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From the Editors

The Vessel and Its New Crew, Passengers and Destinations

Martin van der Velde and Henk van Houtum

As you may have noticed from the last issue of the Journal, the JBS has undergone some changes. The first and probably most eye-catching change has been that the hull has been redesigned. Another contents-related change concerns the geographical scope of the Journal. The current geographical scope, mainly the North-American continent, was ready to be extended on a more structural base. Starting from the previous issue, part of the editorial crew is now from Europe. This may serve as a clear statement that the focus of the Journal is indeed heading towards global coverage. Needless to say, global should not be mistaken for borderless. The making of spatial differences still is and will probably continue to be common practice in the human world. Hence, the need to study, theorize, analyze, and divulge the logic and consequences of these bordering practices in our territorialized society remains of immense significance, maybe even more so, as our world becomes more interlinked, but not equally open and transparent.

The contributions in the issue at hand offer fine empirical illustrations and conceptual elaborations of the latter observation. Schack investigates the conceptual question along the Danish-German border, whether geographical proximity constitutes cross-border interaction itself. Although there is clear division in the spread of activities generated by the difference the state border makes, he emphasizes the importance of contingency and contextuality of the various cross-border activities. Some activities and associations are more transnational than others.

In his contribution, Taylor examines approaches to building trans-border ties in human resource development across the Mexico-U.S. border and Canada-U.S. border from a comparative point of view. The highly economized cross-border relationships along both these borders might gain both strength and depth from these kinds of ties, he argues.

In the same strand, Sargent and Matthews continue that human capital development in border regions can be mutually beneficial. Based on a survey among U.S. expatriates in Maquiladoras along the Mexico-U.S. border, they conclude that the border context provides a favourable environment for human capital development.

Medina links aspects from the formal and informal sector, by studying Mexican cardboard collectors in Laredo, Texas. He shows that this ‘informal’ activity has strong linkages with the formal sector and attributes to the international economic integration in the region. He characterizes these collectors as informal entrepreneurs and supports the official recognition of scavenging activities by public policy.

Finally, Mendoza determines the influence of agglomeration economies on the growth of the manufacturing sector in the northern border region of Mexico. Based on his econometric model, he argues that the urban agglomeration effect and the exter-
nalities generated by industrial specialization in the area have been constituting factors for the employment growth in the manufacturing sector of the area.

This rotating editorial foreword is one of the other new features of the JBS vessel. Michael Patrick, our North American colleague, will introduce the next issue of the Journal. In this respect, we would like to extend the vessel with other features, such as a series written with a ‘rotating pen’ among the readers. We cordially invite our readers to submit ideas about themes, topics and issues for such a series.

In addition to these exciting new destinations, the new editorial team would like to make the journey even more thrilling by attracting new passengers. We hope to expand the readership of the Journal in line with its ever increasing global focus.

It goes without saying that we encourage you all to send in your manuscripts for consideration, and would like to ask you to motivate others to do the same. Together we hope to make the vessel and its trek as inviting, fruitful and interesting as possible. We hope you enjoy the journey.
We wish to extend our gratitude and thanks to the many colleagues who provided reviews of manuscripts for publication consideration in the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*. Many of the articles that appear in Vol. 16, Nos. 1&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 people: Jane Morrison, James Peach, Joan Anderson, James Pick, Alan Gin, Philip Martin, Margaret Young, Chad Richardson, Tamar Wilson, Barbara Hartung, Richard Hofsetter, John Tiefenbacher, Randy Willoughby, Kristyna Demaree, Gayle Berardi, Milagros Peña, Mark Spalding, James Gerber, Alicia Re Cruz, Christopher Brown, Norris Clement, Don Alper, Michael Pisani, Michael Rankin, Jeffery Brannon, Richard Sprinkle, William Gruben, Dennis Soden, Gerald Schmaedick, Paul Ganster, Miguel Salas, David Yoskowitz, Stephen Mumme, Robert Varady, Richard Bath, Lawrence Taylor, Allen McDougall, Ed Williams, Kimberly Folse, David Bellis, Ranjeeta Ghiara, Tom Fullerton, Marian Aguilar, Michael Ellis, and Rosalia Guerrero.

*The Editors*
Cross-Cultural Accommodation and Biculturalists in the Core Borderlands: A View of the Expatriate Experience in Border vs. Interior Multinationals

John Sargent and Linda Matthews*

Abstract: In 1988, the noted international business scholar Steven Kobrin wrote a controversial article where he argued that U.S. multinational companies (MNCs) were reducing their use of U.S. nationals in their foreign subsidiaries because of widespread performance problems. According to Kobrin (1988), U.S. expatriates are often unsuccessful due to a critical lack of cross cultural and second language skills. In a series of studies relying on interviews at 57 MNCs in Mexico, similar to Kobrin (1988), we found that there existed a clear trend towards expatriate reduction in U.S. subsidiaries located in the Mexican interior; that the cross cultural and second language skills of U.S. expatriates were generally low; and that significant conflict between U.S. and Mexican nationals was present because of these skill deficiencies. Utilizing a sample of 45 maquiladoras located in Reynosa, Tamaulipas, in this study we test to determine if these dynamics generalize to the border. Surprisingly, we found just the opposite, i.e. expatriate numbers while relatively low were stable or going down only slightly, there was a high incidence of internationally experienced, bilingual U.S. nationals in border plants; and there appeared to be little open conflict between U.S. and Mexican nationals. To account for these differences, we argue that the border context has contributed to a virtuous cycle of human capital development that is largely absent in interior locations.

Introduction

The maquiladora industry has been the primary force driving economic development along the Mexican side of the U.S.-Mexican border for at least the last two decades. What used to be sleepy border towns have been transformed into strategic export platforms for multinational companies (MNCs) from the U.S., Asia, and Europe looking to supply, as a general rule, the largest consumer market in the world, i.e. the U.S. Given their importance, a long and distinguished list of scholars have examined the maquiladora phenomena in both border and non-border locations. When the unit of analysis has been the individual, researchers have examined such topics as the nature of work for women in operating level positions (Fernández-Kelly 1983), engineers (Hualde 2001), and even mid level managers (Kavanaugh 1997). The purpose of the study is to profile a group that has largely escaped systematic research attention, i.e. the maquiladora plant managers themselves. Taken collectively, there are few if any groups

*John Sargent is Assistant Professor at the Department of Management, Marketing, and International Business, University of Texas Pan American, and Linda Matthews is Assistant Professor at the Department of Management, Marketing, and International Business, University of Texas Pan American.
Informal Transborder Recycling on the U.S.-Mexico Border: The *Cartoneros* of Nuevo Laredo

Martin Medina*

Abstract: This paper examines the informal recovery of cardboard by Mexicans in Laredo, Texas, which is then recycled in Mexico. Cardboard collecting in the area shows strong backward and forward linkages with the formal sector and with the international economy. Scavenging in the area illustrates the ongoing international economic integration between Mexico and the U.S. The paper challenges previous characterizations of scavengers as being poor and marginal; argues that scavengers should be categorized as informal entrepreneurs, and advocates the use of a joint qualitative/quantitative methodology in the study of scavenging. It also argues that public policy should support scavenging activities.

Introduction

The recovery of materials from waste constitutes a common survival activity for disadvantaged individuals throughout the developing world. These individuals are generally known as scavengers—waste pickers, trash pickers or rag pickers in English-speaking areas. They also receive different names depending on the local language; place where they work, and the material(s) they collect. In the Spanish-speaking world, cardboard collectors are popularly known as *cartoneros*.

Despite the ubiquitous presence of scavengers in Third World cities, scholars have neglected the study of scavenging. We lack a thorough understanding of the factors that cause individuals to become scavengers and of the demographic characteristics of those individuals. We also know little about the historical evolution of scavenging and about the social, economic and environmental impact of this activity, as well as its linkages with the formal sector. The author believes that this is the first scholarly analysis of transborder recycling activity on the U.S.-Mexico border. It is also the first study to incorporate the historical, socioeconomic and environmental dimensions of scavenging, as well as the first to use a joint qualitative/quantitative methodology.

This paper attempts to fill some of the gaps in our knowledge of scavenging. Dissertation research conducted in Laredo, Texas and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico—one of the “twin cities” on the U.S.-Mexico border—forms the basis for this paper. Mexicans cross the border into various U.S. border towns in order to salvage a wide range of items discarded by Americans, such as recyclable materials (paper, cardboard, and aluminum cans), as well as anything that can be reused, mended, refurbished and resold, including old clothing, discarded appliances and construction/demolition debris.

*Martin Medina is Professor of Environmental Studies at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana, and Director of Ecoparque.
Approaches to Building Cooperative Linkages in Human Resources Development in the San Diego-Tijuana and Vancouver-Seattle Binational Corridor Regions

Lawrence D. Taylor*

Abstract: The article examines from a comparative point of view approaches to building transborder linkages in human resources development in two distinct border corridor regions of North America: San Diego-Tijuana and Vancouver-Seattle. The article describes the various types of educational and work-training ties which have been established in each of the corridor regions, the organizations involved, as well as their position within the overall context of transborder relations in each zone. The article also considers how the two different regional settings have had a bearing on the development of these linkages and of the results in each case.

Introduction

In the last few decades, the development of human resources has become especially important for the economic growth and survival of nations due to increasing international competitiveness, declining population growth in many of the industrialized countries, and shifting work force composition. Technological innovations have also produced radical changes with regard to industrial manufacturing and organization as well as manpower requirements. Governments and business corporations have increasingly come to realize that much of the power behind international trade and investment stems from knowledge and information, and that an educated and skilled labor force is an important key to competitiveness in the global marketplace. As a result of such tendencies, various forms of partnerships have been built between academia and business. Companies need an educated work force, which institutions of higher education in particular can provide. They also depend to a certain extent on the research capabilities of such institutions.

Human resources development is also an important issue for border or contiguous regions between nations. According to Hansen (1981:19), border regions may be defined as “subnational areas whose economic and social life is directly and significantly affected by proximity to an international boundary.” The areas on opposite sides of

*Lawrence D. Taylor is in the Departamento de Estudios Culturales, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana.

*The author extends his thanks to the Comité Técnico del Programa Interinstitucional de Estudios sobre la Región de América del Norte, El Colegio de Mexico for its financial support to do the research used in this article. He also expresses his gratitude to professors Michael R. Pfau of the University of San Diego, and Theodore H. Cohn of Simon Fraser University for providing useful information and comments in the preparation of the manuscript.
Specialization, Agglomeration and Urban Manufacturing Growth in the Northern Border Cities of Mexico

Jorge Eduardo Mendoza Cota*

Abstract: The objective of this paper is to investigate the effect of agglomeration economies on the manufacturing sector of the northern border cities of Mexico. It is assumed that economic globalization is an important determinant in the trend toward the relocation of manufacturing activities to the northern border region. The present research is based on the hypothesis that agglomeration has had a positive impact on the urban manufacturing growth in the northern cities studied. An econometric model was established to relate agglomeration with manufacturing growth. The results of the study revealed that the externalities caused by industrial specialization among industries make up one of the explanatory factors of manufacturing employment growth during 1988-1993. For the period 1993-1998 the control variables of total initial urban employment and total initial wage level were relevant to urban manufacturing growth. Finally, when including the effect of urban agglomeration, using the population as a proxy, a positive but small impact on manufacturing employment growth was found.

Urban Agglomeration and External Economies

As a result of the liberalization process established since the eighties, the Mexican economy has experienced an important adjustment in its manufacturing sector. One of the most relevant changes has been the geographic restructuring of the industries in that sector. During the eighties new determinants of manufacturing growth emerged, such as foreign investment and the opening of export markets abroad (Hanson 1998). As a consequence of export oriented industrial growth, the northern border cities of Mexico have experienced an expansion in their manufacturing activities and population. During the nineties, the agglomeration of economic activities has become one of the determinants for the manufacturing growth in that region, due to the advantages provided by geographic proximity.

Over the past two decades, industrialization and urbanization in Mexico have changed in character and shifted from the traditional industrial cities of Mexico City, Monterrey and Guadalajara to the northern border cities. These emerging cities are characterized by the existence of concentration and specialization in specific manufacturing industries. Such is the case of Tijuana which is focused on television assembly, Ciudad Juarez, which is primarily dedicated to the production of electrical components and Saltillo, which is specialized in automobile assembly plants. Within this context, it is relevant to investigate whether the development of agglomeration economies and the

*Jorge Eduardo Mendoza Cota is in the Department of Economics at El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana, Mexico.
Regional Identity in Border Regions: The Difference Borders Make

Michael Schack*

Abstract: One significant question for border studies is whether distance translates into closeness. That is, does proximity to state-borders and the neighboring state constitute an interaction context in and of itself? This article relies on data from a research project that was conducted to investigate the perception of neighboring country high school students inside and outside the Danish-German border region. The results of the research points towards an understanding of border regions as regions where several dimensions of social interaction play an important role. Although the research results provide evidence for the importance that nation-states play in perceptual differences between borderlands and non-borderlands, it is not the case on both sides of the Danish-German border. Therefore, contexts other than nation-state borders must be considered. This article argues that the perception of the neighboring country and the border region rely on specific types of cross-border activities and associations with the neighboring country. The less important state-borders become as markers of territoriality and control, the more other types of boundaries might become visible.

Introduction

Border research is not only a multidisciplinary field but also a melting pot of different theoretical and methodological points of departure. Today, there are a variety of approaches, across disciplines, contributing to the multidisciplinary discourse on borders and border regions (Bucken-Knapp & Schack 2001; van Houtum 2000, Anderson & O’Dowd 1999; Donnan & Wilson 1999).

One common assumption is that the border region is constituted by the presence of the state-border and that this presence has an influence on the people living there: the borderlanders. They are considered to differ from non-borderlanders by means of their living conditions, their perception of the neighboring country, the character of their activities, and their interaction level across the border. But is this the case? Does proximity to state-borders and the neighboring state constitute an interaction context in and of itself? Can inhabitants of border regions generally be described as borderlanders?

State-borders seem to divide regional interaction into patterns belonging to different legal, political, economical and cultural frames of references. State-borders undergo substantial changes in their meaning, not simultaneously, but to a different extent and asynchronously. Good examples of borders where processes of integration and differentiation can be observed are the borders between the member states of the European Union. While political efforts are made to integrate the member states of the

*I would like to thank my colleague Gregg Bucken-Knapp for inspiring discussions and Henk van Houtum and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments.

*Michael Schack is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Danish Institute of Border Region Studies.
Book Review

Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions

by Markus Perkmann and Ngai-Ling Sum (eds.)
Houndmills: Macmillan (2002)

Reviewed by Olivier Thomas Kramsch*

“Blair, keep your England. Let me keep my Zimbabwe.”

_Intervention of President Robert Mugabe, “World Summit on Sustainable Development,” as reported on CNN, Johannesburg, September 2, 2002_

Cross-border regions (CBR’s) and the new economic and political strategies have attracted widespread and sustained attention within the broader social scientific community since the early 1990s. This is attributed in no small measure to the demise of the Cold War geopolitical bipolarity, the emergence of new technologies allowing for the heightened porosity of national borders, and the need to develop innovative forms of institution and capacity-building above and below that of the nation-state in order to adequately address the multi-scale political, environmental and economic dynamics wrought in the wake of globalization. Dismissed only a little more than a decade ago by John Friedmann as a “sophisticated provocation” whereby a strong nation-state threatens the sovereignty of a weaker partner, the “time” of the CBRs, it would appear, has finally arrived.

Perkmann and Sum’s recent book is therefore timely, and the range of case studies presented—drawing on recent empirical fieldwork in Europe (Markus Perkmann, Stefan Kratke), Asia (Ngai-Ling Sum, David Arase), North America (Matthew Sparke, James Scott) and Africa (Irae Baptista Lundin and Fredrik Soderbaum)—allows the reader to take clear stock of a research field that until now has existed only in diffuse, patchwork fashion across the academic landscape. With this volume, therefore, the political possibilities inherent in cross-border regional governance heave into view in particularly sharp relief, manifest across a global playing field. The editors aim to position the book between a “culturally inflected” border studies in political geography and “border economics”. Contrary to these latter accounts, the chapters are to provide windows onto the “emergence of new institutional spaces across borders resulting from the interplay

*Olivier Thomas Kramsch is a Research Fellow at the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research, Department of Human Geography, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen in Nijmegen, The Netherlands.
between structural change and social agency”. Adopting a self-consciously “post-disciplinary” perspective, this is to be achieved by focusing on 1) the transformation of territorial scales, rescaling and scalar articulation; 2) the mobilization of discourses and identities; and 3) the building of new cross-border governance institutions. Within this broad conceptual frame the editors view the proliferation of cross-border regions since the 1980s as a “contingent effect” of globalization, regionalization and the end of the Cold War. The particular “opportunity structures” available to actors within each CBR are therefore conditioned by logics defined by their insertion within wider macro-regional blocs (e.g., NAFTA, CUFTA, APEC, EU).

In his contribution Bob Jessop offers a wide-ranging theoretical entree by declaring that what is “at stake” in the study of contemporary CBRs is the “relativization” of the national scale associated with the decline in the particular social contract formerly binding together the national economies, nation-states and national societies of the postwar period. In the shift from Keynesian welfare-statist regimes of national socio-economic steering to neoliberal, knowledge-based forms of governance emphasizing international competitiveness, flexibility, entrepreneurialism and reflexivity, CBRs “illustrate different balances between these primary and secondary objects of economic governance”. Though at present the national scale is said to be “demoted”, no effective scale of economic or political organization has yet emerged to occupy a similar primacy. As a result, an intense competition among actors is purportedly underway in which the existing hierarchy of scale levels is “refigured” so as to provide new “anchorage points” ensuring a “structured coherence” necessary for further rounds of capital accumulation. In his view, territorial scales are not “pregiven”, but subject to “discursive struggles” over mapping and naming, as well as more material contests over their spatio-temporal institutionalization producing new forms of uneven development. Jessop believes in the possibility of cross-border “metagovernance”, whereby the partial loss of de jure sovereignty is compensated for through the mobilization of non-governmental public-private partnerships operating in a “bottom up” manner, coupled with the internationalization of policy regimes, defined by the heightened strategic importance of the international context of domestic state action, thus blurring the distinction between domestic and foreign policy (e.g., paradiplomacy, “intermestic politics”).

Subsequent case studies in Asia, North America, Europe and Africa seek in one way or another to activate and qualify Jessop’s conceptual framework, and it is on this terrain that interesting things begin to happen and divergences can be mapped in the experiences of cross-border regionalism within the various macro-regions under examination. Thus, in South Asia, cross-border regionalization has taken shape in a proliferation of “growth triangles”, whereby local actors attempt to reterritorialize global flows in “dialectical” fashion by expanding and relocating “embedded exportism” to new sites, while engaging in contradictory ways with U.S.-led neoliberalism (Sum). For Sum, unlike NAFTA and the EU, the lack of an overarching macro-regional strategy of integration in South Asia allows for a certain “looseness” in the functioning of APEC, and permits a certain “room” on the part of local-regional actors to further expand growth triangle strategies, revealed in the successful experiments establishing the Singapore-Johor-Riau and Indonesia-Malaysia-Singapore growth triangles. Within such a policy framework, the South Asian growth triangle experiment can be transformed as place-based “investment region” into a portable strategy, expanding its time-space reach to post-Socialist sites such as Myanmar, Lao PDR, Vietnam and Cambodia. A similar macro-institutional “looseness” appears to define cross-border regional-
ism in North East Asia, where, as in the case of a Japan Sea Process involving provinces and larger port cities rimming the Japan and Yellow Seas, local-regional actors are active in reaching out and cooperating with overseas counterparts in an informal and decentralized fashion, with relatively little input from central governments (Arase).

Within the macro-regional policy framework of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the U.S.-Canadian border has spawned a particular neoliberal “vision” of cross-border regionalism—"Cascadia”—stretching from Seattle, Washington to Vancouver, British Columbia (Sparke). Emerging from a previous sediment of ecological and bio-regional “imagination”, contemporary Cascadia is reworked by its boosterish and business-minded promoters as a form of “strategic regionalism” whose discourses are undergirded by an emergent “geoeconomics”, representing a refocusing of traditional geopolitics towards the “potentially lucrative” realm of selling regions within globalized networks of production and consumption. Here, the cross-border region of Cascadia is proffered as one more example of the type of entrepreneurial governance characterizing urban-regional growth machines over the past two decades. For Sparke, the emergent modes of governance emerging on the U.S.-Canadian frontier are politically charged to the degree that their “spatial imagineries” fail to correspond to the “real, juridico-political and social processes” percolating beneath them. It is precisely in the crises produced by the tension and slippage between discursive domains and the more systemic effects of political-economic forces that the lack of a coherent economic region spanning the border can best be situated. The largely neoliberal economic policy context provided by NAFTA also shapes the opportunity structures defining “cooperation regimes” along the U.S.-Mexico border (Scott). Here, cross-border cooperation receives its “mandate” both from looming environmental threats and the need to exploit economic opportunities; in this context special commissions have been created between the U.S. state of Arizona and the Mexican state of Sonora to jumpstart an “integrated economic region” focusing on a strategy of promoting industrial clusters, and a plethora of “binational institutions” have been fostered linking actors in California and Baja California. As if an inverted mirror to Cascadia, whose rhetoric of independence from central state governments is belied by the strength of intra-national trade dependencies, U.S.-Mexico cross-border cooperation actors increasingly seek the institutional backing of federal agencies in providing resources for environmentally-related infrastructure (e.g., BECC, NadBank) but to date have not benefited from improved relations with these entities. Without such national support, U.S.-Mexico cross-border regionalism lacks the financial autonomy to carry out large-scale projects. It is thus in cross-border space that the spirit of U.S. “exceptionalism” confronts a peculiarly Mexican “reticence” in participating in cross-border joint ventures.

Diverging from the North American case, it would appear that in the European theater cross-border cooperation is a much more generally accepted part of the public agency repertoire across the continent. Europe’s Euroregions, defined as a “more or less institutionalized collaboration between contiguous subnational authorities across national borders”, have become a solid institutional feature of an emerging multi-level European polity (Perkmann). Perkmann introduces the concept of “institutional entrepreneurialism” to illustrate the manner in which cross-border regional policy has emerged over the course of the past two decades as an “object” of policy intervention arising from the strategic action of key interlocutors (Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, Association of European Border Regions, public officials of the European Commission, national/regional governments). Embedded within a wider
context of “ordinary” administrative practices targeting less-favored areas under the European Union’s “partnership principle”, Euroregions have nevertheless not been particularly successful in producing transnational forms of governance or in shaping the “emergence of new regions” at the interface of older territorial sovereignties. For Perkmann this is a logical outcome of the way Euroregions have now become an appendage of EU Cohesion Policy; thus as another strand of European neo-regionalism, Euroregions do not reflect a generic decentralization of state functions, but point rather to a “power shift” within the state apparatus reinforcing the executive at the expense of the legislative realm. By contrast, along Europe’s eastern flank, cross-border regions appear to be defined more by their insertion within a transnational division of labor, by the selective integration of cross-border regions in East Central Europe into West European and global production networks. This phenomenon is particularly acute in German-Polish cross-border regions, where cross-border inter-firm networks are defined primarily by German flows of commerce and capital bypassing border areas to locations within Poland’s urbanized and capital-rich hinterland (Kratke). Thus, despite the fact that since 1990 four Euroregions have been established along the German-Polish border zone in an attempt at “political-administrative region-building”, the ongoing socio-economic asymmetries produced by the outer lime of the EU—persisting “mental distance”, low quality jobs, lack of innovative capacity, scarce local multiplier effects, unequal divisions of labor—impede the realization of a fully interconnected German-Polish cross-border region.

With so many cases of apparent policy “failure” within and across the macro-regions under study, it may not be unreasonable to enquire at this point (resonating with the concerns of Jessop, Sparke and Perkmann) how, and under what conditions of possibility, cross-border regionalization processes are currently being legitimized as coherent “structures of feeling” (relying on a perhaps dated term of Raymond Williams). The question may be too hastily posed if we begin by asking, as does Sparke, why cross-border regionalism remains “meaningful” only to its promoters. At this juncture I would like to mobilize a contribution to the volume by Jean-Philippe Leresche and Guy Saez as a way to creatively think through this apparent paradox. Both authors suggest cross-border regions as a certain kind of “limit object” requiring a transcendence of state-centric frameworks of social scientific practice, which posit borders as either barriers or contact-zones for the movement of goods, people and capital. As an alternative the authors propose approaching borders as “uncertain” or “aporetic” territories whose identities may be excavated as “different possible contradictory collective memories of the border”. The ultimate goal: to grasp how, “in cooperation, minds are prepared for a different organization of their representation”, towards an effective “interterritoriality”. Critically, and perhaps reflecting a distinctively Francophone geographical tradition, Leresche and Saez “free” us momentarily from the metaphors of scale in order to perceive border regions as phenomenological objects, where the pre-conditions for successful cross-border interaction are at actively engaged, albeit through a contradictory mix of biologically inflected, neo-functionalist and post-ideological registers. By contrast, the language of “scalar articulation” and “nested territories”, derived homologously from the functionally equivalent territorial container units of the nation-state, provide real epistemological obstacles to theorizing such preconditions in any way other than that which foregrounds neoliberal state- and capital-centric faits accompli. To be provocative, I would go so far as to suggest a “hidden” complicity between the conceptual diad of the bordered “scale” of the nation-state and the politi-
cal economic dynamic of what we know today as neoliberalism, a dualism that will require some sustained unpacking if any headway is to be made in thinking through the problematics of “interterritoriality” to which Leresche and Saez are gesturing.

An advance in this direction may be to acknowledge the particular scale of cross-border regions as qualitatively different from other nested scale levels (e.g., local-regional-national-international), precisely to the degree that—occupying a peculiarly liminal space between national sovereignties—their constitutive elements cannot be so easily shoehorned into a neo-regionalist framework subsumed under the logics of traditional national or interstate relations (as Jessop, Sum and Perkmann in particular would appear to do; for a cautionary view of such a hasty analytical merger see in particular the recent intervention by Anderson 2001). Indeed, in elaborating a theory of “political frontier regimes” Leresche and Saez agree that the similarities between the territorial logic of decentralization and cross-border cooperation “cannot be taken too far”; whereas the former allows for recognition of more or less autonomous spaces, CBRs contribute to the production of a “new local public space” whose articulation with national space is more ambiguous and problematic. In short, there is simply no precedent for the forms of democratic legitimacy applicable to such spaces; they must be created anew through strong imaginative projects that have the seductive power to counter the neoliberal narratives currently filling the vacuum of ideas in cross-border space. It is therefore not so much finding the “right” story for CBRs which can most accurately capture the underlying reality of CBRs (Jessop, Sparke, Baptista Lundin and Soderbaum), but of coming up with alternative “myths” for this particular form of transnational space that is more inclusive, more democratic, more attentive to suffering than that currently provided by the neoliberal agenda. Again, we have no guideposts for this; it will be a matter of contention and struggle, taking place at many levels, but perhaps most importantly in the intellectual realm where the “scripting” of such spaces occurs to most acute political effect. And some macro-regions will be more open and sympathetic to this form of intellectual “re-scripting” than others. At the very least, within the European sphere (from which this author writes) an urgent intellectual task remains to trace the geo-history of national borders as repositories for particular forms of political economic accumulation spawning what we now experience as full-blown neoliberal globalization. We might also find allies for this project elsewhere, notably in the Global South, which has been on the exploitative receiving end of imperial statism.

For a reasoned attempt to overcome “transhistorical theory” informed by the normative concerns of development studies, the chapter contribution to this volume on South African corridor development by Baptista Lundin and Soderbaum is particularly enlightening. I cannot escape this review without addressing the matter of “time”, an issue which moves restlessly throughout the chapter contributions, indeed providing an underexplored leitmotif for the entire volume. For the very raison d’etre of many CBRs is repeatedly attributed to certain key space-time moments: as a result of the end of the Cold War; the emergence of time compression technologies, new modes of “time-space governance”, and the “re-timing” of global flows across multiple spatial scales (Sum); the end of apartheid (Baptista Lundin and Soderbaum); the emergence of “world time” as a global standard, nano-temporalities and the emerging problem of “intertemporal governance” (Jessop); the territorial embodiment of a “fin de siecle” Zeitgeist (Sparke). And yet, as in this collection, the temporal dimension of CBRs loses analytical traction the moment it is proffered, usually in the form of an opening aside. This question merits more serious attention than it has so far received in the Anglophone
world. How exactly did the end of the Cold War produce the conditions of emergence for CBRs? How precisely has the demise of Soviet Communism and the apparent triumph of Western democratic liberalism opened up a space for thinking politics beyond the nation-state? How has the erosion of traditional state sovereignty produced new configurations of temporality which depart from an earlier modernist trajectory grounded in the historicizing “dreamworld” of Soviet-style socialism as well as the state-centric territorialities of Western capitalism (Buck-Morss 2000)? And what forms of solidarity—what new forms of a collective sens—are now enabled by these spatio-temporal reconfiguration, linking diverse actors within and between the macro-regions under scrutiny (Laidi 2003)? If President Robert Mugabe’s recent remark at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg is any indication, we are witness now to a set piece of “time-space cross-border governance” that is at once very new and very old: the eternal and unredeemable face of human harm done, which no amount of “networked” European good cheer can efface.

In their new book Perkmann and Sum have thrown down the gauntlet on these and many other issues of pressing concern. It is now up to us to retrieve it.
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