Mapping the borderland. Mapping impulses in everyday (re-)productions of the German border towards Poland

Judith Miggelbrink, Leipzig

Meaning, ideology and power are indeed—as the call claims—habitually arbitrated through everyday practices. Practices, in turn, produce socio-spatial realities and are produced by them. Mapping, thus, can be understood as a field of "doings and sayings" (Schatzki 2001) rendering spatialities visible by giving them a place on a map. This—admittedly—broad understanding of mapping as a semantic tool and a practice allows for addressing a huge range of established and upcoming technologies, interests and catalysts of locating people, events, problems etc.

My contribution will focus on a very specific topic—border crime and perceived (in-)securities—and aims at discussing in how far actors in the field make use of mapping terminologies and tools in order to make their interests and concerns visible, plausible and legitimate. I aim at tracing some of these mappings and locating tactics that often are incomplete, temporarily, unstable, sometimes unintended and sometimes even contradictory. Some of these mappings are rooted in well established discursive formations, e.g. nation and nationalism. Others seem to come along with counterpolitical/counterpublic positions.

Mapping?
In a first section, I will refer to some conceptual understandings of 'mapping' that have been discussed since the late 1990s to tackle its potential scope and analytical depth. In the field of political geography, for instance, Agnew (1999:499) applies the mapping-terminology as an epistemological tool to reveal the changing spatialities of power focusing on ideal-types of spatiality, on ontological and moral foundations that identify political power with statehood and on empirical movements attempting to undermine this association. Mapping, thus serves as an analytical tool for broadening the focus of political geography, directing its attention beyond the scope of the territoriality and spatialities of statehood. A similar understanding, derived from a discussion of governmentality, gleams through Walters (2002, 2011) inquiry of the Schengen border regime. Here, mapping can be translated as a critical inventory of an ensemble or dispositive unfolding governing on people and practices and, thus making it *visible*. Blaut et al. (2003:166), in contrast, conceptualise 'mapping—the thinking and action involved in reading, making, and using map-like models—' as 'a cultural universal, an ability to cognize and act that is acquired early in life in all cultures'. Following this understanding, mapping is a cognitive technology for 'spatial' orientation. Recent debates, to mention a third field of discussion, have shifted towards mapping as a practice, focusing on how mapping technologies are appropriated by people and practices beyond the world of formal cartography (Elwood 2010, Lin 2013).

Various mapping impulses
In a second section, I will present an inventory of concrete mappings through which meanings of the border are produced and reproduced. Here, I will focus especially on the topic of border crime ("Grenzkriminalität"). Border crime—though not a category of criminal statistics—is mapped by different actors and in different ways. This means that mapping is not a coherent process but disperse and often incomplete; it does not

necessarily follow a certain and explicit agenda. Instead, 'mappings'—if we stick to an open understanding of what mapping could be— -> discursively produced (erzeugt sichtbarkeit); but also a tactically applied instrument

- Daily newspapers' mapping impulses: Though being used incidentally by mass media and politicians in the 1990s, 'border crime' has become a widespread discursive *topos* in (national) daily newspapers not earlier than 2005 prior to the accession of several eastern European States to the EU and the Schengen area (Beurskens, Creutziger und Miggelbrink 2016 (in press). By applying lexicometric methods, it can be shown that the 'problem of (cross-)border crime' is almost exclusively located at the eastern borders of Germany towards Poland and the Czech Republic (and without responding to any criminal statistics). Though probably not intended, nation wide journals produce a map of a dangerous border in the East while other German borders are 'calm and smooth'.
- Mappings of observations, experiences, and gossips: At the same time, we can observe internet-based debates especially on thefts of cars and agricultural engines flaming up time and again. On forums such as www.landwirt.com one can find lively debates on e.g. stolen combine harvesters and potential protection strategies often assuming about the abode of criminal subjects (so called east European bands). In this context, a couple of google-based push pin-maps have been produced about criminal events being reported by citizens[1] in order to give evidence to a problem that is regarded as being underrated and downplayed especially by federal politicians and media people from 'elsewhere'. Here, we can find some parallels to North-American (border) crime mappings. Mapping, in this case, aims at creating authenticity by 'rendering the truth visible'. However, it could be questioned how 'effective' these mappings are.
- Experts' mappings: 'Border crime' is tackled and negotiated by several groups of experts: local mayors, the police, departments of public prosecution, local media representatives etc. In talks about 'the problem of border crime' they all produce mappings, i.e. they locate events, responsibilities, malfunctions etc. on (virtual) maps. These mappings do not lead to 'a proper' map but tell stories about *located* conditions and realities. As local people—inhabitants including those engaged as minutemen—are also experts of the field, this point overlaps with the second. However, here I will concentrate on how they talk about the topic of border crime in interviews and on the spatial orders and relations they present.

Enacting realities through mapping

Based on these observations and empirical findings, the third part will focus on the relation between mapping as a technique of creating visibility through location on the hand and space as a power technique on the other. The latter is rooted in a foucauldian approach to governing and governmentality and has been widely discussed in geography, too. Spaces, thus, are instruments through which power is exerted on subjects and social relations. Mapping, instead, in its broadest sense is a practice of locating, ordering, showing, reifying and reducing the social world and, thus, giving meaning to things. Borders clearly are a spatial instrument of power and, thus, embedded in a wider dispositive of control and surveillance. Mappings of the border and border crime, instead, point to something; they point to the lived realities of borderlanders who often feel neglected by politics and perceive themselves as not being the winners of open borders.

---

[1] E.g. https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=zuIj2PfBKmkU.k5zxE9_ATNoM&hl=de.

Agnew, J. (1999): Mapping political power beyond state boundaries: Territories, identity, and movement in world politics. *Millenium,* 28**,** 499-521.

Beurskens, K., C. Creutziger & J. Miggelbrink (2016, in press): Securitisation from below? Civil engagement within processes of bordering in internal EU borderlands. In: U. Grabski-Kieron, I. Mose, A. Reichert-Schick & A. Steinführer (Hrsg.): *European rural peripheries revalued,* Berlin et al.: LIT-Verlag.

Blaut, J. M., D. Stea, C. Spencer & M. Blades (2003): Mapping as a cultural and cognitive universal. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 93**,** 165-185.

Elwood, S. (2010): Geographic information science: emerging research on the societal implications of the geospatial web. *Progress in Human Geography,* 34**,** 349-357.

Lin, W. (2013): Situating performative neogeography. *Environment and Planning A,* 45**,** 37-54.

Schatzki, T. R. (2001): Introduction: Practice Theory. In: T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina & E. v. Savigny (Hrsg.): *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory,* London, New York: Routledge: 10-23.

Walters, W. (2002): Mapping Schengenland: denaturalizing the border. *Environment and Planning D,* 20**,** 561-580.

Walters, W. (2011): Mapping Schengenland: Die Grenze denaturalisieren. In: M. Pieper, T. Atzert, S. Karakayali & V. Tsianos (Hrsg.): *Biopolitik - in der Debatte,* Wiebaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: 305-337.