



HAL
open science

The State Borders in North America (edited by Anton Kireev and Jussi Laine)

Bruno Dupeyron

► **To cite this version:**

Bruno Dupeyron. The State Borders in North America (edited by Anton Kireev and Jussi Laine). Dal'nauka. Introduction to Border Studies, 2016. halshs-01289576

HAL Id: halshs-01289576

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01289576>

Submitted on 18 Mar 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The State Borders in North America¹

Bruno Dupeyron

In North America, border studies generally focus on two land boundaries, the Canada-US and the US-Mexico borderlands. Yet, maritime borders become increasingly relevant, notably in the Arctic (Le Mière and Mazo 2013), since using the Northwest passage and exploiting raw materials in Northern polar regions may be soon possible, due to climate change, which incidentally triggers border security issues. Still, the core of border studies in North America can undoubtedly be found on the US-Mexico border. This borderland has contributed to forge an interdisciplinary research cluster that has been institutionalized in numerous academic departments. Also, the US-Mexico borderland has led to the emergence of a solid interdisciplinary research network, the Association for Borderlands Studies (ABS), born in April 1976 in Tempe, Arizona (Pisani, Reyes and García 2009). The ABS is now a stimulating research venue for North-American and international scholars alike that welcomes varying theoretical and methodological approaches to border studies.

Those multiple border perspectives in social sciences are scrutinized by Michèle Lamont and Virga Molnar (2002). They examine four main transversal research agendas: social and collective identity; class, racial and gender inequality; professions, knowledge and science; and communities, national identities and spatial boundaries. The literature on borders and border regions in North America reveals that border regions are zones of transition, that range from fully integrated borderlands to sharply divided border territories, with varying socio-economic landscapes (Martinez 1996). On the Canada-US border, smart borders are increasingly tested and implemented, so that border security measures do not disrupt the flows of people and goods (Sparke 2006). The construction of (less smart) border security apparatus, such as border walls and fences in US-Mexico border regions, can regenerate cultural production and interactions (Amilhat-Szary 2012). The criminalization of migrations in North America is also an acute research object (Dowling and India 2013). Other border policy issues, such as the environment, living standards and human development, are also scrutinized by border scholars (Anderson and Gerber 2007).

In this succinct chapter, we will focus on four main sections: first, the history of borders, followed by border conflicts; third, the development of transborder relations and regions; and finally, border and transborder policies.

¹ Dupeyron, Bruno. 2016. "The State Borders in North America." In *Introduction to Border Studies*, edited by Anton Kireev and Jussi Laine. Vladivostok: Dal'nauka.

History of borders in North America

To understand how contemporary borders have been drawn in North America, it is necessary to look back and examine two major historical processes: first, how colonial territories belonging to major European powers have been drawn between the 16th and 18th centuries, and then restructured in the 18th and 19th centuries; second, how those colonial territories have been divided and redistributed through violent and non-violent means during the formation of nation-states, Mexico, the United States and Canada, considering that the territorial formation of the United States has had a lasting impact on its neighbours.

In the 16th century, when Europeans walk upon the American continent, a population of at least four to seven million Indigenous people lives there. Mainly due to slaughters and epidemics, this population decreases to a few hundreds of thousands in the early 20th century. The relations between European settlers and Aboriginal communities differ greatly across space and time, oscillating between support from Aboriginal communities, peaceful relations, trade, marriages, war alliances on one hand, and discrimination, exclusion, forced assimilation, and wars on the other. However, a shared European objective of colonization transpires, as lands of the New World are perceived by the British, French and Spanish crowns as untouched territories, free to be taken over, based on the emerging (and Christian) law of nations (Neff 2005).

The colonization of the continent starts from the South, in the early 16th century, as it is possible to witness in Santa Fe, New Mexico, where the oldest European buildings in North America can be seen. Moreover, geographic names remind this early Spanish presence in North America, not only in current Southern US states, e.g., California, Colorado, Florida, but also along the West coast, e.g., the straight of Juan de Fuca that currently delimits Canada and the US. Nonetheless, the presence of English and Russian posts and communities on the West coast of North America is also documented in the 16th and 17th centuries, which shows that European powers, Russia, Portugal, Spain, France, and later England, seek to exploit or occupy North America with varying means and degrees of success. In 1588, England defeats Spain, which allows England to exclude Spain from the Northern part of the continent. English settlements start in Virginia in 1607. From the mid 16th to the mid 18th century, the French Crown's colonization policy materializes in New France. Political and military confrontations follow, which crystallize the relations between French and British colonial empires in North America. British colonies are established on the East coast from the early 17th to the 18th century, and soon welcome more settlers than in New France, despite immigration and demographic policies encouraging settlements to New France, e.g., King's Daughters in the mid 17th century. The French Crown expands its territory from the northeastern part to the south and west, in the late 17th century, west of the British colonies. In 1713, the Treaty of Utrecht, signed by European powers, has implications in North America: France gives up its

claims to the territories bordering the Hudson Bay (Rupert's Land) and to Newfoundland, and also cedes Nova Scotia to Great Britain. (MAP ABOUT 1750). Around the mid 18th century, French, English and Spanish powers occupy a good half of the North American continent, with vague boundary zones. Yet, it becomes obvious that New France, with limited civil and military presence, cannot be controlled easily, in spite of alliances with Indigenous populations. In the mid-18th century, French and British colonies enter in war, known as the *French and Indian War* or the *Seven Year's War*. In 1762, France secretly cedes Louisiana to Spain. The French, outnumbered, lose some of its territories to Great Britain, in the Treaty of Paris (1763), which end up being split between Great Britain and Spain. The demographic composition of the American colonies is increasingly European, though. Besides, despite the political umbilical cord between the New World and Great Britain that is personified by a governor in each colony, many legal and fiscal decisions are taken locally. Moreover, Enlightenment philosophers influence the elite that increasingly disagrees with Great Britain over a series of policy issues: the lack of political representation in London; taxation efforts, required to cover the cost of the Seven Year's War; the limitations to colonization beyond the Appalachian mountains, in order to avoid conflicts with Indigenous people. New import duties and fear of breaching free competition principles lead to growing tensions in the 1770s, illustrated by the Boston Tea Party, and to the First Continental Congress in October of 1774. The American Revolution is on its way: in 1776, the Declaration of Independence seals the creation of the United States of America, leading to the Independence War, during which the French crown supports the United States. In 1783, in the Treaty of Versailles that also involves Spain, France and the Netherlands, the sovereignty of the United States is recognized by London; in addition, the acquisition by the United States of the territory between the Appalachian and the Mississippi river; the border between the colony of Québec and the United States is redrawn and bisects the Great Lakes, which is concomitant with the recognition by the United States of British colonies in the North; finally, London loses Florida to Spain that becomes the Western neighbour of the United States (Durpaire 2013). This treaty sets the foundations of two future states in North America, Canada and the United States. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the border around the Detroit River is permeable, and allows border communities to have local and varied exchanges (Philips Valentine and McDougall 2004). Thus, instead of seeing the border as a line, it is best to examine it as a constant social construct, certainly influenced by its international component, but firmly anchored locally and regionally.

Following the independence of the United States, new geopolitical dynamics shape North America: in 1800, Spain cedes Louisiana to France, but three years later, due to the Napoleonic wars, France abandons its colonial ambitions and sells this territory to strengthen the United States. Between 1810 and 1819, Florida shifts slowly to US sovereignty, due to private military and

settlers's incursions and to diplomatic efforts. The Gulf of Mexico, and especially New Orleans, is therefore entirely open to US trade. Meanwhile, the French occupation of Spain in 1808 precipitates the fall of the Spanish Empire, as tensions between people from Spain and the colonies increase: after years of civil war, Spanish troops are defeated in 1821. The viceroyalty of New Spain becomes the First Mexican Empire, under Agustín de Iturbide's brief leadership, and then a Federal Republic in 1824. Between the 1820s and the 1870s, a period of political and territorial instability shakes the post-colonial foundations of Mexico: political instability stems from the fierce debates surrounding the type of regime that is envisioned, either federal republic or centralized republic; territorial fragmentation occurs in the 1820s, with the secession, after Iturbide's fall, of southern provinces, which generates the creation in 1823 of the United Provinces of Central America that lasts only until 1840, when it is dissolved to establish new states, notably Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica. The United States will use this period of Mexican instability in order to gain territories from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Coast (Durpaire 2013).

In 1842, the United States and the Hudson Bay Company seek to expand their influence to the plains and further West. They reach an agreement in 1842 to share territories along the 49th parallel. Besides, between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean extends a vast territory, Oregon, used by fur traders along the Columbia river, between Mexico and Alaska (still Russian). The United States want to gain influence along the Pacific coast toward the North, up to the 54th parallel. After prolonged talks with Great Britain that protects the interests of British private interests, the United States concede to purchase of half of the territory in 1846, until the 49th parallel. The United States reach the Pacific Ocean in just seven decades after their creation, which settles boundary claims with Great Britain. Nonetheless, to confront the growing influence of the United States, Great Britain establishes a Canadian Confederation in 1867, initially with four Eastern provinces, then joined a few years later by Manitoba and British Columbia. But another contributing factor to the unification of the territory is the construction of Canada's transcontinental railway, at the end of the 19th century: it is an engine of economic development, supported by wheat exports. In early 20th century, Alberta and Saskatchewan join Canada. Canada becomes gradually independent with the Statutes of Westminster, in 1931. Provinces expand toward the North, and eventually welcome Newfoundland and Labrador in 1949 (Conrad 2012).

After 1846, the United States look to the South and their new independent neighbour. The Republic of Texas, created in 1836 by American settlers in reaction to economic and policy issues with Mexican authorities, seek to claim first Mexican territories until the Pacific coast, but revisits it in order to claim that the boundary with Mexico be on the Rio Grande river. Those boundary issues lead to a moving closer between Texas and the United States, which concludes with the annexation of Texas by the United States in 1845, and the war between the United States and Mexico. In 1848,

the United States win the war and can negotiate in a position of strength the acquisition of Mexican territories stretching from Texas to the Pacific coast. Twenty seven years after its independence, Mexico loses 40 percent of its territory. In 1853, the United States purchase the Gadsden strip to Mexico, in order to build a railway. The Mexico-US border area becomes a zone of licit and illicit trade (Andreas 2013). Between 1861 and 1865, the Union is dissolved due to the Civil War, whose outcome could have have been slightly different and led to the creation of additional boundaries in North America, with a protectionist and abolitionist in the North, and free trade and pro-slavery in the South. In 1867, Saint-Petersburg seeks to sell Alaska to the United States, which is done opportunistically. Canada and the United States work between 1903 and 1913 to draw the boundary line of Alaska. An International Boundary Commission is subsequently created in 1925 to maintain the border infrastructure (Konrad and Nicol 2008).

Gaining undisputed boundaries from European powers, which is expressed in the Monroe Doctrine, is only one external aspect of territorial formation and post-colonization efforts in North America. Especially in Canada and the United States, the other task of nation-state building is domestic, and related to Indigenous people : how to subjugate Native people to the new nation-state order? In Mexico, the early role of the Catholic Church is fundamental to subject Indigenous people in order to open up the way to Spanish colonization. After the independence of Mexico, nation-state building follows the same ethnoracial structure with Indigenous people at the very bottom, but under a thin statistic-administrative veil or “categorization” (Boltanski 1982) that suggests that the vest majority of Mexicans is ‘mestizo’. In the United States and Canada, the relations with Indigenous people rarely involve religious institutions, but generally follow the same objective, i.e., European interests first, with or without Native people. For instance, when the fur trade is a lucrative business for the Hudson Bay Company, Indigenous people are an asset; when wars oppose France and Great Britain in the New World, some Native nations may support one European power, but they may also remain neutral; finally, the need for lands, for colonization, industrialization, or mining is contributing to displace and contain Indigenous people, depriving them from their land and sociopolitical rights, which generates undemocratic and byzantine administrative boundaries. For instance, to finalize colonization efforts and nation-state building, treaties settle European-Indigenous relations, e.g., in Canada, Numbered Treaties (1871-1921) are signed between the British Crown and Indigenous people to speed up white settlements, railway construction and industrialization. However, colonization in British Columbia occurs without treaties. Other public policies are more blatantly racist. The 1876 Canada Indian Act (and its subsequent versions) serves as a blueprint for oppressing Native groups in democratic regimes and less democratic regimes, like South African apartheid. The Canadian Indian residential schools system is an example of a decades-long genocide in Canada: Indigenous children are forcibly taken from their family, sent to

residential schools miles away where many suffer mental and physical abuse, subjugated to forced labour and education meant to eradicate their civilization and culture. The “Canada Scoops” (or “Sixties Scoop”, from the 1960s to the 1980s) also shows how Indigenous children are forcibly taken from their families and sent either to residential schools, or placed in foster care or adoption, domestically and overseas (Conrad 2012). The present overrepresentation of Indigenous people in child welfare and penal institutions illustrates the continuity of this policy against Indigenous people, in spite of symbolic gestures, such as the creation of Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2008-2015). The relations with Indigenous people are reminiscent of the emergence of autonomous or independent borders with European powers, but international public law in the 19th and early 20th centuries is still a Christian law that excludes internal groups and certain undesired foreign countries (Koskeniemi 2002).

Finally, two inter-related issues regarding the establishment of new borders in North America are central in the 19th and 20th centuries, namely the granting of citizenship and the control of people’s movements. With the growing autonomy of colonies, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand or the Union of South Africa, and the independence of the United States, nationality and migrations need to be clarified. Between the United States and Great Britain, negotiations will take decades to solve acute problems, such as the fulfilment of military obligations by British Empire subjects who have become citizens of the United States. In the British Empire, migrations generate several imperial conferences. During one of them, in 1907, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Sir Joseph Ward, delivered a speech in which he claimed that “‘New Zealand is ‘a white man’s country, and intends to remain a white man’s country’ and ‘[we] intend to keep our country for white men by every effort in our power’.” (Karatani 2002, 79). In conjunction with the efforts of London that wants to impose the notion ‘British subjecthood’ as an imperial concept of membership, and at the same time seeks timorously to avoid an obvious discriminatory sealing of British Empire borders, several dominions, including Canada, pass local immigration legislation that has indirect discriminatory purposes, for instance through the Chinese head tax, language tests, and higher poll tax for Asian immigrants (Karatani 2002). This way, similar rights exist in the British Empire, but mobility is racially limited by local norms. It is only in the 1960s that those discriminatory measures will be questioned and toned down to welcome non-European migrants in North America.

Border strains

As we have seen in the previous section, the latest border conflicts in North America occur essentially in the 19th century. But what about the 20th and 21st centuries? North America is then relatively immune to border conflicts, as borders are undisputed. The only notable exception is related to the Gulf of Maine, where an extension of the maritime boundary and the creation

exclusive offshore resource zones are sought; in 1984, the International Court of Justice contributes to solve this dispute between the United States and Canada (Konrad and Nicol 2008). Yet, North American border areas are not totally quiet, as the asymmetry between the United States and its neighbours is flagrant. Besides, changing perspectives allows us to consider that US borders could also be more broadly defined.

Focusing strictly on North America, controlling massive and porous border areas is quite a titanic task, which is conducive to strains between states when specific policy issues are on the neighbour's policy agenda. For instance, alcohol prohibition in the United States, in the 1920s and 1930s, leads to an acute border activity, as alcohol drinks are not illegal in Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean, which is translated into two practices: on one hand, Americans visit neighbouring countries to consume alcohol, which contributes to the flourishing of bars in many border areas; on the other, alcohol is smuggled to the United States, which cannot be controlled due to the land mass and the limited resources of US prohibition agents. The absence of strictly speaking border conflicts in North America is also supported by the Cold War, with perhaps one exception that might be the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, although it is not per se an example of border conflict, but rather a complex US-Cuban affairs and Cold War issue that is framed by Kennedy's administration as a direct threat to US national security and world peace. This crisis impacts Cuba for decades, with a US trade embargo that constrains the growth of its economy, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. In 2015, the restoration of US-Cuban diplomatic ties seems to close this anachronistic parenthesis.

Nonetheless, the US military is regularly active in the Caribbean and in Central America to maintain US hegemony in the region. In this geopolitical context, it may be suggested that US borders do not stop at US national boundaries, but go further to include a wide area of influence that extends to Latin America. For instance, in 1898, in response to the alleged destruction of the *Maine*, the United States declare war on Spain, and occupy Cuba - the last Spanish colony - and Puerto Rico. Before the withdrawal of US troops from Cuba, the Cuban constitution is amended and the 1903 Cuban-American Treaty of Relations is signed so that "the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of the Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty [...]" (historyofcuba.com 2015). This interventionist policy is also illustrated by the training of national guards in Nicaragua, Haiti and the Dominican Republic in the 1930s, and the creation in 1946 of the School of Americas, in Panama, where famous Latin American dictators are trained until 1984, so that the same US 'national security' analytical lenses are adopted by all hemispheric armed forces. For instance, in the 1980s, the direct and indirect US interventions in Nicaragua reveal that supporting the Contras includes turning a blind eye on the Contras' drug

trafficking business that feeds the North-American market through the US-Mexico border and the Caribbean. The School of Americas is then relocated to Fort Benning, Georgia, with a new name, the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, but with very similar hegemonic objectives (Gill 2004).

The most radical policy changes relating to border security come after the 9/11 attacks, in 2001. The perception that porous borders are a national security threat leads to a drastic securitization of the US borders, which are felt significantly at the two main land borders of the United States. Nonetheless, the securitization of the border is also a heightened concern in the 1990s, when anti-immigration sentiments converge with political and bureaucratic interests, and produce focused border policy campaigns that are designed to have a national resonance, e.g., Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego, and Operation Hold the Line in El Paso. Resources and powers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) considerably increase in the 1990s. In addition, the “war on drugs” mobilize military personnel along the US-Mexico border, which leads Payan to show how three wars (drug, immigration and homeland security) cripple US-Mexico borderlands (Payan 2006, 2014). However, this perception of fear in border areas is not necessarily what inhabitants live; instead, this fear may be instrumentalized by local elites to reinforce the status quo and stifle civic mobilizations (Correa-Cabrera and Garrett 2014). Finally, the challenge is to make this border compatible with NAFTA provisions and stress-free for the business sector (Andreas and Biersteker 2003).

Finally, the North Pole is a recent disputed frontier for Arctic countries, since the effects of climate change are now tangible to consider land and underwater mining, as well as sea transport through the Northwest Passage. In this context, several countries have sent territorial claims to the United Nations in order to exploit natural resources in the near future, e.g., Russia, Canada, United States, Norway, Denmark (Le Mière and Mazo 2013)

Development of transborder relations and regions

The development of transborder relations and regions is, as we have seen in the previous sections, a lengthy socio-political construction that spans several centuries in distinct border spaces. Alper and Loucky compare the Northern and the Southern US Pacific border corridors, and emphasize profound economic and environmental differences, coupled with variations in respect to the autonomy of subnational entities (Alper, Loucky and Day 2007, 11-37). Differences also relate to population density that can be a condition of the development of transborder relations.

Canada-US border regions have long and distinct histories. Socio-economic practices, such as trade, regional migrations and cultural practices, constructed local and regional border areas, even before the efforts of delimitation. Because border regions have a specific genealogy, it seems

incorrect to describe them as ‘emerging’, as seen in border studies in the 1980s and 1990s. Therefore, analyzing them as ‘evolving’ ones seems more pertinent (Konrad and Nicol 2008). Nonetheless, the literature on the ‘emergence’ of border regions can be explained by their sudden visibility after the signing of free trade agreements, and their impact in border regions that are become more than ever border corridors for people, goods and contaminants.

After the Second World War, bilateral trade grows significantly, and the need for institutionalized border relations is perceived by the different levels of government, federal and subnational ones. Foundational agreements refer to nearly 200 bilateral treaties that establish the border and its management. For instance, Konrad and Nicol note that 10 of them are related to boundaries, and more than 20 to boundary waters. The other agreements emerge after 1945, and focus on diverse policy issues, e.g., trade, transportation, communication, labour, standards... (2008). In addition to these international treaties, agreements between subnational entities, for instance between states and provinces, or between municipal entities, are an integral part of the evolution of border relations and regions after World War II. For example, the New England Governors-Atlantic Premiers annual conference is formalized in 1973, and focuses on environmental, energy, trade and demographic issues. The Pacific NorthWest Economic Region (PNWER), created in 1991 by US states and Canadian provinces, aims to bring public and private leaders together (Alper, Loucky and Day 2007). A report identifies a typology of five macro-border regions on the US-Canada borders - the Rocky Mountains, the Pacific Coast, the Great Plains, the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Coast - based on several factors, the economy, socio-cultural values and cross-border regional networks and organizations (Policy Research Initiative 2008). The fact that Canadian provinces are fairly decentralized entities tends to support their capacity to design and develop border relations.

Conversely, Mexican states are more centralized, which may be an inhibitor to the development of border relations with the United States. Yet, border ties and regions develop on the US-Mexico border, in particular in the manufacture sector. After attempting an import substitution industrialization (ISI) policy between the 1940 and the 1960s, the Mexican government shifts to a free trade strategy and industrialization toward exports, supported by foreign investments. This is especially the case in border regions, where ISI has little impact, due to border areas suffering from being fairly remote from the Mexican market. The US cancellation of the Bracero program in 1964 leads to a rise of unemployment in border cities (nearly 50 percent in Ciudad Juárez, Tijuana and Mexicali), and accelerates the shift to a free trade and export-driven economy. In 1965, the Border Industrialization Program (BIP) supports the industrialization toward exports of northern Mexican border regions. The BIP marks the emergence of the *maquiladora* industry, made attractive for several reasons: first, importing duty-free US components, and exporting duty-free finalized goods

support the US industry; second, labour wages in Mexico are low and attractive; third, the proximity of maquiladoras from the US market limits transportation costs. On the other side, the Mexican government expects several benefits from this BIP for its border areas: employment, consumption, modern production technologies, which will prove partly incorrect. The number of plants reaches 455 in 1974, but the *maquila* industry is hit by the recession in the US. During the 1970s and 1980s, through a competitive labour policy, the Mexican government seeks to preserve the industrial sector of the northern Mexican borderland, which leads to devalue the peso numerous times to achieve this objective (Taylor Hansen 2003). The deepening of the liberalization of the economy, following free trade agreements and especially the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), along with other factors, destabilizes the Mexican economy in such a way that job losses raise faster than job creations. Mexican immigration to the United States starts to increase in the 1970s and grows at a faster rate in the 1990s and 2000s. Legal and illegal migrants take part in a vast and unregulated US labour market that maintains low-skilled job wages to a minimum. However, US immigration policies criminalize undocumented migrants, which leads to forced deportations and the separation of parents from their children (Ruiz Marrujo 2014).

In this context of differing development of border regions, border and transborder policies can be examined now.

Border and transborder policies

Two preliminary comments should be noted, before providing an overview of border and transborder policies in North America. First, as opposed to the European Union, where cross-border cooperation is supported by all levels of government, including the European Commission, due to the community regional cohesion policy, nothing similar exists in North America, where border territories are meant to be economic variables in a continental free market. How to explain this difference? Foucault suggests, in one of his last lectures at the Collège de France, that the United States and Europe have two opposing models of neoliberalism: the United States have a form of ‘anarcho-liberalism’, whereas Germany has a type of ‘ordoliberalism’ (2008, 104-105). One of Foucault’s points is that the European version of neoliberalism entails “a *Gesellschaftspolitik*, as it was called, that is to say, a policy of society and a social interventionism that is at the same time active, multiple, vigilant, and omnipresent. So, on the one hand there is a market economy, and on the other an active, intense, and interventionist social policy.” (Foucault 2008, 159-161). This German view of neoliberalism may be one of the basic strata that explains the necessity to support a European regional cohesion policy, including cross-border cooperation programs (Dupeyron 2008). Conversely, the other version of neoliberalism in the United States clearly excludes this type of interventionism in border regions. Secondly, what is striking in current border and transborder

policies is the dramatic shift of multilevel governance power structure before and after 2001: after 2001, the federal government is even more heavily present on the US-Mexico border (and a bit more visible on the US-Canada border), due to the continuing war on drugs and immigration policies, as well as the new counter-terrorism measures. This border security shift generally suffocates subnational, civic and private cross-border initiatives, unless they are especially well organized and powerful.

Although federal governments set the tone in border regions with drastic border security policies, they are also present to euphemize them. Border and transborder policies often reveal an unbalanced interdependence of Mexico and Canada with the United States: convergence with US border policies is an enduring pattern of North-American relations; but border policy seems to be diffused asynchronously, generally starting with Canada-US initiatives, and later transposed to the US-Mexico border. However, notable exceptions should be mentioned, for example the ‘frequent / trusted traveler programs’ that are unevenly designed and implemented in North America: on the US-Canada border, the alignment of the Canadian administration on the US one has made the NEXUS program fairly accessible to middle and upper-class people who need to cross the border frequently, in spite of valid criticism (Sparke 2006); however, the SENTRI program on the US-Mexico border is only accepted by US authorities and designed exclusively for US citizens in approved vehicles. How do subnational governments and civic organizations react from a policy perspective to these border security measures?

Corridors take a greater importance in North America. In Canada-US border regions, mainly in the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence, Pacific and Western Interior, where they are not merely checkpoints, but also gateways for multiple purposes (Konrad and Nicol 2008). These corridors contribute to define some border policies. For instance, the International Mobility and Trade Corridor Program (IMTC), in the Pacific Northwest, gathers public and private organizations in order to discuss cross-border transportation and related issues, coordinate planning of the Cascade Gateway, and improve traffic data and infrastructure (IMTC 2015). Besides, regional, local governments and civic organizations play a role in including many additional issues to border policies, as it is the case with PENWR, with 20 working groups in 2015 (PNWER 2015). Finally, PENWR promotes binational tourism with the notion of a “Two Nation Vacation” (Alper, Loucky and Day 2007). Obviously, in US-Mexico border regions, corridors are also crucial to allow the circulation of people and goods. But what emerges in the early 2000s is the need of strengthening the continental transportation system (Bradbury 2002).

In addition, civic organizations are also scrutinized. For example, environmental organizations are present on both borders. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge the fact that there are several US-Mexico borders (Correa-Cabrera and Staudt 2014). In this perspective, Coronado shows

that environmental organizations that are locally or regionally based struggle (Coronado 2014). In the Pacific Northwest, environmental organizations seem delivered from their mandate, as public and private sectors have reengineered a neoliberal version of ecology.

Conclusion

Andreas and Biersteker (2003) consider that it is paradoxical to securitize the border and make it business-friendly at the same time, which is presently one of the main challenges of border regions in North America. However, solving this paradox is possible if we start taking into consideration Wacquant's sociology of the neoliberal state that reveals three facets: the first one contends that neoliberalism, far from being an economic project, is a political one that is implemented, not by shortening sail, but by "reengineering the state". The second refers to the argument that neoliberalism shifts the "bureaucratic field" (Bourdieu 1994) — generally fitted with two wings, one that is both economic and penal, and one that is essentially social and protective, that struggle over the definition and distribution of public goods — toward the economic and penal one. This shift contributes to structure the state around two sets of policies, the first one analyzed as "workfare" policies by Peck (2001), the second that builds on this work by proposing the related notion of "prisonfare" (Wacquant 2010). The third dimension refers to the expansion and praise of the penal wing of the state. Wacquant suggests that the penal apparatus is one of the core features of the neoliberal state, as the neoliberal state must deal with the consequences of neoliberal policies that generate social inequality, work instability and ethno-racial anxiety. Using the metaphor of the Centaur-state, Wacquant shows that it is very liberal, laissez-faire and laissez-passer at the top of the social hierarchy, and is conversely paternalistic, restrictive and rude with those who are at the bottom (Wacquant 2012).

Wacquant's model can be tweaked to analyze North American borders, with the addition of the notion of "borderfare", which refers to the multilevel policy regime that addresses border and migration control problems by deploying militarized border patrols, offshore and domestic detention centres, domestic police forces and specialized courts, bilateral labour migration channels, along with their appendices (Dupeyron, forthcoming). North American borders fall into this analytical triptyque 'workfare-prisonfare-borderfare' that makes sense of the apparent paradox between a sharp border securitization and a sustained growth of border trade flows: in response to domestic socio-economic problems caused by liberalization and globalization policies, border security policies not only offer simplistic and unrealistic solutions, but also frame these problems as being caused by non-domestic factors, i.e., drug war, illegal immigration control, war against terror. When sovereign states deregulate and open their economies, they manifest themselves voyeuristically, especially in border areas that have strong socio-economic and ethnocultural

differences.

References

- Alper, Donald K., James Loucky, and John Chadwick Day, eds. 2007. *Transboundary Policy Challenges in the Pacific Border Regions of North America*. University of Calgary Press.
- Amilhat Szary, Anne-Laure. 2012. "Walls and Border Art: The Politics of Art Display." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 27 (2): 213–28. doi:10.1080/08865655.2012.687216.
- Anderson, Joan B., and James Gerber. 2007. *Fifty Years of Change on the U.S.-Mexico Border: Growth, Development, and Quality of Life*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Andreas, Peter. 2013. *Smuggler Nation: How Illicit Trade Made America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1994 [1993]. "Rethinking the state: on the genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field." *Sociological Theory* 12: 1-19.
- Bradbury, Susan L. 2002. "Planning Transportation Corridors in Post-NAFTA North America." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 68 (2): 137–50.
- Conrad, Margaret. 2012. *A Concise History of Canada*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coronado, Irasema. 2014. "Whither the Environmental Nongovernmental Organizations on Multiple Regions of the US–Mexico Border?" *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 29 (4): 449–64.
- Correa-Cabrera, Guadalupe, and Terence M. Garrett. 2014. "The Phenomenology of Perception and Fear: Security and the Reality of the US–Mexico Border." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 29 (2): 243–55.
- Correa-Cabrera, Guadalupe, and Kathleen Staudt. 2014. "An Introduction to the Multiple US–Mexico Borders." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 29 (4): 385–90.
- Dowling, Julie, and Jonathan Inda, eds. 2013. *Governing Immigration Through Crime. A Reader*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Dupeyron, Bruno. 2008. *L'Europe au défi de ses régions transfrontalières. Expériences rhénane et pyrénéenne*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- . *forthcoming*. "Secluding North America's Migration Outcasts: Notes on the International Organization for Migration's Compassionate Mercenary Business", in Zaiotti, Ruben (ed.), *Remote Control: the Externalization of Migration Management in Europe and North America*. New York: Routledge.
- Durpaire, François. 2013. *Histoire des États-Unis*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

- Gill, Lesley. 2004. *The School of the Americas: Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hamnett, Brian R. 2006. *A Concise History of Mexico*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haughton, Suzette A. 2009. "The US-Caribbean Border: An Important Security Border in the 21st Century." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 24 (3): 1–20.
- historiofcuba.com. 2015. "Treaty Between the US and Cuba, 1904."
<http://www.historyofcuba.com/history/havana/treaty.htm>. Accessed June 21, 2015.
- Karatani, Rieko. 2003. *Defining British Citizenship Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain*. London: Frank Cass.
- Koskenniemi, Martti. 2002. *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations*. Cambridge University Press.
- IMTC. 2015. "About The IMTC – IMTC." <http://theimtc.com/about/>. Accessed June 10, 2015.
- Le Mière, Christian, and Jeffrey Mazo. 2013. *Arctic Opening: Insecurity and Opportunity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lubin, Martin. 2003. "Strains between Governments at the Top, Hands across the Border at the Base: The Role of Subnational Governments during the Bush-Chretien Era and Beyond." *Canadian-American Public Policy*, no. 54 (September): 21-43.
- Martínez, Oscar J., ed. 1996. *U.S.-Mexico Borderlands: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources.
- Newman, David. 2011. "Contemporary Research Agendas in Border Studies: An Overview." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies*, edited by Doris Wastl-Walter, 33–47. Farnham, England: Ashgate.
- Payan, Tony. 2006. *The Three U.S.-Mexico Border Wars: Drugs, Immigration, and Homeland Security*. Westport, Conn: Praeger Security International.
- . 2014. "Ciudad Juárez: A Perfect Storm on the US–Mexico Border." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 29 (4): 435–47.
- Peck, Jamie. 2001. *Workfare States*. New York: Guilford Press.
- PNWER. 2015. "Working Groups." <http://www.pnwer.org/working-groups.html>. Accessed June 10, 2015.
- Philips Valentine, Lisa, and Allan K. McDougall. 2004. "Imposing the Border: The Detroit River from 1786 to 1807." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 19 (1): 13-22.
- Policy Research Initiative (Canada). 2008. *The Emergence of Cross-Border Regions between Canada and the United States: Reaping the Promise and Public Value of Cross-Border Regional Relationships : Final Report*. [Ottawa]: Policy Research Initiative.
- Ruiz Marrujo, Olivia T. 2014. "Undocumented Families in Times of Deportation at the San Diego–

- Tijuana Border.” *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 29 (4): 391–403.
- Sparke, Matthew B. 2006. “A Neoliberal Nexus: Economy, Security and the Biopolitics of Citizenship on the Border.” *Political Geography* 25 (2): 151–80.
- Taylor Hansen, Lawrence Douglas. 2003. “The Origins of the Maquila Industry in Mexico.” *Comercio Exterior* 53 (11).
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2010. “Crafting the Neoliberal State: Workfare, Prisonfare, and Social Insecurity.” *Sociological Forum* 25 (2): 197-220.
- . 2012. “The Wedding of Workfare and Prisonfare in the 21st Century.” *Journal of Poverty* 16 (3): 236–49.

Internet Resources

<http://absborderlands.org>

see links: <http://absborderlands.org/borderlands/resources/>

<http://www.wvu.edu/bpri/>

<http://apps.npr.org/borderland/>

<http://www.colef.mx/?lang=en>