Euroculture Erasmus Mundus Master of Arts Programme

Intensive Programme 2018

Theme Statement

Where is Europe?

Respacing, Replacing and Reordering Europe

Against the backdrop of unprecedented ecological changes and ensuing challenges to global solidarity, the digitalization, transnationalization and automatization of the political and the everyday spheres, and the increasing power of deterritorialized operating systems (such as global financial institutions) in determining political and social realities, it becomes more and more difficult to locate Europe. Contemporary Europe is fluid, deterritorialized, and constantly emerging; as such, it brings into question the analytical strength of categories such as "national," "regional," or "global." Europe nowadays is given meaning and is practiced not only in political and media discourses, nor artistic output such as literature, film and installations, but also in infrastructures (roads and bridges), protocols, and security algorithms. It can be located in various places: not only in the institutions and policies of Brussels, but in the practices of migrants, on Facebook discussion boards, or in travelling exhibitions. Accordingly, we ask you to locate Europe by examining how it may be given (multiple) meanings through actors' practices and experiences, and *where* (meaning the spaces and their material conditions) these practices and experiences are being realized.

The 2017-2018 edition of the Intensive Program thus uses practice and space as analytical categories through which to explore Europe in a new and exciting way. We suggest that Europe is multifaceted; it is not only "something," but it is also "somewhere"; it is not only an "idea," but is also an "act"; it is not only "imaginary," but is also "material." To understand Europe's multifaceted nature, we ask you to study *where Europe is* rather than *what Europe is*. We encourage you to explore the individual and collective practices and processes through which European spaces are given meaning and governed as a social and political imaginary. We are also interested in research which analyzes how feelings, experiences and emotions define relations between people and their (material) environments. For example, how might we encounter and experience Europe through senses of belonging, love and attachment, or fear?

Our approach to space requires you to become aware of how we "produce space" - make meaning of it - in our own interactions with it, and in the kinds of (research) questions we might pose about it. We would like to point out three possible means to approaching space[1].

The first potential approach to space considers it as an environment that we can grasp with our senses, in which agents (human and non-human actors) find themselves, and where they can perform specific actions. This involves seeing spaces as places where individuals and groups engage with the material, visible, and measurable environment (either natural or human-made) that surrounds them. Think for instance about how we make sense of our environment through different spatial categories that we assign and recognize in space: households, public spaces, neighborhoods, nature, parks, cities, regions, nations, borders, etc.

A second possible approach sees space according to the ideological intentions imposed upon it. Here one might consider and investigate how spaces are given meaning and turned into particular places through the work of planners, policymakers, researchers, politicians and other similar actors. The "work" these various actors carry out in order to "produce" particular spaces foresees a specific use of said spaces which is determined and regulated by the conventions, the beliefs, and by the language said actors use to speak about them. In this context, one can think of the impact/effect of maps, plans, regulations, laws, information on pictures, etc., which produce specific statements regarding spaces, and create certain bodies of knowledge about them.

A third possible approach to space is to consider the actual meaningful practices that humans enact in their spatial environments: the "placemaking" processes. How are our direct experiences of the spatial materiality in which we operate mediated by broader socio-economic and political discourses and expectations? How do we live our daily lives in the spaces that we occupy, and how do we make sense of these spatial experiences? How do we talk about these spaces and how do we represent them?

By no means do we want to suggest that these three approaches to space should be seen as separate categories. On the contrary, all three analytical levels are intertwined. Rather, we offer this division so that you will become aware that space doesn't just simply exist, but that different dimensions are involved in how any space - in this case, Europe in particular - is given meaning through socio-spatial practice. Nor do we want to suggest that these approaches are the only possible means to study Europe spatially.

---

[1] This three-point distinction is derived from the work of Henri Lefebvre (relating to his notions of representational space, represented space and lived space) See Lefebvre, H. (1991[1974]) *The Production of Space* (trans. Nicholson-Smith, D.). Blackwell.

Students are asked to approach their research inquisitively and open-mindedly, as a practice of wondering, and to critically reflect upon the intellectual boundaries which are often set between different research fields, methodologies, and analytical dimensions. We hereby welcome problem-driven research that is aware of, but not constrained by, disciplinary frontiers.

In view of this, we have defined the following subject-based (rather than analytical) subthemes:

1) **Respacing Europe in the European Public Sphere** - We study how Europe is given meaning through the emergence of the European public sphere as a place of dialogue and deliberation, but also confrontation and dissent.
2) **Replacing Europe in Everyday Life** - We study how Europe is given meaning through the experiences and practices of Europeans in their daily lives.
3) **Reordering Europe through Political Practices/Institutions -** We study how Europe is given meaning and governed as a political space through policy and political discourses and practices.

Each of these sub-themes reflects on the conceptual, methodological and empirical dimensions of the question: *Where is Europe*?
We invite you to join us in rethinking Europe, and opening the research agenda on Europe to new geographies (respacing), new imaginaries (replacing), and new practices (reordering).

Compulsory literature (included in your *IP 2018 Reader*):

Paasi, A. (2001) "Europe as a Social Process and Discourse. Considerations of Place, Boundaries and Identity." *European Urban and Regional Studies*. 8.1: 7-28.
Shields, R. (2013) "Spatialisations." in: *Spatial Questions: Cultural Topolo/gies and Social Spatialisation*. Los Angeles/London: Sage: 15-40.

Subtheme 1: Respacing Europe in the European Public Sphere

In *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* (1962), Jürgen Habermas lays the foundation of our understanding of public sphere. Originally, it was conceptualized as a space where individuals (not the state, and not the market) – as members of the public – could address the state and engage and interact with each other to discuss political matters of common concern through, for example, journalism or face-to-face debate and critique of the government (Hartley and Green, 2006, p. 342).

Adding the *European* element to this notion raises the question of whether we are talking of a single European(ized) sphere, or multiple spheres across Europe? Also, the notion of "public" implies a socially-shared, communal practice; but where is this practice located? In face-to-face interaction? On the internet? Is there *one* European public, or are there *multiple* publics, depending on the topic under discussion, distributed *across* Europe?

Empirically, we observe at least two parallel processes of how the European public sphere operates. On the one hand, institutionally speaking, the European public sphere seems to have been monopolized by the European Union, which – in her numerous white papers – seems to understand the public sphere as a consensual and instrumental space, within which the objectives of the European integration process are to be decided (Ketola 2013, p. 8). On the other hand, we come across empirical studies which observe the actual interaction on the ground as often being driven by local and transnational communities and associations. These interactions include not only the conventional deliberation of political issues that characterize the public sphere, but also those cultural interactions that are the result of the imagination, and which exist across a range of media (e.g. art, literature, cinema) and cultural activities (e.g. festivals, museum curation, slam poetry) (Jacobs, 2012).

Within both top-down/bottom-up and political/cultural approaches to the public sphere, problems remain in terms of how the concept of "public" is understood, and what the interaction enabled by the public sphere looks like. A key concern is that in all of the various configurations, the concepts of *diversity* (public(s) and counterpublics) and *dissent* (Chantal Mouffe speaks of "agonism") are often overlooked. It is precisely these concepts that challenge the idea of the public sphere as a uniform and consensual practice (see here, for example, the work of Nancy Fraser and her critique of Habermas; also Ketola 2013, p. 8).

In line with the three possible approaches to spaces outlined in the main theme, we invite you to think about respacing Europe in the European public sphere in the following ways:

The first possible approach refers to the material, visible and measurable, physical environment

that enables social practices. Think here of material carriers of debate, such as newspapers (in paper and online), public spaces (such as the European parliament, city squares, monuments and places of heritage, etc.). A specific issue, for example, would relate to the emergence of a digital-only/cyberspace-based European public sphere.

The second possible approach refers to the ideological and planned intended functions of the material and physical environment. A specific issue, for example, would relate to the discursive project about the EU. In this project, a limited number of elements are combined into an originary narrative about Europe that teleologically leads it to the EU (via Antiquity, Judeo-Christianity and the European peace project), thereby excluding a diversity of elements and position-takings that challenge this narrative and the EU itself.

Finally, the third possible approach refers to the actual meaningful (that is, through the use of symbols; think here of language or images) practices that take place and relate (in a wide range of possible ways) to an intended ideology. Here one might think of a public contestation of what a particular practice means/does, as happened in the case of the "Mohammed cartoons" in Denmark. For some this practice enacted the freedom to express a political position in a newspaper, whereas others saw it as an insult to their religious views.

References:

Habermas, J. (1989 [1962]) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere – An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (trans. Burger, T. & Lawrence, F.). Polity Press.

Hartley, J. & Green, J. (2006) "The Public Sphere on the Beach." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9.3: 341-362.

Jacobs, R. N. (2012) "Entertainment Media and the Aesthetic Public Sphere." In: Alexander, J., Jacobs, R. & Smith, P. (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. Oxford University Press.

Ketola, M. (2013) "The Everyday Politics of the European Public Sphere: Moving Beyond EU Policy Perspectives." *Journal of Civil Society* 8.3: 213-228.

Compulsory literature (included in your *IP 2018 Reader*):

Ketola, M. (2013) "The Everyday Politics of the European Public Sphere: Moving Beyond EU Policy Perspectives." *Journal of Civil Society* 8.3: 213-228.

McGuigan, J. (2005) "The Cultural Public Sphere." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 8.4: 427-443.

List of additional suggested readings for subtheme 1:

Alexander, J. (2006) "Public Opinion, Mass Media, Polls, Associations." In: *The Civil Sphere.* Oxford University Press.

Bärenreuter, C., Brüll, C., Mokre, M. & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2009) "An Overview of Research on the European Public Sphere." *Eurosphere Working Paper* 3.

Bax, S., Gielen, P. & Ieven, B. (2015) *Interrupting the City: Artistic Constitutions of the Public Sphere.* Antennae Series 20.

Bjondeberg, I. (2008) "The European Imaginary: Media Fictions, Democracy and Cultural Identities." In: Bjondeberg, I. & Madsen, P. *Media, Democracy and European Culture.* Intellect Books.

Delanty, G. (2011) "On the Cultural Significance of Arts Festivals." In: Giorgi, L.,Sassatelli, M. & Delanty, G. (eds.) *Festivals and the Public Cultural Sphere*. Routledge.

Emden, J. (2015) "Constitutionalizing the Public Sphere? Habermas and the Modern State." In: Fischer, B. & Mergenthaler, M. (eds.) *Cultural Transformations of the Public Sphere*. Peter Lang.

Habermas, J. (1996) "Civil Society and the Political Public Sphere." In *Between Facts and Norms – Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (trans. W. Rehg). Polity Press.

Fraser, N. (1990) "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text* 25/26: 56-80.

Giorgi, L., Sassatelli, M. and Delanty, G. (eds.) (2011) *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere*. Routledge.

Hartley, J. & Green, J. (2006) "The Public Sphere on the Beach," *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9.3: 341-362.

Hepp, A. et al. (2016) "Representing Europe in the Press: The Multi-Segmented European Public Sphere." In Hepp, A. et al. *The Communicative Construction of Europe: Cultures of Political Discourse, Public Sphere, and the Euro Crisis*. Springer.

Lunt, P. & Livingstone, S. (2013) "Media studies' Fascination with the Concept of the Public Sphere: Critical Reflections and Emerging Debates." *Media, Culture & Society* 35.1: 87-96.

Parkinson, J. (2012) *Democracy and Public Space: The Physical Sites of Democratic Performance*. Oxford University.

Subtheme 2: Replacing Europe in Everyday Life

This sub-theme seeks to tackle the overarching question of *Where is Europe?* by considering the *processes* and *experiences* within which Europe might be discovered. We argue that *practices* are central to the processes of "placemaking," for Europe may reveal itself through particular individual experiences and collective actions. Europe is something we "do," rather than something that "is" or that we "have." In turn, this forms a link between private and public life. The examples below represent but a few of the wide range of potential issues in which one might seek to locate Europe.

Living Europe: How to Make Yourself at Home.
Can one identify forms of "everyday Europe," and if so, where do they arise? Is it possible to point to particular European experiences, for example in terms of approaches to the provision of daycare or social care? What about the structures of communities, families, or gangs? Are there specifically European practices when it comes to matters of education, work, and leisure time? Here one could think about the cases of *Wohngemeinschaften*, open-plan offices, or playgrounds.

Consumption might also be a starting point. For example, one could look for Europe within culinary practices and drinking cultures. However, one could equally consider how EU policy might shape nutrition and eating habits. What role does Europe (or the EU) play in daily life and ways of living? In the field of mobility and travel, one could explore the impact of European infrastructure and communication networks on daily practices.

Focusing on culture, are there specific cultural practices which can be identified as European(ising) in terms of which culture(s) are consumed, perceived and understood? Here one could study a wide variety of events, including film screenings, agricultural shows, folkloric festivals, television programming formats, or international contests in arts or in sports. Alternatively, can one also uncover *negative* experiences of European place, i.e. in the form of particular placemaking practices which are exclusionary rather than inclusionary?

Europe in Values, as Experienced in Private and Public Spaces.
How are values and emotions experienced and expressed through practices in everyday life? In this case, we might look at notions of humour and the position humour holds in European societies; we could, for example, analyze the role played by satire in the media. Equally, we might think about concepts and understandings of sorrow, the role of rituals in dealing with death, or different private and public reactions to tragedy. Hereby, ceremonies present a means through which the boundaries between public and private spaces may be transcended. Similarly, spaces may be (re)appropriated by individuals or groups, such as when squatters or

artists use public spaces to criticize social wrongs or create sanctuaries. This might be thought of in terms of distinguishing between possible top-down and bottom-up approaches to "placemaking."

In developing suitable approaches for tackling this subtheme, students may draw on a range of disciplines and theoretical directions, including memory studies, historiography, postcolonial studies, ethnography and cultural anthropology. Here too you could start from the tangible, physical environment where people live, which comprises both public places and private homes. Or you could study how places are "made," for example by establishing memorials, placing street furniture, or through commemorative practices and manifestations. You might consider how particular rituals change over time, or why the importance attributed to specific spaces can change and be interpreted differently. People can give meaning to spaces through performative public acts; through writing, art, or design. Yet you could equally observe the daily practices of ordinary people, and how they share these experiences.

Compulsory literature (included in your *IP 2018 Reader*):

Adler-Nissen, R. (2016) "Towards a Practice Turn in EU Studies: The Everyday of European Integration." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 54.1: 87-103.

Wanner, C. (2016) "The Return of Czernowitz: Urban Affect, Nostalgia, and the Politics of Place-making in a European Borderland City." *City & Society* 28.2: 198-221.

List of additional suggested readings for subtheme 2:

a) Journal articles focusing on notions of space and place, and processes of placemaking

Beynon, H. & Hudson, R. (1993) "Place and Space in Contemporary Europe: Some Lessons and Reflections." *Antipode* 25: 177–190.

Friedmann, J. (2010) "Place and Place-Making in Cities: A Global Perspective." *Planning Theory & Practice* 11.2: 149-165.

Healey, P. (2004) "The Treatment of Space and Place in the New Strategic Spatial Planning in Europe." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28. 1: 45-67.

Pierce, J., Martin, D. G. & Murphy, J. T. (2011) "Relational Place-Making: The Networked Politics of Place." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36.1: 54–70.

Soysal, Y. N. (2002) "Locating Europe." *European Societies* 4.3: 265-284.

Trudeau, D. (2006) "Politics of Belonging in the Construction of Landscapes: Place-Making, Boundary-Drawing and Exclusion." *Cultural Geographies* 13.3: 421-443.

b) <u>Broader reading (covering various approaches from different perspectives and disciplines)</u>

Cavaghan, R. (2015) "Interpreting Europe: Mainstreaming Gender in Directorate-General for Research, European Commission." In *Governing Europe's Spaces: European Union Re-Imagined.* Manchester University Press.

Dunphy, R. G. & Emig, R. (2010) *Hybrid Humour: Comedy in Transcultural Perspectives.* Internationale Forschungen zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft, 130. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Gutierrez Rodriguez, E. & Tate, S. A (2015) *Creolizing Europe: Legacies and Transformations.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Hagen, J. (2008) "Parades, Public Space, and Propaganda: The Nazi Culture Parades in Munich." *Geografiska Annaler. Series B., Human Geography* 90.4:349-367.

Hastorf, C. A. (2017) *The Social Archaeology of Food: Thinking About Eating from Prehistory to the Present.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kraenzle, C. & Mayr, M. (2017) *The Changing Place of Europe in Global Memory Cultures: Usable Pasts and Futures.* Palgrave Macmillan memory studies. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan

Laineste, L. & Voolaid, P. (2016) "Laughing across Borders: Intertextuality of Internet memes." *The European Journal of Humour Research* 4.4: 26-49.

McNamara, K. R. (2015) *The Politics of Everyday Europe: Constructing Authority in the European Union.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polonovski, M. (2010) "Jewish Graves in Europe: Public Commemoration or Ritual Space?" *Museum International* 62.1-2: 69-74.

Pręgowski, M. P. (2016) *Companion Animals in Everyday Life: Situating Human-Animal Engagement Within Cultures.* New York: Springer Science and Buss Media.

Schramm, K. (2011) "Landscapes of Violence: Memory and Sacred Space." Introduction to Special Issue of *History & Memory* 23.1: 5-22.

Sheftel, A. (2011) "Monument to the International Community, from the Grateful Citizens of Sarajevo. Dark Humour as Counter-Memory in Post-Conflict Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Memory Studies* 5.2: 145-164.

Toguslu, E. (2015) *Everyday Life Practices of Muslims in Europe.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Voges, J. (2013) "Laughter *Movens*: Functions and Effects of Laughter in Black British Literature." In: *Postcolonial Translocations: Cultural Representation and Critical Spatial Thinking,* Munkelt, M.,Stein, M. & Schmidt, M. (eds), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Subtheme 3: Reordering Europe through Political Practices/Institutions

This subtheme examines the role of borders and bordering practices in shaping contemporary Europe. We draw borders and boundaries to establish a division between who we are and who we are not; between who or what is included and who or what is excluded. This means borders are more than a geographical demarcation of space through a set of lines on a map. Rather, borders are complex institutions that create links between space, power, and rights. As expressions of political sovereignty, borders give meanings to territories, legitimize authorities, and determine who is entitled to have rights.

Due to the pressures of globalization and Europeanization, national borders are no longer the only nor indeed the most relevant factor in defining societies and governing social mobility. Today, struggles for power exceed the boundaries of sovereign states, becoming global rather than national or international. As a consequence, the legal, political, cultural, and economic properties of a border have become detached from the established geopolitical divisions. As the mismatch widens between geopolitical and administrative divisions on the one hand, and cultural characters - together with economic and military frontiers - on the other, borders and boundaries multiply and are becoming more diverse. Practices of constructing borders - bordering practices - still take place through geographical borderlines and the so-called "hard borders," such as passport and security checkpoints, transit passages, or airport immigration controls. However, nowadays bordering also takes place through the so-called *borderscapes*: a set of discourses, technologies and practices of division and connection that establish the frontiers of contemporary social and political spaces.

What does this mean for contemporary Europe? How can we study Europe's borders and boundaries to reveal *where Europe is*? And where do the borders of Europe lie? Over the past century, borders in Europe have undergone rapid change, mostly due to conflicts. The EU was supposed to eradicate conflict in Europe by eliminating borders and transforming Europe into a space of mobility and openness. Yet, following the celebrations marking the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the boundaries of Europe and borders in Europe remain as topical as ever. Geopolitical reshufflings, trade and technological innovations - together with global governance practices and migration flows - continue to reshape the map of Europe. Moreover, as Europe externalizes its identity and political governance, it creates physical manifestations of Europe and demarcated European spaces *outside* of its geographical borders. As a result not only of the colonial and imperial past, but also the contemporary security and migration policies of European states, today we can find borders of Europe in Africa, Asia or America. Accordingly, contemporary global processes impact Europe substantially, and open up many possibilities in terms of how to approach the question "*Where is Europe?*" from the perspective of borders and borderscapes.

We invite you to consider how the three possible approaches to space as outlined in the main IP theme can help you to better understand Europe and its borders.

The first approach helps you to analyze the relationship between material and tangible properties of a border on the one hand and the idea of Europe on the other. How are border checkpoints, security checks, barbed wire fences or gated communities related to historical narratives and cultural representations of Europe? How do rivers, the sea or mountains demarcate Europe, and why? Why do we connect borders with walls and barbed wire fences, but not with technological tools such as facial recognition or license plate scanners? Could network firewalls be considered a contemporary version of medieval city walls?

The second approach focuses on border representativity. It tells you that borders are social constructs. They are a result of historical power struggles, and the consequent dominance of certain discourses over others. You are asked to critically examine borders and practices of bordering, and their roles in defining Europe. How do socio-political and cultural norms and discourses make contemporary borders and bordering practices possible? What is the purpose of walls and barbed wire fences at a time when state sovereignty is being challenged by the global movements of capital and transnational economic and political institutions? Is the Schengen agreement maintaining or contesting the Cold War and imperial hierarchies and identity representations? How are the borders of Europe being renegotiated in the context of Brexit? How are the borders of Europe (re)produced through policies such as the EU's Global Strategy for Foreign and Security Policy (2016) and the European Agenda on Security (2015)?

The third approach examines how space is given meaning through the everyday experiences of the groups and individuals who inhabit it. You are invited to examine how Europe is constituted in the perpetual interaction between the physical (material) representations of borders, and our routinized practices and feelings of belonging. Simply put, the analysis focuses on the relationship between where we are and where we feel we belong. For instance, a presumably simple act of crossing a border can be studied as a legitimization of one political order over another. Security checks, the Schengen/non-Schengen departure halls at Schiphol (Amsterdam) or Charles de Gaulle (Paris), or the automatized identity controls can be seen as performances of Europe/non-Europe dichotomies. At the same time, border-crossing when carried out by an undocumented migrant can be viewed as an act that challenges these dichotomies and the political systems which epitomize them. Another good example is how cross-border contacts challenge established socio-political divisions.

Compulsory literature (included in your *IP 2018 Reader*):

Eder, K. (2006) "Europe's Borders. The Narrative Construction of the Boundaries of Europe." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9.2: 255–271.

Zielonka, J. (2017) "The Remaking of the EU's Borders and the Images of European Architecture." *Journal of European Integration* 39.5: 1-16.

List of additional suggested readings for subtheme 3:

Atzili, B. & Kantel, A. (2015) "Accepting the Unacceptable: Lessons from West Germany's Changing Border Politics." *International Studies Review* 17.4: 588–616.

Božić, S. & Kuti, S. (2016) "New International Borders - Old Social Spaces: Transnational Migrant Networks across the Boundaries of Post-Socialist Croatia." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 41.4: 409–426.

Deckard, N. D. & Heslin, A (2016) "After Postnational Citizenship: Constructing the Boundaries of Inclusion in Neoliberal Contexts." *Sociology Compass* 10.4: 294–305.

Dominguez, L. & Pires, I. (2014) *Cross-Border Cooperation Structures in Europe: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future*. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Foteva, A. (2014) *Do the Balkans Begin in Vienna?: The Geopolitical and Imaginary Borders between the Balkans and Europe*. New York: Peter Lang.

Fox, J. E. (2017) "The Edges of the Nation: A Research Agenda for Uncovering the Taken-for-Granted Foundations of Everyday Nationhood." *Nations and Nationalism* 23.1: 26–47.

Gott, M. (2016) *French-Language Road Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Hirvonen, A. (2014) "Imagining Europe as Open Spaces." In *Europe Beyond Universalism and Particularism*, Lindberg, S., Ojakangas, M. & Prozorov, S. (eds), London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lough, B. J. & Moore McBride, A. (2014) "Navigating the Boundaries of Active Global Citizenship." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 39.3: 457–469.

Mau, S. (2012) *Transformations of the State: Selective Borders, Unequal Mobility*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oates-Indruchova, L. & Blaive, M. (2015) "Border Visions and Border Regimes in Cold War Eastern Europe." *Journal of Contemporary History* 50.3: 656–659.