Welcome to the second newsletter of the EUBORDERSCAPES project which studies evolving concepts of ‘border’ in European but also wider international contexts. One major component of EUBORDERSCAPES is to survey the changing field of border studies as a reflection of continuity and change in the way we perceive borders socially, culturally, politically.

With the first State of the Debate Report, the EUBORDERSCAPES consortium has attempted to indicate some of the themes and concepts that have been important in the development of border studies as well as briefly discuss emerging drivers of change in the way we think, talk and write about borders.

As the report documents, the study of borders has moved away from an almost exclusive concern with the borders between States in the international system, to the study of borders at diverse socio-spatial and geographical scales, ranging from the local and the municipal, to the global, regional and supra-State compartmentalisation of the world in a post-Westphalian period. The growing interdisciplinarity of borders studies has also moved the discussion away from an exclusive concern with geographical, physical and tangible borders to those which are cultural, social, economic, religious and, in many cases, invisible, but with major impacts on the way in which human society is bordered, ordered and compartmentalised. As such, it is the process of bordering which brings these diverse types of borders within a single frame of analysis for scholars interested in understanding the dynamics of the process.

While there is no single border theory, nor is there likely to be such a theory, this report could help in the development of common glossaries of terms taken from diverse disciplines and applied to the study of borders in other disciplines. For example, notions of border demarcation, delimitation, management, crossing, and so on are no less relevant to an invisible border between cultural groups or entities as they are to a visible border between States. Nor are they any less relevant to borders between urban neighbourhoods as they to the hard physical borders between neighbouring States.

The present document is only the first in the ‘state of the debate’ series in border studies. Other papers will follow that are more specifically targeted, among others, at social issues, the role of European research and the discussion of future research topics. In addition, this report will be subject to updating and improvement as EUBORDERSCAPES proceeds. In order to improve the quality of this report, we welcome all comments and criticisms from our interested readers.

This ‘state of the art’ paper should be considered work in progress. It by no means aims at total comprehensiveness or completeness as the field of border studies is much too broad and variegated for any single attempt at documentation.

Workpackage 4: Europeanisation

Among other areas of socio-spatial transformation, EUBORDERSCAPES explores the impact of European integration and enlargement on concepts of borders. This involves a critical investigation of bordering processes in terms of how official policies, political debates as well as media representations and more informal local ‘placemaking’ practices have contributed to European interpretations of national borders. Work will include uncovering divergences and convergences in various modes of European border representations (e.g. political language, media, academic, cultural representations). The participants in Workpackage 4 (Europeanisation: European Integration and Conceptual Change) met 22-24 March 2013 in Erkner (near Berlin) at the Institute of Regional Development and Structural Planning in order to plan the next empirical steps. On the initiative of Hans-Jochen Bürkner and Heidi Fichter, the workpackage coordina-
tors, the idea of ‘Europeanisation’ was subjected to critical scrutiny.

While discussion brought out very different understandings and receptions of ‘Europeanisation’, there was consensus that this concept is a moving target – it changes as the EU itself is transformed through reform, crises and adaptation. A central debate that emerged during the WP 4 meeting regarded the extent to which Europeanisation implies convergence to a specific norm and/or divergence in terms of local forms of ‘European’ development. This question goes all the way down: is Europe, for example, an a priori given in cultural, historical and geographic terms or is it rather a non-finalisable project of ‘self creation’ through interaction, communication, conflict and negotiation? It is likely that the emergence of common understandings of Europeanisation will involve tensions between all these meanings. It is likely that Europeanisation will be understood in terms of social progress at the same time that it involves different narrations of ‘us’ and ‘them’ and thus arbitrary processes of inclusion and exclusion.

There is no question that these differentiated understandings of Europeanisation have affected how European borders have been narrated as well. EU Borders are at once integrators, guarantors of EU coherence and stability but also generators of injustice, exclusion and, in the opinion of many European anti-border activists (see, for example, the reference to FRONTEXIT below), human rights violations. Through its critical discussion of Europeanisation and borders, the WP 4 team will provide critical impetus to debates regarding the democratic governance of Europe’s borders as well as more generally reflect on the tensions inherent in the project to European Union.


During the Second EastBordNet Conference Relocating Borders: a comparative approach (Berlin, 11-13 January 2013), research approach in Workpackage 5 (Post-Colonial Bordering and Euro-African Borderscapes) of the EUBORDERSCAPES project was presented by Chiara Brambilla (University of Bergamo & participant in WP 5) during the roundtable ‘Borders and Knowledge Production: a Comparative Perspective’. Henk van Houtum (Nijmegen Centre for Border Research), lead participant in WP 5, also contributed to the discussion.

The roundtable, jointly organised by EastBordNet and ABORNE, provided a forum of discussion for scholars belonging to networks – including institutions, centres, research programmes and so on – that have adopted borders and borderlands as core analytical frameworks in their scientific agendas. The roundtable was comparative in nature, meaning not simply ways of establishing similarities and differences between phenomena observed across the globe, but also modes of comparing the conceptual, epistemological and empirical questions generated by studying borders in different regions. The emphasis on geographical (and thematic) diversity served to draw attention to the rootedness of such concerns in specific geo-historical settings and the scholarly knowledge produced on them (e.g. area studies).

Chair: Paolo Gaibazzi (Zentrum Moderner Orient, Berlin, Germany). Participants: Chiara Brambilla (University of Bergamo, Italy); Christine Thurlow Brenner (University of Massachusetts, USA); Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly (University of Victoria, Canada); Irasema Coronado (University of Texas El Paso, USA); Gregor Dobler (University of Freiburg, Germany); Hastings Donnan (Queen’s University, Northern Ireland); Sarah Green (University of Helsinki, Finland); Conrad Schetter (Bonn Asia Centre, University of Bonn); Henk van Houtum (Nijmegen Centre for Border Research, University Nijmegen, The Netherlands).
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1 Chair: Paolo Gaibazzi (Zentrum Moderner Orient, Berlin, Germany). Participants: Chiara Brambilla (University of Bergamo, Italy); Christine Thurlow Brenner (University of Massachusetts, USA); Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly (University of Victoria, Canada); Irasema Coronado (University of Texas El Paso, USA); Gregor Dobler (University of Freiburg, Germany); Hastings Donnan (Queen’s University, Northern Ireland); Sarah Green (University of Helsinki, Finland); Conrad Schetter (Bonn Asia Centre, University of Bonn); Henk van Houtum (Nijmegen Centre for Border Research, University Nijmegen, The Netherlands).
These considerations on the relation between border studies and area studies and the most recent evolutions of the conceptualisation of borders are relevant with specific reference also to the regional focus on Euro-African borderlands investigated in WP 5 of the EUBORDERSCAPES project. The worldwide growth of border-related scholarship has been influencing debates and research agendas in area studies focusing on Euro-African relational geographies. In particular, debates on Euro-African borderlands have been influenced by research on the Mexico-US border. Debates on Euro-African borderlands have been also affected by attempts to frame the Euro-African relationship in ways that reference symbolic dimensions of borders and bordering practices inherent to this colonial as well as post-colonial relationships emerging from the Latin American experience of Iberian conquest, enslavement and independence. At the same time, regional dynamics shape the research questions asked by border scholars and in the case of Euro-African borderlands one can't help but adopt a genealogical viewpoint. The peculiar regional dynamics characterising Euro-African borderlands between colonialism and post-colonialism give border scholars a chance to broaden and deepening debate and research on the spacetime of borders. Historicising Euro-African borderlands would help us to move towards a novel border imaginary able to describe the shifting and crossing processing of bordering between Europe and Africa, thereby denying that Europe and Africa can be reduced to single bounded entities.

Looking at Euro-African borderlands and their genealogy, in WP 5 we propose to use the lens of ‘(post-colonial) Euro-African borderscapes’. This brings us to specifically address another question posed by Paolo Gaibazzi (Zentrum Moderner Orient, Berlin), the chair of the roundtable, by reflecting on borders not only as empirical sites but also as conceptual spaces to think about social reality. Taking the borderscape as a methodological angle, it would be interesting to inquire into the Euro-African border nexus by adopting a multi-disciplinary approach, able to highlight borders as complex multi-dimensional entities. The borderscapes framework allows us to investigate these discursive premises using the relational geographies between EU(rope) and Africa as a critical backdrop in multiple ways. We can examine how the conceptual links between EU-internal, EU-external and non-European borders are embedded within knowledge and control regimes and the consequences of these.

We can examine the postcolonial continuities and ruptures in the European displacement and migration machine, and we can examine the consequences of EU borderscaping for the societal transformations of EU(rope) and Africa, exploring the shifting borders of the EU ‘neighbourhood’, while considering the crucial role of growing transnational communities, multinational actors and hybrid Euro-African spaces within Europe, and mainly within European cityscapes and multiplying hybrid urban thresholds. This means to develop a focus on what we can call ‘transversal Euro-African borderscapes’ across and beyond the borders of European and African regions respectively. This means investigating at the same time Africa(s) in/of Europe and Europe(s) in/of Africa.

As theoretical reflection and empirical work underway in WP 5 suggest, taking the (post-colonial) borderscape as methodological angle gives us a chance to critically rethink the conventional geopolitical imaginaries that inform area/border studies with reference to Euro-African borderlands and beyond.

**EUBORDERSCAPES Conference ‘Mapping Conceptual Change in Thinking European Borders’ in Bergamo (Italy), 2–3 July 2013**

The EUBORDERSCAPES Workshop 3 will take place on 2–3 July 2013 in Bergamo (Italy), organised by Italian project partner University of Bergamo; Centro di Ricerca sulla Compressità (Ce.R.Co).

Right after the Workshop on 3–5 July 2013, the University of Eastern Finland, in cooperation with the University of Bergamo, will organise the first general Conference ‘Mapping Conceptual Change in Thinking European Borders’ of the EUBORDERSCAPES project in Bergamo.

This conference will be organised as a joint event in conjunction with the FP7 project EUBORDERREGIONS (see: [http://www.euborderregions.eu](http://www.euborderregions.eu)). The Conference is intended to present on-going research activities within these two large-scale international projects to the wider public and to make a constructive contribution to the debate within border studies opening up a dialogue with scholars external to the project who are contributing to pushing conceptual, methodological and empirical research on borders and border crossings forward. However, the Conference does not aim to merely gather together researchers and academics who work on the issues of borders, but also social actors, policy-makers, practitioners, institutions and interested parties that are directly (and daily) involved in borders issues, implementing projects and solving problems, providing therefore a broad and multidisciplinary discussion. This will be done in line with policy relevant aspects of the EUBORDERSCAPES and EUBORDERREGIONS projects that
involve different levels of political and economic agency and a variety of social spheres. Keynote Speakers: Prof. Elena dell'Agnese (University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy) and Prof. Prem Kumar Rajaram (Central European University, Budapest, Hungary).

A Summer School will be organised in conjunction with the Conference.

For further information: http://www.euborderscapes.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/CallForPapers1_bergamo_13.pdf

Report on the ‘Border Aesthetics’ conference, University of Tromsø, Tromsø 5–8 September 2012

by JOHAN SCHIMANSKI & STEPHEN WOLFE
Department of Culture and Literature, University of Tromsø

The “Border Aesthetics” conference attracted 53 registered participants, including literary scholars, political geographers, historians, anthropologists, folklorists, linguists, media scholars, urban planners, architects, and students. Regional authors, performing artists, filmmakers, and artistic producers took part in a special panel.

Several researchers from EU FP7 research projects EU-BORDERSCAPES and EUBORDERREGIONS took part, as well as groups of researchers from the Finnish Academy research project Writing Cultures and Borders (WCTB) at the Karelian Institute, University of Eastern Finland, the Barents Institute in Kirkenes, and the Border Conditions group at Delft University of Technology.

EUBORDERSCAPE researchers Stephen F. Wolfe and Henk van Houtum present on ‘The Waiting State: Kafka and Coetzee’s Imaginary Geographies of the B/ordering of the State’

The aim of the conference was to investigate how changing perceptions of borders relate to shifting aesthetic practices, and as such the conference helps lay some of the grounds for the EUBORDERSCAPES work-package 10, on ‘Border Crossings and Cultural Production’. The conference built on ongoing work at the University of Tromsø (the Border Poetics/Culture research group) and was the final conference of the Border Aesthetics research project (2010–2013).

Paper topics addressed the negotiation of borders: in photography, political satire, feature films, artistic happenings, literary fiction, poetry, theatre performances, local communities, urban spaces, architecture, magazines, and life stories. Papers also addressed questions about the aesthetic dimensions of: the visibility/invisibility of borders, culture borders and diaspora, waiting at borders, the borders of the subject, ecological borders, the economic crisis and sovereignty.

The conference featured three keynote lectures by Ulrike H. Meinhof, of the University of Southampton; by Fredrik Tygstrup of the University of Copenhagen. and by Debra A. Castillo of Cornell University.

Four actors in the Barents Region aesthetic border-scape – Knut Erik Jensen (filmmaker), Liv Lundberg (poet and professor of Creative Writing, Tromsø), Liv-Hanne Haugen (dance artist) and Luba Kuzovnikova (artistic director, Pikene på broen, Kirkenes) – presented their work and shared with us their thoughts on cultural production in Northern borderlands in an inspiring panel.

Dmitry Vilensky of art collective Chto delat? / What is to be done?, based in Petersburg, presented ongoing work in a “Songspiel” based on the Russian-Norwegian borderlands. The presentation was held at the Tromsø Gallery of Contemporary Art (Tromsø kunstforening). Their Museum Songspiel: The Netherlands 20XX was shown as an example of previous work, and a lively debate followed involving conference participants and members of the public.

A special issue of conference papers, including two of the keynote lectures, is planned for the periodical Nordlit. The conference and an internal project workshop, which followed, were instrumental in developing work on a
book on Border Aesthetics. Collaboration with the Chto delat? / What is to be done? art collective has resulted in a new issue in their series of newspapers, published in connection with the premiere of their Border Songspiel art video at the Barents Spektakel in February 2013. Financing was provided through the project by the KULVER (Assigning Cultural Values) research programme of the Research Council of Norway and the University of Tromsø, with additional funding from the University of Tromsø and from its Department of Culture and Literature.

**Transcending Borders through Artistic Expression: Chto Delat?, ‘A Border Musical’ and ‘Languages at/of the Border’**

Ongoing cooperation with the St. Petersburg artists collective Chto delat? / What is to be done? involving several EUBORDERSCAPES participants has given input to their new art video and songspiel *A Border Musical* and resulted in the publication of a special issue of their political art theory newspaper. *A Border Musical* is a songspiel with Russian and Norwegian actors addressing the topic of cross-border marriages. It was premiered at an open-air snow cinema screening during the yearly border cultural festival Barents Spektakel in Kirkenes, on 6 February 2013. A trailer is available at [http://vimeo.com/58962390](http://vimeo.com/58962390).

The Chto delat newspaper 11-35 is a special issue on ‘Languages at/of the Border’ produced in cooperation with the Border Aesthetics research project at the University of Tromsø, whose work provides part of the pretext for the EUBORDERSCAPES workpackage 10 on borders and cultural production. The newspaper, printed in the border town of Kirkenes, involves contributions by EUBORDERSCAPES researchers Holger Pötzsch, Henk van Houtum, Stephen Wolfe and Johan Schimanski, along with Jacques Rancière, Morten Strøknes, Mladen Dolar, Oxana Timofeeva, and Urban Wråkberg. It also includes the full script of *A Border Musical* by Tsaplya Olga Egorova and Dmitry Vilensky. The newspaper can be read online at [http://bit.ly/12wCOFO](http://bit.ly/12wCOFO).

**A still from the Chto delat?’s art video A Border Musical (48:30 min.)**

**Cover of Chto delat newspaper ‘Languages at/of the Border’**
Stephen Wolfe and Henk Van Houtum
Waiting at the Border
with Franz Kafka and J.M. Coetzee

There is a need to see that not only migratory, refugee, and immigrant populations find themselves caught in the web of the borderscape, but we all are caught as well. We bring the border with us into any territory we enter, and have become increasingly aware of the diffusion of the border across other territories such as airports, travel offices, CCTV cameras in our cities, and also most every government office. It is in this space that we come before the Law and are forced to place ourselves within the “imagined community” of the nation and disciplined by our internalization of its laws. We must relate to established narratives of the state that are enacted at a distance from us, usually in metropolitan centers, and often force our decisions into an algorithmic order calculated for “threat” risk and “terror” potential. As we resist these dominant narratives we also live inside them, making us very aware of the provisional nature of the boundaries placed around our communities.

These stretched border zones or borderscapes are not only potential sites of negotiation, but also are constantly being negotiated. The view that borders are processes – borderings – rather than fixed lines is clear. And this includes figurative or imaginative borders, which surround us and are created for us and by us. We are, as we argue in this article, caught between a schizoid desire for, and a paranoid fear of borders. Often, however, a moment of intervention is reached or a space of negotiation is opened. This space is part of the borderscape, sometimes contiguous with it, but often far away from the geopolitical border. It is located on the outside of the geopolitical field altogether, and it always retains some link to the territorial border even if at a distance. For the migrant or citizen waiting to cross the border or come before it, this border zone is the space of the border and before the law.

Waiting for the Law at the Border

We propose examining the state of waiting at the border in two famous works of literature, Franz Kafka’s “Waiting for the Law” by Franz Kafka (1914–15, published 1925) and J.M. Coetzee’s novel Waiting for the Barbarians (1980). It is with these two texts that we approach the issues of waiting, so typical of a bordering and othering process. We will argue that the act of waiting consists of two mutually reinforcing parts. First, we will use Kafka’s text, with its emphasis on the individual who waits to come before a state system of authority, and the limitless postponements and adjustments society makes through its officials to subjectify and control the expectations and rights of such individuals within that state system. Second, we discuss Coetzee’s text, in which the citizens and the army of the state identify their social responsibility with a settlement in a borderscape, where they are always awaiting a transgression of their borders by an invading “barbarian force.” The borders they construct and those protected by the Empire’s army symbolize insecurities on the periphery of the Empire. To “contain” such a threat, more walls must be built; a border security force must discipline the citizenship and must “spy” on both its citizens and the “barbarian” Other. Such a force acts in the name of corporate sovereign authority and disciplinary “necessity.” But such necessary waiting and awaiting the barbarians, for both the citizen and the border guard, is intrinsically double edged, as the last line in the poem “Waiting for the Barbarians” by Constantine Cavafy, from which Coetzee has derived his novel’s title, makes clear: “[A]nd now, what’s going to happen to us without barbarians? They were, those people, a kind of solution.”

In Kafka’s brilliant short story, the man from the country is waiting before the Law. He has been waiting all his life to have permission to enter. The principal activity of the man from the country is waiting. For to wait is to discipline oneself. Waiting calls for a standstill, a fixation in a place, and subjection to the passing of time. It makes you aware that you are not taking part in other activities; you cannot spend your time otherwise in other places when you have decided or are forced to wait.

A striking element in Kafka’s text is that the man has to wait before the Law; yet he has no entrance to it. That is, the man from the country is not yet allowed entrance. This “not yet” for the man from the country, however, is a permanent status. It is this waiting before the Law and the not yet that fixes and reproduces state power and creates the internalization of control. The terms are also a destiny, a future, a promise, a life beyond the present reality that can only be reached through training, devotion, honesty, and working, depending on whatever the promise consists of. We are constantly waiting before the Law, and constantly reproducing the time-spatial b/order. It is the promise of good behavior, of good internalization of the dominant order, the promise of final appreciation by the other that constructs the social self, the waiting self. The consequence of this act of waiting is that we live our lives in a “not yet” status, in the flux of constant be-coming, or in the words of Kafka, in indefinite postponement.

We interpret the law of the territorial border in Kafka’s text as a belief, it is a belief in the presence and continuity of a spatial binding power, which becomes meaningful and objectified in our everyday social practices. The spatial separation that a border represents is both goal and means. The border makes and is made. A border should be seen as a verb, bordering, not a noun. The making of a border is the making of a desired be-longing to an order, an in-group in an inland, and in-side, and the making of others, is the making of a be-longing so that the out-group, in an out-land, is out-side.
Although the b/order is an imagined-and-lived reality, that does not stop the desire for the true Self. The true b/order has no end, for realizations of wholeness never align with the fantasy perfectly. The perfect identity is always there, beyond the threshold, beyond the gates of the Law. The identity is the desire of a self or an order that is an unattainable Other. The emptiness of the Law produces a contingent reality and the contingent rituals of truth-keeping of those who wish to maintain the constructed b/order. That means that the lack of fulfillment is perpetual and the final truth of the hordered self is unattainable. In the words of the guard standing before the Law in Kafka's parable, “You are insatiable.”

The man from the country is waiting before the Law, and by internalizing and believing in the fantasy of the Law he has found a pseudo-home, an in-the-moment home at the gate, yet his desire to unmask the void, to have access, to know the truth, to truly come home, is insatiable. This feeling of endlessness is also constructed by the gatekeeper, who warned him already at the beginning of his life, when he first sought permission to enter, that there is no end indeed in searching for the truth, for after the first gatekeeper there are only more gatekeepers, even more powerful and harder to trespass than him. For the man from the country and for us there is no final homecoming. To fill in that lack, we create a fantasy home by waiting before the Law, a simulacrum-home. Hence, we necessarily live in a condition of not yet and never will be. We are unavoidably waiting before the Law.

**Waiting for the Barbarians**

Let us now turn to Coetzee’s novel *Waiting for the Barbarians* and see how the state of waiting before and at a border are used there. Published in 1989, Coetzee’s third novel brought him international acclaim. Set in an unspecified time and place, the novel has been read as an allegory with a strong focus on the South African security police and how the language of the novel reflects the language of the apartheid regime. Dealing with issues of torture, the novel was scrutinized by South African censors on its publication, but avoided being banned. The book is divided into six chapters spread over 170 pages, and the chapters are divided into shorter segments or scenes with allusions to Kalka’s publication, but avoided being banned. The language of the novel reflects the language of the apartheid regime. Dealing with issues of torture, the novel was scrutinized by South African censors on its publication, but avoided being banned. The book is divided into six chapters spread over 170 pages, and the chapters are divided into shorter segments or scenes with allusions to Kalka’s *The Trial*, the novel that contains the short story “Waiting for the Law.”

Many articles have been written on *Waiting for the Barbarians* since its publication, but we want to stress its depiction of the border and border guarding, the laws of Empire, and the complexity of identifying “barbarians.”

At the beginning of *Waiting for the Barbarians*, the Magistrate, who is the narrator, despairs when Colonel Joll’s prisoners are not “barbarians”:

“Did no one tell him the difference between fishermen with nets and wild nomad horsemen with bows? Did no one tell them they don’t even speak the same language?” (19). It is evident that the Other is not merely one kind of Other, but a diversity of Others. Colonel Joll, who is commander of the Third Bureau protecting the town, is ignorant of the frontier settlement; he is incapable of distinguishing “barbarians” from the “fisher folk” of the local community. From the beginning of the novel, what is foreign is always relative to the inside, the domestic, the familiar. The Third Bureau of the Civil Guard, who have come to assess the Magistrate and the frontier community, are “guardians of the state” and are part of the technical machinery of the Law and civil society. They enumerate who are Other according to the Law and have come to see for themselves how the laws of the Empire are enacted by the Magistrate. The creation of the other is crucial not only for creating images of the outsider, but also equally essential for constructing the insider: a white European male, the Magistrate and the colonel.

Kafka’s and Coetzee’s texts both begin with a prohibition: an act of forbidding action or of forbidding a person to act by command or decree. The Magistrate will no longer be allowed to perform his role in the community. He is discredited by not knowing the law, but he is also guilty of ignoring the Law. The countryman and the Magistrate are not allowed entrance, in any case, not yet. Unable to cross the threshold, the men stay and wait. And by so doing they are inside the Law without knowing it.

Let us see now how this is relevant to Coetzee’s novel. To begin with, we will focus on the Magistrate. In the novel, the Magistrate is a border guard both implicated in and self-consciously critical of the “the Law” (“one thought alone overpowers the submerged mind of Empire: how not to end, how not to die, how to prolong its era”) and he is “no less infected with it than the faithful Colonel Joll” (146). The Magistrate’s realization of his role, in the scheme of things, seems to be what triggers his unyieldingness to the Empire and its policies. The acts committed in his jurisdiction in the name of Empire and necessity are acts that rob him of his individual authority and from which he seeks to distance himself. But he cannot distance himself from the torture, rape, and “the dark chamber” Joll uses to torture his victims. The Magistrate becomes increasingly connected with a “barbarian girl” whom Joll tortures: identifying with her becomes an escape from his colonial identity while at the same time confirming it. The Magistrate sets out to mend her broken feet and failing eyesight. The girl’s body is always sexual to him while also symbolizing the conquered land he imagines he can also heal. The girl’s body has traces of the border written on it. He follows the biblical injunction to wash her damaged feet, hoping for a sign of healing but without any corresponding signifier.

The question of the torture of the girl, her father, and the young boy is impossible to evade in any meaningful discussion of the novel. Coetzee says that the novel is about “the impact of the torture chamber on the life of a man of conscience”: the Magistrate (Coetzee, 1992, 363). Further, in his article “Into the Dark Chamber,” Coetzee suggests the torture room as a metaphor for the novelist’s imagination: “[T]he novelist is a person who, camped before a closed door, facing an insufferable ban, creates, in place of the scene he is forbidden to see, a representation of that scene, and a story of the actors in it and how they come to be there” (1992, 364). Coetzee is suggesting that the novelist has the ability to cross boundaries through the use of his imagination. But the Magistrate cannot imagine the girl’s suffering or Joll’s abuse of her. Not, at least, until he is tortured can he begin to understand and “identify” with the girl’s suffering and silence. The room is a border where the victim is held in isolation, waiting. But the room itself gives nothing away: “I stare all day at the empty walls, unable to believe that the imprint of all the pain and degradation they have enclosed will not materialize under an intent enough gaze” (87). Exclusion itself is what spurs the
The Magistrate’s search for “the truth” of what has gone on in the room. The Magistrate searches for a confined space as the setting of his own interrogation of the barbarian girl about her torture. When he washes her feet in his attempt to piece her back together, the curtains are closed, preventing others from seeing what is going on in the room. Recognizing that his interrogations of her body might not withstand the light of day, a sense of secrecy and taboo is created. Yet the barbarian girl’s body comes to represent a closed room in her own right, one that the Magistrate desires to invade, but he finds no way of “penetrating the surface.”

In another sense, the rooms of torture mirror each other. Both are locked rooms, windowless, closed from sight but open to expressions of desire: attempts to capture the “truth” or the promise of forgiveness. The Magistrate is unable to read the traces of torture on the floor or walls. His room and the prisoners’ cells are not transparent; there is no way of peering into the room where acts of torture have taken place except as torturer or victim.

The barbarian girl enters the novel in chapter two and leaves at the end of chapter three, yet her presence is central to understanding the process of waiting at the border. Her presence in town is a disturbing factor for the Magistrate. Her father died during interrogation early in the text, and her people have abandoned her; like the Magistrate, she is a solitary and isolated person. The Magistrate, after discovering her, quickly takes up a peculiar relationship with her. Her body bears the marks of Joll’s intensive interrogation: her eyesight is damaged, leaving her with peripheral vision, and her feet have been broken. Moving her from a life outside on the streets, the Magistrate invites her into his chambers, draws the curtains, lights the lamp and asks to see her feet. Like the torturer Joll, the Magistrate prevents outsiders from seeing what is going on. Then the Magistrate commences his clear ritual of washing the girl’s feet. The Magistrate’s search for forgiveness is aligned with Joll’s search for truth.

Colonel Joll uses pain to find truth. The truth he is searching for is the barbarians’ guilt, but that is something he already knows, so what he wants from torture is an “admission of guilt.” We know the Magistrate is no more looking for the truth than Joll is. His relationship with the girl becomes an exploitation of her body rather than an attempt to heal it. He uses it to find a reflection of his own “truth” and to cleanse himself of guilt he feels. But to do so, the Magistrate must force her to speak and to see himself as an object of desire. Thus the girl becomes the possibility for him to recreate himself, yet his act of forcing her to speak about her torture is an act of torture, mirroring Joll’s attempts to make the tortured speak “truth.” In this way, the Magistrate is no different from Joll.

The Magistrate wants to save himself from the barbarity of the “civilized”: “what has become important […] is that I should neither be contaminated by the atrocity that is about to be committed nor poison myself with impotent hatred of its perpetrators. I cannot save the prisoners, therefore let me save myself” (114). Watching his fellow townspeople, women and children all participate in the beating of the “barbarian” prisoners, the Magistrate is determined to be the “one man who in his heart was not a barbarian.” He wants not to be infected by the disease that has overtaken the town. The “barbarians,” in this instance, first have the word “ENEMY” written on their backs, then are “washed clean” through beating. The ironic parallelism between the Magistrate’s earlier actions in his room with the barbarian girl do not bear repeating.

Waiting processes at the border and their significance

The first part of the process is the internalization of the desire to cross the border hoping that something will be decided or performed on the other side. The man from the country belongs to the Law while he waits for the border guards’ permission to even allow him entry for consideration of his case. The rite of passage and its attendant feelings of anxiety and tension are internalized, as the man becomes his own gatekeeper: he comes to prevent himself, as he is both disciplined and policed by his own desire for bordering. This applies to the reader reading as well, since we read, “Before the law stands the doorkeeper” and we go on reading. The text as law functions the moment the text starts and we do not move.

The second part of the process is marked by the self-controlled performances of border guards: they know that, behind the door, the Law must be present but is concealed from the supplicant. In the words of Walter Benjamin, “even if the law remains unrecognizable, this is not because it is hidden by its transcendence, but simply because it is always denuded of any interiority: it is always in the office next door, or behind the door, on to infinity.” The act of waiting is enacted by border guard and border crossing, and is part of the same machine: the machine that demands you wait for “justice.” But it is a machine with a “necessary” metaphorical form and function. It has books, symbols, personnel, and precedents controlling what can be said and what can be desired. And it is this process that becomes internalized.

In Coetzee’s novel, however, citizen and border guard both wait for the barbarian Other within the machine of Empire and its Law. These figures wait in fear, making the Other subject to torture and the necessity of censorship of themselves and their speech. Coetzee complicates this by representing the Magistrate as both desiring to escape the waiting as well as being a border guard who waits. Can he escape the emptiness of his own sexual desire and guilt through his prescribed desire to be free, outside possession by the system he has served so well? Does he really have any strategies for refashioning himself? He seems, at the end of the text, to be a man without content. So, in both these texts, the border stands between fear and desire and as a representation of both fear and desire.
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Despite new border studies perspectives that favour a broad cultural, economic and complex governance view of borders and borderlands, a strict top-down international relations view of borders continue to dominate policymaking. This current era of heightened globalisation requires that we pay attention not only to the tendency of increased governance of borders and border regions, but also at the regional responses to such development. Through regional responses to globalisation, borders are reproduced, for example, in situations of conflict where historical memories are mobilised to support territorial claims, to address past injustices or to strengthen group identity – often by perpetuating negative stereotypes of the ‘other’. However through new institutional and discursive practices contested borders can also be transformed into symbols of co-operation and of common historical heritage.
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New publications from EUBORDERSCAPES team members


Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore published a special issue (52/2012) on *Borders and Life-Stories* after the fifth Autumn Conference of the Centre of Excellence in Cultural Theory, ‘In, Out and In-Between: Dynamics of Cultural Borders’, University of Tallin, on 17–19 October. EUBORDERSCAPES researcher Stephen Wolfe from the University of Tromsø presented a keynote lecture at the conference, and the special issue includes, along with articles on border narratives, an interview with Stephen Wolfe on border studies and aesthetics, and a review article by fellow EUBORDERSCAPES researcher Holger Pötzsch on borders in a North-Norwegian film classic (*Aspects of Liminality in Knut Erik Jensen’s Stella Polaris*). The whole issue can be read here: [http://www.folklore.ee/folklore/vol52/](http://www.folklore.ee/folklore/vol52/).

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one of the most prominent issues in world politics today. Few other issues have dominated the world’s headlines and have attracted such attention from policy makers, the academic community, political analysts, and the world’s media. Joel Peters and David Newman have produced an edited volume that brings together contributors who are leading authorities in their field and have published extensively on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict/peace process. Many have played a leading role in various Track II initiatives accompanying the peace process. This Handbook provides a comprehensive and accessible overview of the most contentious and protracted political issue in the Middle East. The editors have gathered together a range of the top experts from Israel, Palestine, Europe and North America to tackle a range of topics from historical background, through to peace efforts, domestic politics, critical issues such as refugees and settler movements, and the role of outside players such as the Arab states, US and EU. Sections present the reader with the historical background to the conflict, an understanding of the complexity of the issues that need to be addressed in order to resolve the conflict, and a detailed analysis of the varied interests of the actors involved.
Borders as Controversy and an Issue of Human Rights: 
the FRONTEXIT Initiative

Frontexit is an international campaign for the defense of migrants’ human rights at the external borders of the European Union. It is led by 21 associations, researchers and individuals from both North and South of the Mediterranean (Belgium, Cameroon, France, Italy, Mali, Morocco, Mauritania, international organisations, regional networks).

Frontexit has a twofold objective: to inform a wide audience about the impacts of Frontex operations in terms of human rights, and to denounce these impacts to the political representatives who are directly involved.

More concretely, through actions of investigation, litigation, awareness-raising and advocacy, this campaign aims to obtain:

- transparency surrounding the mandates, responsibilities and actions of Frontex;
- the suspension of those activities of the agency identified as violating human rights;
- the cancellation of the ruling creating the Frontex agency, if it is proven that the agency's mandate is incompatible with the respect of fundamental rights.

For more information see: http://www.frontexit.org/en/