

A preprint version of Johan Schimanski and Stephen F. Wolfe, “Intersections: A Conclusion in the Form of a Glossary”, in *Border Aesthetics: Concepts and Intersections*, eds. Johan Schimanski and Stephen F. Wolfe, New York: Berghahn, 2017, pp. 147-69.

Intersections: A Conclusion in the Form of a Glossary

Johan Schimanski and Stephen F. Wolfe

In this book we have let six key words – *Ecology*, *Imaginary*, *Invisibility*, *Palimpsest*, *Sovereignty* and *Waiting* – steer parallel but interconnected paths through the field of border aesthetics. The time has come to pull some of the arguments proposed in the introduction together, sum up our conclusions, and make the links between chapters more visible.

Embedded in each chapter are many different terms relevant to chapter themes, and a number of these terms appear in more than one of the chapters. By treating this theoretical lexicon as a network of relations between the chapters, we hope to present a snapshot of our thinking here about border aesthetics, at this point of time in the academic debate. Any such state can only be a momentary and incomplete crystallization of a field, pointing as it does towards future and often unknown potentials for research. So while in the following we provide some hopefully useful definitions of the terms which make up the nodal points, definitions which may seem to claim to be definitive, we are very aware that we do this in order to provide a practical basis for debate and criticism, and that given the historical nature of borders and the other phenomena we are examining here, our definitions must be taken as contingent.

We have chosen to take the idea of nodes in a network and of definitions very literally by drawing up a network of terms cited or suggested in the chapters, and then providing lexical explanations for these terms in the style of a glossary. To make this conclusion more readable, however, our nodes are not simply arranged alphabetically, but are

In the following, we use cross-referencing by specific lettering styles (thus for example ‘*RELATIONS*’ indicates a relation to the entry on relations); this helps to counteract any tendency to limit all of the terms to just one rhizome or perspective. Each entry ends with a reference to the chapters in which the term is used or hinted at, in *italics*. The glossary form brings with it a certain amount of repetition, as the relationality of the different nodes in these networks often opens up different perspectives on the same questions. In this way, the reader can trace intersections with other material in the book. The first section of this glossary and conclusion are anchored by three figures, and then develops in slightly longer groupings throughout the rest of the text.

The Book Rhizome

The first three nodes addressed here, the first three words in our vocabulary, are those which form the main theme of the book itself: *borders*, *aesthetics* and *border aesthetics*. As such, they are connected to all of our six key words and addressed in each of our chapters. Our glosses here are slightly more encyclopedic than otherwise, since these three main nodes function as umbrella terms.

- **Borders** have tended to be part of *B/ORDERING* processes of *EXCLUSION* and inclusion, becoming fixed as lines of demarcation. Part of that process can be one of *NATURALIZATION*, and even seeing borders as natural borders. However, cultural and discursive processes allow them to surface as aesthetic *FIGURATIONS* – narratives or tropes – which can also interrogate their including/excluding function. Borders are also produced through negotiation with *BORDER-CROSSERS*. Such interrogations point towards a more deterritorialized and process-orientated concept of *BORDERING*, in which borders emerge as more flexible entities, folded and diffuse, played out across

zones or *BORDERSCAPES* in which many historical layers may be present. Borders can demarcate the edges of *TERRITORIES*, or they can shelter for example the social imaginary of a *COMMUNITY*; indeed, they can exist in and connect an almost endless variety of different locations, scales and levels. What happens in the border zone can be both regulated by the sovereign and through the use of various technologies, but it can also provide an *UNCANNY* and *IN-BETWEEN* space for *BORDER SUBJECTS* or *BORDER BEINGS*. Borders are places of crossing and waiting, and *BORDER-CROSSERS* constantly contribute to the redefinition of the border. Borders are thus often ambivalent and Janus-faced, caught between the *LAW* and that which transgresses the law, between fixity and change, between line and zone. This ambivalence can cause *INDETERMINACY* at the border. *See all chapters.*

- **Aesthetics** as a field can be defined in often (but not always) convergent ways, as focusing on: 1. the senses, perception and cognition; 2. the judgement of beauty and other related values; or 3. artistic production (cf. Welsch 1997). As an *EPISTEMOLOGY* of the *SENSIBLE* (or the ‘sense-able’), it has a crucial social, political and *B/ORDERING* function, since it can make constituencies both visible and invisible, audible and inaudible. ‘Appearing’ in the *PUBLIC* sphere is an aesthetic process. The aesthetic can thus both give and take away agency and *SUBJECTIVITY*, function in both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ways, both include and *EXCLUDE*. Aesthetic categories of judgement and medial technologies regulate these processes of *IN/VISIBILIZATION* etc. The transition between the insensible and the sensible, the *THRESHOLD* to the sensible, is the emergent and instituting space of the imaginary, the ‘as if’ and the *UNCONDITIONAL*, a creative, shaping space often instituted in modern democracy as that of *ARTISTIC FORMS*. *See all chapters.*

- **Border aesthetics** is a way of understanding the aesthetic dimension of borders, *BORDERING* and *BORDERSCAPES*. Borders can only exist to the extent that they are tangible; they thus always have an aesthetic dimension. Aesthetical works may give access to imaginaries about borders. At the same time, the *B/ORDERING* function of borders is a way of differentiating between and making visible social groups and political constituencies. Jacques Rancière's definition of the political as a 'partage du sensible' (2004), a partition and sharing of that which can be *SENSED*, contains within it the notion of partitions and borders. Yet aesthetics in itself also involves *BORDER-CROSSINGS* of medial borders, the borders between things and the representations of things. *ARTISTIC FORMS* are bordered, being paradoxically both *INCOMPLETE* and whole, folded in on themselves, presented in frames, and approached via *THRESHOLDS*.
See all chapters.

The Six Key Words Rhizome

Each of the book's six key words is given a proper discussion in their own chapter; but they also appear in other chapters, creating new links in our network. The length of the entry below for *IN/VISIBILITY* indicates its centrality to the book's discussion throughout.

- **Ecology** is suggested as a way of breaking with a common circular logic that *NATURALIZES* borders and notions of home. Ecology is more orientated towards a dynamics of mobility and *MIGRATION*, and can encompass a more *RELATIONAL* and entangled approach (e.g. in Bruno Latour's 'political ecology' [2004], in contrast to a more mythic 'natural ecology'), which transcends the divisions between culture and nature, which such circularity is based on. One can envisage a political ecology of

borders and of aesthetic *BORDER BEINGS*. See chapters on *Ecology, Sovereignty and Palimpsests*.

- **Imaginary.** Aesthetic pre-*FIGURATIONS* and *IMAGES* can break with accepted and legitimating social imaginaries, such as those defining national *COMMUNITIES* and sovereignty, and move towards new imaginaries. Such change takes place in a dynamic field involving acts of ‘institution’, *TRADITION* and the imaginary. *ARTISTIC FORMS* are institutions that can produce the imaginary through the imagination; the aesthetic allows for thinking ‘as if’. The radical imagination as defined by Cornelius Castoriadis (2007) is orientated towards that which is in the process of *BECOMING*. The imaginary is often instrumentalized in both alarmist and optimistic ‘frontier’ scenarios, and if it does not transcend dreams of commonality it will often end up in images of the *MONSTROUS*. Imaginary geographies form our relationship with the *OTHER*, and are thus an important part of *BORDERSCAPES* and activities of *B/ORDERING*. We tend to desire and wait for something on the other side of a border. See chapters on *Imaginary, Sovereignty, Palimpsests and Waiting*.
- **In/visibility** may refer figuratively to other senses than the visible or to the *SENSIBLE* in general, and also to *EPISTEMOLOGICAL BORDERINGS* such as the inarticulate, the incomprehensible, the unknown, the unrecognizable, the irrelevant, the *MONSTROUS* or the *INDETERMINATE*. Specifically visual forms of the sensible constitute a field of inquiry where for example maps, landscapes and symbolic *FIGURATIONS* may be central. Invisibility and visibility are central categories of the *BORDERSCAPE*, which makes some *SUBJECTIVITIES* and their articulations visible, allowing them to participate in a performative way in public political processes, while *OTHERS* are silenced and marginalized. Being visible may however be the opposite of privilege, as when people are made visible through surveillance and other forms of *POLICING*,

perhaps forcing them to hide themselves from sight. In/visibility is regulated by many different technologies, *MEDIAL BORDERS* and aesthetic processes. Such regimes can give visibility and take away *SUBJECTIVITY* at the same time; they can, for example, make borders so ahistorical, stereotypical, *TRADITIONAL*, ubiquitous, monumental or *NATURALIZED* that they are rendered invisible and absent; or they can *AESTHETICIZE* in a superficial fashion (as in the aestheticization of sovereign power). Territorial borders can be part of hegemonic *B/ORDERINGS* which render other subjectivities than the nation invisible; creating a border establishes the *INTERNAL AND THE EXTERNAL*, thus framing the visible and the invisible. Historical layering in the form of cultural palimpsests can be rendered invisible through selection, folds and erasure. A political ecology, *HAUNTING* or an epistemology of seeing has the potential to interrupt regimes of in/visibility and epistemologies of blindness; without countering the regimes themselves through silence or mimicry, subjectivities run the risk of being made visible on the terms of the regime. *See all chapters.*

- **Palimpsest** is a paleographical term for a manuscript written on parchment which has been used before and is often imperfectly erased of previous writing, rendering that previous writing sometimes partly visible as historical layers behind the present text. It is now often used metaphorically for an intertextually layered text, or also a culturally layered landscape and multi-layered borderland, i.e. a borderland made up of different registers, scales (global-local) and cultural histories. Layers cannot remain autonomous however; rather, meaning and values cross the borders between them, and they find themselves *RELATIONALLY* entangled; the present cannot be seen as wholly separate from the past, and must be thought of in a genealogical or archaeological fashion. The palimpsest is an aesthetic rendering of in/visibility. Territorial and other borders may also function as cumulative palimpsests, hiding

behind them many earlier versions accessible through archives and *MEMORY*. The palimpsest is a figure connected with *TEMPORAL BORDERS*, shifts between for example historical periods, the old and the new, the traditional and the modern – though these shifts can often be crossed by hidden continuities. The palimpsest encourages reuse, bricolage and *COLLAGE*, and the renegotiation of previous uses and meanings. *See chapters on Palimpsests and Imaginary.*

- **Sovereignty**, in modern *DEMOCRACIES*, is associated in public discourse with the people's right to self-government, with claims over national *TERRITORY*, and transgressions of other nations' rights; but underlying these somewhat abstract principals is the historical figure of the sovereign, the royal or imperial head of state. Sovereignty is a regime which has traditionally been most *SENSIBLE* through the *SPECTACLE* of power (originally through the body of the head of state), and (in modern nation-states) most arbitrarily powerful or despotic at the territorial border: in the *IN-BETWEEN*, on the *THRESHOLD*, in spaces of waiting and interrogation where the *LAW* is no longer a protection. Sovereignty is thus concerned with determining where we are in relationship to the border, and where the border is. The Sovereign stands at the far end of the *BORDERSCAPE* (just as the border stands in the far end of the 'sovereignscape'). Giorgio Agamben (1998) has posited that sovereign power is now generalized in variously permanent states of exception, which render subjects into *BARE LIFE*, and the on-going tendency towards the *INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL* dissemination of state border *POLICING* across extended *BORDERSCAPES* provides an example of this logic. Sovereignty thus relates to the citizens with *SUBJECTIVITIES* which can be transformed into a lack of subjectivity, but is at the same time haunted by 'insovereign' *BORDER BEINGS* who may escape this economy by taking up *INTERDETERMINE* positions which worry the boundaries of in/visibility. Such border

beings become figures of the potential *UNCONDITIONALITY* of aesthetic *ART FORMS*. See chapters on *Ecology, Sovereignty, Palimpsests and Waiting*.

- **Waiting** is an activity which often takes place at borders, on *THRESHOLDS*, places in which attempting *BORDER-CROSSERS* wait to cross and border guards wait for the *OTHER*. Indeed, the border can be defined as an act of waiting. Through waiting, the border becomes a zone, a liminal space, or an *IN-BETWEEN*, regulated by a process of *B/ORDERING*. Waiting produces both *SUBJECTIVITIES* and *TERRITORIES* through aesthetic encounters and acts of witnessing characterized by in/visibility of the crosser, the guard, the border and the *LAW*, within the *BORDERSCAPE*. Through waiting, border *POLICING* becomes internalized. Acts of waiting also characterize our experiences with *ARTISTIC FORMS*: waiting for stories to begin or end, waiting for meaning, etc. See chapter on *Waiting*.

The Border-Crosser Rhizome

- **Bare life** is a concept developed by Agamben (1998), designating a marginal form of existence produced by and necessary to the workings of sovereignty. Typically, bare life results in a lack of *SUBJECTIVITY* stripped of rights by *LAW* within a *B/ORDERING* process of in/visibilization and *EXCLUSION*. Thus *BORDER SUBJECTS*, *BORDER BEINGS* and *BORDER-CROSSERS* (such as migrants) can be reduced to states of bare life in the border zone or *IN-BETWEEN*. Aesthetic processes can make visible subjects out of bare life. Yet some border beings may escape the bare life/sovereignty economy by attaining an alternative state of *INDETERMINACY*. See chapters on *In/visibility and Sovereignty*.
- **Border beings** are a more general category than *BORDER SUBJECTS*, since border subjects relate to the border and make it tangible, thus partaking in an act of

B/ORDERING. Border beings can however retain a more *INDETERMINATE* position, and may include nonhuman actors, ghosts and the *MONSTROUS*. *See chapters on Sovereignty and Waiting*.

- **Border subjects** are *BORDER BEINGS* who have attained *SUBJECTIVITY*, negotiating regimes of in/visibility so as to become *SENSIBLE*. Border subjects include border guards, *BORDER-CROSSERS*, and borderland dwellers, and can have the potential to enact new strategies of in/visibility. *See chapters on In/visibility and Sovereignty*.
- **Border-crossers** are *BORDER SUBJECTS* who alter the *BORDERSCAPE* by entering border zones and crossing borders. Their crossings are regulated by border *POLICING*, which can act selectively, and some attempted border-crossings are unsuccessful. Border-crossers may be *MIGRANTS*, displaced persons, tourists, business travellers, family visitors, artists, researchers, smugglers, etc., but also animals, goods, *ARTISTIC FORMS* and ideas. *See chapters on Ecology and In/visibility*.
- **Migrants** are *BORDER-CROSSERS* with displaced citizenships who often are seen as passive *BORDER BEINGS*, but may disturb the workings of *B/ORDERING*, and through the negotiation of in/visibilities may be able to participate as *SUBJECTIVITIES*. A political form of ecology can provide migrants with new imaginaries, which are not *NATURALIZED*, creating *CONTACT ZONES* and *RELATIONS*. Migrants are often forced into positions of waiting, while border police also wait for migrants. Migrants can be given agency through access to plurivocal agencies inherent in specific aesthetic and *ARTISTIC FORMS*. *See chapters on Ecology, In/visibility, Sovereignty and Waiting*.
- **Others** are products of a specific form of *B/ORDERING* process, ‘othering’, which excludes *SUBJECTIVITIES* and places them in *EXTERNAL* spaces. Historically it is a category common to many *IMPERIALIST* cultures, which tend to think of the self as civilized and the Other as barbarian. The Other is *FEARED*, but creates strength for the

self. Others are subject to the workings of in/visibility; they are sometimes *AESTHETICIZED* (and thus made invisible) through stereotypical exoticism, sometimes able to show resistance through silence. A discourse may allow (an often inauthentic) respect for those on the other side of the border, but at the same time partake in an othering of *BORDER BEINGS* living in the *IN-BETWEEN*. The Other can sometimes appear as part of the self, creating an *UNCANNY* effect. *See chapters on Ecology, In/visibility, Palimpsests, Sovereignty and Waiting.*

- **Subjectivity** is here defined as the agency to interpret for oneself and more generally to have some agency or autonomy as a discursive or psychoanalytical subject, rather than being the object of representation. Subjectivities are made *SENSIBLE* through different processes of in/visibility. Attaining subjecthood, according to Louis Althusser's logic of interpellation (1971), can paradoxically mean to internalize regimes of *B/ORDERING*. Subjects are structured as selves, often in contrast to *OTHERS*, but paradoxically the borders between self and the other can often house *IN-BETWEENS*, in which the *MONSTROUS* and the *UNCANNY* can be manifested. The development of *SUBJECTIVITY*, as it takes place for example in childhood, involves the production of transitional objects and third spaces. A processual form of politics would involve alternative and participatory forms of subjectivity and *DEMOCRACY*, contributing to counter-hegemonic *BORDERSCAPES*. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility and Waiting.*

Each of the following five 'border plane' rhizomes is introduced with the entry for the border plane (topographical, epistemological, symbolic, temporal and medial) concerned. Other entries in each of these sub-glossaries follow in alphabetical order.

The Topographical Rhizome

- **Topographical borders** can exist on many scales and configured (and subject to *FIGURATION*) in many different ways in both concrete and conceptual landscapes or spaces. They can be mapped onto or articulate spatially other border planes, be they *SYMBOLIC*, *EPISTEMOLOGICAL*, *TEMPORAL* or *MEDIAL*, all of which can be spatialized and thus made topographical. They are part of the *BORDERSCAPE*, and are both physically visible, and, existing in palimpsests, partly hidden. *See all chapters.*
- The **body** has topographical borders, albeit on a micro scale when compared for example to nation-state *TERRITORIES*. The body provides metaphorical *FIGURATIONS* of other territories, such as nation states. The body is the basis of *SUBJECTIVITY*; its borders can encourage a *NATURALIZING* organicism, but also manifest the *INCOMPLETE* and the *MONSTROUS*. Bodily or corporeal borders are subjected to regimes of in/visibility; they can articulate narratives and can be subject, like texts, to *READINGS*. *BORDER BEINGS* have incomplete bodies which can be situated in *BORDER-CROSSING* locations. Captivity, torture and the meeting of bodies attempt to double the border of the body, confining the already bordered body with another border; one may desire, through *FEAR*, to be captive and *INTERNALLY* self-disciplined, or desire to be free from captivity. *See chapters on Sovereignty and Waiting.*
- **Borderscape** is a recently coined term combining the words *border*, *landscape* and Arjun Appadurai's notion of *scapes* (1990). The term *borderscapes*, like *scapes*, is mostly used in a more metaphorical way than *landscape*; the *borderscape* combines the physical *landscape* with many other levels. However, the word *landscape* also suggests a way of thinking the physical object (a topographical *landscape*) at the same time as the representation (a *landscape painting*); thus *borderscapes* bring together representations and practices. The notion of *landscape* also suggests a regime of

in/visibility (since a landscape can be seen from a power perspective). In line with Appadurai's notions of various imaginary scapes connecting up our globalized world, borderscapes are more extended, flexible, disjunctive, amorphous and flowing than border landscapes, peripheries, border zones or borderlands, at least when those are thought of as contiguous areas bordering onto a border. Borderscapes are multileveled, *RELATIONAL* networks entangling different objects, imaginaries, *BORDER SUBJECTS* and *INTERNALIZED OR EXTERNALIZED* borders. They involve everything involved in the processes of *BORDERING* and *B/ORDERING*. Borderscapes are politically ambivalent: on the one hand they are regimes of hegemonic in/visibility, but on the other they avoid the *TERRITORIAL* trap of thinking borders as lines and thus open up deterritorialized zones and *IN-BETWEENS*. Potentially, they can be the basis for counter-hegemonic borderscaping, a word pointing back to the etymological roots of the element *scape*, having to do with shaping and creating, suggesting the relevance of *ARTISTIC FORMS*. Borderscaping can potentially be a form of performative resistance. Since they are *SENSIBLE* and open to the imaginary, borderscapes are home to many forms of border aesthetics. It is possible to conceptualize different levels of borderscapes: audio-visual borderscapes, sonic borderscapes, borderscapes of sovereign power, etc. See chapters on *Ecology*, *In/visibility*, *Sovereignty*, *Palimpsests and Waiting*.

- **Contact zones**, Mary Louise Pratt's (1992) term for a shared space or zone in which imperial travellers can meet indigenous peoples and engage in cultural translation, are places of what Mireille Rosello has called 'performative encounters' (2005) in the sense that *IDENTITIES* are negotiated on both sides. They are where the *OTHER* can be seen, heard, etc., and while they are regulated by regimes of in/visibility, they are also susceptible to unexpected effects which disturb such regimes, such as when an

interrogator meets the other and questions his/her own *SUBJECTIVITY*. Some border zones are however interdicted, and encounters can be bordered in such a way that no true encounter happens, or be hindered by the *INDETERMINACY* of *BORDER BEINGS* in an *IN-BETWEEN*. Border zones can be places of mixing, but also of the *B/ORDERING* of selves and others etc. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility, Sovereignty and Waiting.*

- The **in-between** is a third space between two territories; a borderless zone created in the contested spaces, folds and overlappings of the border, an effect of the discrepancies between borders on different, sometime incompatible levels and scales in the palimpsest or as seen from two different perspectives, those of the periphery and the centre. It is a place of doubling and the *UNCANNY* where in/visibility is uncertain and ambiguous, a liminal space or *THRESHOLD* that makes *INDETERMINACY* and insovereignty possible. It is a transitional place for in-between *BORDER BEINGS*. Homi K. Bhabha has argued that the in-between or third space is a site of creativity, the 'location of culture' (Bhabha 1994b). *See chapters on Ecology, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*
- **Incomplete.** *ARTISTIC FORMS, COMMUNITIES, BODIES, SUBJECTS, TERRITORIES, NATURES, sovereignties and NATIONS* have traditionally been perceived as bordered wholes, yet the *BORDERSCAPES, IN-BETWEENS* and border zones which are associated with their borders challenge this presumed completeness. Incompleteness creates fragments, *MONSTROUS* and *UNCANNY* effects. *B/ORDERING* desires wholes, yet perfect wholeness is an unattainable fantasy; the *UNCONDITIONALITY* of the aesthetic may however function as a transitional, unfinished and fragmented wholeness. *See chapters on Ecology, Sovereignty and Waiting.*

- Internal and External.** Borders are increasingly being seen (not least where nation-state borders are concerned) as not only located at outer edges, but also projected outwards into other spaces and introjected inwards into one's own space. They thus become disseminated over an extended *BORDERSCAPE*, crossing the divides between the internal and the external, the inside and the outside, the self and the other, us and them, civilized and barbarian, community and the alien. The folding of border inwards and outwards challenges *NATURALIZED* notions of borders as instruments of *EXCLUSION* and inclusion, while at the same time extending the sovereign power to *B/ORDER* in both directions. The internal and external dissemination of borders is often seen as an effect of globalization, which is now revealed as globalizing borders rather than moving to a world without borders, and at the same time has led (like imperialism before it) to a proliferation of *BORDER-CROSSERS* and *BORDER BEINGS*. Sovereignty, *B/ORDERING* and the *LAW* ask that things be located either inside or outside borders, and yet are themselves both inside and outside borders, as are border beings. Being *IN-BETWEEN* or on the *THRESHOLD* can mean being both internal and external. Borders and *BORDERLANDS* also face inwards and outwards, creating an *UNCANNY* doubleness at the border; and borders which have been folded inwards can be the basis for forms of treason and shame in relationship to *TRADITION*, or to *POLICING* itself. *SUBJECTIVITY* can give an external agency in the public sphere, but also mean that external regimes are internalized. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility, Sovereignty and Waiting.*
- Territory** implies a hierarchical regime of *B/ORDERING* and sovereignty, edged by borders and demarcations dividing between the *INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL* and constituting a unit. Within the *BORDERSCAPE* paradigm, the discrepancies and disjunctions between territories are taken seriously, and territories become less stable,

more fluid. They are, to use Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's terms (1986), de-territorialized – and often then re-territorialized through renewed b/ordering processes. Such processes are accompanied by *BORDERING* and re-bordering. Deleuze and Guattari's argument that territorialization may apply not only to terrestrial territories, but also for example to bodily or semantic territories (i.e. meaning), is a reminder that the logics of the territory can apply on many different levels. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility and Sovereignty.*

The Epistemological Rhizome

- **Epistemological borders** are the borders marking the difference between the known and the unknown, between the comprehensible and the incomprehensible, between *TRUTH* and lies, between the articulate and the inarticulate, between reality and the imaginary. They can be mapped onto borders on other border planes – *TOPOGRAPHICAL, SYMBOLIC, TEMPORAL* and *MEDIAL*. For example, the border to another country is often a barrier to understanding, and the *OTHER* is often seen as an unknown; or the past can be lost to *MEMORY*, forgotten in the folds of the palimpsest and thus become part of the unknown. Epistemological borders, since they mark the borders of the known, are part of the aesthetics of the *SENSIBLE* and of in/visibility. *See chapters on Imaginary, In/visibility and Palimpsests.*
- **Aestheticization** is a process where objects and subjectivities are given an aesthetic surface which conceals *B/ORDERINGS* and the workings of power. As such it is part of a regime of in/visibility. It can take the form of gentrifying design (of urban landscapes, but also of the control stations of border *POLICING*), stereotypical exoticization, political rhetoric, the dazzling dress or ritual of the sovereign, or *SPECTACULARIZATION*. Aestheticization in this sense should not be confused with what Wolfgang Iser

calls ‘epistemological aestheticization’ (Welsch 1997a), i.e. a turn in the human sciences away from a ‘reality’, which is seen as inaccessible, and towards interpretations. This is a turn which places aesthetics as central in fields such as border studies. *See chapters on In/visibility, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*

- **Indeterminacy**, ambiguity, ambivalence, *UNCONDITIONALITY* and contradiction between different parts of the *BORDERSCAPE* are the products of entanglements between layers of the palimpsest and of the mixings of the *IN-BETWEEN*. Indeterminacy seems to contradict *B/ORDERING* and the territorialization of meaning, avoiding a recourse to *TRUTH* and authenticity. With reference to in/visibility, it makes it difficult to see whether something is *EXTERNAL OR INTERNAL* to the border. The unconditionality and ecological mobility of the aesthetic can render *ARTISTIC FORMS* indeterminate. *See chapters on Ecology, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*
- **Reading** is an act not only of crossing epistemological borders of interpretation, but also of crossing the *MEDIAL BORDERS* constituted by the borders of a text; landscapes can also be read as texts and as palimpsests. Texts come into being through acts of reading, and since a reading or interpretation is an attempt to find an ever deferred meaning in a text, reading is also an act of waiting. *See chapters on Palimpsests and Waiting.*
- **Relations** are central to an ecology of borders in which beings, objects, ideas and *ARTISTIC FORMS* in the *BORDERSCAPE* find themselves entangled with each other. Latour (2004) theorizes relations as ‘matters of concern’, which have no clear boundaries, being ‘tangled beings’ which form metaphorical rhizomes and networks. If borders can no longer be seen as clear-cut lines, they can potentially be understood as relations (Schimanski and Wolfe 2013, based on work by the Border Aesthetics project group). Objects, *SUBJECTIVITIES* and practices exist on the borderlines between

different fields, discourses, layers in the palimpsest, inextricably connecting them into *BORDERSCAPES*. Thinking in terms of relationality and networks can counter more hierarchical *B/ORDERINGS* and mechanical ways of dividing representations into border planes. Unlike *COMMUNITY* belonging, relations do not tend to include/*EXCLUDE*; they might also be *UNCONDITIONAL* ways of connecting to *BORDER BEINGS*. Aesthetic objects such as *ARTISTIC FORMS* can be described as being both entangled and partly autonomous in their relationships to the world. *See chapters on Ecology, In/visibility, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*

- The **Sensible** is here understood as that which can be sensed and perceived and which is subject to cognition, rather than just possessing ‘common sense’. It is thus part of an aesthetic field and often addressed through a particular form of the sensible: in/visibility. Attaining *SUBJECTIVITY* is often associated with been seen, or articulating oneself and social imaginaries so that they can be heard in the *PUBLIC* sphere. For Rancière, politics is defined as the ‘distribution of the sensible’ (2004), connecting *DEMOCRACY* to different aesthetic regimes of in/visibility. Borders must always have a sensible or tangible component. *CONTACT ZONES* are built around the possibility of perceiving the *OTHER*. *ARTISTIC FORMS* can redistribute the sensible, as long as they do not *AESTHETICIZE* in a superficial way. Instead, as Shklovsky argues (1965 [1916]), aesthetic representations of the border may estrange and thus heighten cognition, allowing us to see things anew from a distance. *See chapters on Ecology, In/visibility and Waiting.*
- The **truth** is a promise of territorialized meaning and authenticity, ultimately inaccessible and thus producing situations of waiting. Border-crossers are often perceived as liars, and borders are places of fantasies, fiction, figuration, the *UNCANNY* and the imaginary. The job of border *POLICE* is surveillance. The sovereign and other

agencies of *B/ORDERING* seek the truth and the authentic. The *NATURALIZED* and the originary in an ecology or a palimpsest can appear authentic. *See all chapters.*

- The **uncanny** is according to Sigmund Freud (1955) the product of an unexpected perception that part of the self is *OTHER*: the familiar suddenly seems unfamiliar. It creates a doubling of the *SUBJECT*. Bhabha (1994a) connects the uncanny with national borders. *BORDER BEINGS* can put the sovereign, in its search for *TRUTH*, in an uncanny position. *See chapter on Sovereignty.*

The Symbolic Rhizome

- **Symbolic borders** are differences or conceptual oppositions between concepts, values and *SUBJECTIVITIES*. They are borders in a mental or social landscape that can be articulated as *TOPOGRAPHICAL BORDERS* (cf. Simmel 1997 [1903]), or other kinds of borders, including those created rhetorically, or through *FIGURATION*. The symbolic is an essential component of both social and aesthetic worlds, and can often be represented in the form of images set in cultural landscapes. Power and *B/ORDERING* are not only expressed, but also work symbolically. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary and Palimpsests.*
- **Communities**, for example nations, have been shown to be dependent on common understandings or social imaginaries – also in the guise of *ARTISTIC FORMS* such as the novel – by thinkers such as Benedict Anderson (1991) and Charles Taylor (2004). They are homogenized forms of belonging and participation constituted within *NATURALIZED* borders, providing both homes for their members or citizens and the basis for *DEMOCRACIES* and *PUBLIC* spheres; as such they express a desire to internalize *B/ORDERING*, to include and *EXCLUDE*. Communities posit a bounded homogeneous *TERRITORY* which reinforces their naturalness, but their perceived homogeneity may be

disturbed by the *UNCANNINESS* of borders, for example in the form of multiculturalism. Borders, while bounding the community, belong also to other communities and create *IN-BETWEENS*, which are *HAUNTED* by *BORDER BEINGS*. In borderlands, the naturalized markers of belonging in the palimpsestal landscape may be more susceptible to being revealed as inauthentic, lacking in *TRUTH* value. New communities in the borderlands may create new borders which overlap with and diffuse earlier ones. The borderscape paradigm may help communities to accept a *DEMOCRACY* of *BECOMING* rather than a naturalized politics of being. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility, Palimpsests and Waiting.*

- **Democracy** has traditionally been based around *COMMUNITIES* of citizens who have been allowed to participate in a *PUBLIC* sphere. It is thus a space for the representation of *SUBJECTIVITIES*, bringing together politics with in/visibility. Democracies also guarantee through the rule of *LAW* the *B/ORDERING* of communities; but this form of sovereignty is haunted by earlier forms of despotism. *ARTISTIC FORMS* have had an important role to play in the development of democracies, since the aesthetic, with its *UNCONDITIONALITY*, can be a space in which to make visible alternative imaginaries without being excluded. The participatory dimension of democracy can be activated as a strategy in art, for example in participatory migrant videos; but *MIGRANTS* and *OTHERS* are often *EXCLUDED* from citizenship, and forced to wait outside democracies. A new form of democracy must be imagined if *BORDER BEINGS* are to become *BORDER SUBJECTS*; borders must be democratized. Politics as process (rather than politics as *POLICE*) would promise a democracy in the form of an ecology which would avoid *NATURALIZATION*, allow plurivocal negotiation and participation in the *PUBLIC* sphere, and encourage the creation of new imaginaries. *See chapters on Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*

- **Exclusion** and inclusion are the products of a regime of *B/ORDERING* which divides between the *INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL*. Exclusion makes people into *OTHERS*, and denies them *SUBJECTIVITY* and participation in *COMMUNITIES*. Borders function selectively, including some and excluding others. Hegemonic *BORDERSCAPES* strengthen exclusion, while counter-hegemonic borderscapes can include new subjectivities through a constant *INDETERMINACY*. *ARTISTIC FORMS* may also exclude and include through regimes of in/visibility, but the *UNCONDITIONALITY* of the aesthetic can foster an indeterminacy which avoids such regimes. *See chapters on Imaginary, In/visibility and Sovereignty.*
- **Imperialism** is a form of *COMMUNITY* which has historically produced many *IN-BETWEEN* border zones in the form of colonies and also caused massive migration movements across global frontiers. Imperial ideologies treat external *TERRITORIES* as gendered *BODIES* with crossable borders. Many *NATURALIZED* ways of thinking about borders (for example, as peripheries or frontiers, as *B/ORDERING* dividers between selves and *OTHERS*, or as subject to a specific form of despotism on the side of the sovereign) stem partly from imperial and colonial thinking, be it Roman, European or Soviet, and haunt our contemporary *PALIMPSESTUAL* landscapes as dreams and imaginaries in waiting. *See chapters on Ecology, Palimpsests, Sovereignty and Waiting.*
- The **law** (and all kinds of cultural and *TRADITIONAL* norms) is intimately connected with *B/ORDERING*, social imaginaries and traditional forms of *DEMOCRACY* and sovereignty. It also however implies the possibility of transgression, a form of *BORDER-CROSSING*. The law paradoxically produces *IN-BETWEEN* spaces of exception, and the *BORDER BEINGS* in these in-between spaces live *UNCONDITIONALLY* both inside and outside the law, both waiting and transgressing, as does the law itself. *ARTISTIC*

FORMS are often held against the standards of aesthetic norms, and can often transgress those norms at their *MEDIAL BORDERS*. See chapters on *Ecology, Sovereignty and Waiting*.

- **Fear and desire** are two sides of waiting at the border: on the one hand a paranoid fear of the *OTHER* and need for *B/ORDERING*; and on the other a schizoid desire for the other and need for debordering, which is also a desire for *BECOMING* and transcendence. Fear and desire also correspond to various aesthetic effects – the *UNCANNY*, the *MONSTROUS* and the sublime. See chapters on *Imaginary, Sovereignty and Waiting*.
- **Policing** is a major *B/ORDERING* industry, involving border guards and various other forms of securitization, control and internalization of *FEAR*. Central to policing is surveillance, involved in regimes of in/visibility. According to Rancière (2010), policing is an oppressive form of politics which stands in opposition to politics as process, a form of *DEMOCRACY* in which new *SUBJECTIVITIES* may appear and be negotiated. People living in borderlands may be disciplined into internalizing regimes of *B/ORDERING*. See chapters on *In/visibility and Waiting*.
- The **public** sphere is itself a *BORDERED* space, and should ideally guarantee participation and regulate in/visibility so as to make sensible new *SUBJECTIVITIES*, but at the same time resist strategies of *POLICING* which invade the private sphere, securing, as Hannah Arendt (1958) suggests, the invisibility of the natural. See chapters on *Ecology, Imaginary, In/visibility, Palimpsests, Sovereignty and Waiting*.
- The **unconditional** is a form of *RELATION* which does not act in a *B/ORDERING* fashion, avoiding the power and desire of the sovereign and thus suggesting new models of citizenship in *DEMOCRACIES*. It is not *NATURALIZED* and does not find its origins in *TRADITION*. *BORDER BEINGS* live in a state of unconditionality and *INDETERMINACY*.

ARTISTIC FORMS may attain unconditionality and help *SUBJECTIVITIES* do the same. See chapters on *Ecology, Imaginary and Sovereignty*.

The Temporal Rhizome

- **Temporal borders** mark the shifts between different periods of time in history or in the life of a person, thing or artwork; they can also divide the present and the past (crossed by *MEMORY* and *HAUNTINGS*, but also the intertextual *PALIMPSESTS* we surround ourselves with), or the present and the future, that which is *BECOMING*. All forms of *BORDER-CROSSING* are also crossings of a temporal border between a before and an after. Temporal borders are configured as processes and transitions which, just like other borders, are not necessarily clear-cut. Indeed, they are often *RELATIONALLY* entangled and involve *IN-BETWEEN* spaces of waiting and the liminality of the *THRESHOLD*. In such spaces we may find *BORDER BEINGS* and the transitional objects that Donald Winnicott (1971) mentions in connection with processes of children becoming *SUBJECTIVITIES*. Borders themselves change with time, opening and closing, undergoing debordering and rebordering, and border studies itself has undergone a ‘processual turn’ towards thinking borders as borderings or *B/ORDERINGS*. The attempt to *NATURALIZE* borders, to pretend that they are based on primary or ‘natural’ borders, denies the possibility of rupture, transcendence and becoming. Certain changes, such as sudden changes in *MIGRATION* patterns, appear as *SPECTACULAR* ruptures that take away attention from more long-term transitions. See all chapters.
- **Becoming.** The future, utopias, emergent borders and *SUBJECTIVITIES* are in a state of becoming; they wait on a *THRESHOLD*. Creating, instituting or performing the new is a function of the social imaginary, and counteract *NATURALIZED* and *TRADITIONAL* conceptions of borders and *COMMUNITY*. *ARTISTIC FORMS* can be capable of creating

UNCONDITIONAL spaces in which the new comes into being, and of contributing to processes of creative *BORDERSCAPING*. That which is in a state of becoming can promise transcendence, or can appear as *MONSTROUS* and cause *FEAR*, and being caught in a waiting position can be a way of avoiding the new. Utopian scenario building and the appeal to the ‘frontier’ can however be a way of in/visibilizing through *AESTHETICIZATION* and *SPECTACULARIZATION*, and thus a form of *B/ORDERING*. See chapters on *Imaginary, In/visibility, Palimpsests and Waiting*.

- **Bordering** and **b/ordering** are relatively new concepts in border studies (cf. Houtum and Naerssen 2002), intended to give a more verb-like, processual and performative dimension than that conveyed by the noun *border*. B/ordering often takes the form of a regime of in/visibility, for example mapping, which can provide the basis of using borders to *EXCLUDE* and to include. Bordering as such is always an transitional activity involving processes of debordering and rebordering; it thus creates an *INDETERMINACY* which paradoxically subverts b/ordering regimes and diffuses the border across extended *BORDERSCAPES*. B/ordering and the *LAW* can become *INTERNALIZED* as a position of waiting. See chapters on *In/visibility and Waiting*.
- **Hauntings** and encounters with ghosts often take place on *TOPOGRAPHICAL BORDERS*, but are also figurations of the temporal border between the living and the dead. Ghosts are a form of *BORDER BEING* that create an *UNCANNY* effect in the *IN-BETWEEN*; like the *MONSTROUS*, they are typical of imaginative and gothic *ARTISTIC FORMS*; as apparitions, they regulate an indeterminate in/visibility, and, importantly, are often associated with traumatic *MEMORIES* in either a historical or a familial context, making visible a spectral palimpsest. See chapters on *Imaginary, Palimpsests and Sovereignty*.

- **Memory** is a *BORDER-CROSSING* between a present and a past, the actual temporal border being that of forgetting. Borderscapes and border ecologies do not however focus on *NATURALIZED* origins or a past *TRADITION* as such, but on archaeological or archival elements which are palimpsestually present in the cultural landscape, or as *HAUNTINGS* from previous historical (e.g. *IMPERIALIST*) and sometime traumatic *B/ORDERINGS*. See chapters on *Ecology and Palimpsests*.
- **Naturalization** designates an ideological tendency, made *SENSIBLE* in many border *FIGURATIONS*, to use nature as an essentializing and circular principal in the *B/ORDERING* of *SUBJECTIVITIES* and *TERRITORIES*. *TRADITIONS*, along with notions of home and *COMMUNITY*, are often naturalized, along with their borders and norms or *LAWS*. Territorial borders are sometimes called natural or artificial, though it is clear that it is symbolic processes of b/ordering which determine whether for example a mountain range becomes a national border. While ecology is often presented as a science or principal of nature, naturalization paradoxically goes against and renders in/visible the notion of a political ecology of borders; the latter would allow for greater mobility and transgressions, for example made visible in *MIGRANT* border-crossings and *ARTISTIC FORMS*. *BORDER-CROSSERS* are often *OTHERED* as unnatural; but at the same time *PUBLIC* invisibility often reduces subjectivities to sets of naturalized traits, a ‘natural visibility’. See chapters on *Ecology and In/visibility*.
- The **threshold**, combining both temporal and topographical borders, is a central chronotope in Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) and in theories of liminality (from Latin *limen*, ‘threshold’) proposed by Arnold van Gennep (1960) and Victor Turner (1970, 1992). The threshold is an *IN-BETWEEN* and transitional space of waiting, whether it is by the door to a building, at a border-crossing control point, or at the beginning of an *ARTISTIC FORM* like a literary text. See chapters on *Sovereignty and Waiting*.

- **Traditions**, like *MEMORIES*, cross a temporal border between the past and the present, even continuing on into the future. Crossing that border, however, they involve, as the etymological origins of the word *tradition* suggest, a form of ‘treason’. As traditions move into the field of *BECOMING*, they are betrayed by new ideas, and thus within their self-same logic of identity hides an obscure darkness: the *INTERNAL* borders in the social imaginary of a community. Traditions can both *NATURALIZE* fixed ideas of what borders are by appealing to their origins, and be used in an ideological, *AESTHETICIZING* way to cover over *B/ORDERING* processes. Understanding the cultural landscape as *PALIMPSESTS* produced in the conflict between globalization and tradition aids in seeing traditions as part of a present-day *COLLAGE*. See chapters on *Imaginary and Palimpsests*.

The Medial Rhizome

- **Medial borders** are the borders of the (re-)presentation rather than any borders which might be represented; ‘medial’ is here meant in the general sense, as connected to the different media (e.g. text, paintings, installations, film, architecture, sound, digital networks, etc.) which provide material, *TECHNOLOGICAL* supports and cultural constraints to *ARTISTIC FORMS* and other forms of communication. For example, literature works mostly with textual and written media, and works of literature are framed with beginnings and endings; they feature textual *THRESHOLDS* and shifts between sections, styles and narrative modes, and they present a *SENSIBLE* and interpretative border to the person who is *READING* them (a medial border which is also an *EPISTEMOLOGICAL BORDER*). As with other borders, medial borders can be crossed or transgressed, they open up into diffuse and folded *IN-BETWEENS*, and they can be used in an aesthetic *B/ORDERING* and *BORDERSCAPING* process. See all chapters.

- **Artistic forms**, genres, and styles in many different media together constitute one of the fields addressed by aesthetics as a discipline. They also present themselves as the outer medial borders of artworks, and both experiment and negotiate with different border concepts. Since every artistic form presents a specific (and sometimes highly sophisticated) way of distributing the *SENSIBLE*, they will have to be evaluated separately for their aesthetic impact on the political. Artistic forms have a key role to play in making visible new imaginaries of *SUBJECTIVITIES* and borders, in a process of *BECOMING*; where borders are concerned, artistic forms such as *MIGRANT* and transcultural forms of art may have special importance as elements of *BORDERSCAPES*. In the tradition of Kantian aesthetics (1977 [1790]), artworks have been understood as independent of political interests; we suggest however that artistic autonomy – the border around the artwork – is *RELATIONALLY* entangled rather than clear-cut, and moreover stands in a relationship of *UNCONDITIONALITY* to the political. The artistic form can thus potentially act as a *BORDER BEING*, escaping the sovereign. One artistic form in particular, architecture, has a major impact on geographical landscapes, in particular urban spaces, and can be read for the social shifts they represent and constitute in a cultural palimpsest. *See all chapters.*
- The **collage**, in which elements of different cultural providences are reused in a new context, is an important aesthetic effect of palimpsest, and thus a typical effect of (historical) *TEMPORAL BORDER*-crossings in urban landscapes, though it is also an active aesthetic strategy in other cultural forms. The collage mixes the old and the new, the local and the global, emphasizing medial borders in a fragmented, torn and cut continuum or network of images, buildings or words. It comes about through the actions of *bricoleurs* reusing disparate, hybrid and transcultural elements to create a pastiche in which new imaginaries are formed (or mimicked), at the same time that

others are erased. These *bricoleurs* could be border subjects such as *MIGRANTS*, but they could also be opportunistic substitutes for the sovereign in, for example, post-Soviet spaces. *See chapters on Imaginary, In/visibility and Sovereignty.*

- **Figurations**, in which one image, word or phrase is used to form or convey another, are in themselves *BORDER-CROSSINGS*, creating deviations which cross between different semantic, linguistic and visual fields; or perhaps *EPISTEMOLOGICAL BORDERS* in themselves, making some meanings visible and hiding other meanings (like a palimpsest), including and *EXCLUDING*. Figurations make *SENSIBLE* in an indirect way, which is to say that they do not, like representations can pretend to do, operate in a direct way. In a broad sense, figurations include for example metaphors and tropes, the use of fiction and other deviations from the *TRUTH*, narrative configurations of real or fictional worlds, visual images, monuments, maps, etc. Figurations condition and make sensible borders, determine how we think about them, and participate in social imaginaries and in the *BORDERSCAPE*. Border-crossers, caught in an in-between, often have to narrate their stories and articulate themselves figuratively. *See all chapters.*
- The **Monstrous** is often a by-product of *BECOMING* as it is enacted through new imaginaries; as such it creates *FEAR* similar to that expressed in reaction to the *UNCANNY*. Within regimes of *B/ORDERING*, all transgressions of norms and the *LAW* are monstrous; in normative aesthetics, transgressions of period and style are seen as creating ugliness in art. As an aesthetic category, it is often used in imaginative, gothic modes, and is particularly apt at making *SENSIBLE* disjunctions between *SUBJECTIVITIES* and *BODIES*; formally, the monstrous is the transgression of bodily borders. The challenge to the new is to find ways of making itself sensible which do not evoke the monstrous. *See chapters on Ecology and Imaginary.*

- **Spectacularization** is a medial process (often mass medial) by which complex issues (such as borderscapes) are reduced to simple narratives and *FIGURATIONS*, thus making invisible the complexity behind them. In this way, an aesthetic makes *SENSIBLE SUBJECTIVITIES, MEMORIES*, etc., but at the same time *EXCLUDES* them from the public sphere. Spectacularization is common in *B/ORDERING* processes (one example being the gestural politics of erecting border fences and walls), and is used as a way of concealing the power processes of the sovereign. The combination of rewriting and erasure makes the spectacle a simple form of palimpsest, and in some cases, careful *READING* of the spectacle can bring out its *COLLAGE* of disparate elements. In the urban palimpsest, architectural and sculptural monuments often function in a spectacular manner; mass tourism, in its representations of such landscapes, often spectacularizes and makes the landscape or borderscape for the most part invisible. *See chapters on In/visibility, Palimpsests and Sovereignty.*

Configuring Borders

We know that to come to a conclusion is to come to a border – a place or space to verify our findings and our arguments for the reader – which we have sought to do in the elaboration of a network of terms in the glossaries above. But in doing this we have not sought to demonstrate our sovereignty over a field, a place, an Other. We have not sought to create or conclude the book in this fashion. Rather, we have provided the reader and ourselves with a way into a new field in border studies so that we can make full use of the arguments and conceptualizations opened up as at the thresholds of our disciplinary perspectives and within the interconnective patterns of thought developed in this book. For by operationalizing the interactions of aesthetics and borders we have sought to set in motion important questions. How can we make and tolerate the ‘risky attachments’ and ‘tangled objects’ that political

thinking – and we would add aesthetic thinking – should recognize and engage with in our contemporary societies? And how can we make clear the tenuous process by which imaginative and imagined representations of emerging worlds and worldviews in cultural productions mark stages in the process whereby tropes and genres have been placed, through spatialization, into an aesthetic space?

Finally, these questions have also been echoed in our cover photo of a site-specific installation by Morten Traavik at the ‘Barents spektakel’ border arts festival in Kirkenes, Norway, 2011. Look carefully and you can see two countries’ border posts in the town street. This installation interrogated the relationship between borders, visibility and processes of inclusion and exclusion and its negotiation within a specific space – the town of Kirkenes – and within an outdoor space. By moving the border posts into an installation within an urban space, Traavik not only sought to aestheticize the border, but also clearly reminds us that the border is already an aesthetic construct.

Bibliography

Agamben, G. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. D. Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Althusser, L. 1971. ‘Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)’, trans. B. Brewster, in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: NLB, pp. 121–173.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised and extended edn. London: Verso.

Appadurai, A. 1990. ‘Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy’, *Theory, Culture & Society* 7(2–3): 295–310.

Arendt, H. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics', trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist, in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 84–258.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1994a. 'DissemiNation: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation', in *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, pp. 139–170, 266–269.
- _____. 1994b. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Border Poetics Working Group. 2008. 'Border Planes', in *Border Poetics Key Terms*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø. Retrieved on 31 May 2016 from <http://borderpoetics.wikidot.com/border-planes>.
- Castoriadis, C. 2007. *Figures of the Thinkable*, trans. H. Arnold. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. 1986. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. D. Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freud, S. 1955. 'The "Uncanny"', trans. J. Strachey, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth, pp. 217–256.
- Gennep, A. van. 1960. *The Rites of Passage*, trans. M.B. Vizedom and G.I. Caffee. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Houtum, H. van and T. van Naerssen. 2002. 'Bordering, Ordering and Othering', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 93(2): 125–136.
- Kant, I. 1977. *Werkausgabe: Band 10: Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Latour, B. 2004. *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*, trans. C. Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pratt, M.L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Rancière, J. 2004. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, trans. G. Rockhill. London: Continuum.

- _____. 2010. *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, trans. S. Corcoran. London: Continuum.
- Rosello, M. 2005. *France and the Maghreb: Performative Encounters*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Schimanski, J. 2006. 'Crossing and Reading: Notes towards a Theory and a Method', *Nordlit* 19: 41–63.
- _____ and S. Wolfe. 2007. 'Imperial Tides: A Border Poetic Reading of *Heart of Darkness*', in J. Schimanski and S. Wolfe (eds), *Border Poetics De-limited*. Hannover: Wehrhahn, pp. 217–234.
- _____ and S.F. Wolfe. 2013. 'The Aesthetics of Borders', in K. Aukrust (ed.), *Assigning Cultural Values*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 235–250.
- Shklovsky, V. 1965. 'Art as Technique', trans. L.T. Lemon and M.J. Reis, in L.T. Lemon and M.J. Reis (eds), *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, pp. 3–24.
- Simmel, G. 1997. 'The Sociology of Space', trans. M. Ritter and D. Frisby, in D. Frisby and M. Featherstone (eds), *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*. London: Sage, pp. 137–170.
- Taylor, C. 2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Turner, V. 1970. 'Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*', in E.A. Hammel and W.S. Simmons (eds), *Man Makes Sense: A Reader in Modern Cultural Anthropology*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, pp. 335–369.
- _____. 1992. 'Variations on a Theme of Liminality', in *Blazing the Trail: Way Marks in the Exploration of Symbols*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 48–65.
- Welsch, W. 1997. *Undoing Aesthetics*, trans. A. Inkpin. London: SAGE.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1971. *Playing and Reality*. London: Tavistock.