Introduction

Over the last twenty years, social sciences and cultural studies have advanced the transdisciplinary perspective of border and borderland studies. Accordingly, borders are no longer understood as one-dimensional dividing lines, but are characterised by complexity (Haselberger 2014) and high dynamism (Rumford 2012; Paasi 2009). In addition to territorial demarcations, such as state or EU borders (Mau 2006; Vobruba 2012), this also applies to non-material boundaries and demarcation practices. These include social boundaries between groups or classes (Lamont, Molnár 2002) or temporal boundaries between eras or different time periods (Lorenz, Bevernage 2013). Against this background, the often-cited dictum by Étienne Balibar that “borders are everywhere” (Balibar, 1998) can be understood better. To understand the extended meaning of borders, one has to account for their multidimensional, relational and procedural nature, as also expressed in the increasingly popular terms of bordering and boundary work.

In light of this overlap of political and geographical border theory with social and cultural boundary theory, current advanced research on border(land)s can draw on an increasingly rich and nuanced debate, but also faces the challenge of retaining a sense of orientation. Our contribution takes up this challenge by charting out some heuristic perspectives as well as fundamental questions that can underpin such an expanded range of border research. Clearly, recent contributions already offer some possible avenues to come to terms with the shifting meaning of borders, especially by offering different metaphors, such as borderscapes (Brambilla 2014), borders as networks (Karafillidis 2009), as assemblages (Sohn 2015) or fluid tidemarks (Green 2009). However, we like to support efforts for concept building from a different angle, namely by presenting a (methodological) principle and a related heuristic typology on border dimensions and boundary processes. Starting with the integration of border and boundary
theory, our main argument is to consider borders as a demarcation tool, which divides both different spatial, temporal, cultural or social units on the one hand and orders on the other. As such, any border deserves to be studied in its own right, but can simultaneously serve a distinct perspective on these demarcated units and orders. The resulting methodological principle of *thinking from the border* implies a fundamental change of perspectives: borders move to the centre of attention, rather than being perceived as a peripheral phenomenon.1 This also means taking the complexity of borders more seriously.

In particular, one can distinguish an internal and external take on complex borders. The former unpacks the varied and multidimensional processes of demarcation. Borders can, thus, be analysed across several spatial, social and temporal dimensions, each of which can express differing states of durability, permeability and liminality. The external perspective starts from borders, however constituted, and raises the question of the relationship of these borders and further orders. Hence, this implies rethinking the mechanisms and consequences of such powerful demarcations or division between orders, starting from processes of bordering. While borders can be considered as a special place where orders become fragile and have to be made explicit in the face of the other, they are also the place where at least two orders meet and new orders may arise. Taken together, thinking through the range of options that apply to both the internal and external perspective on borders helps to maintain analytical coherence or structure, even when transcending existing disciplinary perspectives.

To be clear, these perspectives should not be understood as a general and comprehensive theory of borders as such (Paasi 2011). It is not our intention to engage with deeper philosophical debates about a possible inalienable logical meaning of borders, such as proposed by philosophy (e.g. Hegel 1991 [1830]), social theory (Luhmann 1984) or literature and cultural theory (Kleinschmidt, Hewels 2011). However, we argue that the following exposition of different concepts helps to direct empirical investigation on border phenomena. We will also illustrate how the principle of thinking from the border can be linked with existing analyses of borderlands that constitute the focus of this companion. With these aims in mind, the argument in this chapter proceeds as follows. First, we explain the util-
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1 This standpoint also underpins the interdisciplinary research centre B/ORDERS IN MOTION at the European University Viadrina in Frankfurt (Oder), where some ideas discussed in this chapter originated from (Schiffauer et al. 2014).
ity of merging border and boundary research. This leads to a richer understanding of borders that covers their multidimensional character in space, time and social relations as well as their various procedural qualities of durability, permeability and liminality. The second part of the chapter then turns to the external view on borders and illustrates a range of possible relationships between borders and orders. In particular, one should be more explicit when moving beyond standard assumptions about a bilateral qualitative dialectical relationship between one border and an inside order that is delineated by this border. The conclusions highlight the main implications and point to further possible research avenues based on such an enriched theoretical perspective on borders.

An interdisciplinary heuristic of multidimensional borders

While the history of border(land) research dates back to the beginnings of geography and the modern social sciences, only comparatively recent developments in the late 20th century, such as the growth of globalisation and the transformations of the nation state, stimulated the interdisciplinary scientific research agenda which has come to be known as border studies. Broadly speaking, the overarching notion of border regimes, which approaches borders as a result of power relations, and border work, which highlights various forms of agency engaged with the construction of borders, emerged as central organising elements or analytical discourses. In a similar vein, border(land) research focused on the varied influences that created, fostered and (de-)stabilised borders between nation states and regions, and on the subsequent impact of such demarcations on societies and their members. Thus, over the last twenty-five years the question of “what happens at, across and because of the borders” (Wilson, Donnan 2012: 1) generated extensive as well as increasingly sophisticated research.

At the same time, social and cultural studies extended and deepened their engagement with theories that problematise questions of demarcation, such as post-structuralism and actor–network theory. Although each of these approaches exhibits distinct characteristics, they are united by their attention to processes of boundary drawings with respect to social, cultural and temporal phenomena. This observation of a parallel trend raises the question of whether border and boundary studies could be integrated. On the one hand, many contemporary border(land) studies remain centred on the analysis of spatial and political borders – be they on a global,
national or regional level. So despite the mentioned attention to wider border regimes, spatial demarcations continue to appear as something that is “good to think with” (Löfgren 1999: 6), whereas alternative understandings of borders are less easily grasped. On the other hand, borders have not been of primary interest for social and cultural studies for a long time. Instead, the notion of boundaries has been more central in these disciplines. Already Émile Durkheim’s sociology (Durkheim, Mauss 1993 [1901/02]) introduced classificatory systems for differentiating people, social groups and other social units as the foundation of (non-organic) society. The wider flourishing of cultural and social sciences subsequently gave rise to the question how related concepts of borders/boundaries and differences could be distinguished. According to Ferdinand de Saussure’s (1967 [1916]) famous structuralist claim, identity and meaning always presumes difference in relation to something else. Departing from another point of view, sociological systems theory underlines the centrality of ‘boundary-maintaining mechanisms’ (Parsons 1951). In the view of Niklas Luhmann (1984), the basic system–environment boundary is a ‘border of meaning’, which separates chaos from order as well as different ordered systems through means of codes, expectations and semantics.

In short, classic social and cultural research focused on social, cultural and other non-spatial differences or boundaries (Lamont, Molnár 2002). To bridge the apparent gap between these research traditions and more spatially oriented border research, we have to turn to more recent theoretical arguments about the lack of stability of meaning over time, but also in space. Post-structuralism and post-colonialism question and challenge the assumption of clearly discernible entities, systems or structures, and underline the constant unstable play of meaning and meandering differentiation (Moebius, Reckwitz 2008; Young 2001). This creates an opening to connect with contemporary border research that highlights hybridity, creolisation and the general ambiguity, ‘in-between-ness’ or regular transgression of borders. As a particularly radical approach from social and cultural sciences, actor–network theory deepens the critique of the naturalness of dividing lines and categorisations, focusing in particular on the borders that modern societies allegedly maintain between the social and the material world (Kneer, Schroer, Schüttpelz 2008).

With these perspectives in mind, one can start to sketch out a more fluid as well as comprehensive perspective on the possible meaning of borders and boundaries, neither of which are ‘natural’ and consequently tied to a particular expression in space or social relations. A summary overview on
different, but overlapping, forms of bordering and boundary-making could include: a) functional differentiation (borders demarcating different sets of practices); b) stratification (borders producing hierarchical super- or sub-ordination of social units); c) segmental distinctions (borders separating units with equal rights); d) centre–periphery distinctions (borders demarcating an asymmetrical opposition). These possible options or perspectives will also be touched upon in the second part of this chapter, which reviews various relationships between borders and demarcated orders. Suffice it to state here that borders clearly contain an important affective or symbolic level and lead to social consequences which revolve around the creation of differences and processes of identification or exclusion (Schiffauer et al. 2014: 16).

Yet it is important to underline that spatial considerations are equally central to the play of social practice and cultural meaning. Contemporary cultural geography underlines that social practices and categorisations have to be analysed in their spatial manifestations. According to Löw (2001), creating or breaking down borders may be understood as the rearrangement of objects, creating new configurations in space. Obviously, this can play out at different levels of analysis, including: a) macro-borders (e.g. national borders); b) meso-borders (e.g. spatial borders within cities) or c) micro-borders (borders regarding architecture). And as Schiffauer et al. (2014: 15) underline, ‘boundary work’ and ‘in-between spaces’ can be of particular interest for integrated analyses of spatial and social bordering. For instance, classic rites de passage (Turner 1969, van Gennep 2005 [1909]) often do not only include performative practices and rituals that mark and fill the procedural transition from one social status to the other, but also spatial dimensions or movements, such as specific ritual locations.

Once we are receptive to such a richer and integrated perspective on the meaning of borders and boundaries, it is equally important to consider time alongside space and social relations. Temporal considerations clearly apply to shifts or transformations of borders, as we can see in the case of territorial and political borders. Focusing further on the temporal dimension of borders leads to historical research on epochal breaks, thresholds and transformation processes, problematising the question of repetition and transformation (Koselleck 2004). Yet even with regard to ‘stable’ situations, one can point to diverging temporalities or temporal effects of borders. As mentioned above, rites of passage that revolve around the changing status of community members over time provide a classic example,
whereas research on contemporary border security underlines the growing focus on controlling the speed and timing of migratory movements (Pallitto, Heyman 2008).

In short, in order to be able to do justice to the rich symbolic of borders, which can play out in space, time and social relations, we need to link approaches and concepts from border studies and boundary theory. Moreover, borders are not ‘out there’, but are actively (re-)generated or demarcated in all these multiple dimensions and respects. This point leads to further process-oriented characteristics of borders (or bordering). One such characteristic directly derives from the discussion up until here: the liminality of borders is based on the post-structuralist insight that any distinction, be it in space or other categories of meaning and social existence, is likely to remain ambiguous. This ambiguity can be contested and may create zones of transition or hybridity, which, in turn, can have empowering, creative or marginalising effects. But this is not the only possible qualifier of bordering processes. As borders have been denaturalised, their changing location and ‘hardness’ has become the object of intense scrutiny. This can be analytically differentiated further into two useful categories, namely the permeability and the durability of borders. The latter denotes the hardness, stability and longevity of borders, which spans right across their social, spatial and temporal dimensions. For instance, hard state borders can manifest themselves in fences and walls, but need related social practices of border control to be effective and are often legitimated by temporal references, such as seemingly self-evident historical national communities. In contrast, the notion of permeability denotes the relative openness or porosity of borders, which can vary strongly over time or with respect to different flows (Appadurai 1990) of subjects, objects and signs/information. Taking these considerations together leads us to an overarching heuristics2 that can enrich and contextualise sophisticated research projects on borders and related phenomena such as borderlands.
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2 As indicated above, this relates to the work of the B/Orders in Motion Centre of the Europe University Viadrina and the initial conceptual work by Schiffauer et al. (2014). Please see https://www.borders-in-motion.de/en_US/projekte.
In the following, we outline possible connections between these abstract considerations on borders and boundaries with existing borderland research. To begin with, borderlands should be understood in relation to the emergence, constitution and multidimensional manifestation of borders as outlined above. In particular, borders give shape to borderlands (Schlögel 2013: 58) that can be understood as the outcome of interactions that are facilitated by the border (Brunet-Jailly 2011: 3). Different concepts of borderlands, thus, depend on our understanding of the process of bordering. The integration of border and boundary theory notably suggests that linear or one-dimensional conceptualisations of borders are too simple to grasp the complexity of borderlands. To view borderlands as, above all, spatial phenomena is to remain in the so-called ‘territorial trap’ (Agnew 1994).

One can already build on important research that avoids this narrow conceptualisation of borderlands. The familiar concept of ‘spatial othering’ (Paasi 2003) underlines the fundamental connection of the spatial and social dimension that can be rather easily applied in borderland research. For instance, Versluys (2002: 100) argues in her study on the construction of territoriality in Dakar that: “The most important means of constructing a … spatial identity, however, is by means of a form of othering, namely in contrasting it to other localities.” Christian Wille (2014) introduces a further practice-centred perspective to highlight the diverse practical connections and constitution of ‘spaces of the border’. In his analysis, regularised social and spatial practices, e.g. border commuting, transform classically defined territorial units such as nation states. Similarly, Mathias Wagner and Wojciech Łukowski’s (2010) book on smuggling as an economic resource in borderlands shows how this practice not only motivates crossing borders but also creates a ‘world at the border’ which includes everyone who is concerned with this practice.

While these different studies overcome one-dimensional descriptions of borderlands, they still tend to neglect temporal dimensions. In contrast, Michiel Baud and Willem van Schendel (1997) provide a comparative history of borderlands and propose a corresponding life-cycle approach. They
argue that borderlands can pass through six stages: embryonic, infant, adolescent, adult, declining, defunct. A comparable three-dimensional approach can be found in Meinhof and Galasiński’s (2002) cross-generational study of negotiations of Eastern and Western identities among a German–Polish border community. Whereas the three-generational families share a spatial localisation, the changing history of the border after the Second World War as well as the different emerging possibilities of identification (local, regional, national, transnational) lead to criss-crossing identity constructions that cannot be separated from the spatial as well as temporal context. Furthermore, the study highlights “that because collective identifications at regional, cross-regional, national or transnational levels are complex, potentially multilayered and often self-contradictory, they are not placeable on oppositional scales of mutual antagonism or complementarity” (Meinhof, Galasiński 2002: 80).

Similarly, it is not only the multidimensionality and historical evolution but also the varying processual qualities of borders – which we describe as durability, permeability and liminality – that define borderlands. For instance, the changing infrastructure of the German–Polish border that was triggered by the accession of Poland to the EU Schengen Area could be seen as a dramatic change of permeability, be it for personal mobility, economic opportunities or cultural exchanges (Mihułka 2008). Yet permeability is not the same as erasure of borders. A closer look at the borderland may reveal the underlying durability as well as liminal effects of the border. So even if the German–Polish border has often been described as vanishing or increasingly invisible (e.g. Łada, Segeš Frelak 2012), the respective border(land) revolves around persistent and daily work of sense-making, as exemplified by challenges to multilingualism or linguistic demarcations in public spaces (Gerst, Klessmann 2015).

Emphasising these rich and resistant interconnections between borders and borderlands may go against the grain of salient analyses about dislocated or mobile borders (see Walther, Retaillé 2014; Sheller, Urry 2006; Richardson 2013), as is especially evident with regard to contemporary border controls in airports (Walther, Retaillé 2014: 2). However, a conceptual disconnection of a mobile border and a fixed territorial borderland ‘at the old border’ would incorrectly essentialise the latter. Instead, dislocated bordering practices may well create their own mobile borderlands, as one could, for instance, discern in neighbouring states to the EU that undertake early controls before migrants reach the Schengen Area. From a different, but related angle, the notion of ‘phantom borders’ (von Hirschhausen et. al
2015) may be an interesting approach. It describes borders that formally ceased to exist, while their connected social and spatial relations continue to have an effect. So one could assume that phantom borderlands may show that they continue to yield consequences across the varying dimensions and processes outlined in the heuristic presented above.

In addition, the heuristic of border dimensions and processes can help to pose further questions about the internal relationship of these characteristics: to begin with, the differentiation of the durability and the permeability of borders can be linked to the ‘thickness’ or ‘thinness’ of borders as proposed by Haselsberger (2014). She understands complex borders as ‘sets of boundaries’ or layers, whereby the cumulative logic of single boundaries defines the thickness of a specific border. In her case study on the Austrian state border, she demonstrates how “different boundaries were aligned to a single ‘line’” and subsequently created the border as a “newly established collectivism [that] got transmitted from one generation to the next via time-independent preservative symbolic artefacts (e.g. anthem, flag, state treaties, national holidays) and operational educational practices (e.g. school curricula, musical tradition, collective remembering)” (Haselsberger 2014: 18). In other words, the durability of borders is the outcome of a stepwise accumulation and reproduction of overlapping boundaries in time, space and social relations.

At the same time, more multidimensional processes of bordering could be made more visible and highlight less familiar combinations. One may think, for example, of acts of ‘temporal othering’ (Diez 2004), reflecting the temporal and social dimension of borders. This is especially pronounced with regard to “Europe’s temporal other” that helps to explain demarcation processes and identity-building of this particular polity (Diez 2004: 325). Besides Europe’s spatial othering in the Eastern or Southern Neighbourhood, the European history of war and “Europe’s own past which should not be allowed to become its future” (Wæver 1998: 90) has been made a particular point of reference and symbolic act of exclusion. Yet we should not only think of various forms, processes and characteristics that ‘add’ to ‘thick borders’. Beyond a simple layering, different non-linear or complex dynamics of strengthening and weakening are imaginable (Wimmer 2008), which can only be uncovered in concrete empirical studies.
Borders and orders

The next step is to reflect on the wider analytical consequences of such a rich and varied heuristic of borders. Following the analytical perspective or principle to think from the border means asking about the relationship between borders and respective groups, entities or categories of meaning that are demarcated by bordering practices. To ask about the general relationship between borders and orders is a broader formulation of the relationship between borders and borderlands just touched upon. This relationship has already been a key interest in border studies (e.g. Popescu 2011; van Houtum, Kramsch, Zierhofer 2005; Albert, Jacobson, Lapid 2001), but further reflection on this topic is necessary. Especially in the contemporary context of complex borders, one should be sceptical with regard to seemingly logical or coherent dialectics of bordering and ordering. This relates to the classical argument about the importance of hard territorial borders to modern state formation or of identity formation and social othering by means of overlapping social or cultural boundaries (Wilson, Donnan 1998). Such dynamics remain clearly highly relevant, as is underlined by the current political crisis over migration and border control in Europe or the related rise of right-wing populism. Yet they do not exhaust or capture the possible range or breadth of relationships and connections that can be drawn between orders and borders.

In general, it should be clear by now that borders cannot be treated as singular entities. Beyond the internal differentiation of borders discussed above, they demarcate at least two orders on the ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, or rather multiple insides and outsides. Thus, borders are the site where several orders become contested, negotiated, reframed and in this way become more clearly observable. Michiel Baud and Willem van Schendel (1997: 216) express this point with regard to social interactions in borderlands: “But from the perspective of the border, borderlands are broad scenes of intense interactions in which people from both sides work out everyday accommodations based on face-to-face relationships.”

To differentiate this general argument further, one can outline a range of possible analytical relationships between borders and orders. Starting with the most fundamental logical level, borders are seen as inherently and qualitatively intertwined with orders. Following classical philosophical considerations of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1991[1830]) or Ferdinand de Saussure (1967[1916])) already alluded to above, the existence of orders is the outcome of differentiations. These differentiations rely upon,
or simply are, borders and bordering processes. To build an identity of a subject or object, or to be anything in a meaningful sense, is to distinguish it from someone or something. When it comes to the formation of social identities, such processes are typically described as ‘othering’, or the classic dialectics of self and other.

But a border can be more than this kind of logical and largely binary distinction. The principle of thinking from the border leads to a sensibility towards the plurality of orders. As mentioned before, Victor Turner (1969) describes rites of passage as liminal episodes, which open up temporal spaces of possibility in between two fixed orders, one to come from and one heading towards. In a similar vein, the concept of ‘third spaces’ (Bhabha 1994; Soja 1996) plays a crucial role in contemporary social theory: third spaces are venues where meanings – coming from different social worlds – and thus identities are selectively and strategically negotiated and adapted. These processes are well documented in Gloria Anzaldúa’s classical book on borderlands (1987). Dealing with the geographical space that spans across the US–Mexican border, she emphasises the emergence of hybrid identities, which draw on the multiplicity of boundaries in terms of nationality, ethnicity, culture and gender. Similarly, European integration processes are largely based on the creation of cross-border administrative as well as socio-cultural spaces such as Euroregions, Eurodistricts or Macroregions (Ulrich 2015). These – predominantly territorial, administrative and geopolitical – cross-border phenomena are facilitated by legal and financial tools such as the INTERREG programme or the European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC), which are meant to enable new forms of social cohesion across borders and nation states (Hooghe, Marks 2003).

In contrast to this focus on identity and definition, however, borders can also be understood as an expression of more quantitative differences between different orders, regions or units. In this sense, the border does not necessarily define the fundamental characteristics. Instead, it depends on relative markers of concentration and diffusion that can apply on either side of the border. A typical approach is to focus on relative distribution of wealth, or more generally on the definition of lines or thresholds for determining membership in a given set, such as a poverty line (Groh-Samberg 2009). A classic line of thinking in border research would be the definition and importance of centre–periphery dynamics (Appadurai 1986). Alternative metaphors are borders as ‘membranes’ (von Schumann 2005) that primarily regulate the relative concentration of certain matter on either side,
focusing on the management of quantitative flows. With respect to borderlands, various phenomena deriving from such asymmetrical conditions are observable. Ruben Gielis and Henk van Houtum (2012) for example describe the situation along the Dutch–German border, where “tens of thousands of Dutch people have decided to buy or build a house just across the border in Germany. … The aim of their migration is largely to simply obtain a more spacious and, in most cases, comparatively cheaper house” (Gielis, van Houtum 2012: 798). Here, the asymmetrical situation in the local housing markets motivates a dwelling migration that is directly linked to the border in terms of distances as well as differing economic, legal, cultural etc. conditions.

Yet a different analytical perspective treats borders as a particular manifestation or analytical lens to foreground wider orders. This means that borders not only designate inside/outside or self/other dichotomies, but are rather to be seen as indicators and manifestations of overarching structures and differentiation processes. For example, systems of classification, such as the taxonomies for botanists and biologists (Bowker, Star 1999), may be mentioned as logical superstructures. They imply an overarching logic of differentiation, which dictate the formulation or placement of a specific border between two species. Similarly, socio-political systems of meaning are fundamental to societies as they assimilate the making and unmaking of boundaries between for example socioeconomic classes, ethnic groups, or gender or age cohorts (Lamont, Molnár 2002). Pushing this line of analysis into a more explicit political direction, one could argue that liberal capitalism represents a global order with extremely wide-ranging effects on inequalities. Contemporary border controls that are built on advanced technology and data collection to filter out the ‘undesirable’ individuals and goods from transnational economic flows (Heymann, Campbell 2009; Laube 2013) would be one pertinent, but far from the only, manifestation of these global inequalities.

Finally, borders themselves can be seen as complex micro-orders, which has already been shown in the first part of this chapter on the basis of the proposed heuristic of border dimensions. For instance, local border regimes negotiate or reproduce borderlands that can be analysed with regard to their durability or permeability to diverse cross-border exchange. Or, the process of constituting borderlands can be understood as the outcome of ordering practices, such as the daily activities of security guards (Schwell 2008). Borderwork as a local and contextual everyday activity (Rumford 2008) emphasises the role of actors that may otherwise be
marginalised or considered secondary from the viewpoint of larger structures, such as nation states.

To sum up, focusing on the border as our primary research site or analytical perspective can lead to a wide variety of arguments about related social, cultural and geographical phenomena and orders. So, to come to a rounded and reflexive understanding of the meaning of border research, we should not only bridge the gap between border and boundaries, but should also remain attentive to the ever-shifting relationship between borders and orders.

Concluding remarks

This contribution adopted a broad social and cultural perspective on borders. We emphasised the analytical principle of thinking from the border to link border and boundary research in a fruitful manner. In particular, we explicated two major consequences resulting from this perspective: first, to recognise borders as analytical objects themselves and, secondly, to take borders as a methodological starting point for analysis.

Discussing the first implication, we argued for the recognition of borders as complex entities with different unique dimensions on the spatial, social and temporal level as well as procedural qualities, namely durability, permeability and liminality. Such a multidimensional understanding overcomes the dominant spatial perception of borders and facilitates meaningful transdisciplinary border research. Furthermore, by presenting borders as a profound analytical concept, we implicitly tried to encourage researchers – particularly within the social and cultural studies – to understand borders more precisely and to break away from using borders either as an empty metaphor or overly broad synonym for differences. Subsequently, we argued in favour of reflecting on wider notions of order from the viewpoint of the border. In this line of argumentation, borders have a profound influence on orders, social units and power balances. They also require us to rethink the mechanisms and consequences of divisions and to start from the act of bordering. Against this background, we distinguished several relationships between orders and borders: (1) borders are qualitatively intertwined with orders; (2) borders are an expression of quantitative differences between different orders, regions or units; (3) borders reveal wider overarching orders; (4) borders themselves are intrinsic complex orders.
Taken together, these considerations help us to approach borders in a systematic manner, and should be equally applicable for researchers from the field of border(land) studies and wider social and cultural studies. Yet this can only be the first step for more transdisciplinary border research that is reflexive in its choice of concepts. To begin with, one could look further into the difference between borders or bordering and various other forms of demarcation processes. So the typology of border dimensions presented above does not only link border and boundary research, but also could be used to sharpen our understanding of divergences. For instance, do various boundary-making options in time, space and social relations accumulate, debilitate or intertwine in complex borders? For instance, the mentioned phenomenon of phantom borders challenges straightforward assumptions about the simultaneous layering of different kinds of boundaries. Another related research avenue would be to focus on one specific aspect, such as *temporal borders*, which has been comparatively neglected. Temporal breaks highlight the processual dimension of identity work and social boundaries, and destabilise our taken-for-granted principles, in other words: orders. Borders also exhibit a temporal dimension in their own right – i.e. they have a history, a present and usually a future, all of which are of fundamental relevance for border work. Conversely, approaching temporal demarcations more explicitly from the perspective of border theory can highlight liminal effects and enlarge the ‘space’ between different time modes.

Finally, further high-level analytical categories could be integrated more closely with border and boundary research. First and foremost among them would be the concept of *mobility*, which should not be reduced to, or simply be confused with, the permeability of borders. As argued elsewhere, mobility may, in itself, pose a distinct analytical challenge and perspective, rather than simply an empirical ‘fact’ or quantifiable process (Sheller/Urry 2006; Salazar/Smart 2011). In this sense, one could think from the perspective of mobility rather than borders, and ask to what extent borders are not obstacles to, but rather essentially constituted by, different forms of movement. In a related vein, the interconnection of borders with technology – which crucially defines mobility, but also countless other aspects of identity, time, space, etc. – deserves further attention beyond specific empirical sites of interest, such as contemporary Schengen borders. In particular, one could reflect on the significance of ideational, cultural and social processes of bordering in contrast to new materialist accounts of borders that underline the deep technological con-
stitution of our contemporary lifeworld. This is not the place to develop this further, nor do we want to add category after category and build ever-larger typologies and theoretical edifices that become too complex to be useful. Yet it is essential to remain sensitive to numerous open questions and to continuously engage with the fruitful tension between, on the one hand, applied, empirical research on borders and borderlands and, on the other hand, wider frameworks that allow us to talk beyond individual case studies or even disciplines.
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