderlands
Studies

Borderlands

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

Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
The Netherlands

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

Assistant to the Production Editor: Jose Molina, Jr. (Texas A&M International University)

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 21 • No. 1 • Spring 2006

Contents

Security and Borders	1
Security and Border Security Policies: Perimeter or Smart Border? A Comparison of the European Union and Canadian-American Border Security Regimes Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly	3
Rethinking the North American Frontier After 9/11 Stuart Farson	23
The Canada-U.S. Border After September 11th: The Politics of Risk Constructed Heather Nicol	47
International Migration, Border Controls and Human Rights: Assessing the Relevance of a Right to Mobility Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire	69
Security and Borders in a Digital Age: Implications for Canadian Government and North American Governance Jeffrey Roy	87
Book Reviews	
As Borders Bend: Transnational Spaces on the Pacific Rim by Xiangming Chen	109
Changing National Identities at the Frontier: Texas and New Mexico, 1800-1850 by Andrés Reséndez	113
Borders and Border Politics in a Globalizing World by Paul Ganster and David E. Lorey (eds.)	117
Instructions for Authors	125

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 Polkinhom
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 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, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Terms for 2004-2007

Sergio Peña Medina, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas

Kimberly Collins, San Deigo State University-Imperial Valley, Calexico, California

Henk van Houtum, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Terms for 2005-2008

Donna Lydecker, Penn State University-Altoona, Altoona, Pennsylvania

Raul Saba, Center for Latin American Studies, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona

Lawrence Taylor, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana, México

Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies (2006-2007)

President:	Christopher Brown New Mexico State University
President Elect:	Manuel Chavez Michigan State University
Executive Secretary:	Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada
Immediate Past President:	Irasema Coronado University of Texas at El Paso

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)
Radboud 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/jbsmascriptstyle.htm

Authors' Contact Information

Security and Border Security Policies: Perimeter or Smart Border? A Comparison of the European Union and Canadian-American Border Security Regimes

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

Rethinking the North American Frontier After 9/11

Stuart Farson
Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada
e-mail: farson@sfu.ca

The Canada-U.S. Border after September 11th: The Politics of Risk Constructed

Heather Nicol
University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia
e-mail: hnicol@westga.edu

International Migration, Border Controls and Human Rights: Assessing the Relevance of a Right to Mobility

Antoin Pécoud
International Migration Section, UNESCO, Paris, France
e-mail: a.pecoud@unesco.org

Security and Borders in a Digital Age: Implications for Canadian Government and North American Governance

Jeffrey Roy
Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
e-mail: roy@dal.ca

Security and Borders

From the Guest Editor

Since the September 11th attack on New York and Washington, D.C., border security has been high on the public policy agendas of European and North American states. Governments and security agencies are now confronted with an almost impossible task: to cooperate in order to find the “needles” (the dangerous substances and individuals) “in the haystacks” (the millions of goods and people that flow across air, sea and land border gates daily).

It is also clear that the events of 9/11 have transformed our perception of the function of borders. Since then, borders and border security have certainly become more popular subjects of study. This renewed academic interest was evidenced by the fact that the 2005 meetings of both the Border Region in Transition, a European network of scholars, and the U.S.-based Association of Borderland Studies, held, respectively, in Jerusalem, Israel, and in Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A., had panels on borders and security. In a follow up to these panels, the Local Government Institute and the Center of Public Sector Studies at the University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, invited twenty-five scholars from seven different North American and European countries to discuss their research on borders and security. It was at this workshop, held on December 2-4, 2005, that the possibility of this special number emerged.

In the post September 11 era, immigration, security, and borders have become central themes of the world’s economic and technological globalization; globalization being understood here as the relative increase in trade across continents, an activity that has been increasing five fold since 1985 (from about 2 trillion U.S. dollars to about 10 trillions U.S. dollars in 2005). Also, because it is tightly related to an overall increase in immigration flows from southern to northern countries, globalization, and immigration have greatly impacted borders and concurrent treatment of immigration and security concerns along border gates. These are now increasingly a focus of scholarship.

As noted by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, immigration to OECD members-states increased to about 60 million immigrants, including legal, illegal, and asylum seekers, between 1990 and 2000. In some instances, this is a welcome flow of skilled labor necessary in most OECD countries. In many other instances however, as argued in the volume by Nicol citing Beck, this labor flow is also a “risky” proposition. Hence, the increasingly specific views that address, sometimes bluntly, the need to progressively implement complex and sophisticated border policies that will protect northern countries from “undesirable” southern immigration.

Clearly, 9/11 dramatically increased the complexity and difficulty of border security policies to prevent terrorism, as discussed by Brunet-Jailly and Farson. Since the terrorist attack on New York, border security officials are required to find the very few—statistically insignificant, but highly dangerous individuals - that cross borders, along with the millions of migrants that travel yearly. This special issue contains five papers that look at different facets of those themes from a particularly Canadian and North American perspective.

In “Security and Border Security Policies: Perimeter or Smart Borders—A Comparison of the European Union and Canadian-American Border Security Regimes,” Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly compares the border-security model in place in the European Union, a border perimeter, with the Smart Border Agreement in place on the Canada-U.S. border. Brunet-Jailly finds these systems vastly different, notably that perimeter security is considerably less expensive. Europeans are functionalists that find economies of scale in pan-European security partnerships on borders, security, and prevention policies; in North America, border security is a policy exercise of multilevel governance that involves a multitude of government agencies working together to implement security.

Stuart Farson, in “Rethinking the North American Frontier after 9/11,” argues that borders are not only in a constant state of flux, but that they must also be understood as multidimensional and multifaceted as well as multi-spatial and temporally layered.

Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire, in “International Migration, Border Controls and Human Rights: Assessing the Relevance of a Right to Mobility,” discuss the difficult question of the “right to mobility.” Pécoud and Guchteneire argue that border policies limit migration to a large extent but fail to attain their complete goals in large part because of the myriad traffic flows that arise to answer the demands for greater migration.

The paper by Heather Nicol questions the nature of Canada and the United States in view of their reactions to the events of 9/11. In “The Canada-U.S. Border after September 11th: The Politics of Risk Constructed,” Nicol suggests that Canada and the U.S. may be seen as old-fashioned nation-states facing a newly constructed “risk society.” Their policy answers to 9/11 have been consistent with their historical narratives of nationhood in which Canada is highly dependent on trade and the U.S. on the security within its frontiers.

The last paper of this special issue is by Jeffrey Roy. In “Security and Borders in a Digital Age: Implications for Canadian Government and North American Governance,” Roy presents the very complex issues of security and border security in the digital age. His work suggests that in an era of increased security needs, governments are confronted with (1) issues of secrecy and hierarchy that are not only under growing pressure due to the openness and transparency required of governments but also contrary to the traditions of security agencies and (2) complex issues of governance resulting from trans-regional, transnational, and international governance architectures designed to manage interdependencies.

This project would not have been possible without the support of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, the Canadian Social Science and Humanities Research Council, the European Commission, the University of Victoria European Union Center and Global Studies Institute, the Jean Monnet Chair and Professor Amy Verdun, and the University of Victoria Center for Public Sector Studies.

Furthermore, as guest editor, I would like to thank Martin van der Velde and J. Michael Patrick, co-editors of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, for their editorial mastery, and all the referees for their invaluable and generous comments.

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly,
Guest Editor, *Journal of Borderlands Studies*
University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada
May 2006

Security and Border Security Policies: Perimeter or Smart Border? A Comparison of the European Union and Canadian-American Border Security Regimes

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly*

Abstract: *Did the traumatic act of September 11, 2001, lead European and North American governments to reconsider their security regimes and their border security policies in particular? Canada and the United States brokered the Smart Border Agreement while the European Union member-states elected to work together to build an area of freedom, security and justice. As both of these free trade regimes increasingly integrated, security costs also increased. The European Union abolished borders between member-states in order to concentrate resources on external borders and co-operate on security issues. In North America, each state reinvested in border security and increased co-operation.*

Functionalists and neo-functionalists would suggest that supranational institutions permit states to establish an effective border security perimeter strategy. However, issues of sovereignty may frustrate such views, and realist or multilevel governance approaches might predict more accurately how states reorganize their border security regimes. In this paper, the argument is made that neo-functionalism best explains the European strategy, whereas the multilevel governance approach best explains the Canada-U.S. strategies. Ultimately, however, this paper documents that sovereignty has a cost.

Introduction

Since September 11, 2001, and the subsequent bombing on March 11, 2004, of Madrid's Atocha train station, security and border security policies in Canada, the United States, and across the European Union (EU) have become renewed areas of co-operation and investment.

After 9/11, a large number of scholars, public commentators, and elected officials in Canada and the U.S. contended that borders were porous and that security measures had to be taken. Some suggested the establishment of a security perimeter; others argued that only national policies could address the security issues of sovereign states. In December 2001, Canada and the U.S. signed the Smart Border Declaration, which reaffirmed a well-established tradition of bilateral co-operation as well as the fundamental shared view that Canadian-American problems can always be dealt with through common functional and technical approaches. Since its inception, the declaration's

*Brunet-Jailly is Assistant Professor in the School of Public Administration and Co-Director of the Local Government Institute at the University of Victoria in Victoria, Canada.

Rethinking the North American Frontier After 9/11

Stuart Farson*

Abstract: *This paper is primarily concerned with changes to the border dividing Canada from the U.S. after 9/11. Two arguments are made: that these changes were sufficiently profound to warrant a re-conceptualization of what constitutes a border and how it operates; and that for Canadians, border relations with the U.S. have become a highly complex, multifaceted business managed both horizontally and vertically by a full range of governments and their various departments on both sides of the border. In policy terms, the line drawn to distinguish foreign from domestic policy has become decidedly blurred, melding into what some have called the “intermestic.” In order to understand these changes, it is necessary to contextualize them. The method chosen is to begin by examining the changes that occurred in Europe and North America in the period after the cold war, with an emphasis on matters such as the process of democratization, the significance of peace dividends, new security paradigms, the forces of globalization, distinctions between internal and external borders, and migration. This is followed by an analysis of the period after 9/11 through three lenses: changing values, perceptions of the threat, and new policies and structures. In the first case, the goal is to contribute in a small way to the old debate over divergence or convergence between Canada and the U.S.; in the second, it is to explore the possibility that the U.S. and Canada came to quite different conclusions about the threat posed by al-Qaeda to the West. The goal of the third part is to suggest what the key changes to the structure of government portend—whether they truly represent breaks from the past and have broader implications for the development of security, intelligence, and foreign policy. By way of a conclusion, the means by which developments along the Canada-U.S. border might lead to a broader re-conceptualization of borders are suggested.*

Introduction

Borders, it may be argued, are in a continuous state of flux. That is not to imply simply that maps defining country boundaries are continually being redrawn although that is often the case. Rather, it is to suggest that the ideas, policies, and structures that underpin border operations are constantly changing. In some instances, such changes may be relatively minor and largely go unnoticed; in others, they may portend shifts of very significant proportions.

*Farson is Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science at Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

*Aspects of this paper were first presented at two conferences: “Brave New World? Understanding Global Security Challenges, Reforming National Security Practices,” 20th Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Security and Intelligence Studies, Ottawa, 20-22 October 2005 and “European Union and North American Border Security Policies in Comparative Perspective,” School of Public Administration, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C. 2-3 December, 2005. The author wishes to thank participants for their constructive comments. Some of the ideas first appeared in “From ‘49th Parallel’ to ‘Security Perimeter’: Changing Conceptions, Values and Structures along the U.S. Border, in James J.F. Forest (ed.), *Homeland Security: Protecting America’s Targets*, Volume 1: *Borders and Points of Entry* (Praeger Security International: Westport, 2006).*

The Canada-U.S. Border After September 11th: The Politics of Risk Constructed

Heather Nicol*

***Abstract:** Many significant changes have occurred in North American security and border management since September 11, 2001. There has been much speculation about how Canada-U.S. relations will change, as well as the broader issue of what this means for North American regionalism economic integration and transnationalism. This chapter suggests that if we are to find the answers to these questions, we need to appreciate the context in which security, border management and transnational cooperation has evolved in North America in recent times. We also need to appreciate that the final outcome will not be solely the result of U.S. decision-making, but will involve negotiating consensus and cooperation with its neighbors in order to manage the risks posed by closed or open borders. The way in which security risk is constructed, politicized and publicly discussed is instrumental in maintaining the border and in setting the tone for border management. So also are issues such as technological application, identity politics and historical nationalisms, institutional capacity for transnationalism.*

Introduction

As the European Union (EU) proceeds toward greater levels of economic, cultural, and political integration, some scholars have remained skeptical of the ability of North American nations to follow suit.¹ The “Good Old-Fashioned Nation States of North America” remain an anathema to the re-territorializing effects of globalization witnessed elsewhere in post-industrial countries. Although North America is the point of origin of many of the current economic, political, and cultural forces propelling the global economy, it remains somewhat impervious to globalizing interpenetration. A case in point is the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); although successfully negotiated between Canada, the United States, and Mexico, it remains incomplete in its potential to effect substantive economic integration or even to resolve the most pressing questions of North American integration and security in the twenty-first century. The recent resolution of the Canada-U.S. softwood lumber dispute, for example, was protracted and although resolved, still requires some additional negotiation concerning details. Many more pressing issues now revolve around confidence in the ability of economic integration measures to protect North American populations from undocumented immigration and the penetration of terrorists. In this sense, NAFTA has not been an institutional vehicle for transnationalism. Rather, integration under the NAFTA has been a desired outcome as its various sectoral agreements encourage but do not necessarily facilitate transnationalism.

*Nicol is Associate Professor in the Department of Geosciences at the University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia.

International Migration, Border Controls and Human Rights: Assessing the Relevance of a Right to Mobility

Antoine Pécoud and Paul de Guchteneire*

***Abstract:** This article discusses the arguments in favor of and against a right to mobility. It argues that contemporary migration and border policies are largely restrictive but still fail to meet their proclaimed objectives which call for alternative approaches to international human flows. From a human rights perspective, tight border controls are accompanied by major challenges; including trafficking, the asylum crisis, and the death and vulnerability of irregular migrants; which ultimately threaten the moral foundations of liberal democracies. In this context, a right to mobility may constitute a relevant answer and the article examines the implications of such a right in terms of world justice, social cohesion, economic wealth, security, and border/migration governance.*

Introduction

Is it possible to envisage a right to mobility? According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 13-2), “Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.” But if the right to emigrate is acknowledged, what about the corresponding right to immigrate? This question is of particular relevance because contemporary migration policies are increasingly characterized by a restrictive spirit that makes international mobility problematic. While skilled workers circulate quite easily, those who do not belong to this elite have little access to migration opportunities, at least within a legal framework. In the meantime, globalization has increased the mobility of capital, information, goods and even services, thus making the non-liberalization of human mobility the exception rather than the rule.

These diverging patterns in international mobility take place in a context characterized by the contestation of this order by irregular migration flows and by receiving states’ attempts to stop them. This article argues that this dynamic leads to important human rights challenges that are yet to be fully acknowledged. It suggests that a possible rights-based answer to the challenges of migration lies in the elaboration of a right to mobility, and it examines some of the implications of this approach, including its relationship to issues such as world justice, social cohesion, economic wealth, security, and migration governance.

*Pécoud is Program Specialist with the International Migrations and Multicultural Policies Section in the Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy at UNESCO in Paris, France. De Guchteneire is Chief of Section of the International Migrations and Multicultural Policies Section in the Division of Social Sciences, Research and Policy at UNESCO in Paris, France.

Security and Borders in a Digital Age: Implications for Canadian Government and North American Governance

Jeffrey Roy*

***Abstract:** A central influence on the Canada—United States (U.S.) border today is post-9-11 security. A related influence is the growing prominence of the Internet and information and communications technologies (IT). This heightened digital interdependence, intertwined with global commerce and finance, also translates into the need for concerted political action—calling into question an exclusive notion of borders as boundaries of independence. This new nexus between security and digital technology may transform the meaning and governance of national borders. Alternatively, this nexus could also reinforce much that is traditional about bilateral politics and policies and thus, the preservation and management of national borders. A key argument of this article is that much depends on their usage by both governments and all sectors (including citizenries) and whether the pursuit of security reinforces national insularity and secrecy—or instead promotes an openness that can help facilitate cross-border dialogue and shared governance.*

Introduction

For Canada, the strategic importance of interrelations with its southern neighbor, the United States, is hardly a novel topic. The border separating these two countries had been the focus of both armed conflict and free-trade negotiations even prior to the formalization of Canadian sovereignty in 1867. Subsequent to this date, a major tenet of Canada's first national development plan comprised tariff walls, an approach in keeping with nineteenth-century protectionism and the efforts of the first prime minister to cultivate a strong national identity, both economically and politically, clearly distinguishable from that of the U.S. (Laxer 2003).

The dawn of the twenty-first century finds much that is similar in today's circumstances: ongoing frictions with the U.S. over trade issues such as beef and softwood lumber and Canadian political leaders asserting Canada's interests in a forceful tone. Political historians would point out that with a federal election looming in the near future a bolstered stance on the part of the Canadian government is neither surprising nor coincidental. Despite expectations in some quarters that former Liberal Prime Minister Paul Martin would seek a warmer and more collaborative tone with the U.S. (than was the case under his predecessor Jean Chrétien); such a shift was not forthcoming.

Yet, there are three unique and important aspects of today's political context surrounding the Canada-U.S. border. First, on softwood lumber in particular, the issue goes beyond mere assertions of outright sovereignty to include fairness and respect for

*Roy is Associate Professor in the School of Public Administration at Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Book Review

As Borders Bend: Transnational Spaces on the Pacific Rim

by Xiangming Chen
Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield (2005)

Reviewed by Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly*

As Borders Bend, by Xianming Chen, is probably one of the most significant contributions to the field of border region studies of the last few years. In this resourceful book, Chen details three large trans-border sub-regions of the western Pacific Rim, and then compares them to four other South Asian cases and more general observations made on trans-border regions in the European Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement. Going beyond the borderless-world argument, the author argues that borders have become more permeable but that a process of de-bordering and re-bordering is taking place. His case studies show that the impact of the economic logic linking local economies across trans-border regions and the global economy is uneven. His observations of territorial rescaling and of de-centered state power seem to suggest marginal reconfigurations of central state power. Yet, his work shows that trans-national spaces arise where social capital does not fit into the legal boundary lines of states. His statement reminds the reader of Fernand Braudel's claim regarding the permanence, endurance, and resilience of cultural and ethnic ties that bring together economic activities and social capital across international borders. In addition to social capital ties, the author's model suggest a dynamic model of analysis of the bordering process where the culture, the market economy, governments, and transportation infrastructures are critical to creating and maintaining new transnational spaces; trans-border regions.

Overall, Chen depicts trans-border regions as constituting new transnational spaces and governance challenges; in this new environment, ethnic groups, private actors, as well as non-governmental organizations are important partners to local and regional governments who also must confront the traditional authority of central governments. In fact, in the new governance of trans-national regions, central governments have retreated to being only one of many actors with influence although still holding a relatively central place.

*Brunet-Jailly is Assistant Professor in the School of Public Administration and Co-Director of the Local Government Institute at the University of Victoria in Victoria, Canada.

Three themes organize this book: Part one focuses on bending borders and emerging transnational spaces; part two discusses diversity among cases; and in part three the author compares cases, generalizes, and concludes.

Chapter one focuses on trans-border dynamics and globalization in the Asia-Pacific region. Chapter two conceptualizes trans-border sub-regions, and chapter three suggests an integrated and analytical framework. In part two, Chen introduces the three central case studies of this work. Chapter four focuses particularly on the great south-east China sub-region of Hong Kong, Shengzhen, Fujian, and Taiwan. According to Chen, this may very well be a prototypical trans-border sub-region where, according to his model, the global-local (1) economic nexus demonstrates trans-regional synergies, themselves reinforced by local government officials amenable to investors, and (2) the existence of strong social network testimony of social capital and effective infrastructures. This case study seems to demonstrate the effectiveness of his model as each dimension reinforces and clarifies the other.

Chapter five centers on the Bohai/Yellow sea sub-region; it comprises southern Japan, parts of South and North Korea, and China. This is the case study of a trans-border sub-region in the making. It does not have the scope or sustained economic complementarities of his first case study but similar economic flows. All three states have decentralized to local and regional governments for a variety of reasons, including internal, and thus, this region appears to be subjected to more heterogeneous decentralization pressures than the Hong Kong region. The impact of social capital is much more limited, but sea and air transportation links are sustaining frequent and efficient interactions across the trans-border region.

Chapter six discusses the great Tumen sub-region that links North Korean, Chinese and Russian ports of Sonbong, Khasan and Vladivostok, respectively, to Japan and South Korea. Chen's research here reveals a trans-border sub-region that is lagging behind its counterparts in other regions of the world and one where natural resources do not make up for limited economic and spatial integration. In essence, this region is economically underdeveloped. Internal tensions stall the interaction of competitive advantages, such as lower labor costs; and social networks, despite strong evidence of their existence, seem unable to bridge the economic communities across the trans-border region. As this case study indicates, there is ample evidence that challenges Chen's harmonious hypothesis of the growth of trans-border sub-region.

Part three compares these three case studies to others in Asia, Europe, and North America. Chen compares his three main case studies to four other Asian cases in chapter seven and to European and North American examples in chapter eight. Chen's first three case studies and findings are further tested both in chapter 7 and 8 where he presents evidence that "any or all four sets of factors could matter to the formation and development of a trans-border sub-region." Yet, one factor seems more important than any other: strong economic links and competitive advantage synergies. He concludes, "the addition of any or all of the favorable political, socio-cultural, and infrastructure factors would only increase the chance of success cumulatively." And furthermore, when looking at European and NAFTA borderlands, Chen finds that central state action is an important factor in order to understand trans-border region formations, and that social and transportation networks only help refine our understanding of form, scale, and the outcome of trans-border regions and integration.

The author's original contribution is a synthetic analytical model that hypothesizes that trans-border sub-regions result from the harmonious strengthening of relations at

four analytical levels: the global-local economic nexus, de-centering the state, social capital, and finally, proximity—transportation. This model assumes that relations of interactions among all four levels are either harmonious or incompatible, and consequently, influence, favorably or not, the formation and expansion of trans-border sub-regions. Despite the originality and strength of his model, his overwhelming reliance and focus on economic linkages and different levels of analysis may be open for contention; however, this is a book for graduate students and border scholars that will be discussed in future works on trans-border regions and will impact our understanding of their transformations.

Book Review

Changing National Identities at the Frontier: Texas and New Mexico, 1800-1850

by Andrés Reséndez
New York: Cambridge University Press (2005).

Reviewed by Oscar J. Martínez*

During the period examined in this book, Mexico lost the northern half of its territories to the United States. The process began with the infiltration of European Americans into Texas, New Mexico, and California in the early nineteenth century when these provinces still formed part of Spain. Immigration increased after 1821 once newly-independent Mexico, desirous of populating and developing that part of the country, allowed more foreigners to establish colonies, especially in Texas. That province subsequently witnessed a flood of mostly illegal European American immigration, and by 1830 foreigners greatly outnumbered the local Mexicans. The newcomers, contemptuous of Mexico, capitalized on already existing political tensions between *tejanos* and the central government in Mexico City to successfully lead a movement for total independence. With the participation of some Mexicans, they gave birth to the Republic of Texas in 1836. Almost a decade later, Texas became part of the United States through annexation. While Mexico did not recognize the new republic, the subsequent U.S. conquest of the Southwest during the war of 1846-1848 confirmed the status of Texas as a permanent state in the union. New Mexico, Arizona, California, and other former Mexican territories also became part of the United States as a result of the war.

The major argument in this book is that, in the case of Texas and New Mexico, a pivotal political identity change took place among resident Mexicans that had an important bearing in connection with the U.S. takeover. One part of the identity change stemmed from an erosion of loyalty toward Mexico that occurred among sectors of the *tejano* and *nuevomexicano* population triggered by the seizure of the Mexican government by centralists who diminished the autonomy of Texas (and the other provinces that constituted the Mexican republic). The other part was driven by a simultaneous growing orientation toward the United States, a condition brought about by benefits that *tejanos* and *nuevomexicanos* derived from increased interaction with the U.S. economy.

Oscar J. Martínez is Professor of History in the History Department at the University of Arizona.

Reséndez does an excellent job of showing the disaffection with Mexico's central government and the growing ties with the United States. He succeeds in painting the complex picture that unfolded among frontier Mexicans exposed to competing political, economic, cultural, ethnic, and racial forces during a time of rapid change that would ultimately result in the creation of new national boundaries.

Reséndez strongly suggests that the destabilizing pressures from Mexico's interior and the economic magnetism from the United States were as significant as U.S. expansionism itself as causes of Mexico's loss of its northern frontier. He describes these influences as "tsunami-like structural forces [that] swept through this frontier" (3). In Reséndez's view, these forces washed away the desires of many frontier Mexican leaders and ordinary people to remain subjects of Mexico.

However, I would argue that the identity re-orientations can hardly be considered in the same category as the monstrous tsunami that swallowed up the Mexican northern frontier—the U.S. military territorial conquest. The forces emphasized by Reséndez were mini-tsunamis at best, and these played themselves out on side stages. The overpowering U.S. aggression of the period is the only force that belongs on center stage in explaining border alterations.

I found trying the author's insistence that his interpretations were more "nuanced" and "sophisticated" than that of "simplistic" scholars who have preceded him. "Traditional histories of the U.S. Mexico borderlands," he writes, "have tended to assume that frontier residents had clear national loyalties" (264). Yet Reséndez gives no examples of the guilty parties. Reséndez is not the first historian to point out that divided loyalties existed among Mexicans in Texas, New Mexico, and California. There are scholars who have ignored the topic or glossed over it, but serious historians in both Mexico and in the United States have long recognized the relevance of the issues discussed in this book. Reséndez's real contribution to borderlands historiography lies not in identifying or discovering the ambivalence felt by frontier Mexicans, but in elaborating on that theme. The publication of this book now makes the story more complete, and that is good.

In the end, one wishes that Reséndez had better control over his tendency to claim more than the evidence supports. For instance, to illustrate opposition to Mexican fiscal and immigration policies, he points out that Mexican leaders in Texas advocated an open border with the United States. To be sure merchants and politicians who benefited from interactions with foreigners were expected to feel that way. But Reséndez contends, without citing data, that a *majority* (my emphasis) of *tejano* leaders supported a "porous border" (29). In addition, he strongly implies that not only *tejano* leaders, but the masses, desired more European Americans in their midst and were mentally ready to drift away from Mexico. He devotes space to *tejanos* who backed Texas succession but largely ignores those who fought against it or the many migrants who sought refuge in Mexico during the rebellion. The tragic story of prominent *tejano* leader Juan Seguín, who came to regret his involvement in the European American-led Texas insurrection of the 1830s enough to switch sides back to Mexico during the 1840s, is strangely missing from this book. Only his picture is included.

Reséndez's propensity to exaggerate is further illustrated in his elevation of the influx of foreign products into the Mexican frontier to the level of an "economic revolution" or "market revolution." The implication is that the foreign products that were imported and the attendant interaction with European Americans had a major transformational effect on Mexicans. That may be true for some of the elite Mexicans who

could afford such goods and who developed close ties with the foreigners, but certainly not for the masses. In reality, relatively few *tejanos* and *nuevomexicanos* consumed U.S. products or had substantive links with European Americans. A “revolution”? Hardly.

Despite the misgivings mentioned above, others of lesser import not expressed, and the pretentiousness of the author, this book has plenty to offer. It provides much new and interesting information about life in Texas and New Mexico during a crucial period in history. Its insights are worth contemplating. But I admonish that it be read with caution.

Book Review

Borders and Border Politics in a Globalizing World

by Paul Ganster and David E. Lorey (eds.)
The World Beat Series No. 5, Latham: SR Books (2005)

Reviewed by Heather Nicol*

This book begins with the question “Is there a tension between globalization and the continued pervasiveness of borders that will result in their fading over time? Or will border regions, with their social and political complexities and stresses, be a defining feature of our more globalized world?” While this is an updated version of the “borderless world” question, with which political geographers struggled throughout much of the last decade, the editors of this book suggest, and not without foundation, that there is a permanency to the question. Indeed, this seems to be the intent of this volume, which includes a series of nineteen essays, all previously published, written over a period of approximately twenty years. Each essay asks how the specific border came to be, how it relates to the larger world, and how it has changed and adapted over time. Each essay made an important contribution to the conceptual and actual study of borders over the past two decades, and each essay suggests that borders have become paradoxical, their contradictions and complexities revealed through the process of situating them in time and space. The case studies have been chosen to represent the major challenges to the understanding of human interactions along the border and within borderlands—be they national or interethnic boundaries.

The volume is divided into seven sections that address borders as barriers; border migrants and refugees; borders and partitioned groups; border perceptions and culture; borders and the environment; border goods and services; and the new frontiers of maritime and space borders. In the first section of the book, the historical case studies all draw attention to the concept of walls and functional borders designed for military purposes and yet serving as the focus of border community—which means exploring how walls have functioned as borders over time. The first chapter, for example, is an examination of Hadrian’s Wall, a historical fortification which at one point extended across the northern frontier of the Roman Empire A.D. 122-126 in what is now Great Britain. The wall was not so much a line but a place where frontier society evolved in a distinctive way marked by the function of the wall itself. A “wall” is also the subject of Chen Dalin’s chapter on the Great Wall of China. The Great Wall is again a historical

*Nicol is Associate Professor in the Department of Geosciences at the University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia.

example of the development of a well-defined border within the ancient world. It was, in fact, a series of walls for defensive purposes. Its objective was to protect from that which posed a threat to the Chinese state or to create the defensive conditions for peaceful coexistence if possible. Indeed, Dalin argues that the Great Wall “was simply the major military defense system of ancient China, and it was never considered anything else.” In his discussion of the Berlin Wall, Baker goes a step farther, however, and draws attention to the contested meaning of walls and to the very essence of the idea of a wall itself: as symbol, wall as marker, and wall as functional boundary between two distinct societies. Like Dalin and Wilkes, Baker suggests that there was no such thing as a “wall” but rather a series of walls, of consolidated boundaries given meaning and coherence by state-centered or perhaps even civilizational projects such as “containment.” But the point is not lost that the fall of the wall, rather than the wall itself, has also had significance—perhaps even greater significance than when the wall was in place. Similar to Dalin and Wilkes, Baker draws attention to the larger political and economic context in which territorial space was bordered by the Berlin Wall. Intimately tied to the division between a command and capitalist economy, the wall gave way to pressures which were themselves political and economic.

If the first part of the book explored walls as barriers, the second part explores movement across barriers—migration and flows across borders that create transnational spaces. In *Sahuayo, Mexico, and its U.S. Colonies* David Fitzgerald considers specific U.S. locations to be economic colonies of Sahuayo, Mexico, since the latter has been a longstanding center for out-migration to Chicago and Texas and later to Santa Ana and other locations in California. It is the network, especially the network organized around church, fiestas, and festivals, which comprises the inherent glue which ties the community together—not across a frontier zone per se but across community to colony.

Along these same lines, David McDonald, Lovemore Zinyama, John Gay, Fion de Vletter, and Robert Mattes discuss current migration patterns in South Africa—namely migration from Lesotho, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe to South Africa. Like the Sahuayo situation described in the previous chapter by Fitzgerald, the motive for emigration is economic as large scale migration across borders occurs. But the fundamental trend in recent times has been a shift from large scale consisting of almost exclusively contracted labor for the mines and farms of South Africa to non-contract employment and migration flows from other parts of the continent. Post-Apartheid South Africa is now in the midst of a major revision of its immigration policy to accommodate new trends in human rights legislation as well as to address South Africa’s important role in the labor market. It is, McDonald et al. suggest, a sensitive and dynamic moment in the definition of South Africa’s borderlands, border policies, and border practices. The chapter’s real concern is policy implications, unlike previous chapters in the volume which, in a sense, are exploring the nature of linkages and border communities themselves. McDonald et al. focus upon movement and activity—the establishment of migration purpose and perception—rather than the nature of the transnational experience or the experience of community at the border. This is a real contribution to the book and an important example of the applications of border theory to the immigration process itself.

The third section of the book deals with boundaries and partitioned groups rather than flows and immigration networks. Chapter Six, a discussion of African boundary making by J.D. Hargreaves, explores the apparent cartographic irrationality of African boundaries, or more explicitly the partition of West African populations by European

colonial boundaries, in context of the rationality and context of their construction. The apparent “accidentality” of the location of borders is explained as an issue of reconciling both European rivalries and African territorial claims. European archives promote the theory that African borders were produced haphazardly or “accidentally” in which African rules played a minor role, but only minor indeed. Hargreaves notes that “the populations of the frontier were envisaged, if at all, only as dim and inarticulate presences in the background in which the imposed boundaries subsequently operated.” Perhaps the problem was that the European concept of frontier was just that—a zone where people were non-existent. In this sense it would be interesting to link the neglect of indigenous influence and notions of frontier to contemporary events, new post-colonial conditions, and conflicts since the 1980s when the article was first published.

While Hargreaves is concerned with the process of boundary-making, the second essay in this section, by Catherine Elton, deals with another boundary or partitioned group between Peru and Ecuador. The Jívaro people, separated by Peru and Ecuador’s decades long border conflict, were recently reunited as border crossings were restored. She describes the way in which contemporary Jívaro have responded to the opening of borders, both in terms of removing the barriers that divide the community and negotiating new social practices and new ways of developing the border region. Elton’s point is the severe impact of boundaries which partition ethnic groups—boundaries that, like Hargreaves has suggested—have been discussed with little reference to indigenous peoples and with the view in mind of reinforcing the borders of European-style nation states.

The third contribution to this section, *Boundaries as Social practice and Discourse: The Finnish-Russian Border*, by Anssi Paasi, is one of the volume’s most conceptually sophisticated. Paasi’s interest is in the area of social practice and discourse, something that is assumed in previous chapters but not elaborated on. The essay asks: where do ideas about boundary and exclusion intersect with landscape, concept, and sets of practices or discourses which spread throughout the whole society? Paasi suggests that the Russian-Finnish borderlands reflect a similar process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization as that which has occurred in Europe in the post World War II and post cold war era. Tracing the border from its early 20th century definition through its revision in the post-Soviet era, Paasi discusses how the process of reterritorialization has become incorporated into practice and discourse at all levels within Finnish society, but particularly in the borderlands. While the post-Soviet era has seen increased interaction between Russia and Finland, this increase has not obliterated Finnish national interest or identity in the borderlands region. Rather, it has become more nuanced and complicated. New social practices are linked to the deterritorialization of the Finnish-Russian border in the post-Soviet era, which “are gradually turning the border areas into interdependent borderlands.”

This theme is followed up in the next section of the book which deals with borders, perception, and culture. Pirjo Jukarainen’s discussion of the attitudes of youth on both sides of the Finnish-Swedish and Finnish-Russian borders identifies some of the common ways in which Finns, Swedes, and Russians identify and define what they consider to be “the other” and what they consider to be the differences that divide the nationalities, despite their cross-border context. Exploring the comments of Finnish, Swedish, and Russian youth residing in the borderlands of each country, and specifically in the Torino-Haparanda and Lappeenranta-Vyborg regions, Jukarainen describes how cross-border context contributes to perception of others, and indeed how cross-

border identity has failed to develop even where significant efforts have been made to obliterate borders through transnational cooperation and cross-border flows. Language, identity, and perception seem to be resilient influences although they are shaped in context of cross-border interaction, reinforcing what Paasi suggests in the previous chapter.

The following essay by Roger Gibbins builds upon the idea of perception and difference in terms of locating the Canada-U.S. border within a more general understanding of borderlands in North America. This paper on the meaning and significance of the Canadian-American border is a classic and important essay, but in this volume suffers from the fact it was written prior to the main events which currently define Canada-U.S. border relations and are likely to do so in the future. Security measures concerned with fallout from September 11, terrorism, cross-border crime, and the snowballing trade effects of the NAFTA find little discussion in this essay. Moreover, because of the date it was originally published, the conditions for new 9/11-focused transnational cooperation with its focus on security and the implementation of new technologies are not discussed in this essay. Yet they seem to be the critical contemporary issues. In this sense it would have been worthwhile to have the author update the discussion to incorporate the fact that it is no longer possible to suggest that the Canada-U.S. border does not share a security community with the U.S.

The same comment is true of the essay by Michael Ignatieff on Northern Ireland. An important and interesting essay, it was written well before the Good Friday Agreement was proposed and leaves us wondering how this enduring history connects to events in this region today. Published in 1993, can Ignatieff's observations about ethnic tensions in late 20th century Belfast be true today? Probably, but there are different issues which enter the equation. And what of the border with Southern Ireland? While the piece is clearly historical and a classic work, it also leaves us wondering where globalization fits in light of the title of this volume and its promise of engagement with globalization. What is it about the changing world that has had an impression on the situation in Northern Ireland and the partitions at ethnic, religious, and national levels?

The fourth and final essay in this section on border perceptions and culture is an essay by Thomas Friedman, taken from his book *From Beirut to Jerusalem*, published in 1989. Friedman's essay, although dated in terms of contemporary discussions about Palestinian-Israeli border contexts, provides a basis from which to understand and appreciate the foundations of the enduring conflict. Yet there is little discussion of the actual location of the border between Israel and Palestinian provisional territories.

The problem is not so much the deficiencies of the author's, but rather the use of these essays as definitive of modern processes. It would seem that this section of the volume, dealing with borders, perception, and culture should indeed be the most contemporary section of the book stemming from the tremendous volume of material which has been generated recently on this topic. Yet many of the papers seem dated—they have just missed discussion of defining events which need to be taken into consideration in any discussion of borders and globalization as the volume title suggests. Yet the essays in this section are classic and valuable leading to the suggestion that the section title and order of the essays in the volume should be reconsidered.

In section five, discussion turns to borders and the environment. It is here that the first substantial discussion of globalization and borders in a contemporary sense really takes place in the essay by Norris Clement, Paul Ganster, and Alan Sweedler. The authors explore some of the contexts of globalization and border regional development

and look at the implications for economic development, environment, and security. An excellent essay, previously published in 1999, it seems oddly out of place in this section of the volume. The concepts about globalization it presents might be more auspiciously placed near the beginning of the volume in order to better define the relationship between borders and globalization which is the topic of this collection. And once more, the problem is raised that the issues of environment, development, and security in relations to borders have changed dramatically since 1999. It would have been useful to have the authors update and address the problem.

Disaster on the Danube, the essay by Brian Erskine that follows, takes a close look at the plans between then Czechoslovakia and Hungary to divert Danube waters for hydroelectric purposes, initially during the cold war period, but more recently in the post-Soviet era. The project was inherited by the Slovakian government, and continued to be a thorn in the side of Hungary which has pressed its grievances concerning potential environmental impacts to the International Court of Justice and the European Community (now the EU) in the mid-1990s. The point of the essay is to highlight the complicated border politics of transnational ecological impacts stemming from large-scale infrastructure projects closely linked to national development schemes.

The final essay in this section, by Pascal O. Girot, is an interesting analysis of relationships between border regions in Central America and initiatives for sustainable development implemented by Central American leaders in the 1990s. Girot explores the major stressors which have impacted upon Central American border regions, and which are unique in the sense that such regions are generally found in interior, poor, and isolated parts of the region. As a result, they have come under tremendous pressure in times of war, large scale human migration, and political instability of ineptitude. Sustainable development represents a new approach to the issue of environmental conservation and will have tremendous impact upon the borderlands where many natural areas are targeted for conservation. Girot suggests that the impact of this new paradigm upon border regions is still uncertain.

The two essays in the next section of the volume deal with borders, goods, and services. The first essay explores the changing Mexican-American border in terms of its role in catering to cross-border innovation and vice while the second essay discusses Canada-U.S. cross border shopping. In Keith Bowman's *The U.S.-Mexican border as a Locator of Innovation and Vice*, the argument is made that the border has had a powerful effect in determining the location of industries catering to vice—such as prostitution, teenage drinking or gaming, and that the intensity of these activities and their frequency adjusts over time to the situation in surrounding borderlands. Dallan J. Timothy and Richard W. Butler explore more legitimate activities in the following chapter in the sense that they discuss cross-border shopping in context of its role within transnational tourism industries. The latter essay, while interesting, again suffers from the fact that significant changes in the exchange rate between both countries have recently affected the trends which they discuss. Written in 1995, there are significant developments which might be noted in an update. At the same time, the point is being made that cross-border shopping is increasingly important to borderland areas, and this is an important conclusion. One wonders if examples from the European Union or geographical regions other than North America might have been useful additions to this text.

The final section of the volume deals essentially with what are often perceived as less important, or even simply futuristic areas of border study—maritime regions and

space. In two classic and competent articles, one by Daniel Dzurek and one by Malcom Anderson, maritime spaces and outer space are discussed. Dzurek's article, *Maritime Agreements and Oil Exploration in the Gulf of Thailand*, first published in 1988, lays out the facts of the various boundary disputes in the Gulf of Thailand. The details of negotiations, agreements, and rationale for boundary resolution according to the United Nation's Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) are visited and explained. One wonders, however, whether it would also have been possible to draw upon some of the more recent work in the area of maritime boundaries, where disputes concerning environmental resources, management, and ecological impacts have produced what some have suggested is a post-UNCLOS regime, or an integrated coastal and maritime border management regime. The latter is a new perspective which is increasingly important to such conflicts and to maritime border studies in general.

Similarly, the article by Malcolm Anderson, *New Borders, the Sea and Outer Space*, also speaks to maritime borders. Anderson suggests that frontiers are part of a political process with defining characteristics which justify and reproduce territorial states. But this territorial state is impacted upon by modern technologies and communications, so much so that national borders may become obsolete in some areas. At the same time, new frontiers or borders are emerging as technology takes us to new spaces and places in the oceans and outer space—more often thought of as empty space or increasingly “common space.” Anderson also acknowledges the increasing pressure for international agreements not only to define the applicability of the international regime of law for such places, but also to cope with the increasing interconnectedness of a world where the reach of states extends well beyond their territorially defined spaces (as do the negative impacts of processes such as pollution or conflict). The trend toward international negotiation over uninhabited spaces is increasing and will probably remain important in the future, Anderson argues, as technologies of telecommunications, transportation, and surveillance impact upon the definition of state itself.

While the essays in this volume are valuable and will serve as an excellent resource for students looking towards some of the benchmark literature in border studies, particularly in North America, one of the weaknesses of this volume is the fact that it does not include exploration of any but essays which “treat border regions as historically coherent areas” (xii). This makes the main thrust of the book historical. Its many wonderful essays are reprints of classic and important papers but these being dated fail to consistently link to important critical events which have shaped the contemporary world—like the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland, September 11's impact upon security in North America and Europe, or the recent round of unrest in the Middle East. Each essay discusses a region which has been significantly changed since the essay was produced. Interrogation of border discourse, itself a dominant methodology in recent border studies, is all but missing. Perhaps only Anssi Paasi asks the critical question of how borders have become social practice and discourse or more than lines which define the nation-state, albeit at some discomfort for those groups who are not considered constitutive of the national population.

Many of the interesting aspects of border studies today come not from the intractable historical disputes concerning delimitation or demarcation of borders, but more subtle discourses concerning the new bounding effects which global economies impose. These would by necessity focus less upon the state as a territorial given, and more the construction of post-Westphalian spaces. The volume explores pre-Westphalian space and Westphalian spaces thoroughly, yet does not include examination of what

might indeed become post-Westphalian boundary processes. Globalization as a process is implicit but not explicit; the chapter by Ganster represents the first real attempt in the book to engage with the concept of globalization as an organizing factor. In this sense it may not achieve its claim as a discussion of globalization, although it does comprise an important set of classic border essays which have shaped border scholarship of the early 21st century.

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)
Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

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 the article after it

has been published in the *JBS* without charge, for any book or anthology of which he or she 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 welcomed.

Electronic Submission

Send an e-mail, with “JBS Manuscript Submission” in the subject line and include the manuscript as an attachment to the editors respectively. 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.

In the body of the e-mail, include the name of the author(s), his/her institutional affiliation and college or department, position or title, academic rank, and the name, address, telephone, fax and e-mail of the contact person with respect to the submitted manuscript. Please include this same information on a cover page at the beginning of the manuscript. The electronic manuscript should be in either MS Word or WordPerfect (preferred formats).

Preparation of Copy

The electronic manuscript should be single spaced and include the cover page with the contact information at the beginning of the manuscript. Subsequent pages should include the title, abstract, introduction, the body of the manuscript (to include all indented material and tables), endnotes and references. Number all pages consecutively. A separate electronic file clearly

identifying and defining all mathematical symbols must be attached. All graphs and illustrations should be submitted in separate files (see Format of Graphs, Illustrations and Tables). Indicate clearly where graphs or illustrations should appear in the text. A note in the text in brackets will be sufficient, as in the following example:

[Figure 1 about here]

The *JBS* prefers the use of citations in parentheses within the text, and the use of footnotes is unacceptable. Endnotes may be used for substantive observations but not for the purpose of citing sources. Endnotes must appear separately at the end of the body of the manuscript prior to the references. 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.

JBS-preferred styles for in text citations and references follow the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th Edition unless otherwise indicated (see Format of In Text Citation and References).

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.

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 lowercase. The page orientation should be set to “letter” and “portrait.” Left and right margins should be set to 1.88 inches (4.76 centimeters), and top and bottom margins to 1.50 inches (3.81 centimeters). This will approximate the printable area of the *JBS* and will provide a guide for the sizing and orientation of graphs, illustrations and tables.

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 authors’ names 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 parenthetical citations in the text (including endnotes) do not agree. Problems include the item referenced in the text not appearing in the list of references at the end of the manuscript, the year of the citation within the text not agreeing with the year listed in the reference section, inconsistent spelling of authors’ names, and failure to include accents and other diacriticals for foreign-language references (due to some typographic limitations some diacriticals may not appear exactly as in the original text).

In Text Citation Placement*

An author-date citation in running text or at the end of a block quotation consists of the last (family) name of the author, followed by the year of publication of the work in question. In this context, “author” may refer not only to one or more authors or an institution but also to one or more editors, translators, or compilers. No punctuation appears between author and date. Abbreviations such as *ed.* or *trans.* are omitted (unless an original and an edited work by the same person appeared in the same year, in which case *ed.* would be added to the text citation where appropriate).

(Pacini 1997)

(U.S. Department of Transportation 1998)

Parenthetical citations are placed just before a mark of punctuation.

Recent literature has examined long-run price drifts following initial public offerings (Ritter 1991; Loughran and Ritter 1995), stock splits (Ikenberry, Rankine, and Stice 1996), seasoned equity offerings (Loughran

and Ritter 1995), and equity repurchases (Ikenberry, Lakonishok, and Vermaelen 1995).

If the author of a source referred to appears in the text, it need not be repeated in a parenthetical citation.

Litman (1983) finds that Academy Award nominations or winnings are significantly related to revenues.

Although citation of a source normally follows a direct quotation, it may precede the quotation if syntax permits.

As Edward Tufte points out (2001, 139), “a graphical element may carry data information and also perform a design function usually left to non-data-ink.”

Note: The source of a block quotation is given within parentheses at the end of the quotation and in the same type size. The opening parenthesis appears *after* the final punctuation mark of the quoted material. No period either precedes or follows the closing parenthesis.

...pertaining to the area. Additional studies concluded that there were inefficiencies in the system involving support services. (Gonzalez 2001, 234)

When a reference list includes two or more works published in the same year by the same author or authors, the text citations as well as the reference list must use the letters “a,” “b,” and so on.

(Beijing Zoo 1974a)

For works by two or three authors, all names are included. The word “and” is used, not an ampersand.

(Hollingsworth and Sockett 1994b)

(Yoskowitz, Pisanni, and García 2000)

For four or more authors, only the name of the first author is used, followed by “et al.” or “and others.” Note that “et al.” is *not* italicized in text citations.

(Zipursky et al. 1997)

In a study by Zipursky and others (1997), the data pointed...

Two or more references in a single parenthetical citation are separated by semicolons. The order in which they are given may depend on what is being cited, and in what order, or it may reflect the relative importance of the items cited. If neither criterion applies, alphabetical or chronological order may be appropriate.

(Armstrong and Malacinski 1989; Beigl 1989; Pickett and White 1985)

Additional works by the same author(s) are given by date only, separated by commas except where page numbers are required.

(Whittaker 1967, 1975; Wiens 1989a, 1989b)

(Wong 1998, 28; 1999, 475)

For further examples of citations consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

Format of In Text Citations and 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. The *JBS* prefers that the full names of authors be used. Last name and first initials may be used, but the listing must be consistent. There should be no mixing of either format within the references. Headline style capitalization should be used and only book titles are 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 in text citations and their corresponding reference formats:

Book with One Author

(Martin du Gard 2000)

Martin du Gard, Roger. 2000. *Lieutenant-Colonel de Maumort*. Trans. By Luc Brebion and Timothy Crouse. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Editor (Compiler or Translator) Instead of Author

(Kamrany and Day 1980)

Two Authors or Editors

For two authors use the conjunction “and” (not an ampersand).

(Walker and Taylor 1998)

Walker, J. R., and T. Taylor. 1998. *The Columbia Guide to Online Style*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

(Brush and Clark 1983)

Brush, A. H., and G. A. Clark Jr., eds. 1983. *Perspectives in Ornithology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Kamrany, Nake M., and Richard H. Day, eds. 1980. *Economic Issues of the Eighties*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Editor (Compiler or Translator) in Addition to Author

(Menchu 1999)

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1999. *Crossing Borders*. Trans. and ed. Ann Wright. New York: Verso.

Chapter in a Book

(Phibbs 1987, 122-24)

Phibbs, Brendan. 1987. Herrlisheim: Diary of a Battle. In *The Other Side of Time: A Combat Surgeon in World War II*, 117-63. Boston: Little, Brown.

Three Authors or Editors

(Schellinger, Hudson, and Rijsberman 1998)

Schellinger, Paul, Christopher Hudson, and Marijk Rijsberman, eds. 1998. *Encyclopedia of the Novel*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Organization as Author

(British Standards Institute 1985)

British Standards Institute. 1985. *Specification for Abbreviation of Title Words and Titles of Publications*. Linford Woods, Milton Keynes, UK: British Standards Institute.

More than Three Authors

For works by four to ten persons, all names are given in the reference list. In a note or text citation, only the name of the first author is included, followed by “and others” or “et al.” with no intervening comma. Note that these are not italicized in parenthetical citations.

(Sechzer et al. 1996, 243)

Sechzer, J. A., S. M. Pfaffilin, F. L. Denmark, A. Griffin, and S. J. Blumenthal, eds. 1996. *Women and Mental Health*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Contribution to a Multi-Author Book

(Wiens 1983)

Wiens, J. A. 1983. Avian Community Ecology: An Iconoclastic View. In *Perspectives in Ornithology*, eds. A. H. Brush and G. A. Clark Jr., 355-403. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Multi-Volume Work

(Wright 1968-78, 2: 341)

For references with eleven or more authors, the first seven are listed followed by “et al.” The in text citation follows the same format as more than 3 authors.

Wright, Sewell. 1968-78. *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*. 4 vols. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Particular Volume in a Multi-Volume Work

(Wright 1969, 129)

Wright, Sewell. 1969. *Theory of Gene Frequencies*. Vol. 2 of *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Electronic Book

(Sirosh, Miikkulainen, and Bednar 1996)

Sirosh, J., R. Miikkulainen, and J. A. Bednar. 1996. Self-Organization of Orientation Maps, Lateral Connections, and Dynamic Receptive Fields in The Primary Visual Cortex. In *Lateral Interactions in the Cortex: Structure and Function*, ed. J. Sirosh, R. Miikkulainen, and Y. Choe. Austin, TX: UTCS Neural Networks Research Group. <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/nn/webpubs/htmlbook96/> (accessed August 27, 2001).

Scholarly or Professional Journal

In reference lists, the volume number follows the journal title without intervening punctuation and is not in italics. Arabic numerals are used even if the journal itself uses roman numerals.

(Terborgh 1974)

Terborgh, J. 1974. Preservation of Natural Diversity: The Problem of Extinction-Prone Species. *BioScience* 24: 715-22.

In reference lists, the issue number is in parentheses.

Allison, G. W. 1999. The Implications of Experimental Design for Biodiversity Manipulations. *American Naturalist* 153 (1): 26-45.

When a journal uses issue numbers only, without volume numbers, a comma follows the journal title.

Meyerovitch, Eva. 1959. The Gnostic Manuscripts of Upper Egypt. *Diogenes*, no. 25: 84-117.

When the year itself serves as volume number, it is an indispensable element and should therefore not be enclosed in parentheses. A comma follows the journal title.

Myers, N., and R. Tucker. 1987. Deforestation in Central America: Spanish Legacy and North American Consumers. *Environmental Review*, Spring 1987, 55-71.

Forthcoming Works

If an article has been accepted for publication by a journal but has not yet appeared, *forthcoming* stands in place of the year and the page numbers. Any article not yet accepted should be treated as an unpublished manuscript.

(Researcher and Assistant, forthcoming)

Researcher, A. A., and B. B. Assistant. Forthcoming. Article Title. *Journal Name* 103.

Newspaper Article (Printed and Online)

Newspaper articles are commonly cited in notes or parenthetical citations. A list of works cited need not list newspaper items if these have been documented in the text. No corresponding entry in a reference list would be needed for the following citation:

In an article on rampage killers (*New York Times*, April 10, 2000), Laurie Goodstein and William Glaberson describe...

If for some reason, an entry were included, it would appear as follows:

(Mitchell and Bruni 2001)

Mitchell, Alison, and Frank Bruni. 2001. Scars Still Raw, Bush Clashes With McCain. *New York Times*, March 25, 2001.

Citations to online newspapers or news articles posted by news services are identical to their print counterparts, with the addition of a URL and the date the information was accessed.

Mitchell, Alison, and Frank Bruni. 2001. Scars Still Raw, Bush Clashes With McCain. *New York Times*, March 25, 2001. <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/3/25/politics/25MCCA.html> (accessed January 2, 2002).

Unsigned Newspaper Article

Unsigned newspaper articles or features are best dealt with in text or notes. But if a reference list entry should be needed, the name of the newspaper stands in place of the author.

(*New York Times* 2002)

New York Times. 2002. In Texas, Ad Heats Up Race for Governor. July 30.

Working Paper and Unpublished Work

(Ferber 1971)

Ferber, R. 1971. Family Decision-Making and Economic Behavior. Faculty Working Paper 35, College of Commerce and Business Administration, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Thesis or Dissertation

(Schwarz 2000)

Schwarz, G. J. 2000. Multiwavelength Analyses of Classical Carbon-Oxygen Novae (Outbursts, Binary Stars). PhD diss., Arizona State Univ.

Paper Presented at Meetings, Seminars, or Conferences

(O'Guinn 1987)

O'Guinn, T. C. 1987. Touching Greatness: Some Aspects of Star Worship in Contemporary Consumption. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Letters and other Communications in Published Collections

A reference to a letter, memorandum, or similar communication in a published collection begins with the names of the sender and the recipient, in that order, followed by a date and sometimes the place where the communication was prepared. The word *letter* is unnecessary, but other forms, such as reports or memoranda, should be specified. The title of the collection is given in the usual form for a book.

In a letter to Charles Milnes Gaskell from London, March 30, 1868 (Adams 1930, 141), Adams wrote...

Adams, Henry. 1930. *Letters of Henry Adams, 1858-1891*. Ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Unpublished Letters or Personal Communications

In parenthetical citations the terms "personal communication" (or "pers. comm."), "unpublished data," and the like are used after the name(s) of the person(s) concerned, following a comma. Reference list entries are unneeded. The abbreviation "et al." should be avoided in such citations.

(H. J. Brody, pers. comm.)

(E. Simpkins, S. Warren, M. Turck, and S. Gorbach, unpublished data)

Government Document

(U.S. Bureau of the Census 1986)

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

Internet Document

When referencing sources of information found on the internet, please include

sufficient information so that other researchers can easily locate the materials.

(Kameras 1996)

Kameras, David. 1996. NAFTA Hearing Exposes Sprint. AFL-CIO News. <http://www.aflcio.org/newsonline> (accessed March 8, 2002).

Interview

In whatever form interviews or personal communications exist—published, broadcast, preserved in audiovisual form, available online—the citation normally begins with the name of the person interviewed or the person from whom the communication was received. The interviewer or recipient, if mentioned, comes second.

Published Interview

An interview that has already been published or broadcast is treated like an article in a periodical or a chapter in a book.

(Bellour 1979)

Bellour, Raymond. 1979. Alternation, Segmentation, Hypnosis: Interview with Raymond Bellour. By Janet Bergstrom. *Camera Obscura*, nos. 3-4: 89-94.

Unpublished Interview

Unpublished interviews are best cited in text but they occasionally appear in reference lists. Citations should include the names of both the person interviewed and the interviewer; brief identifying information, if appropriate; the place or date of the interview (or both, if known); and, if a transcript or tape is available, where it may be found.

(Hunt 1976)

Hunt, Horace [pseud.]. 1976. Interview by Ronald Schatz. Tape recording. May 16. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.

For further examples of citations consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

Format of Graphs, Illustrations and Tables

The initial manuscript submission to the *JBS* may include graphs and illustrations within the text. Once a manuscript is accepted by the editors for publication, it is the responsibility of authors to submit all graphs and illustrations separately and in the proper electronic format. Authors may wish to provide graphs and illustrations to *JBS* specifications at the time of original submission of the manuscript in order to avoid delays.

If authors do not or cannot provide 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.

Graphs and Illustrations

Graphs may be placed in the text for positioning, but a separate electronic file must be provided in its native file format (such as Excel —*.xls— or equivalent) with its accompanying data. At times, adjustments need to be made due to space limitations and/or grayscale issues, thus requiring corresponding data.

Illustrations may be placed in the text for positioning, but a separate electronic file must be provided in its native file format. Acceptable formats are JPEG, TIFF or AI (Adobe Illustrator). These illustrations should be 300 dpi or greater in resolution and may be submitted in black and white or grayscale.

Size

All illustrations and tables, including titles, legends and notes, must fit within the printable area of the *JBS*. The area is 4.75 inches (12.065 centimeters) wide by 7.75 inches (19.685 centimeters) high. The margins provided previously in the "Preparation of Copy," are a good approximation and should be used as a guide for orientation (portrait or landscape), size, readability and placement of these items.

Fonts

The preferred font for illustrations titles and legends is Helvetica/Arial at 8 point.

Frames

Graphs and illustrations should not be enclosed in frames. Appropriate framing will be done at the time of production editing.

Titles and Legends

Tables should be titled and numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. The title should be in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point, bold, and in initial capitals and lowercase. The legend should be placed at the bottom in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point 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 title should be located at the top of the illustration and centered in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point and in initial capitals and lowercase. The legend should be placed at the bottom in the same typeface and point size.

Questions Regarding Illustrations

For more information with regard to illustration requirements and formats, contact *JBS* Production Editor Baldomero G. 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.

*Examples derived from the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

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:

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Ph.D. (absexec@uvic.ca)
Executive Secretary
Association for Borderland Studies
School Public Administration
University of Victoria
Victoria, BC V8W 2Y2
Canada

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 78041-1900

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

www.absborderlands.org/jbs/jbsmanuscriptstyle.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)
Radboud 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