

Andersen, D.J. & E-K. Prokkola (2022). Introduction: Embedding Borderlands Resilience. In Borderlands Resilience: Transitions, Adaptation and Resistance at Borders, eds. D.J. Andersen & E-K, Prokkola. London, Routledge, pp. 1-18. ISBN: 9780367674274 (hbk), DOI: 10.4324/9781003131328-1

Introduction: Embedding Borderlands Resilience

Dorte Jagetic Andersen & Eeva-Kaisa Prokkola

Borderlands under cumulative stress

Borderlands almost worldwide are currently experiencing considerable transitions because of the intensifying global trend of tightening control at state borders. The slight optimism of moving into a ‘borderless’ world, present especially in Europe in the 1990s and early 2000, has vanished and the question of border security and national protectionism have veered to the front of political agendas. Border scholars have documented a shift from an open borders’ policy and transnational collaboration towards the building of new border fences (Brown 2010; Jones 2012; Bromley-Davenport et al. 2018; Paasi et al. 2019).

In a global context, border regions have suffered from the financial crisis of 2008 and faced the large influxes of refugees and migrants. In Europe, many countries that for decades strived to abolish the barriers that borders create, have since the 2015 ‘long summer of migration’ (Scheel 2015) continuously reinforced and strengthened border controls, also at internal Schengen borders. Moreover, the United Kingdom’s Brexit referendum and Trumpist politics underlined how strongly purported the need seem to be to restrict and control human mobilities. The geopolitical tensions after the Russian annexation of the Crimean Peninsula have greatly influenced cross-border mobilities and trade relations between Russia and its neighboring states were particularly affected (Koch & Vainikka 2019; Raudaskoski & Laine 2018). In 2020, we have experienced a dramatic change in the discourse of borders, that is, the closing of borders globally as a response to the COVID-19 pandemics. Alongside these ‘fast stress events’, borderlands face different slow crisis like climate and environmental change and prolonged industrial restructuring. These are often more difficult to measure because of their cumulative nature.

To respond to what is understood as a continuous, and as indicated above, cumulative crisis (Hudson 2010), academics from various disciplines, including governments and international organizations, have turned their theoretical and practical interests towards resilience. Resilience is abundantly examined in the context of climate change, risk management, urban transitions, and regional economic crisis, among others. This has opened promising avenues both in research and in policymaking, but also critique. The increasing interest towards resilience is often explained in terms of neoliberal governance, that is, policymakers are seeking to support the resilience of communities and are indicating a need to increase self-reliance and sustainability at the community level (OECD 2014; Wagner & Anholt 2016). Moreover, resilience is sometimes explained, in somewhat problematic ways, to stem from the fact that the opening of state borders has made places and regions more permeable to the effects of what were previously thought to be external processes. Consequently, the resilience debate contributes to the naturalization of borders as security measure (Prokkola 2021). However, if resilience is pretheoretically reduced into a neoliberal strategy, we will lack an understanding of complex mundane practices of people and communities (Wandji 2019). People can act on and transform the world, and they are not just objects of governance but also capable of resisting and finding alternative ways of living (Chandler & Reid 2016). Hence, the study of people and institutions in place and how reinventions are established in shifting conditions may offer a different version of ‘what counts as resilience’ than what the neoliberal discourse suggests.

The mushrooming resilience research touches upon various ecological, economic, political, and social questions. Regardless of its multidisciplinary and global reach, the questions of borders and their impact on resilience has only recently started to gain attention (Wandji 2019; Prokkola 2019; Korhonen et al. 2020). Recent research points out that resilience research and interventions usually take bounded regions and communities as a point of departure (Healey & Bristow 2019, 2020), even when the problems to be addressed would be highly transnational and global in their scope. It is important to recognize, however, that resilience is not inherently bound with some bordered, administrative entities. Cooperation across scales and times forms an essential factor for human adaptability as connections and networks across borders facilitate social interaction, the flow of ideas and resources (Davoudi et al. 2013; Korhonen et al. 2020). The neglect of the topic of borders is surprising considering that the significance of inter-scalar relations and border crossing was acknowledged already in the influential early writings of socio-ecological resilience in terms of ‘panarchy’ (Walker et al. 2004). To understand contemporary resilience processes, it is crucial to recognize the significance of borders and border crossing, as well as the political contestations, cultural values and norms that are manifested in and through bordering. Border studies has potential to engage with and contribute to the social scientific resilience discussion by examining what roles

borders have in the social and regional resilience processes and how borderland communities are adapting, renewing and resisting the border transitions and changing border environments. The view from borderlands complicates the prevailing, territorially bounded understandings of social resilience.

The collection provides new knowledge about the present, highly complex border transitions that are taking place at the EU internal and external border areas and globally, and their influence on the lives and mobilities of borderland people. The enduring question is, how different groups of people whose lives are always-already entangled with borders and border crossings maintain well-being and adaptive capacities in the face of border transitions, including reinforced securitization as well as new openings. A related question concerns the possibilities for resisting transition in the borderlands. This volume brings together border cases through which it examines the impacts that multilayered and multi-sited borders have in order to rethink our understandings of resilience. The focus is on different borderlands and groups of borderland people, and their practices, conceptions, memorizations and visual and textual representations of border transition, adaptation, coping strategies and capacities and resistance. Thus ‘seeing like a border’ (Rumford 2012), the book aims at opening a new path to understanding borderlands resilience.

Multidisciplinary resilience

The idea of resilience has its background in psychology, mathematics, and ecology. There is no consensus about the exact definition of resilience, however, and different disciplines underline different understandings and epistemic standpoints. Although the term social resilience – referring to the ability of groups and communities to cope with external stresses as a result of social, political and environmental change (Adger 2000; Walker et al. 2004) – is prolifically employed, the application of resilience theories in social scientific research is considered rather problematic from methodological and normative perspectives. Accordingly, there is a voluminous literature discussing in what ways social scientific resilience research is meaningful and important, or not (Joseph 2018; Brown 2013). The reason for the concern is understandable: whereas the ecological resilience research focuses on environmental hazards, in the social sciences discussions of resilience have been extended to include different human-made crisis like economic shocks, terrorism and even migration ‘crisis’, hence placing resilience first and foremost in political, cultural and normative context (Joseph 2018. pp. 13-14).

The traditional social-ecological perspective would direct its focus on border landscapes, infrastructure, and environmental design (Grichting & Michele Zebich-Knos 2017) but pays less attention to complex political and socio-cultural nature of borders. From a socio-ecological context, we appropriate the idea that social resilience expresses and is connected to materially, above

and beyond in how borderland communities (attempt to) restore the status quo. Inherent protective and wellbeing factors are emphasized, leading to questions of what are the assets, resources, and strengths possessed by the society or community making it able to cope when faced with adversity, including assets such as social and political capital, or certain cultural, institutional or economic factors. Different historical times are also compounded of different social and political assets. Accordingly, resilience is best understood as a continuous process to sustain wellbeing, not a trait or an outcome (Southwick et al. 2014, p. 4).

The socio-ecological resilience thinking has been developed further in regional studies and planning where it has opened a field of researching regional vulnerabilities and strengths from a more holistic perspective. The focus has been on factors that could possibly explain why other regions and communities succeed in adapting to changing economic and institutional conditions while others do not (Hassink 2010). Resilience is often approached as the capacity of complex regional ‘systems’ to accommodate shocks and to move back to the conditions before a shock. Recently many scholars have turned their interest towards the long-term capacity of regions and cities to renew their institutional structures and to find new growth paths (Boschma 2015). More understanding, however, is needed on the role of extra-national public policy, interregional and cross-border cooperation in regional resilience processes. Moreover, in borderlands and other transnational contexts, the fundamental question of resilience, namely ‘resilience for whom’, is highlighted and intimately intertwined with the institutional and everyday politics of solidarity (Healy & Bristow 2020).

There is also an interdisciplinary interest towards ‘structural resilience’, emphasizing how communities or societies have incorporated resilience over time, thereby making resilience an inherent characteristic of the community. Prasad et al. (2009) for instance refer to ‘the resilient society’, which has the ‘capacity of a community or society to adapt when exposed to hazard [...] A resilient society can withstand shocks and rebuild itself when necessary. Resilience in social systems has the added human capacity to anticipate and plan for the future.’ (p. 32). The claim is that one can speak about ‘resilient cultures’, thereby linking the notion of resilience to identity-formation. We discuss the links between resilient cultures and borderlands at length below.

In addition, resilience remains a complex construct because of the origins of the resilience debate in developmental psychology. In this context resilience concerns the individual, and focus is on the individual’s ability to adapt or manage sources of stress and trauma and thus ‘bounce back’ over a lifespan. Methodologically development psychology follows people (also located in groups, like families or institutions) over time. Psychological resilience discourses have attempted to ‘turn the tables’, so to speak, and move away from a purely deficit-based model of mental health to instead focus on strengths and competence-building when people experience stress. In this context,

the link to meaning making is emphasized, that is, the way human beings are making sense of things in the face of chaos, conflict, violence, etc. Resilience is understood to be supported by an ‘ability to hang on to a sense of hope that gives meaning and order to suffering in life and help articulate a coherent narrative to link the future to the past and present.’ (Southwick et al. 2014, p. 10) The focus on meaning making, narratives and imaginaries inform our accounts of resilience in this volume, also when our concern is with society, culture and community. Hence, and as we explore further below, we find the situational approach, the analyzes of resilience processes in their historical, political, and cultural contexts, useful (Cote & Nightingale 2012) in the study of borderlands.

Borderlands resilience

To conceptualize *borderlands resilience*, we have scrutinized both the concept of social resilience and the various meanings of ‘borderland’. The term borderland is usually used to refer to a region that straddles along, or across one or more international borders. In the modern system of states, borderlands have been often seen as peripheral and, in many ways, vulnerable regions (Sahlins 1989). This understanding has been partly challenged since the establishment of the free trade areas (EU, NAFTA) and border openings that shifted border regions from a peripheral position to a more economically and politically favourable one (Hanson 2011). Researchers have documented how the EU internal border regions and many global border cities have become important nodes for international flows (Sohn 2014). Moreover, some scholars like Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) have employed the concept of borderland as a synonym to cultural diversity and hybridity, thus paying attention to a very specific cultural and psychological meaning of borders and border crossing in the lives of people. In comparison, border studies usually underline the materiality of borders, yet no longer understood to materialize merely at the physical borderlines but extend as social-political institutions. Thus, the enacted effects of a border can take place in multiple locations, often in rather surprising ways (Andersen et al. 2012; Amilhat Szary & Giraut 2015; Laine 2016). To outline, a borderland refers to terrain and landscape where borders materializes in very powerful ways in the lives people.

Borderlands are without doubt specific ecological, political, and social environments where people and communities have historically had to find their ways to cope with and within the structures of two or more states, as well as their transitions. Changes in border areas, such as infrastructural ones and those related to cross-border mobilities and attitudes influence borderlanders’ lives and anticipates futures in different ways. It is rarely asked, however, how political borders and strengthened border securitization hinder the vernacular and regional resilience strategies in the face of environmental, economic and socio-cultural change. When border communities and mobile people

need to cope with manmade material border infrastructures, renewal and resistance may emerge as a response to such border transitions. Considering a recent trend away from open borders scenarios towards border securitization and unsolved political conflicts, these questions become highly pertinent. Secondly, borderlands, like other places and regions, are vulnerable to environmental hazards, economic shocks and social conflicts that are by no mean territorially fixed. Yet the means and strategies available for states and communities to cope with changes and risks are often territorially confined, focusing efforts on the geographical areas where countries have their sovereignty. From the perspective of borderlands resilience, the border location and the material and discursive nature of the border may have considerable, still largely unidentified impacts. The situational approach is important: European internal border areas and African postcolonial borderlands (Wandji 2019; Laine et al. 2020), for example, have rather different historical and cultural narratives of borders, yet in all borderlands people have strived to maintain their meaningful social-material relations, everyday activities, cultural heritage and identity. Borderlands are often seen as hybrid cultural spaces, yet connections across borders are not something that would automatically sustain in all border contexts when the conditions change. For understanding borderlands resilience from the perspective of identity and everyday lives, we need to pay attention to the different material and social institutions that both connect and bound and separate people.

‘People’s resilience’

When studying resilience in a context of borderlands, we need methodological approaches that are sensitive to agency and simultaneously pay attention to the context and institutional structures that support the processes associated with resilience. Unlike other life forms, human beings can make and plan interventions into the processes to diminish, sustain, and enhance resilience (Davoudi 2012). Therefore, to understand resilience processes, attention need to be paid to the capacity and interest of different groups of people to make and discuss, to forecasts and anticipate vulnerabilities and consciously change their behavior and/or location. As Gillian Bristow (2013) explains, resilience has a strong behavioral element, that is, resilience emerges not only from inherent institutional and structural conditions – like the establishment or withdrawal of border regulations – but also from the stimulus of people who are able to impact the trajectory of change. People may establish and find new creative ways to cope with the environmental, social and economic change and border transitions. As well as understanding how the borderland people adapt to stress situations, it is important to pay attention to how they interpret, articulate and make sense of different shocks, and how this influences their responses.

The study of borderlands resilience therefore includes the examination of the situational practices, experiences and narratives of borders, border crossing and belongings from the perspective of adaptation and resistance among different groups and communities. Of interest are, first, practices, social relations and belongings in which borders, and border crossings make a difference and, second, the ways through which people reorient their practices and relations with regards to border transitions. It is possible to gain understanding of the entanglement of resilience processes with the long lasting socio-cultural and geopolitical power relations and contestations by analyzing how these relations are manifested in border experiences and narratives providing guidance to adaptive pathways and resistance. At political borders, different versions of resilience may intertwine in surprising ways and people may intentionally ignore and resists the political discourses of resilience in their everyday environments, place-making, social, and cultural practices. Hence, our choice has been to problematize how resilience expresses in various ways in borderlands, including policy-making processes and the everyday life of people living there. We believe the ‘bottom-up approach’ is needed because the discussion of borders remains under-developed in the resilience literature. As Levine and Mosel tells us: ‘People are resilient to the degree that they avoid falling into unacceptable living conditions’ (2014) but the understanding of what are ‘unacceptable living conditions’ vary from place to place, from threat to threat and from stress to stress.

To understand borderlands resilience, close attention should be paid to people’s many ways of ‘making sense’ of what is ‘a life worth living’ and problematizing resilience at this level, involves posing simple questions about what it takes for people and communities to achieve a ‘good enough life’ in a real-life context. As Catherine Panter-Brink puts it: ‘I think that the most important and effective way to approach resilience is to start with listening to what people have to say about their everyday lives.’ (Southwick et al. 2014, p. 10) Resilience is a situated, interpretative process, involving what is already had (resources, skills, etc.) in combination with what is known (mobilizing possibilities). Hence, the attempt is to understand resilience intrinsically as dependent on the circumstances of those effected and the context in which stress is experienced, rather than normative ideals about ‘the good life’. Peoples stories of their cultural goals lead us to matters that elucidate their resilience (Ibid., p. 10)

Moreover, and following Wandji (2019), we emphasise the situated meaning of, not just resilience, but also of threat, shock, stress and disruption and how resilience also involves questioning notions of what is threatening and what is causing stress. Wandji (2019, p. 289) points out that while the conventional definition of resilience causes the notion of threat to be limited to an idea of catastrophe or shock, threats and shock can actually be slow moving and barely perceptible to people with an outside perspective. Instead, threat is reconfigured in terms of a ‘plurality of disruptions’,

something that embraces the idea of the need to be resilient in the face of constant challenges, but questions the idea that this has to be seen in terms of a dramatic external event. Zooming in on resilience processes in everyday life, we avoid getting trapped in the normative zero-sum game of applying a universalized notion of ‘the threat’ communities are exposed to, making the threat purely external and turning crisis into processes local communities are unable to control or be partly responsible for. Any universalized notion of threat runs the risk of depoliticising the threat itself, presenting it as if it was natural and unavoidable (Wandji 2019). Moving beyond presumed universality is important in relation to our understanding of borderlands agency, as well as how geopolitical borders may themselves present a threat in the borderlands (cf. above).

Our main concern could thus be termed ‘people’s resilience’, that is, different social groups’ ability to self-organise and mobilise skills and resources to create opportunities when faced with adversity and to act in solidarity when their community is disturbed and even disrupted. Hence, the most important insight we take with us from border studies, is that borders are complex, practical constellations and never either ‘good’ or ‘bad’:

‘That is why when we look at borders in terms of their supposed decline as barriers to movement we must balance this expectation with the evidence that many borders continue to act as gates, sometimes open, sometimes closed [...] and the business of enforcing the laws that swing such gates open and closed is in fact big business for many nations.’ (Donnan & Wilson 2010).

In doing this we keep a wary eye to questions concerning the unique status of borderlands in relation to other geographical areas. Borderlands are not equal but diverse since some borderlands are highly urbanized areas while others consist of hinterlands. Most borderlands have been influenced historically by conflict and populations movement (can be both voluntary and forced), they may be more diverse population wise than the national inland and they thus tend to adopt different approaches than the center when it comes to politics, identity-formation and ultimately also survival strategies. Memories and the geographical imagination may also be very different from that of the center and it may be more trained to withstand shock. Over the years various concepts have developed to characterize such places, concepts such as ‘bufferzones’ and ‘frontier regions’.

Borderlands identities as resilience

Closely related to discussions of ‘people’s resilience’ are questions concerning identity-formation and the role played by identities and identifications in borderlands resilience. In the resilience literature, identity issues are mainly dealt with from two perspectives; one a developmental

psychological perspective, focusing on the individual's identity-formation over time; and the other a socio-ecological perspective, where the concern is the identity of cultural systems. As the form of identity-formation we are concerned with in this volume is cultural and express in the self-identifications and othering processes of communities and social groups, we draw more on the socio-ecological understanding of identity and especially the notion of 'cultural resilience' which, 'has emerged to refer to this continuity of a co-constituted set of long-term relationships between the cultural identity of a people and the set of socio-ecological relationships within which this identity was founded' (Rotarangi & Stephenson 2014). It has for instance been shown how indigenous societies in the face of transformation manage to maintain: 'key elements of structure and identity that preserve their distinctness.' (ibid.) Here the focus is on the integrity of the 'system' and the maintenance of cultural structures and identity in the face of adversity, ultimately identifying general 'change drivers' involved when these communities manage to preserve their cultures and identities, and thereby survive as distinct cultural community.

However, when dealing with identity-formation, we challenge the static structural-functional understanding of collective identity-formation, locating in system-thinking, where culture (including collective identity) is understood as a stabilizing part of a broader set of socio-ecological relationships. Rather, our understanding of identity-formation is inspired by post-structuralism (Hall 1997), raising question concerning representation, meaning-making narratives and memory, ultimately asking if identities developing beyond and above geopolitical power-relations does not make for dynamic and complex components of both resilience and threat in everyday practice. This is to say that self-identification and othering processes are understood as resources appropriated by actors (ultimately as practices) rather than mere structural assets, thus also emphasizing agency and real-life complexity to questions concerning identity-formation. Again, the approach avoids universal claims about identity, presupposing that it is a positive asset when it works as a stabilizing factor. We illustrate how the self-identifications of people in the borderlands may be an important asset and resource involved in attempts to deal with geopolitical changes to borders and how processes of identity-formation might be understood as resources making borderlands resilient. Moreover, we also illustrate how exclusive, inflexible identity narratives may pose a threat to the integrity and wellbeing of borderlands, something, which is highlighted in for instance historical struggles between national identity-formation and regional identity-formations, or in a more contemporary setting in relation to the homogenous, ethnic identifications vs. more heterogenous, cosmopolitan identifications and heritage making (Andersen & Prokkola 2021). Identity-formation is thus understood as multiple practice and thereby much more than mere preservation and a matter of the survival of a cultural system.

This finally brings us to the complex relationship between resilience and continuity. The idea of ‘rebound and resume’ is often promoted by resilience discourse with the person, community, company or service provider expected to carry out business as usual. Yet resilience is also about adaptation or transformation, and a tension exists between embracing change and staying true to the previous status. Bieder (2020) for instance makes a positive case for the 1999 Greek-Turkish earthquake as a critical juncture, which enhanced cross-border cooperation in the region, hence the earthquake as exogenous shock had a positive effect on social structures in the borderlands. This tension between continuity and change is evident even in the original ecology discussions (Holling 1973), and it seems inherent to any discussion of resilience, also making it essential to understanding resilience as situated rather than universality.

As noted above, Wandji introduces the idea of disruption which might be said to challenge the idea of continuity or could be read as living with continuous disruption. He argues that the border community does not seek transformation and is resilient essentially in terms of adaptation as a form of continuity rather than change. The border-threat and all the obstacles this presents to communities becomes part of daily life and enables the continuity of social life across two countries divided by a political boundary and the complex, often disruptive, practices associated with this. What we are interested in is thus how such stress or disruption is experienced and dealt with by people in the local communities, including what would be the geographical imagination of people – what do people actually conceive as a threat – as well as how the same people absorb stress and disruption into everyday life and thereby work to mitigate and neutralize its impact on the geographical imagination and beyond. Ultimately this discussion brings us back to questions of identity-formation, and how identification is played out in local context. The question we raise, also by problematising identity-formation as long-term, historical processes of relating to geopolitical borders in everyday life, is whether inclusive and flexible self-identifications does not prove to be far more durable and sustainable than any essentialist quest for identity as preservation, especially in the face of adversity; when communities are in crisis, one-sided identifications closing of border imaginaries to multiple possibilities appear to work against the tackling of crisis.

Introducing the contributions

The book’s chapters approach this conceptual terrain by bringing together a range of cases, which both theorize various forms of borderlands resilience and exemplify contextually how they manifest. As argued above, our focus is on groups of people living in borderlands, analyzing their practices, conceptions, memorizations and representations of border transition, adaptation, coping strategies and capacities and resistance. The individual empirical studies provide thick and context-specific

understanding of regional and social resilience and non-resilience, considering the complex effects of policy strategies, institutional structure, historical development, culture, and identity (cf. Hill et al. 2008). As ensemble, the chapters provide a rich repertoire of studies on borders and borderland resilience, bridging well-established border theories and conceptualizations with the social scientific ideas of resilience. The studies thereby also provide insights into similarities between how groups of people and communities experience, adapt to, or resist transitions and uncertainties of border closures and securitization in their everyday lives. Thinking different, yet related forms of borderlands resilience through each other act as comparative lens aiming to trace relations between spatial and timely performances of resilience constituting, not just separated but also inter-related practices, materializations and affects. Hence, by bringing together different case studies of borderlands and resilience, it is possible to strengthen dialogue between different versions of social resilience concerning border areas, thereby generating new understanding through bridging governmental and bottom-up community resilience debates.

The collection begins from the conceptual horizons described above that resilience discussions are neglected in border literature and, at the same time, borderlands have so far been neglected in interdisciplinary social scientific resilience literature. Hence, the aim in this first part is to open the discussion of how the volume adds to the existing literature by offering theoretical and empirical insights into borderlands resilience and by examining what roles borders play in resilience. In her chapter, 'Border security interventions and borderland resilience', Eeva-Kaisa Prokkola illustrates how the top-down politics of resilience interlink with current ambivalent border governance and security thinking where the imaginaries of risk in a 'borderless world' are often employed to explain the increasing importance of developing resilience. Attention is paid to the processes and discourses of resilience regarding border security interventions in three different geo-historical contexts. Firstly, it considers the EU neighborhood policies and resilience building initiatives, conceptualizing these in terms of 'border-work' that stretches beyond the external borders of the Union. The chapter then shifts focus from top-down resilience discourses towards actual social resilience processes in the European borderlands. The second case examines borderland resilience vis-à-vis geopolitical events in the Finnish-Russian borderland after the Crimean Crisis. Thirdly, the chapter examines the changing political environment and border security efforts at the Finnish-Swedish borderland. Particular attention is directed to the border security interventions during the 2015 migration influx and the COVID-19 border regulations. The chapter sheds light on the contextual nature of border interventions and borderlands resilience and highlights the importance of recognizing the politics of resilience and values in the formation of the conception of resilience.

Katharina Koch's chapter, 'Cross-border Resilience in Higher Education: Brexit and its impact on Irish – Northern Irish University Cross-Border Cooperation', provides an example of the consequences of border transitions for the very successful cross-border cooperation between Ireland and Northern Ireland initiated with and since the Good Friday Agreement. The chapter approaches resilience from the perspective of mobility and examines cross-border cooperation between universities in Ireland and the implications of Brexit for student-, faculty- and staff mobility. Higher education contingency plans are understood as a preparatory form of resilience, emphasizing the role of renewal, adaptation and, to some extent also, resistance regarding relations at the shared border. Hence, the chapter illustrates the transformative power, agencies and preparations of borderland populations and professionals working in different sectors and creating new paths for cooperation and wellbeing in a changing border landscape. Moreover, the examination of cross-border resilience in higher education in the context of Brexit underlines the importance of taking a critical stance to the top-down political resilience debate. When neglecting the borderlands and the experience of actors living in them in these processes there is a risk that instruments supposed to work towards resilience have the exact opposite effect.

María Lois, Heriberto Cairo and Mariano García de las Heras' chapter "Politics of resilience... politics of borders? In-mobility, in-security and Schengen 'exceptional circumstances' in the time of COVID-19 at the Spanish-Portuguese border" contributes to understanding resilience in relation to borders at different scales. It focuses on the problematic relation between the resilience of borderland people as against state bordering yet illustrating the importance of revitalizing historical trajectories in a contemporary context. In the light of current border securitization and by using the COVID-19 border closures as example, the chapter explores the role of historical memory and cross border daily activities in borderlands resilience. In recent years, the European Union cross-border cooperation policies have turned internal borderlands into iconic places for aid and action programmes and border communities have been reframed in continuous processes of meaning-making, becoming discursive sites where various actors negotiate what is to be narrated and what spatial identities are mobilized. Currently, these narratives of open borders clash with intensifying border closures and state securitization in Europe, leaving the borderland populations to, yet again, reiterate their identities anew. The chapter brings forth how the resistance to the decisions of central governments as well as the historically formed 'border tactics' and creative resistance are central to understanding borderlands resilience in the exceptional COVID-19 circumstances. Together the chapters in part one thereby set the scene for understanding the significance of geopolitical border transitions, the shift from open border policy towards strengthened regulation, and that borderlands

processes of adapting to, renewing and resisting the changes and disruption of border landscape may differ considerably from the high-scale political expectancies.

Following up on the importance of ‘seeing like a border’ (cf. above; Rumford 2012), the chapters in the volume’s part two problematize the consequences of border transition and closure from the location of resilience among a range of social groups living in borderlands. The chapters offer an understanding of resilience among various cross-border communities, including cross-border commuters, farming communities, welcome cultures, property owners, transnational movements and stateless people. Their adaption, renewal and resistance are scrutinized through local and mundane interactions, incorporating also forms of silent resistance and recognizing the agency of vulnerable people. Together, the examples provide an understanding of how border closures and transitions trickier multiple yet related social resilience practices in geopolitically and socio-culturally different borderlands, including well-integrated European Union internal border areas, areas with European Union external borders and South Asian borderlands. While exploring resilience in these different contexts, the chapters bring in new theoretical takes on the processes through which resilience is build and maintained, and the limits of resilience.

In the first chapter in the section, ‘Resilience at Hungary’s borders: between everyday adaptations and political resistance’, Péter Balogh and Sara Svensson analyses resilience processes through cross-border communities’ relations in three different contexts in the Hungarian borderlands. In the first example, the focus is on cross-border agglomerations at Hungarian borders and how multi-ethnic communities adjust to geopolitically enforced changes of border security. These communities whose existence has for long been encouraged by the European Union, prove to be highly vulnerable to such changes because they dependent on the border’s openness. The second case illustrates how food production has become sites of important nationalist symbolism towards which local cross-border food communities may imply resistance or endorsement. Thirdly, with a focus on solidarity movements that support refugees, the chapter illustrates how borderlanders and their civil society organisations responded to Hungary’s policy of hardening borders from 2015 onward. The cases illustrate how borderlands resilience is a highly complex phenomenon, involving many social actors, who are affected by border transitions in various ways and thus expressive of multiple social resilience practices. Such practices do not just clash in their relation to geopolitical decision-making; they sometimes also stand in conflictual relations in the borderlands themselves, where social groups cope very differently with the stress of border closure.

Olga Hannonen’s chapter ‘Mobility turbulences and second-home resilience across the Finnish-Russian border’, explores social resilience and its limits by demonstrating the local effects

of national and international mobility regimes and the resilience practices of trans-border second-home movers in the Russian-Finnish borderlands. Whereas the border closures and shifts experience on the EU-internal borders are still moderate, the external borders have experienced tremendous shifts in recent years. With a brief period of openness and slight optimism about developing cross-border relations in the 1990s and early 2000s, the securitization of the Finnish-Russian border is again intensifying, considerably affecting mobile people whose social and economic lives have become entangled with border crossings. The examined case demonstrates a form of resilience incorporating silent resistance, a temporary coping strategy for second-home owners. These newly adapted practices of Russian second-home owners are reactions to changed circumstances, e.g., visa regimes and changing back policies, which are not sustainable over time but often rather inconsistent solutions to far greater problems. With the examples, the chapter provides an understanding of the limited space of coping mechanisms and agency at external EU-borders confronted with intensified mobility regulations and border transitions.

In the chapter, ‘Stateless’ yet resilient: Resistance, disruption, and movement along the border of Bangladesh and India’, Md Azmeary Ferdoush argues that frameworks investigating structural change in borderlands often lose sight of the nuances of daily life, especially when it comes to conceptualizing the resilience of stateless populations. With the focus on the Bangladesh-India border, the chapter complicates the prevailing narrative of ‘vulnerable populations’ as merely an object of governmental resilience building interventions, showing how even stateless borderland populations who are not endowed with citizenship rights possesses the capacity of acting to refuse the sovereign, as opposed to being a silent recipient of violence. It shows that expanding the focus of resilience study to a marginal borderland population, allows us to unearth overlooked, yet significant, layers of complexities and materiality on the ground. The chapter sums up this section by way of a criticism of Agamben, illustrating how paradoxes of sovereignty are reiterated as tensions in everyday life. Hence, the chapter opens up powerfully for an understanding of how some populations around the world may have an easier time dismantling, disrupting and ‘getting around’ borders than those, who are trained to believe in them as second nature, eternal value and unquestionable power.

Following up on the processes of dismantling, disrupting and getting around, the chapters in part three dig deeper into borderlands resilience by zooming in on questions of identity-formation and cultural representations in border and diaspora communities evolving historically. This section underlines self-identification and othering processes as resources appropriated by actors in the borderlands, thus emphasizing agency and real-life complexity to questions concerning identity-formation. It thereby helps underline the conclusions from the previous sections that borderlands resilience is not

determined by top-down politics but should be understood as practices of active socio-cultural resistance, adjustment and meddling with possibilities in intersection between geopolitics and everyday life. While doing this, the section is able to relate current debates on resilience and borders to historical processes, on the one hand, by asking how the historical processes are exemplary for borderlands resilience in a contemporary context and, on the other, by showing how borderlands resilience itself does not constitute instances of fire-fighting but rather depend on longer trajectories acting as stabilizing assets in the everyday life of the borderland populations. The chapters thus illustrate how resilience is tied with historical memory and ongoing struggles over people's identifications and this, again, in multiply ways.

In his chapter, 'Schleswig: From a Land in Between to a National Borderland', Steen Bo Frandsen examines resilience in a historical regional setting by way of developments in the border province of the composite Oldenburg monarchy; Schleswig, today the border region of Denmark and Germany. The chapter scrutinizes the dramatic border changes that the region experienced and how resilience formed over time in the region. It shows how state and nation-building processes, including national historiography, have done the utmost to erase regional identifications. Schleswig confronted the destructive power of national ideologies in the early 19th century making the regional identity almost non-existent today. The Schleswigians were literally forced to choose sides in conflicts between two states, the Danish and the German, each of which were going through very different developments. The chapter shows that borderlands resilience is tied with historical memory and the difficult struggle for identifications in the borderlands. One element of resilience is a fight against the other national ideology, an element which has been strong in the nationalizing narrative of the Danish state and where the border region of Schleswig became instrumental. Another element is the resilience of the regional identifications pressured by the conquering states and nationalizing narratives leaving limited space for borderlands resilience.

The next chapter, Christian Lamour and Paul Blanchemanche's 'A resilient Bel Paese? Investigating an Italian diasporic trans-locality in-between France and Luxembourg', shed light on resilience in the Italian diaspora found in a cross-border urban basin in-between France and Luxembourg in the course of an intensified urbanization of the border area. This resilience is approached through Appadurai's conceptualization of trans-locality as 'scapes', mobilised to show how cross-border relations and identity are maintained in flows located beyond the spaces of governance, and by linking their country and cultures of origin and their places of everyday life. Empirically, these flows are brought forth in the article by focusing on one structuring element, which has helped renew the meaning of an Italian diasporic space over the past 40 years: Italian film

festivals. Based on the analysis of the posters of the festival of Villerupt since the 1970s and its inclusion in contemporary narratives of local residents with Italian roots, the research shows that the resilience of the Italian cross-border trans-locality involves constant reiteration and reshuffling of connections between the inherited Italian culture and the urban space of the France/Luxembourg cross-border area. The example illustrates how resilience is a continuous process involving multiple appropriation and directions, as well as constant renegotiation even within the same social group and cultural community.

Juha Ridanpää's chapter, 'Minority language work as a socio-cultural resilience in border regions', also illustrates the ability of borderlands populations to mobilise identity-formation and historical memories as means of resilience, here with a focus on minority languages. The chapter focuses on Meänkieli language revitalization in the Swedish-Finnish borderland. As has been the case with several subaltern languages, a perception exists of Meänkieli speakers as passive, oppressed and harshly treated by the majority population and feelings of shame remain embedded in the self-perception of the speakers. In such cases, the question of linguistic sovereignty is inherently connected with the bitterness directed at the denial of belonging and cultural roots, and thus with processes of colonization, marginalization and trauma. In case of minority groups and languages, resilience thinking thereby provides an alternative to common top-down language policies, that is, it paves the way for a bottom-up approach where decisions are made by the affected populations. The chapter pays specific attention to the changing role of the Swedish-Finnish border, which, in relation to the Meänkieli language and identity represents a symbolic marker for a shameful past. The key question concerns how cultural activists involved in language revitalization re-narrativize their shifting identities by linking resilience thinking together with the practices of active socio-cultural resistance. Hence, the chapter illustrates how conflicting viewpoints over the socio-political status of minority languages in borderlands may, through creative resilience, interpret into simultaneous acceptance of uncertainty and hope for a better future for minorities.

In the book's final chapter, 'Line-practice as resilience strategy: The Istrian Experience', which is also concluding section three of the volume, Dorte Jagetic Andersen shed light on bordering practices located in intersections between geopolitical decisions and the everyday life of people living on the Italian, Slovenian and Croatian peninsula, Istria. Inspired by Sarah Green's notions of traces and tidemarks, as well as studies in the Western Balkans emphasizing the populations' ability to mimic power and play with identifications, the chapter opens towards an understanding of resilience as practice with multiple layers and possibilities ready to be adapted. On Istria, the constant re-drawing of borders by different geopolitical powers open possibilities for various kinds of 'line-practice' and new border closures are not just perceived as problematic for the

borderlands, rather, lines are worked with, crossed and overcome, and sometimes even used strategically to articulate diversity in an otherwise integrated space. The redrawing of borders, in whatever shape they may take, tend to integrate into everyday life practices. Hence, the chapter illuminates how intersections between geopolitics and everyday life express in a landscape of multiple line-practices, where resilience towards external stress is first and foremost one of coping, meddling, disrupting and in other ways working with geopolitical transformations imposed by powers located far away from the peninsula itself, and this through a constant renegotiation of what it is to be Istrian. The chapter thereby sums up the multiplicity of resilience practice exposed in the previous chapters, and how borderlands resilience needs to be perceived in situated expressions and enactment of social relations, movement, identity-formation and historical memory in borderlands effected by border transitions and closure.

References

- Adger, N 2000, 'Social and ecological resilience: are they related?', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 347-364.
- Amilhat Szary, A, Giraut, F 2015, *Borderities and the politics of contemporary mobile borders*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Andersen, D. J, Klatt, M, Sandberg, M (eds.) 2012, *The Border Multiple*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Andersen, D. J & Prokkola, E 2021, 'Heritage as Bordering: Heritage Making, Ontological Struggles and the Politics of Memory in the Croatian and Finnish Borderlands', *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, Vol 36, no 3, pp. 405-424.
- Bieber, F 2020, 'Global Nationalism in Times of the Covid-19 Pandemic', *Nationalities papers* (published online in advance of print).
- Boschma, R 2015, 'Evolutionary Economic Geography: Towards an Evolutionary Perspective on Regional Resilience', *Regional Studies* vol. 49, no 5, pp. 733-751.
- Bristow, G & Healey, A 2020, 'Supranational policy and economic shocks: the role of EU structural funds in the economic resilience of regions', in Bristow, G & Healy, A (eds) *Handbook of Regional Economic Resilience*. Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 280-298.
- Bromley-Davenport, H, Mac Leavy, J & Manley, D (2018) 'Brexit in Sunderland: The production of difference and division in the UK referendum on European Union membership', *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*. doi.org/10.1177/0263774X18804225
- Brown, K 2013, 'Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience?', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 38, no 1, pp. 107–117.

- Brown, W (2010) *Walled states, waning sovereignty*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Chandler, D & Reid, J 2016, *The Neoliberal Subject. Resilience, Adaption, Vulnerability*. Rowman and Littlefield, London.
- Christopherson, S, Michie, J & Tyler, P 2010, 'Regional resilience: theoretical and empirical perspectives', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, vol. 3, no 1, pp. 3–10.
- Christopherson, S & Rygiel, K 2015, "'Resiliency Humanitarianism': Responsibilizing Refugees through Humanitarian Emergency Governance in the Camp', *International Political Sociology*, vol. 9, no 4, pp. 333–351.
- Cote, M & Nightingale, A 2012, 'Resilience thinking meets social theory: Situating social change in socio-ecological systems (SES) research', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 36, no 4, pp. 475-489.
- Davoudi, S 2012, 'Climate risk and security: New meanings of 'the environment' in the English planning system', *European Planning Studies*, vol. 20, no 1, pp. 49–69.
- Donnan, H & Wilson, T (eds.) 2010, *A Companion to Border Studies*. Blackwell, Boston.
- Grichting, S & Zebich-Knos, M (eds.) 2017, *The Social Ecology of Border Landscapes. The Anthem Series on International Environmental Policy and Agreements*. Anthem Press, London.
- Hall, S 1996, 'Who Needs Identity?', in Hall, S & du Gay, P (eds.) *Question of Cultural Identity*. Sage, London.
- Hassink, R 2010, 'Regional Resilience: A Promising Concept to Explain Differences in Regional Economic Adaptability?', *Cambridge Journal of Regions Economy and Society*, vol. 3, no 1, pp. 45-58
- Healy, A, & Bristow, G 2019, 'Borderlines: Economic Resilience on the European Union's Eastern Periphery', in: Rouet, G & Pascariu, G (eds) *Resilience and the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Hill, E.W, Wial, H & Wolman, H 2008, Exploring regional resilience. Institute of Urban & Regional Development. IURD Working Paper Series. Paper WP-2008- 04.
- Holling, C.S 1973, 'Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems', *Annual review of Ecology and Systematics*, vol 4, pp- 1-23.
- Hudson, R 2010, 'Resilient regions in an uncertain world?', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, vol. 3, no 1, pp. 11–25.
- Jones, R 2012, *Border walls: Security and the war on terror in the United States, India, and Israel*. Zed Books, London.
- Joseph, N 2018, *Varieties of Resilience: Studies in governmentality*. Cambridge University Press.

- Koch, K & Vainikka, V 2019, 'The Geopolitical Production of Trust Discourses in Finland: Perspectives from the Finnish-Russian Border', *Journal of Borderlands Studies*. doi: 10.1080/08865655.2019.1646152
- Korhonen, J, Koskivaara, A, Makkonen, T, Yakusheva, N & A. Malkamäki 2021, 'Resilient cross-border regional innovation systems for sustainability? A systematic review of drivers and constraints', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, DOI: 10.1080/13511610.2020.1867518
- Laine, J 2016, 'The Multiscalar Production of Borders', *Geopolitics*, vol 21, no 3, pp. 465-482.
- Laine, J, Moyo, I & Nshimbi, C 2020, 'Borders as sites of encounter and contestation', in Changwe, C, Moyo, I & Laine, J (eds), *Borders, Sociocultural Encounters and Contestations: Southern African Experiences in Global View*. Routledge, London, pp. 3-14.
- Levine, S & Mosel, I 2014, *Supporting Resilience in Difficult Places. A Critical look at applying the resilience concept in places where crisis is the norm*. HPG commissioned, March 2014 <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8881.pdf> (accessed 24.08.2020).
- MacKinnon, D & Derickson, K 2012, 'From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of resilience policy and activism', *Progress in Human Geography*, vol 37, no. 2, pp. 253-270.
- OECD 2014, *Guidelines for resilience systems analysis*, OECD Publishing.
- Paasi, A, Prokkola, E-K, Saarinen, J, Zimmerbauer, K (eds.) 2019, *Borderless Worlds for Whom? Ethics, Moralities and Mobilities*. Routledge, London.
- Phelan, L, Henderson-Sellers, A & Taplin, R 2013, 'The Political Economy of Addressing the Climate Crisis in the Earth System: Undermining Perverse Resilience', *New Political Economy*, vol 18, no 2, pp. 198-226.
- Prasad, N, Ranghieri, F, Shah, F, Trohanis, Z, Kessler, E & Sinha, R 2009, *Climate Resilient Cities: A Primer on Reducing Vulnerability to Disasters*, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Raudaskoski, M & Laine, J 2018, 'Changing Perceptions of the Finnish-Russian Border in the Post-Cold War Context', in Laine, J, Liikanen, I & Scott, J.V (eds), *Post-Cold War Borders: Reframing Political Space in the EU's Eastern Europe*, Routledge, London, pp. 129-146.
- Rotarangi, S.J & Stephenson, J 2014, 'Resilience Pivots: Stability and Identity in a Social-Ecological-Cultural System', *Ecology and Society*, vol. 19, no 1, art. 28.
- Rumford, C 2012, 'Towards a multiperspectival study of borders', *Geopolitics*, vol. 17, pp. 887-902.
- Sahlins, P 1989, *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*, University of California Press.

- Scheel, S 2015, 'Das Konzept der Autonomie der Migration überdenken? – Yes Please! [Rethinking the Concept of Autonomy of Migration? – Yes Please!]', *Movements*, vol. 1, no 2, pp. 1-15.
- Sohn, C 2014, 'Modelling Cross-Border Integration: The Role of Borders as Resource', *Geopolitics*, vol 19, no 3, pp. 587-608.
- Southwick, S.M, Bonanno, G.A, Masten, A.S, Panter-Brink, C & Yehuda, R 2014, 'Resilience Definitions, Theory and Challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives', *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, vol. 5, no 1.
- Walker, B, Holling, C, Carpenter, S & Kinzig, A 2004, 'Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems', *Ecology and Society*, vol 9, no 2.
- Wandji, G 2019, 'Rethinking the time and space of resilience beyond the West: an example of the post-colonial border', *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses*, vol 7, no 3, pp. 288-303.