

Borderlands

Volume 22 No. 1
Spring 2007

Journal of
Borderlands
Studies

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 22 No. 1

Spring 2007

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 22 • No. 1 • Spring 2007

Contents

Cross-Border Planning at the U.S.-Mexico Border: An Institutional Approach Sergio Peña	1
Exported Retail Sales Along the Texas-Mexico Border Roberto A. Coronado and Keith R. Phillips	19
Undocumented Immigrants and Quality of Life in New Mexico and Arizona <i>Colonias</i> Angela Donelson and Adrian X. Esparza	39
Where War Met Peace: The Borders of the Neutral Netherlands with Belgium and Germany in the First World War, 1914-1918 Maartje Abbenhuis	53
United States-Mexican Border Watershed Assessment: Modeling Nonpoint Source Pollution in Ambos Nogales Laura M. Norman	79
Silesian Identity: Social and Political Problems Maria Szmeja	99
Book Reviews	
Talking Borders: A Review of the Ashgate Series on Border Regions General Editor, Doris Wastl-Walter	117
Holding the Line: Borders in a Global World by Heather N. Nicol and Ian Townsend-Gault (eds.)	123
The Three U.S.-Mexican Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration and Homeland Security by Tony Payan	127
Instructions for Authors	129

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 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

Terms for 2006-2009

Heather Nichol, State University of West Georgia, Carrollton, Georgia

Hector Padilla, Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, Cd. Juárez, Chihuahua, México

Cristine Brenner, Rutgers University, Camden, New Jersey

Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies (2007-2008)

President: Manuel Chavez
Michigan State University

President Elect: James Scott
Free University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Executive Secretary: Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly
University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

Immediate Past President: Christopher Brown
New Mexico State University

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

From the Editors

This issue of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies (JBS)*—Volume 22, No. 1—marks the start of our seventh year of editorship, since the transition from the previous editors Joan Anderson and Paul Ganster in 2001. Over the past six years, we have made every effort to continue to bring to our readers the latest research being conducted over border-related issues over a wide spectrum of disciplines in Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Africa and South America. We look forward to our continuing work of publishing scholarly research on international boundaries and border regions during these times of unparalleled change in world affairs.

The Editors

Editors' Note of Appreciation

We wish to extend our gratitude and thanks to the many colleagues who have provided reviews of manuscripts submitted for publication consideration in the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*. Many of the articles that appear in Vol. 21, No. 2 of the *JBS* were substantially improved by the critiques and suggestions provided by the reviewers. In particular, we acknowledge the efforts of the following colleagues: Ruben Alanis, Elena Bastida, Kimberly Collins, Irasema Coronado, Michael Ellis, Cecilia Garza, Larry Herzog, Robert Huesca, Jim Peach, and Michael J. Pisani. In addition, we extend our sincerest thanks to Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly for all his hard work as the guest editor of the *JBS* Vol. 21, No. 2 special issue titled, "Security and Borders."

The Editors

Authors' Contact Information

Cross-Border Planning at the U.S.-Mexico Border: An Institutional Approach

Sergio Peña
The University of Texas at El Paso
e-mail: Spena2@utep.edu

Exported Retail Sales Along the Texas-Mexico Border

Roberto A. Coronado
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
Houston Branch
e-mail: Roberto.Coronado@dal.frb.org

Keith R. Phillips
Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas
San Antonio Branch
e-mail: Keith.R.Phillips@dal.frb.org

Undocumented Immigrants and Quality of Life in New Mexico and Arizona Colonias

Angela Donelson
University of Arizona
e-mail: donelson@email.arizona.edu

Adrian X. Esparza
University of Arizona
e-mail: axe@email.arizona.edu

Where War Met Peace: The Borders of the Neutral Netherlands with Belgium and Germany in the First World War, 1914-1918

Maartje Abbenhuis
University of Auckland, Canterbury, New Zealand
e-mail: m.abbenhuis@auckland.ac.nz

United States-Mexican Border Watershed Assessment: Modeling Nonpoint Source Pollution in Ambos Nogales

Laura M. Norman
U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Geographic Science Center
e-mail: lnorman@usgs.gov

Silesian Identity: Social and Political Problems

Maria Szmeja
Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland
e-mail: mszmeja@uj.edu.pl

Cross-Border Planning at the U.S.-Mexico Border: An Institutional Approach

Sergio Peña*

***Abstract:** The general objective of this article is to contribute to the understanding of cross-border issues from an urban planning perspective. Cross-border planning in this article is approached as an institution-building process whose primary emphasis is on the facilitation of collective action with regards to the shared natural, built, and human environments constrained by territorial politics and boundaries of nation-states. It is argued throughout the paper that the existing institutional framework at the U.S.-Mexico border has been the result of a “muddling through” process. The existing cross-border planning institutions are the result of an adjustment process, to a great extent due to challenges to the status quo by border actors and organizations. The main conclusion of the article is that the environment and the uncertainty that this poses for the future is an issue that decision makers have been able to “muddle through” more successfully and should continue doing so by fine-tuning and supporting existing institutions and continuing the incremental process of institution building.*

Introduction

The general objective of this article is to contribute to the understanding of cross-border issues from an urban planning perspective. The presence of relatively large urban binational conurbations, such as San Diego-Tijuana and El Paso-Ciudad Juarez to mention only few, makes the U.S.-Mexico border unique. Thus, it is important not only to make urban settlements a subject of inquiry but also to discuss how urban planning can contribute to improving the quality of life of border residents.

Cross-border planning, in this article, is approached as an institution-building process whose primary emphasis is on the facilitation of collective action with regards to the shared natural, built, and human environments constrained by territorial politics and boundaries of nation-states. This approach to cross-border planning closely resembles what Lindblom (1996) calls the science of “muddling through” where decision-making is done in an incremental fashion.

According to Lindblom (1996, 291), incremental planning is a method that is “continually building out from the current situation step by step and by small degrees.” In other words, decision-making is a process that adjusts to existing circumstances and changes in societal values that challenge the *status quo* and which demand a new institutional framework (Bromley 2006). It is argued throughout the paper that the existing institutional framework at the U.S.-Mexico border has been the result of a “muddling through” process. That is, existing cross-border planning institutions are the result of an adjustment process that, to a great extent, is due to challenges to the *status quo* by border actors and organizations.

*Peña is Professor of Public Administration at the University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas.

Exported Retail Sales Along the Texas-Mexico Border

Roberto A. Coronado and Keith R. Phillips*

***Abstract:** Trade between the U.S. and Mexico has boomed over the past 10 years due partly to the significant reduction in tariffs from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the strong growth in the maquiladora industry. While commercial trade between the countries is well documented, less is known about the size of the cross-border retail trade that occurs. Though the size of this activity is small in comparison to commercial trade, it is a significant part of the economies of many border cities. In 2005 alone, there were more than 45 million non-commercial crossings at the bridges along the Texas-Mexico border. Many of these individuals were coming to purchase goods to take back to their home country. Since most of the retail trade conducted on the U.S. side of the border is done in cash, it is difficult to document the share of retail spending accounted for by Mexican nationals. In this article we use several techniques based on a simple consumption function to estimate the size of retail spending that is essentially exported to Mexico via cross-border shoppers. We then check our estimates of the proportion of retail sales going to Mexican nationals in the Texas border metros to see if they are consistent with the impacts to retail sales of movements in the real peso-dollar exchange rate.*

Introduction

Over the past decade, trade between the U.S. and Mexico has boomed. This is partly due to the significant reduction in tariffs from the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the strong growth in the *maquiladora* industry. From 1993 to 2004, total trade between the U.S. and Mexico increased threefold from about \$87.5 billion to more than \$275 billion. Since 1999, Mexico has displaced Japan as the second largest U.S. trading partner behind Canada.

Along with the expansion in trade has been an acceleration in already strong population growth along the northern border of Mexico. In 2000, the four largest Texas-Mexico twin border cities were home to 4.15 million people; 57 percent of these people located on the Mexican side of the border and 43 percent on the Texas side of the border (See Table 1 on next page). Generally, the populations of the cities on the Mexican side of the border are significantly larger than the corresponding populations of their U.S. sister cities. For example, in 2000 the population was 680,000 in El Paso and 1.2 million in Ciudad Juarez, and 193,000 in Laredo and 311,000 in Nuevo Laredo. Also, the South Texas border MSAs are a short drive from the industrial city of Monterrey, which had a population of 3.8 million in 2000. The large and growing populations on the Mexican side of the border represent an important consumer base for retail stores in the U.S. border towns.

*Coronado is an Assistant Economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Houston Branch in Houston, Texas. Phillips is a Senior Economist and Policy Advisor at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, San Antonio Branch in San Antonio, Texas.

Undocumented Immigrants and Quality of Life in New Mexico and Arizona Colonias

Angela Donelson and Adrian X. Esparza*

***Abstract:** Recent legislation aims to stop the northward flow of undocumented immigrants into the United States by creating amnesty and formal guest worker programs and by increasing the “deterrent effect” at the border. The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) contained similar policies, and subsequent research tells us much about what to expect from proposed “reforms.” However, virtually no research has considered how immigration reforms have played out at the local level. This holds especially for colonias that line the border from Texas to California. We respond to this deficiency by examining how the 1986 IRCA affected undocumented immigration and quality of life in unincorporated colonias of Arizona and New Mexico. We find that the IRCA legislation did little to stop the flow of undocumented immigrants to Arizona and New Mexico colonias and led the rise of deprivation.*

Introduction

There is mounting concern about the number of undocumented immigrants entering the United States from Mexico. Issues at hand include labor market competition, financial burdens placed on local, state, and federal levels of government, human rights violations, and border security. According to some, the situation has been exaggerated while others believe the border is nearly out of control (Vernez and McCarthy 1996; United States General Accounting Office 1999; Moser 2003; Office of Border Patrol 2004; Camarota 2004; Carroll and González 2005; Innes 2006; McCombs 2006). The federal government subscribes to the latter perspective as evidenced by recent legislation. The 109th Congress responded to the “border crisis” by ratifying legislation in 2006 that calls for the construction of 700 miles of physical barriers—walls—mainly along the southern Arizona border but also in Texas. Congress also approved the hiring of 6,000 additional Border Patrol agents as part of “Operation Jump Start” (United States Customs and Border Protection 2006). These measures are aimed at deterrence, but the 110th Congress will consider other reforms such as amnesty programs, employer sanctions, foreign worker programs, and beefing up high technology surveillance. It is likely that some of these programs and policies will come on line in the near future but it is difficult to say which ones will receive Congressional support.

Although it is too early to assess the impacts of these reforms, looking back to the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986 provides clues about what to

*Donelson is an Adjunct Lecturer in the Department of Geography and Regional Development at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona. Esparza is an Associate Professor in the School of Natural Resources at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Where War Met Peace: The Borders of the Neutral Netherlands with Belgium and Germany in the First World War, 1914-1918¹

Maartje Abbenhuis*

Abstract: In wartime, neutral territory beckons as a beacon of safety from the conflict and strife. This was especially true for the neutral Netherlands in the First World War (1914-1918), which was situated within a short distance of the Western Front and was bordered by belligerent Germany and German-occupied Belgium. The Dutch land border became the country's most important neutrality frontier, functioning as the geographical place where neutrality began and ended, which necessitated increased border security, witnessed new border-crossing activities, and ensured that life for border residents changed dramatically. This paper illustrates that, once Germany occupied Belgium, the Dutch border region in the south became a fraught zone between 'war' and 'peace.' But the eastern border with Germany proper also changed in character. The war situation and changing circumstances at the frontier impacted on the relationship between locals and the state (the authority in charge of border security) and changed locals' understandings about what it meant to be 'neutral,' a 'frontier-zone resident,' and 'Dutch' in this extraordinary situation.

Introduction

Borderlands researchers tend to analyze the impact of neutrality as frequently as historians study the borders of nation-states; very rarely. This paper attempts to contribute to both fields by bringing the multi-disciplinary scholarship on borderlands into a historical framework and situating a neutral border in a time of war to inform borderlands studies. During the First World War (1914-1918), neutral European governments upheld strict controls at their national borders to an extent not witnessed or deemed necessary before the war. The viability of their neutrality depended on the territorial integrity of their border regions and on their ability to uphold international neutrality obligations there. In many respects, the border was the barometer of a neutral country's security, safety, and independence. With the German invasion of neutral Belgium on August 3-4, 1914, for example, the Dutch border became the most important neutrality frontier for the Dutch state, especially in the south. It necessitated careful policing in the form of military guards and a heightened customs officer presence. This meant that life for frontier-zone² residents changed dramatically. While the border hardly featured in the everyday lives of locals until August 4, 1914, from this point on crossing into German-occupied Belgium, as well as Germany proper, and back out again became

*Abbenhuis is Lecturer in the History Department at the University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

United States-Mexican Border Watershed Assessment: Modeling Nonpoint Source Pollution in Ambos Nogales

Laura M. Norman*

Abstract: *Ecological considerations need to be interwoven with economic policy and planning along the United States-Mexican border. Non-point source pollution can have significant implications for the availability of potable water and the continued health of borderland ecosystems in arid lands. However, environmental assessments in this region present a host of unique issues and problems. A common obstacle to the solution of these problems is the integration of data with different resolutions, naming conventions, and quality to create a consistent database across the binational study area. This report presents a simple modeling approach to predict nonpoint source pollution that can be used for border watersheds. The modeling approach links a hillslope-scale erosion-prediction model and a spatially derived sediment-delivery model within a geographic information system to estimate erosion, sediment yield, and sediment deposition across the Ambos Nogales watershed in Sonora, Mexico, and Arizona. This paper discusses the procedures used for creating a watershed database to apply the models and presents an example of the modeling approach applied to a conservation-planning problem.*

Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identifies sediment as the primary nonpoint source pollutant in streams and water channels. Excessive sediment load upsets the ongoing ecology within streams by smothering bottom-dwelling organisms and further interferes by reducing light penetration, which affects photosynthesis. Turbidity, which is the optical property of water that causes light to be scattered, absorbed, and diffracted rather than transmitted directly, is an obvious form of visual impairment that is strongly associated with suspended mineral sediment (Hawkins 2003). Sedimentary materials are nonpoint source pollutants that also act as carriers of nutrients and toxins, inhibit fish reproduction, and alter natural streamflow (Stringer and Perkins 1997).

The stewardship of borderland watersheds is a collective socio-economic and environmental responsibility. Population growth, urbanization, and development along with aquifer depletion, surface-water usage, pollution, and climate change, all threaten the availability of water resources along the United States-Mexican border (Nitze 2003). The International Boundary Water Commission (IBWC) manages and allocates the use

*Norman is a Research Physical Scientist at the U.S. Geological Survey, Southwest Geographic Science Center in Tucson, Arizona.

This research was supported by the U.S. Geological Survey's Geographic Analysis and Monitoring (GAM) program to conduct a geographic assessment based on its mission to improve understanding of the rates, causes, and consequences of natural and human-induced processes that shape and change the landscape over time. I thank D. Phillip Guertin and Leila Gass for their careful reviews of this manuscript.

Silesian Identity: Social and Political Problems

Maria Szymeja*

Abstract: *This paper focuses on Silesia, where a phenomenon now forgotten in Europe (i.e. the formation of a new nation) has recently appeared: in this case, the Silesian nation. After World War II, which inflicted suffering and heavy losses on some national and cultural minorities inhabiting the territory of Poland, people of different race and apparently different culture simply vanished from Polish public life. After the democratic changes, people talk more openly about their different traditions and different backgrounds. A totally unexpected phenomenon is the strong emphasis placed on cultural diversity by the Silesian group. It appears as an attempt at creating a new nation. Demographers estimate the number of Silesians to be approximately 350,000 (Rauzinski 1997). However, the last census, carried out in June 2002, revealed that in Silesia 172,700 people defined themselves as members of the Silesian nation, whereas 136,200 people declared themselves as members of the German nation. At the beginning of the 1990s, up to 500,000 Silesians called themselves Germans. Now, the number of Germans has diminished. It is interesting to point out why Silesians neither want to be members of the Polish, nor of the German nation. For many people, the frequent changes of national identity in that part of the Polish borderland are hard to accept. In the 1990s, Silesians—through various associations of German minorities—were becoming political partners of Poland. They have now declared themselves members of a new Silesian nation. The problem of the volatility of Silesian national identity and the recent attempt to create a Silesian nation are not too widely discussed in sociological literature. Silesia is a borderland area and borders that cross that territory have changed at least three times during the 20th century. It resulted in identity problems for indigenous people we have observed nowadays. This is an ongoing process so it is hard to forecast the future for Silesia since changes are taking place so fast and frequently.*

Why is Polish Society Non-Ethnical?

The cultural diversity of Polish society is an evident fact. However, it has far too often been overlooked. Common thinking, as well as the media and scholarly dissertations, used to be dominated by the concept that Polish culture was a monolithic structure. This was a result of War World II and the post-war policy of the Polish communist government.

After the Holocaust, which inflicted suffering and heavy losses on some national and cultural minorities inhabiting the territory of Poland (such as Jews and Gypsies), people of different race and apparently different material culture simply vanished from Polish public life. They can no longer be encountered on the street or at social events. Furthermore, due to geopolitical changes, many people of mixed Polish-Ukrainian, Polish-Lithuanian, and Polish-Slovak culture have found themselves beyond the Polish borders.

*Szymeja is an Assistant Professor in the Institute of American and Polish Diaspora Studies at University Jagiellonian, Krakow, Poland.

Book Review

Talking Borders: A Review of the Ashgate Series on Border Regions

General Editor, Doris Wastl-Walter

Books Reviewed:

Living (with) Borders: Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe
by Ulrike H. Meinhof (ed.) (2002)

Challenged Borderlands: Transcending Political and Cultural Boundaries
by V. Pavlakovich-Kochi, B. Morehouse and D. Wastl-Walter (eds.) (2004)

B/ordering Space
by H. Van Houtum, O. Kramsch and W. Zierhofer (eds.) (2005)

Drawing the Line: Nature, Hybridity and Politics in Transboundary Spaces
by Juliet Fall (2005)

EU Enlargement, Region Building and Shifting Borders of Inclusion and Exclusion
by James Wesley Scott (ed.) (2006)

Reviewed by David Newman*

The books reviewed in this essay are part of the impressive series of border related texts, which have been published as part of the Ashgate Border Regions series. With one exception, *Drawing the Line* by Juliet Fall, the books are collections of essays, some of which have been brought together as a result of conferences and seminars which have been held on border related topics during the past decade, a period in which there has been an exponential growth of border studies both in Europe and North America.

The books throw up the diverse themes which have become part of Border Studies during this period; notably, the relationship between borders and identity, the changing function and role of borders in Europe in general (and the EU in particular), and the functional nature of borderland and trans-boundary regions. Most of the volumes present a wealth of case studies, largely drawn from the European context, adding enormously

*Newman is a Professor in the Department of Politics and Government at Ben Gurion University, Israel, and is Editor of *Geopolitics*.

to our knowledge of the processes and dynamics of change which are constantly taking place in and around borders.

In *Living (with) Borders*, edited by Ulrike Meinhof, a consortium of researchers—from countries straddling the borders which have undergone change as a result of the dramatic social and political upheaval in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union—conducted fieldwork and interviews in an attempt to gain a deeper understanding of people's everyday experiences, their memories of the past, and their understanding of and feelings about “the others” across the border. The results, presented as a discursive collection of border narratives, demonstrate the multiple identities which people living in close proximity to borders often display. These identities play out differently amongst the age cohorts, with each of three generations of people living in these border communities and displaying diverse understandings of the major political, social, and economic changes which have taken place.

These narratives emphasize the substantial impact that borders have on the daily life practices of people in border communities. Many of these practices are mediated through the existence and, subsequently, the removal of the boundary. The contributions show how complex identities can be understood through personal narrative of the way people perceive those who live on the “other” side of the border and the extent to which those perceptions change as a result of the border openings. This is particularly important in relation to German, Austrian, Polish, Hungarian, Italian, and Slovenian borders; where political tensions during the Cold War era were heightened and the border often symbolized the line at which enemies confronted each other—rather than neighbors meeting each other—as occurred when the borders re-opened. The post War political tensions and the desire by governments—not only on each side of the Iron Curtain border but even within the respective West and East domains of control—to maintain and to institutionalize their borders with effective means of management and control often resulted in the strengthening of separate identity consciousness, even in regions where languages and histories were common to many of the peoples.

The opening of borders theme and its impact upon local communities is taken further in *Challenged Borderlands*, edited by Pavlakovich, Morehouse, and Wastl-Water, by drawing on notions of economic flows and benefits which, it is generally argued, result from border openings. Much of the borderless world discourse has emerged from the field of Economics where the notion of global capital flows and global markets have, for many, replaced the former economic focus on borders as tariff and customs barriers. The book explores some of the contradictory, yet simultaneous, processes affecting border regions; not least where the economic or political opening of borders does not necessarily correspond with a merging of cross-border identities. Diverse chapters offer a wide range of perspectives on global, national, regional, and local processes and provide a useful matrix for understanding their complex, multilayered implications. Here too, diverse local and regional case studies, mostly from Central Europe, highlight key concepts such as the impact of globalization on the role and function of borders and the way in which identities are negotiated and mediated through the existence of borders.

Implicit in some of the opening chapters of this book is the drawing together of the North American experience with that of post-1990 Europe, a period during which the perceived benefits of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) had a major impact on border thinking, research, and management in that continent. The increasing flow of goods, capital, ideas, and people across boundaries promised to reduce physi-

cal and cognitive distances. In the pre 9/11 era, the U.S.-Mexican border emerged in public consciousness as a location of new opportunities and academics and public officials sought ways in which to make the border easier to negotiate as a means of increasing the flow of trade. Following this era, the emphasis has been, once again, on the way in which to close and seal borders (especially in the USA) to the perceived threat of terrorism and instability from the outside. Border scholars—who in the 1990s were funded by organizations eager to find ways of making borders more elastic, flexible, and easier to cross—are now faced with the demand to show government agencies how borders can be closed more tightly and sealed against the perceived threats emanating from beyond the border. Thus, the functional role of borders is highly politically contingent and, although the general trend is for borders to move along the continuum from closed to more open, events can occur which partially reverse this process.

While all of the books contribute important case studies to our changing understanding of the bordering dynamics, the one text, which is explicitly more conceptual than the others, is *B/ordering Spaces*, edited by Van Houtum and his colleagues at the Nijmegen Centre for Border Studies in the Netherlands. The authors show how, in the wake of globalization, notions of mobility, fluidity, and “hybridity” characterize the presumed “deterritorialization” and de-bordering of contemporary social and economic relations. This book brings together a group of human geographers to explore the use of these concepts in relation to space, place, and territory. In doing so, they (re)situate the subject of borders as active socio-spatial processes from a variety of theoretical perspectives. The contributors link debates on borders to discussions within the wider sphere of cultural studies, notably those addressing themes of migration, post-colonialism, the formation of national/regional identities, and radical democratic practice. An important question that arises out of these contributions is the nature of power relation in the way that borders are constituted in the first place as a means of ensuring power hegemonies, both within and between States and local communities. The same power relations are an important factor in understanding the way in which borders may be “deconstituted” in other places and at other times—often the same power elites—constructing and deconstructing borders as a result of changing historical and political contingencies, but ultimately serving the same, not new, political interests.

The chapters in the Van Houtum volume focus on those discursive practices that “constitute ‘bordered’ geographical entities in the first instance through differentiated regimes of discourse.” The book thus transcends the narrower field of borderlands research by building bridges to other domains of enquiry within political and human geography. Border studies have become increasingly cross-disciplinary, with political scientists, sociologists, and anthropologists (to name but a few) meeting geographers and planners in a new trans-boundary space in a joint attempt to understand the dynamics of the bordering process. As such, flows and networks are of greater significance than the simplistic notions of fixed spaces and territories. This is highlighted in those contributions which focus on boundary poetics along the Portuguese-Spanish borderlands (Sidaway), spaces of absence along the Dutch-German border (Struver), spaces of orientation in Israel/Palestine (Gregory), and the re-imagining of bounded routes and discourses (Natter).

The one authored (as contrasted with edited) collections book in this collection is *Drawing the Line* by Juliet Fall. This book provides a critical examination of the spatial assumptions underpinning transboundary-protected areas in Europe at a time of surging interest in the creation and management of such areas. It explores how the reliance

on the natural science approach to space within environmental planning has led to a return of exclusionary discourses, in paradoxical contrast to the stated claims of designing “peace parks” which are perceived as straddling borders, bringing mutual benefits to residents of both sides of the border. The book builds a much-needed link between the critical geopolitical literature on boundaries and social approaches to nature and “hybridity.” Examples from France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and the Ukraine all highlight the complexity of trans-boundary experiences even when the common cause—environment and quality of life—is far removed from out and out political objectives. The book does raise important questions concerning the nature of relations in trans-boundary regions and the extent to which these areas are characterized by a form of “hybridity,” resulting from forms of inclusion, or whether past political separation and tensions prevent this from happening to the extent that border theoreticians argue should be the case.

Fall’s book, which concentrates on trans-boundary environmental issues, is a good example of how different notions of border and boundary can be drawn together when discussing the most physical of phenomena. She shows how the organization and delimitation of space continues to be of fundamental importance even where the traditional forms of spatial and territorial compartmentalization are crossed at the border. The discussion of the myth of boundless nature is of particular significance as it challenges our basic understanding of what does, and what does not, cross boundaries with ease. In its place, she discusses the notion of complex spatial scenarios as well as the way in which science and politics intervene and mediate in the design of protected areas, cross-boundary peace parks, and contested boundaries.

And even as borders undergo physical opening as a result of political agreements, we are reminded that there always remains an external border, but that it is continually shifted from one location to another. This is highlighted in the collection of essays brought together in the book on *EU Enlargement* edited by James Scott. The 2004 entry of 10 Central and Eastern European countries, along with Malta and Cyprus, into the EU has caused a huge shift in the EU’s external boundaries. The socio-economic and political transformations that this shift has caused not only suggest new regional development opportunities, but also many potential problems and tensions. While the EU insists that enlargement will not signify “new divisions,” processes of inclusion, exclusion, and the imposition of visa restrictions on non-EU citizens could pose obstacles to co-operation and conjure fears of an emerging “fortress Europe” that effectively divides the continent. This is clearly apparent with the new wave of anti-immigration feeling which has arisen in some western European countries as a result of the mass movement of people seeking employment from Poland and Slovakia, a feeling which will be exacerbated even further following the inclusion of Romania and Bulgaria to the EU in 2007. The outer borders of the EU, those brought about by the Schengen Agreements, will become tougher to cross and will undergo new processes of border closing, demarcation, and management.

The Scott book does, however, emphasize the importance of cross-border regions as an important step in the gradual opening of what were once closed borders. Illustrated with case studies from Central and Eastern European border areas, this book examines capacities for region building across national borders within the context of EU enlargement, suggesting ways forward for the future development of the EU’s “Wider Europe” strategy. Borders as places of meeting and cooperation do not have to wait for the formal opening or removal of the border for such interaction to take place while, in

many cases, the formal opening of the border is helped along in those areas where there has already been a heightened degree of cross-border regional activity.

Two themes, which are thrown up in each of the books reviewed here, are those concerning border narratives on the one hand, and the local scale of daily life practices along the border on the other. Border related texts of the previous decades focused almost entirely on the border as a component of the State at the macro level of political relations between neighboring countries. Whether a border was open or closed was traditionally seen as being the prerogative of the State, and it was assumed that, almost miraculously, the opening of a border would bring about flows of people, goods, and neighborly interaction. The recent discussion of border narratives, past and present, as discussed in some way or other in all of the texts reviewed here show that the perceptions and understandings of the border are something which are felt at the local and micro levels of daily behavior, more evident when the border is formally closed, but also apparent even long after the border has been opened and when the physical movement and interaction of people has been allowed to take place freely. It is possible that second and third generation border residents, who have been born and grown up entirely in a situation of open borders, may have completely different border narratives than their parents' and grandparents' generation; all of whom lived along closed borders for part of their lives, some of whom still went to war over border and territory related issues.

These excellent books go a long way to dispelling notions of a borderless world, as if this notion had not been dispelled already. However, with the notable exception of the Van Houtum, Kramsch, and Zierhofer volume and some of the introductory chapters, these books stop short addressing some of the more conceptual aspects of border studies. The border literature of the past decade is not lacking case study material, especially from the Western and Central European milieux. What is lacking, however, is a concerted attempt to create a text which will examine the changing notions of borders and bordering as a phenomenon that spreads well beyond the geographical and the physical borders and takes in the various sociological and philosophical understandings of what borders are and what their role is in the era of globalization. The cross-disciplinary debate, which has taken place at numerous workshops and conferences during the past decade, is not necessarily translated into a text which creates a common border language, addressing such topics as crossing borders, borders as bridges or barriers, borderland and frontier milieux, the management of borders, and the binary distinctions which borders are perceived as creating in most instances. This is the challenge awaiting the next generation of border books and one for which the Ashgate series is well suited to pursue.

Book Review

Holding the Line: Borders in a Global World

by Heather N. Nicol and Ian Townsend-Gault (eds.)
Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press (2005)

Reviewed by Bruno Dupeyron*

Holding the Line: Borders in a Global World is a collection of papers, edited by Heather Nicol and Ian Townsend-Gault, which were originally presented at the Permeable Borders and Boundaries Conference in Vancouver (B.C.) in August 1999. This book presents a series of nineteen case studies and conceptual papers organized in eight parts. According to the editors, they “offer different perspectives on the nature of the new seismic forces” (2) at work on and around borders and borderlands as they are transformed by globalization.

Part one, *The World Stage: New Opportunities and Problems*, sets the stage with three chapters linking border issues with globalization and regionalization. Chapter one, written by Gerald Blake, discusses how general views on the permeability of borders may blur and over-simplify complex realities. In chapter two, Thomas M. Edward provides a normative view on how and why transnational corporations and national states should share a common space of interest. In the third chapter, Robert Adamson offers a legal and political point of view on how public policies have acquired a growing dependence on relatively latent international and transnational issues in the past decades. Part two, *Regionalism and Subregionalism in Europe*, discusses European boundaries whose functions are increasingly defined by the regional integration process. In chapter four, Eberhard Bort compares internal and external borders as they obey cyclical re-definitions to accommodate politics (e.g. they are open and regulate migratory flows). In the fifth chapter, James Wesley Scott examines infra-national activities in the Baltic Sea area and concludes that such cross-border activities constitute necessary dynamics to EU building. The third part of the book, *Emerging Perspectives*, is particularly original because it introduces discussions to the little-known border regions of Africa and Southeast Asia. In chapter six, Anthony I. Asiwaju promotes non-national perspectives in post-colonial Africa. Clive Schofield’s chapter focuses upon trans-maritime cooperation in Southeast Asia and helps to understand how maritime borders reflect transnational cooperations within joint development zones for fishing—in the Gulf of Thailand for instance. Part four, *Redefining Boundaries in the Americas*, sheds light on Latin America. In chapter eight, Heather Nicol shows how the Caribbean states have attempted to promote a regional identity and political links in developing a

*Dupeyron is a Post-Doctoral Fellow in the School of Public Administration at University of Victoria, Canada.

common neo-liberal project. Roy Bradshaw's chapter reminds us of the very specific nature of South American borders that are historically rooted in the colonial Spanish Vice-Royalties and Portuguese colony and Empire: Bradshaw's analysis reflects current aspects of Latin American regional integration dilemmas, in spite of the recent widening of MERCOSUR. Part five, *A Borderless North America?*, examines the Cascadia cross-border region with three chapters (eleven-thirteen) by Donald K. Alper, Alan F. J. Artibise, and Daniel E. Turbeville III and Susan L. Bradbury. They focus on the economic, historical, and political perspectives of this Northwestern cross-border region. Theodore H. Cohn, in chapter ten, compares transportation and infrastructure issues in Cascadia and the San Diego-Tijuana areas.

The last three parts and six chapters of this book change focus from case studies to theoretical discussions. Part six concerns the idea of *Borders as Metaphors*. In chapter fourteen, Mathew Coleman emphasizes the discursive dimensions of borders that are spatial markers as well as symbolic, textual, and social constructions. In chapter fifteen, Steven Jackson presents Malaysia's Multimedia Super Corridor to suggest that common optimistic perspectives on information technologies hide a more bordered socio-spatial organization of society. The seventh part, *Rethinking Borders: Lines, Spaces and Continua*, then focuses on cartographic and textual views of borders. William B. Wood, in chapter sixteen, shows how the recent humanitarian agenda of NGOs and international organizations has contributed to an increased use of geographic information systems. These, in turn, have led the way to new international operations. In chapter seventeen, Alan K. Henrikson argues that the concept of "good neighbourhood," though pertinent in matters of diplomacy, implies that a boundary policy "should be a 'Mending Wall'" (355) or, in other words, should result from a "consociative" initiative. In the eighth part, Stanley D. Brunn *et al.* underline that boundaries and borderlands have a constant significance in spite of the siren song of a borderless world. In chapter nineteen, David Newman suggests that the tools to measure dynamic objects such as borders and borderlands should be adaptable as well.

Holding the Line thus offers a multi-disciplinary perspective to border studies, taking into account recent global and local events. Three main comments may be suggested. First, it is successful in refusing a deeply rooted border "doxa" (Bourdieu 1998) since it exclusively focuses on questioning practical knowledge of borders. It is also successful in confronting scientific approaches in vogue in the 1990s that depicted the world as "borderless" and globalized. Finally, it provides rich readings that represent a solid toolbox for further comparative and "self-analytical" (Touraine 1995) researches about borders and borderlands.

In conclusion, Heather Nicol reminds us of the role of border "doxa" through the eloquent metaphor of "the framework of the grade-school political map (to which we have all become accustomed)" (418). Arno Peters' work in cartographic studies imposed a healthy distance from European-centered maps that jeopardize our scientific attitude regarding border studies in particular (Peters 1989). In the same vein, the various authors of *Holding the Line* give a multi-disciplinary picture of boundaries. What is striking is the diversity and richness of this volume, not only because most continents are studied, but also because they let us become aware of the relative stability and permanence of borders over time, as reflected in the title.

This volume has another virtue: the editors and each contributor reject the 1990s "borderlessness" principle. Instead, finely shaded scientific analyses make us think about borders according to broad norms but also as "symbolic violence" (Bourdieu

1984; 1993) as they are emerging from the rich perceptions, discourses, and “instrumentalizations” of borders. To do so, the authors focus on specific topics such as: *border security*—whose transgression is, at present, mainly reflected in trans-national terrorism and criminalized migratory issues (e.g. Wacquant 2006); *corporate uses of boundaries and territories*—with global products but differentiated local marketing strategies and inventive fiscal tactics; or *variable social and political re-territorialization*—with various distinct effects in Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia, North America, and Europe. In the end, the call for a “conceptual framework for boundary studies” (419) is extremely well documented and justified.

This volume will be very stimulating for scholars. Students, scholars, and political decision-makers will most likely be the first readers of this book. However, a much wider audience interested in understanding the current socio-political environment will also be interested.

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, ed. 1993. *La Misère du monde*. Paris: Le Seuil, Collection Libre Examen.
- _____. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Peters, Arno. 1989. *Peters' Atlas of the World*. Longman, Harlow.
- Touraine, Alain. 1995. *Critique of Modernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Wacquant, Loic D. 2006. *Deadly Symbiosis: Race and the Rise of Neoliberal Penalty*. UK: Polity Press.

Book Review

The Three U.S.-Mexican Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration and Homeland Security

by Tony Payan
Praeger Security International (2006)

Reviewed by Heather Nicol*

The Three U.S.-Mexican Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration and Homeland Security employs a narrative approach to its topic: tracing lives of borderland inhabitants, both Mexican and American, who depend upon crossing the U.S.-Mexico border on a regular basis. Their stories are “a powerful image of the border” and can truly claim to be “representative illustrations of life at the southern edge of the American empire,” a theme which is tackled in this very compelling study. Indeed, the book squarely addresses the complexity of this southern edge—at times chaotic, lawless, and yet also a symbol of hope, courage, and hard work. These two worlds, the good and the bad, are intimately connected in a strip of land running 2100 miles along the southern edge of the U.S. and the northern edge of Mexican territory. But in order to appreciate the real border, its function, meaning, and future; Payan argues that it is necessary to see where and how the border has formed and the impact of these “lawless” and “chaotic” border stories upon the definition of border policies, border management, and cross-border processes. While the border is a homeland to many, contemporary border images focus almost exclusively upon the turmoil and disarray.

In reviewing the history of chaos and “management” along the U.S.-Mexico border, Payan identifies four periods in which the U.S. government has largely shaped the meaning of the border for its residents (frontier, customs border, law enforcement border and security border). Each stage is marked by changes in policy and, equally important, changes on the ground in terms of border landscapes, management, and infrastructure.

These four stages, roughly defined by contemporaneous historical events and U.S. policy responses, have culminated in the current border management regime. Today the U.S.-Mexican border is largely perceived as a concern for national security and has experienced successive levels of closing as escalation of control along the border on each side sees the addition of greater levels of surveillance, control, and personnel to control it. But, Payan argues, the real problem is that in all of this effort to define and control, those who live in the borderlands have not been consulted: “Border residents

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

have little control over the image and reputation of their homeland” (15). The border has become a symbol, instead, for politicians to grandstand over drugs, undocumented immigration, and homeland security and bears little resemblance to the way in which the border is perceived by its residents. Payan suggests that for forty years, in fact, the U.S. has waged war on its border, principally over drugs and undocumented immigration. Only in the past five years has the third border war emerged—a war on terror as it potentially manifests itself as a “threat” to national security along the U.S.-Mexican borderlands.

For Payan, the wars and the policies they embody are the subject of the remainder of the volume. In the chapters that follow, he traces both the emergence of concern over various issues—immigration, drugs, and terror—and the border management eras that have been constructed to effectively wage war on each. Yet, Payan suggests that there is a democratic deficit in terms of the citizens of the borderlands. Borderland residents have no input into how the federal governments of their homelands deal with regional issues and, as a result, do not govern themselves. Rather they are governed from afar, or above, with little input into the process. The result has been a stereotype about “the dangerous border” and conflation of very different issues. Moreover, as new policies are implemented to militate against perceived escalation of danger, from politicians and afar, the same management mistakes and misperceptions become so entrenched and institutionalized that they are repeated and perpetuated. Escalation of control, the theme of the past century of border relations, has now led to a fenced and indeed militarized border. Yet, the problematic flows for which they seek to stem the tide have only increased.

Overall, this book is excellent and innovative in its understanding of contemporary U.S.-Mexican border management policies. The book captures the essence of Payan’s overall argument about the evolution of the contemporary U.S.-Mexican border. There is no doubt that it is a complex and, at times, chaotic region. There is no doubt that there are tremendous challenges to be faced and resolved in order to ensure human security within the region. There is also no doubt that the problems of the border region have been conceptualized and generalized in broader economic, legalistic, and security geopolitical paradigms which neglect the specific context of the borderlands themselves, the people, and the processes which are encountered in daily living. Thus Washington’s mobilization to produce a more secure border has also failed for the same reasons that other efforts to manage and control transnational processes within the region have not met with success. The result has been a conflation of issues such as undocumented immigration and overstayed legal immigration, law enforcement and visa adjudication, open borders and closed border policies, and intelligence failures.

The book is thus a welcome change from some of the previous literature on U.S.-Mexican border management, which speaks to the issue of transnational tensions in less informed and nuanced ways, and will be of use in the classroom for undergraduate as well as graduate reading. Where Payan shines in his analysis is in his ability to capture the sense of complexity and contradiction in the area of border formation and management and in applying the analytical framework in which a series of federal policies are clearly recognizable as a coherent, if ill-advised, series of policy solutions “eras” in which the U.S.-Mexican borderlands are rapidly closing. Payan makes no pretense that he has the answers for the failed policies but rather suggests the place to look for answers that are more effective. The answers will not be found when imposed from above without appreciation or consultation of the region’s residents themselves.

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 (effective January 1, 2008 dues will be \$50). 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 of 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/jbsmanscriptstyle.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