




A **toolkit** for **diversifying knowledge** and **tackling discrimination** through **civil society participation** in universities.

# BORDERING



# BORDERING

## DEFINITION



**T**he processes through which the boundaries demarcating what is proper to a nation-state (geographical territory, social body, history, etc.) - what legitimately belongs in or to it, versus that which does not, and is excluded, expunged, removed, or differentially included, generally by violence - are constituted, reproduced, and naturalised.

# BORDERING PROCESS

**T**his concept was chosen by the researchers involved in the PAR\* group (based at the Feminist Autonomous Centre for Research and the University of Brighton), based on their political commitments to no borders and free movement. We chose to focus on border(ing) because we believe that a critical analysis of the violent operations of borders--and their constitutive role in differentiating "citizens" from "migrants" from "refugees" from "tourists"--is crucial to a decolonial feminist pedagogy.

Our perspectives on border(ing) have been shaped by our own experiences as people who have migrated (with various statuses) and by our research trajectories in the field of "migration studies." Reflecting on our positionalities as well as learning from the experiences and analyses of others, whose positionalities differ from ours, due to the differential ways that we are interpellated in the global regime of migration management have been formative of our theoretical approach to this field.

Mobility, migrations, and borders is one of the strands of research and intervention of the Feminist Autonomous Centre for Research; in collaboration with the network of academics and activists Feminist Researchers Against Borders (which we helped found) we have been organising a Feminist No Borders Summer School for the past 3 years.

Members of the PAR\* group that elaborated the concept of border(ing) for the toolkit have been involved in organisations, networks, and collectives engaged in rescue support in the Mediterranean; mobilising against detention and criminalisation of undocumented migrants; and practical solidarity efforts in refugee housing occupations and squats. These experiences inform our engagement with the academic literature comprising the research field of migration studies, from which we drew to synthesise the definition of border(ing) presented in this toolkit.

**W**e are accustomed to thinking of borders as static lines separating countries. Borders are dehistoricised (they are constructed as having always existed); naturalised (they are constructed as self-evident boundaries between essentially different and existentially incompatible ethno-national groups); and represented as safety barriers (they are constructed as being necessary for the safety of the populations they contain and the security of the nation-states that enforce and defend them). But this habitual way of viewing borders is a product of state thought, globalised in the postcolonial era (of formal decolonisation) in the international nation-state system.

## State Thought

---

State thought is “completely inscribed within the line of demarcation that divides ‘nationals’ from ‘non-nationals.’” It is “a form of thought that reflects through its [mental] structures . . . the structure of the state, which thus acquires a body.” State thought constructs migrants as a “double absence”: they are seen as physically absent from their societies of origin, which are constructed as their natural homeplaces, and they are sociologically absent from the “host” societies in which they are permanently perceived as strangers, aliens, foreigners—as being out of place. Hence, state thought is necessary to the functioning of the nation-state, not only in the sense that without the dividing line between nationals and non-nationals “there can be no national state.” We are conscripted as citizens into a “double mutual recognition effect”: It is not enough for the state to recognize nationals; nationals “must recognize themselves in it” (279). The category of the “refugee,” or the “migrant,” then, exists only from the point of view of the national, the “citizen,” who gives state thought a body.

Source:

*Abdelmalek Sayad, The Suffering of the Immigrant. Pierre Bourdieu (ed), David Macey (trans) (Cambridge: Polity, 2004), 278, 281–82.*

## Methodological Nationalism

---

Even in research on forced displacement and the migration-asylum nexus, state thought often expresses itself in methodological nationalism, the assumption that the nation-state is the natural container for society. From this basis, migrants trouble the “assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world” and the “isomorphism between

people, sovereign, and citizenry.” [1] Methodological nationalism privileges sedentarism, assigning to migration across borders an exceptional status, while migration within borders often escapes attention or is regarded as unremarkable. For instance, the discursive focus in the “refugee crisis” on people who cross international borders, erasing those who are “internally displaced,” yet, who are two-thirds of the sixty-five million reported to be displaced by the UNHCR in 2016, within the territorial borders of their “own” nation-state. Basically, methodological nationalism is the internalisation and deployment of state thought by scholars (not to mention policy makers) who take for granted the idea that we all have natural homeplaces, and that the norm is to remain within those, rendering mobility abnormal or unnatural, always problematic, and licit only for those with powerful passports; that is, citizens of nation-states that are centres of capital. (The power of passports and the economic relations between centres, semi-peripheries, and peripheries are, of course, not static and universal but shifting and relative.) The reproduction of categorial borders (e.g. refugee/economic migrant) and their compulsory internalisation, embodiment, and perception as fixed identities (that are racialised, gendered, and class-specific)--what has been referred to as “categorial fetishism” [2]--is perhaps the most common way in which methodological nationalism is expressed in hegemonic discourses and scholarly work on migration and borders.

Sources:

[1] Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, “Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation- State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences,” *Global Networks* 2, no. 4 (2002): 301–34.

[2] Heaven Crawley and Dimitris Skleparis, “Refugees, Migrants, Neither, Both: Categorial Fetishism and the Politics of Bounding in Europe’s ‘Migration Crisis,’” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (2017), <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1348224>.

## **Bordered reality**

---

Shifting our perspective from viewing borders as static entities with a determinate geographical location (at the boundary edges of nations) to viewing borders as an assemblage of practices, policies, and relations of power that suffuse our lives and target us differentially for surveillance, discipline, and control, requires that we track “the territorial displacement and relocation of borders and border controls being carried out by anyone anywhere.” That is, that we examine the operations of the border as a function of dispersed actions distributed to various state and civil society agents. Processual approaches to bordering analyse how institutional and hegemonic logics differentiate “us” from “them.” In order to “understand borderings as constructed within everyday life, we must pay attention to [intersecting] social divisions” and “their constitution within hierarchies of power.” [1]

“Bordered reality is material, conceptual, affective, and cognitive; it is not reducible to the geopolitical borders around nation-states but refers to the ways in which states compete and collaborate to run

those borders through our bodies in our everyday lives. The border is multiplied; it is everywhere, and structures even our most intimate experience. For whom we feel concern, and for whom we do not; who can sleep in a bed, and who must sleep in a cell, container, or a tent; who has the right to attend the neighbourhood school and who is turned away; who can make choices for the future (to emigrate to search for a job or attend university), and for whom choices are foreclosed, razor-wired shut like the many fences that have been erected along migration routes. ... [T]here is even a border that runs through crisis, so that which 'crisis' you are discursively constructed to be experiencing--the financial crisis or the refugee crisis--depends on which side of the border you are on. Circulating in official state discourse since the summer of 2015, the phrase 'a crisis within a crisis' exemplifies the 'state thought' which structures hegemonic understandings about migration into bordered places. At the heart of both 'crises' is, above all, a crisis of sovereignty, which is negotiated through the violent imposition of a bordered reality." [2]

Source:

[1] Kathryn Cassidy, Nira Yuval-Davis, Georgie Wemyss, "Intersectional Border(ing)s." *Political Geography* 66: 2018, 139-141.

[2] Aila Spathopoulou & Anna Carastathis, "Hotspots of Resistance in a Bordered Reality." *Environment & Planning D: Society and Space*, 5 March 2020, 4, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775820906167>.

## **Walled States**

---

Borders have become increasingly militarised in recent times. Over the past twenty years, border barriers (fences and walls) have multiplied so that there are now over forty barriers on international borders around the world. In Greece, where this is being written, in addition to the fence built in 2012 on the northern land border with Turkey, and the fence built in 2015 on the border with Macedonia, floating sea barriers in the Aegean have been installed this spring (2020) to prevent crossings by boat, giving new literality to the no borders slogan "No More Walls In the Sea."

The wall is the metaphor par excellence of "hardened, securitised" and ultimately "violent borders." [1] Yet, some have argued that the fortification of borders--or "walled sovereignty"--signals a crisis of national sovereignty rather than its affirmation. The frenzied construction of fences and walls coincides with the "waning" of national sovereignty in light of the penetration of neoliberal capitalist globalisation, and the rise of religious fundamentalisms sanctioning political violence. Although walls "may appear as hyperbolic tokens of such sovereignty, like all hyperbole, they reveal a tremulousness, vulnerability, dubiousness, or instability at the core of what they aim to express ... Hence the visual paradox of these walls: What appears at first blush as the articulation of state sovereignty actually expresses its diminution relative to other kinds of global forces." [2]

Others have sought to "separate the border from the wall, showing how the regulatory functions and symbolic power of the border test the barrier between sovereignty and more flexible forms

of global governance.” [3] Thus, international borders are sites where spectacles of enforcement are staged, whereby migrant ‘illegality’ and exclusion is rendered spectacularly visible, while at the same time, its obscene is differential inclusion of a highly precarious and therefore hyper-exploitable labour force. [4]

### **Global Apartheid**

Differential inclusion refers to laws, policies, and practices that function not to exclude particular groups of people from national space, but to include them as non-nationals. Contemporary border control exercised by nation-states sustains “a global regime of apartheid, in which at least two different legal systems operate within the space of any given national state—one that regulates national subjects and another that regulates foreign objects. In this, the imposition of identities, be they state categorical identities or identities imposed by ideas of race, nation, and gender, is crucial.” [5]

### **Border Imperialism**

Border imperialism refers to the inextricability of contemporary borders from ongoing processes of imperialism (including slavery, extractivism, settler colonialism, dispossession, genocide, displacement, and sexual violence). Border imperialism targets “migrants, who are displaced as a result of the violences of capitalism and empire, and subsequently forced into precarious labor as a result of state illegalization and systemic social hierarchies.” Operating jointly through forced displacement (e.g., through imperialist war and occupation) and differential inclusion (through secured borders and apartheid laws differentiating citizens from migrants), border imperialism is the predominant form of contemporary western statecraft. [6]

Sources:

[1] Reese Jones, *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move* (London: Verso, 2016).

[2] Wendy Brown, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* (London: Zone Books, 2010, second edition, 2017), 23-24.

[3] Sandro Mezzadra & Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2013), 8.

[4] Nicholas De Genova, “Spectacles of Migrant ‘Illegality’: The Scene of Exclusion, the Obscene of Inclusion,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(7): 2013, 2.

[5] Nandita Rani Sharma, *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of ‘Migrant Workers’ in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 7.

[6] Harsha Walia, *Undoing Border Imperialism* (Oakland: AK Press/Institute for Anarchist Studies, 2013), 42-43.

### **Border Industrial Complex**

---

Not only do borders facilitate the production of precarious and hyper-exploitable clandestinized and temporary migrant workers; borders constitute an economic sector unto themselves. The “border industrial complex,” or “immigration industrial complex” refers to “the confluence of

public and private sector interests in the criminalization of undocumented migration, immigration law enforcement, and the promotion of ‘anti-illegal’ rhetoric” [1]. When university lecturers are instructed to take attendance and report international students’ absences from their classes to the Home Office, they are not only acting as proxy border guards; they are actively participating (albeit under coercion) in the border industrial complex as it articulates the neoliberal university. The neoliberal university relies upon, and reproduces the Border Industrial Complex: not only through the exploitation of so-called international students, but also through “brain drain” from the global south, and, on an epistemological level, through production of knowledge about “migrants” and “refugees” who are constructed as objects of knowledge and social intervention. The conceptualisation of borders as constituting an industrial complex integral to racial capitalism draws on the previous abolitionist articulation of the prison-industrial complex, and is complemented by the concept of a humanitarian industrial complex, “which operates through the commodification of suffering, subtle forms of care-control technologies, as well as subordination and discipline of migrants’ agency”; these three industrial complexes (borders, prisons, and humanitarianism) intersect in a “war on migration” [2]. Scholars who work on the border industrial complex urge us to “shift the analysis from border and prison regimes’ roles in war-making to one in which prisons and border fortifications are war-making” [3].

### **Offshore detention**

Employing “systematic torture to erase the identity, agency, and personhood of imprisoned refugees,” detention centres such as those located on the islands of Manus Island (Papua New Guinea), Christmas Island, and Nauru used in Australia’s offshore detention system are “rooted in coloniality”: “border politics are part of the same colonial thinking that continues the displacement, dispossession, and repression of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples” [4] Emerging from the “shared philosophical activity” of Behrouz Boochani (a Kurdish person persecuted in Iranian society who sought refuge in Australia only to be imprisoned for six years in its offshore prisons) and his collaborator and translator Omid Tofighian (an Iranian exile now living in Australia), Manus Prison theory “aims to analyse the detention industry by identifying its connections with other forms of violence and domination; this approach focuses on how systems of oppression are interconnected. Manus Prison is a location but for Boochani it is also a concept that functions within a complex ideology ... a transposable synecdochic (part/whole) relationship connecting the nation-state with its detention industry deserves further critical analysis ... A site such as Manus Prison, created by Australia, reflects Australian society and also has a symmetrical relationship with its progenitor. In this sense, Manus Prison and Australian society determine each other.” [5]

Sources:

[1] Tanya Golash-Boza, *“The immigration industrial complex: Why we enforce immigration policies destined to fail.”* *Sociology Compass* 3 (2): 2009, 295.



[2] Deanna Dadusc & Pierpaolo Mudu, "Care without Control: The Humanitarian Industrial Complex and the Criminalisation of Solidarity, *Geopolitics*, 17 April 2020, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2020.1749839>.

[3] Jenna M. Loyd, Matt Mitchelson and Andrew Burridge, *Beyond Walls and Cages: Prisons, Borders, and Global Crisis* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2012), 3.

[4] Omid Toghifian, "Introducing Manus Prison theory: knowing border violence." *Globalizations*, 29 January 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1713547>, 7.

[5] *Ibid.*

## Hotspots

---

In the midst of the "refugee crisis" declared by European leaders in the summer of 2015, a new infrastructure of bordering was instituted by the European Commission: by 2016, "hotspots" were created on 5 islands in Aegean Sea (Lesvos, Chios, Samos, Leros, and Kos) near the maritime border between Greece and Turkey; 5 more hotspots were created on the islands of Sicily (Trapani, Messina, Pozzallo) and Lampedusa as well as the Italian port of Taranto in the Central Mediterranean. Other ports in Italy function like hotspots (Brindisi, Cagliari, Catania, Catanzaro, Cosenza, Crotone, Lecce, Napoli, Palermo, Reggio Calabria, Salerno, Siracusa, Sassari, and Vibo Valentia). The explicit aim of the hotspot approach to migration management is for the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) to aid local authorities to "swiftly identify, register and fingerprint incoming migrants," dividing those eligible to apply for asylum and, potentially, relocation or family reunification in other European countries, from those ineligible for asylum, who are slated for deportation. Further, Europol and Eurojust are to assist the Member State (Greece or Italy) in the dismantling of "smuggling and trafficking networks." [1]

The hotspots impose a geographical restriction on the movement of asylum seekers, confining them to islands. Combined with the EU-Turkey Agreement, which mandates the return of asylum seekers arriving on the Greek islands to Turkey, and the operation of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), including its Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration programme (AVRR) within the hotspots, the hotspots, as it has unfolded since 2016, have proven to function primarily as a deportation mechanism. [2] At the same time, the hotspot islands have turned into spaces of containment and indefinite detention of refugees and migrants, modeled on the Australian system of "Offshore Management" of "Irregular Maritime Arrivals" (IMA): the so-called "Pacific Solution." In both cases, the EU and Australia, "islands are sites where nation-states exploit isolation to control migration," whereby "'offshoring' forms an archipelago of exclusion that capitalizes on sub-national island jurisdictions to shrink spaces of asylum legally." [3]

Much like the border moves and multiplies beyond the site of its geographical demarcation to the interior of nation-states, the hotspot is not merely an infrastructure limited to its declared location (e.g., a set of administrative and legal processes inside Centres of First Reception on the

ten aforementioned Greek and Italian islands and ports). The concept of the “mobile hotspot” refers to the motility and expansionist reach of the logic of the hotspot (the naturalised division of “refugees” from “economic migrants”) and its spatial extension to transportation, policing, housing, recognition, and clandestinisation beyond the geographical limits of the hotspots themselves. [4] The categories of representation generated by the hotspot mechanism which spatially exceeds the actual migration management infrastructure end up being ascribed to entire islands, cities, and countries. This spatial slippage is naturalized by the mediatized spectacle of the scene of arrival in Lesbos (the most infamous of the hotspot islands); the whole island (not only the reception, identification, and detention center in the Moria camp) is referred to as a “hotspot.” Greece is characterized as the “hotspot of Europe,” [5] becoming, post-2015, at first a space of transit and then a space of containment.

Sources:

[1] European Commission, “Explanatory note on the ‘hotspot’ approach,” July 2015, <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2015/jul/eu-com-hotspots.pdf>. See Antonis Vradis, Evie Papada, Joe Painter & Anna Papoutsis, *New Borders: Hotspots and the European Border Regime* (London: Pluto Press, 2018).

[2] Aila Spathopoulou, Anna Carastathis & Myrto Tsilimpounidi, “‘Vulnerable Refugees’ and ‘Voluntary Deportations’: Performing the Hotspot, Embodying its Violence.” *Geopolitics*, under review.

[3] Alison Mountz, “The enforcement archipelago: Detention, haunting, and asylum on islands.” *Political Geography* 30: 2011, 119, 120.

[4] Aila Spathopoulou, “The Ferry as a Mobile Hotspot: Migrants at the Uneasy Borderlands of Greece.” *Society and Space*, 15 December 2016, <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-ferry-as-a-mobile-hotspot-migrants-at-the-uneasy-borderlands-of-greece>.

[5] Evthymios Papataxiarchis, “Being ‘There’: At the Front Line of the ‘European Refugee Crisis’—Part One.” *Anthropology Today* 32(2): 2016, 5–9; Heath Cabot, “Crisis, Hot Spots, and Paper Pushers: A Reflection on Asylum in Greece.” *Cultural Anthropology* 28, June 2016, [www.culanth.org/fieldsights/898-crisis-hot-spots-and-paper-pushers-a-reflection-on-asylum-in-greece](http://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/898-crisis-hot-spots-and-paper-pushers-a-reflection-on-asylum-in-greece).

## **Externalisation of Borders**

---

In addition to instituting hotspots on its external borders in the Central and Eastern Mediterranean, the EU has pursued a policy of externalising its borders in order to control migration. Externalisation of borders refers to “a range of processes whereby European actors and Member States complement policies to control migration across their territorial boundaries with initiatives that realize such control extraterritorially and through other countries and organs rather than their own.” [1] “Remote control” has been pursued since the post-Cold war era, but more aggressively so in the 21st century. [2] These processes include bilateral agreements between the European Union and Turkey (the aforementioned EU-Turkey Deal, 2016), EU-Libya Deal (2017), EU-Tunisia Mobility Partnership (2014) EU-Africa Partnership for Migration, Mobility and Employment (2007) with the African Union, Migration Partnerships with individual African countries (after 2011); as

well as bilateral agreements between European Member States and other countries; notably, the agreements between Spain and Morocco, Mauritania, and Senegal (dating back to the 1990s, but renewed and “hardened” since the “refugee crisis” was declared), [3] effectively closed the Western Mediterranean passage and entry to Spain from North Africa. [4] Spain’s continued colonial reign over two “enclaves” in Morocco, the fortified cities of Ceuta and Melilla on the Mediterranean coast, as well as the Canary islands in the Atlantic, could well be viewed through the lens of border externalisation.

While border externalisation policies would seem to contravene the principle of non-refoulement (a principle enshrined in international law that forbids states to return persons seeking asylum to a country where they would face persecution), their aim is to circumvent legal responsibilities to persons seeking asylum by “outsourcing” them to non-European or EU-aspirant states. “European borders thus (re-)emerge as ubiquitous, multi-modal and translational systems of coercion--as an interconnected network of ‘little Guantánamos’. This, in turn, creates a distance, both physically and ethically, that is utilized to shift away concomitant responsibilities.” [5]

Sources:

[1] Violeta Moreno-Lax & Martin Lemberg-Pedersen, “Border-induced displacement: The ethical and legal implications of distance-creation through externalization.” *Questions of International Law* 56: 2019, 5.

[2] Ruben Zaiotti, “Mapping remote control: The externalisation of migration management in the 21st century.” In Ruben Zaiotti (ed), *Externalizing Migration Management: Europe, North America and the spread of 'remote control' practices* (London: Routledge, 2016), 3-30.

[3] Aderanti Adepoju, Femke van Noorloos & Annelies Zoomers, “Europe’s migration agreements with migrant-sending countries in the global South: a critical review.” *International Migration* 48 (3): 2010, 42-75.

[4] Alessandro Lanni, “A political laboratory: How Spain closed the borders to refugees.” *Open Migration*, 29 February 2016, <https://openmigration.org/en/analyses/a-political-laboratory-how-spain-closed-the-borders-to-refugees/>.

[5] Moreno-Lax & Lemberg-Pedersen, 2019, 6.

## **Fortress Europe**

---

Fortress Europe is a struggle concept that condenses condemnation of the continent’s border politics and their racist colonial underpinnings. (Similarly, no borders activists and scholars there refer to “Fortress North America” comprising the United States, Mexico, and Canada.) The origins of the term seem to be approbative in Hitler’s strategic plan to fortify Nazi-occupied continental Europe (so-called Festung Europa) against British military offensive. Neonazis today continue to use the term approbatively (particularly in German) to indicate their genocidal desire for a “racially-cleansed” Europe.

To the south of the Fortress, the Sea has been made into a moat. Of course, “[m]igrants do not simply die in the sea, but through the strategic use of the sea ... the Mediterranean has been

made to kill through contemporary forms of militarized governmentality of mobility which inflict deaths by first creating dangerous conditions of crossing, and then abstaining from assisting those in peril." [1] This is sometimes referred to as "Let them drown" policy, referring specifically to the elimination or defunding of search and rescue agencies by national and supranational entities in the Mediterranean, and their replacement by maritime border defense.

## **Black Mediterranean**

---

The proximity between two landmasses kept violently apart by a "sea that does not end at the land's edge" [2] is betrayed in the concept of the Black Mediterranean, which draws on the previous account of the Black Atlantic, or the "continent in negative" underpinning the Black diaspora, a space produced through Africans' forced crossings during transatlantic slavery as well through the proliferation of interconnected, hybrid Black cultures linking Africa to North and South America, to the Caribbean, and to Europe, integral to global modernity. [3] Historically, "the Black Mediterranean [w]as a precondition to the Black Atlantic and the making of Europe itself ... the Black Atlantic was a conceptualization bound to the Middle Passage and the pervasive genocidal politics born from the transatlantic slave trade and present in the aftermath of slavery. Rather than existing solely as a metaphor, a fixed geography or a paradigmatic site of loss often referred to as a "wet cemetery," the Black Mediterranean is a variegated site of Black knowledge production, Black resistance and possibilities of new consciousness." [4] "The Black Mediterranean is not this empty liquid space that separates a neocolonial and impoverished south from a post-empire and fractured north. It is a hybrid and discursive space through which both Europeans and Africans have defined themselves and their project of modernity. As a result of a long history of violence and war, that far exceeds that of the Black Atlantic, this space can only be mediated, for now, through the negative." [5]

After centuries of extractive capitalism, as sea levels rise in a warming world, the inextricable connection between letting die those trying to cross the Mediterranean, and letting whole countries become submerged (or desertified) due to ecological catastrophe, is becoming clearer: "A culture that places so little value on black and brown lives that it is willing to let human beings disappear beneath the waves, or set themselves on fire in detention centres, will also be willing to let the countries where black and brown people live disappear beneath the waves, or desiccate in the arid heat" [4].

Sources:

[1] Charles Heller & Lorenzo Pezzani, *"Liquid Traces: Investigating the Deaths of Migrants at the EU's Maritime Border,"* *Drift* (New York: Nightboat, 2014), 658-659.

[2] SA Smythe, *"The Black Mediterranean and the Politics of Imagination."* *Middle East Report* 286: 2018, 7, <https://essaysmythe.files.wordpress.com/2018/06/smythe-the-black-mediterranean-and-the-politics-of-imagination.pdf>.

[3] Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Harvard University Press, 1993).

Ida Danewid, "White Innocence in the Black Mediterranean: Hospitality and the erasure of history." *Third World Quarterly* 38(7): 2017, 1674-1689.

[4] Smythe, 7-8.

[5] Haythem Guesmi, "Next time you see the Mediterranean." *Africa Is A Country*, 13 August 2017, <https://africasacountry.com/2017/08/next-time-you-see-the-mediterranean>.

[6] Naomi Klein, "Let Them Drown: The Violence of Othering in a Warming World." *London Review of Books* 38(11): 2016, <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v38/n11/naomi-klein/let-them-drown>.

## **No Borders Politics**

---

No Borders politics are a prefigurative decolonial vision that affirms mobility as prior to and beyond the nation-state system and its institutions, capitalism and its colonial inheritances and perpetuations, and reproductive heteronormativity as the oldest globaliser in the world. [1] By "prefigurative" we mean that while a world without borders would be a very different world than the one in which we now live, nevertheless, in people's struggles, practices, and movements we get glimpses of what that world might look like (e.g., in the March of Hope through the Balkan Route in 2015)--and how far we have to go in order to actualise it. [2] Opposing borders means opposing war, since, as we have seen, borders are functional to a state of permanent war waged against those who cross them without relying on citizenship in centres of capital (and, therefore, having powerful passports that suspend the necropolitical functions of borders) or being owners of significant capital themselves. Since the contemporary international system of bordered nation-states is an inheritance and a continuation of colonialism, envisioning its elimination means embracing decolonial politics and self-determination beyond the model of nation-state sovereignty. Given the inextricability of borders and prisons (and the antecedents of both forced migration and carceral punishment in slavery) no borders politics is intrinsically abolitionist. Postcolonial citizenship is seen, from this perspective, as a legal form of racism that survives the deracialisation of nation-states that was supposed to have been accomplished in the era of formal decolonisation, and upholds a global system of apartheid. Thus, no borders politics constitute a "status for all" perspective that calls for the freedom of circulation—for the recognition and respect of a person's human right to travel. No Borders requires systematic change that would transform society completely; in this sense, it differs significantly from calls for "open borders" that do not dispute the legitimacy of the state, but place limits to sovereignty in the name of ensuring the survival and human rights of people on the move [3].

Sources:

[1] Bridget Anderson, Nandita Sharma & Cynthia Wright, "Editorial: Why No Borders?" *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* 26(2): 2009, 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.32074>.

[2] Natasha King, *No Borders: The Politics of Immigration Control and Resistance* (London: Zed Books, 2016)

[3] Reece Jones, ed. *Open Borders: In Defense of Free Movement* (Athens: University of Georgia, 2018), 13.