

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Borders *in a Hurry*

Lines on maps, and what they do to people

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 40

Go Deeper 45

Notes and Sources 47

Bibliography 54

The Whole Thing in One Page

A border looks like a line because an atlas has no room for the rest of it. On the ground, the legal boundary may follow a river, cut through a building, cross open desert or pass beneath the sea. It may be marked by concrete, wire, pillars, paint or nothing visible. What gives it force is organised authority: the power to decide which law applies, who belongs, what may cross and what follows when somebody rejects the answer.

The line is the thinnest part of the border.

First comes a territorial claim. Then come words intended to survive disagreement: a treaty, statute, judgment or administrative settlement. Surveyors translate those words into coordinates, channels and landmarks. Joint commissions place and repair markers. Customs officers classify goods. Passport officers classify people. Courts interpret old documents. Police and soldiers enforce the division when routine compliance fails. A functioning border is a jurisdictional switch surrounded by an operating apparatus.

That apparatus developed unevenly. Many earlier polities ruled cities, routes, tributaries and mobile communities without assigning every field to one exclusive state. Others used exact local limits and surveyed land. The later global order joined continuous territorial states to mutually recognised boundaries, national documentation, modern cartography and the expectation that almost every place must belong to one country. European empires helped spread this package globally through conquest and unequal bargaining, often overlaying historical political frontiers, seasonal routes and overlapping rights.

Its human effect is classification. A boundary can turn neighbours into foreigners, a local majority into a national minority, a field into foreign land and a family visit into an application. In 1947, the Radcliffe awards divided Punjab and Bengal after about five weeks of work and were published only after India and Pakistan had become independent. Roughly 14 to 15 million people reached another part of the new states by 1951, amid violence and

fear whose causes preceded the line. At Baarle, intricate Belgian and Dutch enclaves work through cooperation. Between India and Bangladesh, the 162 enclaves were exchanged in 2015 because elegant geometry had left residents struggling to reach the state that formally governed them.

Borders do not stop everything evenly. They admit selected passports, tax selected goods and channel selected journeys. The Berlin Wall was a 155-kilometre layered system built chiefly to prevent exit, yet even formidable barriers redirect behaviour as well as deter it. Borderlands answer with trade, kinship, bilingualism, brokerage, evasion and local agreements that capitals rarely planned.

The final turn is that control has spread away from the boundary. It now operates at a consulate before a visa is issued, at an airline desk before boarding, in a biometric database after arrival and inside ordinary institutions when status is checked. The attempt to make the territorial edge effective has made the operating border harder to locate.

Borders can reduce territorial uncertainty, organise public authority and make rights dependable. They can also preserve conquest, unequal mobility and categories imposed on people who had little part in choosing them. To understand one, ask where the legal line runs, how it was made, which machinery applies it and who bears its costs.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

Imagine an ordinary airport gate. Two travellers present themselves to the same machine and receive opposite futures. Their bodies may have travelled together. Their passports have not. One document opens the gate. The other triggers a visa check, questions or refusal. In a few seconds, nationality, legal status and travel history become permission or delay. The destination may still be hundreds of miles away.

That moment reveals the subject. Borders organise much more of ordinary life than the line on the map suggests. They decide which government may

tax you, arrest you, educate your children and protect your property. They affect which currency pays your wages, which medicines may be sold, which phone network connects, which food becomes dearer after customs and whether a marriage creates a right to live together. A boundary can remain quiet for decades while structuring documents, prices and public services around it.

It also distributes danger. For one person, crossing a border ends immediate violence and begins a claim for protection. For another, the same boundary prevents return to a home visible across a fence. A recognised line can reduce the risk that neighbouring states reopen old territorial claims. The same stability can freeze a partition that left communities divided or politically subordinate. Peace and justice do not always recommend the same map.

Borders make sovereignty concrete. The word sounds remote until an officer searches a vehicle, a court assigns an island or a survey team chooses which branch of a river carries the line. The small choices are often decisive. A treaty may say the boundary follows the main channel, but rivers divide and move. A mountain watershed may fork. A wall may stand inside one state's territory while the legal boundary lies metres away. At sea, a rock can matter because of the maritime claims argued around it. The atlas achieves certainty by hiding years of bargaining, measurement and maintenance. Those hidden choices matter when a fishing boat, a farm, an oil field or a village sits near the result. Technical language can decide which state receives the tax, patrols the water or recognises the deed.

The subject corrects two opposite fantasies. One treats borders as ancient natural facts waiting to be discovered. The other treats them as arbitrary marks with no defensible purpose. Most are political settlements shaped by terrain, force, law, administration, bargaining and inherited practice. Once recognised and maintained, they can make authority predictable. Their constructed character does not make them unreal. Money is constructed too, and scepticism does not settle the bill.

Borders become visible when rules change faster than roads. War, epidemic

disease, sanctions, independence or constitutional rupture can turn a familiar crossing into a queue and a lawful journey into an offence. Nothing physical need move. The permissions surrounding the route have changed. That contrast makes borders one of the clearest places to watch institutions convert geography into unequal consequences.

This book does not decide whether borders as a whole are good or bad. The question is too blunt. Nor does it attempt the complete politics of immigration, the full law of refugee protection or a catalogue of current territorial disputes. It asks the prior question that those debates often skip: how does a mapped line acquire the power to rearrange human lives?

Once the answer is visible, straight segments become compressed histories. A checkpoint becomes a sorting institution rather than scenery. A passport looks like a portable relationship with a state. An apparently open border becomes a decision about where control has moved. A distant dispute becomes an argument over law, resources, security and belonging attached to a place.

That shift matters because it replaces arguments about whether a line exists with harder questions about who built the system, whose movement it favours and who can challenge its mistakes.

The line is simple. The system around it is where the world changes.

The Core Ideas

Jurisdiction Made Geographical

A border is a decision about jurisdiction attached to a place. One authority claims the right to make and enforce public rules on one side; another claims it on the other. The course may follow a river, ridge, coastline or older political division, but the feature does not announce the law. Terrain presents possibilities. People assign legal meaning to them.

Baarle, on the Belgian-Dutch border, makes the distinction visible. The settlement contains 22 Belgian enclaves and eight Dutch enclaves, seven of

the Dutch parcels lying inside Belgian enclaves. White crosses mark sections of the boundary across pavements. It passes through gardens, shops and houses. A building's address commonly follows its front door, and a door cut by the line can carry two national house numbers. No obstacle compels this geometry. Treaties, property records, administrative cooperation and public acceptance keep assigning each patch to one jurisdiction.

A large obstacle may meanwhile fail to be a boundary. The Great Wall of China joined and extended defensive works across different periods, but it was never one fixed legal line enclosing an unchanging state. Rome's limes combined rivers, roads, forts, settlements and supervised zones. A fence can stand without separating sovereign jurisdictions. A boundary can separate them without any fence.

For the line to work, several forms of recognition must converge. Governments need a legal description. Officials need procedures for applying it. Other states must treat each side as belonging to a different authority. Residents organise property, taxation and movement around the division. These forms can split apart. A government may control territory that others regard as occupied. Two states may accept most of a boundary while disputing an island. A state may claim a remote district in law yet administer little there. The map then records a position in an argument rather than a settled fact.

The best mental model is a stack. At the base is a territorial claim. Above it sit legal texts, maps and coordinates. Markers and administrative routines translate them into the landscape. Documents connect people and goods to categories. Courts interpret disputes. Police and armed forces remain available when ordinary compliance fails. The consequences arrive at the top: taxation, voting, property, public services, military duties and permission to move.

Calling borders invented therefore settles little. Institutions are made by people and can still govern with force. A boundary becomes durable through repetition: a deed is registered, a child receives documents, a court applies

the law, a vehicle stops at a crossing. Millions of ordinary acts make the division look as if it had always been there.

The stack explains why a border can move without the mapped line changing. A recognised boundary may survive while the state loses the capacity to patrol it. The reverse is possible too. A government may project control abroad through visas and carriers, or inward through status checks, while the legal line stays fixed. Territorial title, recognition and effective control interact, but none can be read straight from the others.

The line matters because a system keeps turning location into authority. Remove enough of that system and a boundary thins towards a frontier. Extend it far enough and the border begins operating nowhere near the line.

Frontiers Became Lines Unevenly

For much of history, political power did not fit neatly inside closed shapes. Rulers controlled cities, routes, river valleys, ports, tax districts and communities that owed them loyalty. Authority weakened with distance, overlapped with rival claims and varied by purpose. A merchant might pay customs to one ruler, answer a property case in another court and recognise a religious authority whose territory ignored both. The edge was often a frontier: a broad, inhabited zone in which control thinned and identities mixed.

This was another way of organising power, not failed administration measured against a timeless ideal. Premodern states rarely had the staff, measurements or incentive to inspect every traveller and assign every field to one exclusive jurisdiction. Empires often preferred graduated control. They wanted tribute, troops and secure routes. Border peoples traded, translated, negotiated and absorbed danger between centres.

The shift towards continuous lines came from pressures that accumulated at different speeds. States expanded tax systems and standing armies. Land surveys and registers tied obligations to location. Printed maps encouraged rulers to view territory as a bounded object. Censuses classified populations. Diplomats wanted descriptions that could survive a dispute.

Exclusive territorial rule became a stronger ideal: one place, one final public authority, one recognised edge.

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 is often made the birthday of this order. The settlements mattered in ending wars and rearranging authority within Europe, but they did not announce a complete modern doctrine or dissolve layered jurisdiction overnight. Territorial states developed over centuries, and linear demarcations existed beyond Europe long before them. What became globally dominant was a package of continuous territory, international recognition, surveyable boundaries, national citizenship and an atlas that assigns nearly every habitable place to one state.

Empire spread that package through coercion and adaptation. European powers claimed territory, negotiated spheres of influence and converted colonial administration into bounded units. Officials often worked with poor information and extreme inequalities of power. Yet the familiar picture of Africa divided in one meeting is false. A 2025 study of 107 bilateral colonial borders places the median initial formation in 1891 and the median final formation in 1908, after the Berlin Conference. Under its coding, historical political frontiers directly affected 66 of those borders, while rivers and other major water bodies supplied frequent reference points.

Those findings correct a caricature, not the moral balance sheet. European states directed the colonial project and enforced settlements that African populations had no equal power to approve. Treaties with rulers could be translated selectively, extended beyond their terms or used within rivalries intensified by imperial expansion. Local knowledge and African political action influenced many lines without controlling the system that turned them into international borders.

The change from frontier to boundary brought clarity and compression. It reduced some overlapping claims and made jurisdiction easier to state. It also forced mobile, mixed and layered worlds into exclusive boxes. A frontier could accommodate ambiguity. A line demands an answer. The answer may prevent recurring interstate argument while creating a lasting problem for people who use land, language or kinship networks on both

sides.

Nationalism sharpened the demand. Once the state was imagined as the political home of a people, its edge became a statement about identity as well as administration. Governments used schools, censuses, official languages and citizenship rules to make the population resemble the national map more closely. The state did not merely enclose a finished nation. Its border helped produce one.

The modern map records no single transition and no neutral victory of precision. It is the result of states learning to make authority spatially exact, then extending that format through diplomacy, conquest, decolonisation and recognition. The line solved a problem of governing territory. It did not make human geography line-shaped.

A Border Must Be Built and Maintained

Drawing a boundary is easy until somebody must live by it. Specialists separate the work into stages because each can fail differently.

Definition establishes the legal basis and broad settlement. Delimitation translates that settlement into a description, map, coordinates or some combination of them. Demarcation places the agreed line on the ground through pillars, signs, cleared strips, fences or buoys. Administration keeps the result usable: officials maintain markers, operate crossings, share survey data, manage rivers, handle incidents and update records when the landscape changes.

An elegant treaty can therefore produce an ugly dispute. Phrases such as *the main channel* or *the crest of the mountains* look precise in a capital. On the ground, a river divides around islands, a watershed forks, or a village farms both slopes. An old map may have the wrong scale. Surveyors then discover that locating the line requires a political choice rather than a better tape measure.

So-called natural boundaries contain the same decisions. A river can be divided along one bank, its median line or the thalweg, commonly the

principal navigable channel. Whether a boundary moves when the river changes depends on the treaty and applicable law. Gradual movement and a sudden new channel may receive different treatment, but there is no automatic global rule. A mountain boundary may follow a watershed, a ridge or named peaks, which need not coincide. Terrain can aid defence and description without writing the settlement itself.

At sea, the geometry expands. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea permits a territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles from lawful baselines. The coastal state exercises sovereignty there, subject to rules including innocent passage. An exclusive economic zone may extend up to 200 nautical miles, giving specified rights over resources and certain activities without turning the water into land territory. Where coasts face one another, entitlements overlap. Islands, rocks, concave coasts and contested baselines can affect claims across large areas.

Better technology increases precision but does not remove judgement. Satellite positioning can locate a monument closely. High-resolution imagery can reveal a settlement missed by an old survey. Neither decides which legal source governs. Precision may sharpen conflict by destroying a useful vagueness that once allowed both sides to behave as if they had won.

Coordinates carry histories too. Older surveys used local datums and instruments. A coordinate copied into a modern global reference system can place the recorded point elsewhere unless it is transformed correctly. A treaty may give legal priority to a monument, map or verbal description when sources disagree. Boundary experts must establish the hierarchy rather than assuming the newest number is the truest answer.

The strongest boundaries are maintained relationships, not completed construction projects. Joint commissions inspect markers, agree survey methods and settle practical incidents before they become tests of national honour. A shepherd's path, damaged pillar or shifting channel stays local when officials trust one another. The same detail can become evidence in a sovereignty dispute when that relationship fails.

The atlas also hides height and depth. Airspace, subsoil, tunnels, pipelines and offshore reservoirs cross the same vertical plane under different legal rules. A boundary is drawn flat because paper is flat. The jurisdiction around it is three-dimensional and function-specific.

The border exists through translation: from political settlement to legal language, from language to location, and from location to routine. Each translation can clarify the previous one or expose what it concealed.

Borders Rank Movement

A border is often imagined as a barrier whose success is measured by how little crosses it. Most working borders perform a more selective task. They divide movement into categories: authorised, taxed, inspected, delayed, refused and concealed. The useful comparison is a filter, provided we remember that people design the filter and live with its errors.

Goods show the mechanism plainly. A lorry may cross after its operator declares the cargo, proves origin, pays duty and meets product rules. Another carrying prohibited plants, undeclared cash or controlled technology may be stopped. Customs does not aim to end trade. It makes trade legible and applies different conditions to different goods. Those conditions create price gaps, and price gaps create incentives for avoidance. Smuggling is one of the markets a border can produce.

People are ranked through nationality, citizenship, residence rights, visas, security information and purpose of travel. A passport ordinarily identifies its holder and records a legal relationship with the issuing state. Its practical value depends on the issuing state, the destination's rules and the traveller's other status. Two documents with equally reliable chips can carry sharply different access. Administrative precision does not create equality.

Systematic passport control is newer than its air of permanence. Safe-conducts and travel papers are old, but movement within and across parts of nineteenth-century Europe could involve fewer documentary barriers than the system built around the First World War. Wartime states tracked enemy nationals, deserters and departures. International meetings

then pursued more uniform passport practices. Once national documents became standard, lacking one became a condition that governments could recognise and enforce.

Protection law exposes the limits of ordinary entry categories. The 1951 Refugee Convention defines a refugee through a well-founded fear of persecution for specified reasons. Its non-refoulement rule ordinarily bars return to a territory where that person's life or freedom would be threatened on those grounds, subject to Article 33(2) of the Convention. Other non-return duties can arise under human-rights law, including the prohibition on sending someone to a real risk of torture. These rules do not abolish border control or grant a general right to choose any destination. They require states to distinguish a protection claim from an ordinary request to enter.

Statelessness exposes another gap. A world organised through nationality contains people whom no state considers its national under its law. Without recognised documents or consular protection, education, work, property, birth registration and travel can become difficult. The system still classifies such a person, often by prolonging uncertainty rather than resolving it.

Openness is relative. The Schengen framework covers 29 countries. Routine checks are removed at most shared internal borders, although Cyprus participates without yet having its internal controls lifted. The states remain distinct. Police powers, courts, taxes and citizenship rules still change at the line, and temporary checks can return under the rules. Common visa arrangements and coordination at the external border support easier movement inside.

Ask four questions before describing a border as open or closed: who may cross, what may cross, under which conditions, and at whose cost? Capital may travel in seconds while a worker waits months. A tourist may board with a visa waiver while a person with a possible protection claim cannot obtain the document a carrier expects. A tariff may slow goods while people pass freely. Permeability belongs to a flow, not to the line in the abstract.

Borders regulate exit as well as entry. States have restricted emigration, pursued deserters and controlled the movement of capital. The Berlin Wall was built mainly to prevent departure from East Germany through Berlin. Freedom of movement therefore requires two permissions often separated in debate: the ability to leave and the ability to enter elsewhere.

The central power of a border is classification backed by consequences. It converts political choices about belonging, risk and exchange into routine administrative decisions. The queue may look neutral. The categories seldom are.

Exact Lines Create Minorities

A boundary does not move only territory. It changes the political position of everyone it surrounds. People who were neighbours under one administration may become citizens of different states. A majority counted across a valley becomes a minority counted within a new province. A language community that governed locally may depend on guarantees from a distant capital. The line changes scale, and scale changes power.

Partition makes the mechanism brutal because the legal answer arrives faster than social life can adapt. In 1947, commissions chaired by Cyril Radcliffe divided Punjab and Bengal between India and Pakistan under severe time pressure. Punjab contained Sikh, Muslim and Hindu populations mixed across districts, cities, irrigation networks and property. Bengal had its own pattern of religious majorities, trade and transport. No continuous line could place every community, shrine, canal and market inside the state its users preferred.

The awards were published on 17 August, after independence on 14 and 15 August. Violence, political mobilisation and fear were already present. The territorial verdict intensified uncertainty and directed flight as people tried to reach the side on which they expected safety. By 1951, census reconstruction records about 14.5 million arrivals across the new states and estimates higher departures from home. Death estimates vary more widely. The line did not create communal politics or every act of violence. It gave

those forces an urgent geography.

Colonial boundaries produced slower transformations across Africa and elsewhere. They joined some regions, divided others and tied peripheral societies to new administrative centres. Calling every line arbitrary misses important variation. A 2025 systematic study found that historical political frontiers mattered in nearly two-thirds of its 107 bilateral cases. Major water bodies also supplied frequent focal points. That challenges the idea that European officials drew most boundaries once, blindly and at random.

It does not show that colonial boundaries were democratic, benign or faithful to local identities. The study asks how European powers located lines while coordinating their own claims. African rulers and political geographies sometimes influenced those decisions under a system whose coercive power they did not control. A frontier used to help one empire bargain with another is not a border chosen by the population who would live under it.

After decolonisation, new states faced a trap. Revising inherited boundaries in the name of ethnic or historical justice risked a chain of rival claims. A transfer that made one group a majority could strand another. Historical maps offered several dates and incompatible answers. *Uti possidetis*, the principle that former administrative boundaries become international borders at independence, favoured stability by freezing the territorial question.

African governments affirmed respect for inherited borders through the Organization of African Unity in 1964. The decision did not endorse colonial rule. It recognised the danger that independence could become the opening round of permanent boundary war. Courts later used the principle beyond its original Latin American and African settings.

Stability does not settle justice. The International Court of Justice could decide that legal title to the Bakassi Peninsula lay with Cameroon, as it did in 2002, while leaving governments to manage withdrawal, nationality, residence and local livelihoods. A judgment clarifies the interstate claim. It cannot make social connections disappear.

Boundaries therefore perform two tasks that pull apart. They reduce

uncertainty by stating where jurisdiction changes. They compress mixed histories into binary outcomes. A line may be preferable to recurring war and still leave a credible grievance. Its age proves only that changing it is costly, not that the original settlement was fair.

Demography then feeds back into territorial politics. Groups that fear becoming minorities treat censuses, elections, migration and settlement as contests over the future map. Governments may encourage loyal populations to move into disputed areas or describe ordinary cross-border ties as threats. A border classifies a population, then changes where people live and how they identify. The line's social consequences help reproduce the line.

Borderlands Make the Line Work

From a capital, a border is the state's outer edge. From a borderland, it may be the centre of daily life. Families, markets, roads and languages can predate the line and continue across it. Residents learn to use, negotiate or evade the difference between jurisdictions. Their routines are part of how the border operates.

The difference can be punishing. A farmer may need permission to reach land now lying abroad. A hospital can be near in kilometres and inaccessible in law. Police may stop at the line while a suspect keeps moving. Schools teach different national histories to children whose grandparents shared a village. Where documents are weak or nationality disputed, registering a birth, receiving electricity or inheriting property can become a test of state membership.

The same differences create opportunity. Fuel prices, wages, taxes, subsidies and product rules diverge across the boundary. Twin towns develop shopping and labour patterns around the gap. Traders learn two systems. Languages mix. Informal routes persist because the official line interrupts a practical region that people still use as one. Smugglers, customs officers and brokers may become mutually dependent even while the state condemns the trade.

Emergencies reveal the dependence. Closing a crossing can separate patients from the nearest clinic, workers from farms and rescue services from the quickest road. National rules may change overnight while rivers and transport networks remain where they were. Border districts then rely on local permits, shared facilities or informal cooperation to keep ordinary life functioning.

Baarle turns the mechanism into street furniture. Belgian and Dutch enclaves interlock through homes and businesses. The line crosses floors and pavements, while front doors help assign municipal addresses. The arrangement is intricate but workable because records are trusted, both states cooperate and movement in the wider European setting is easy. Geometry that would be intolerable between hostile governments becomes a managed inconvenience.

The former India-Bangladesh enclaves showed the opposite. Until the 2015 exchange, 111 Indian enclaves lay inside Bangladesh and 51 Bangladeshi enclaves lay inside India. Some contained counter-enclaves. Residents could be surrounded by one state while formally belonging to another, with uncertain access to police, schools, health care, electricity and documents. What looked like a puzzle in an atlas was a problem of public authority.

India and Bangladesh simplified the boundary through agreement, exchanged the enclaves and gave residents a choice within the implementation process. The repair worked because it brought jurisdiction closer to the lives it was meant to organise. A less interesting map produced a more usable state.

Borderlands resist clean national stories. Kinship crosses the line. Minorities resemble communities on the other side. A local official may tolerate a practice that a minister denounces. This does not make border residents naturally peaceful or cosmopolitan. Border regions can be militarised, exploited and fiercely nationalist. Their distinctive knowledge is practical: people who meet the line repeatedly learn which parts are rigid, negotiable or dependent on personal relations.

That knowledge can become institutional design. States open local crossings, recognise seasonal grazing, issue resident permits, coordinate ambulances and maintain shared water systems. Such arrangements make a hard legal line liveable without changing sovereignty. Enforcement and adaptation are not opposites. A border endures partly because people develop ways to cross or work around it without contesting the final jurisdiction.

The treaty records the intended division. The borderland reveals the bargain that keeps it usable. The line may be drawn from the centre, but its daily credibility is produced at the edge.

Control Spreads Beyond the Line

The familiar border sits at a port, road or airport where territory changes. That location creates a limit for the state. By the time a traveller reaches it, the person is physically present, the journey has occurred and a legal claim may have to be heard. Governments have therefore moved parts of border control outward, forward and inward.

Outward control begins with permission to approach. Consulates and online systems decide visas abroad. Governments share watchlists and immigration data. Some fund or pressure other states to stop departures. Maritime operations may intercept vessels before they reach the intended coast. These arrangements can move practical control beyond the territory while making legal responsibility harder to locate.

Forward control uses transport companies. Many states penalise carriers that bring passengers without required documents, so airlines and ferry operators check passports and visas before boarding. The employee is not deciding refugee status. The company decides whether it will carry a person under rules that expose it to cost or return obligations. Someone who may wish to ask a state for protection can therefore be stopped before reaching the official process. The public rule operates through a private refusal.

Inward control continues after entry. Depending on the jurisdiction, employers, landlords, universities, banks or public agencies may have

duties to check status. Police and administrative databases can connect identity to immigration records. A person's permission can expire while their location does not change. The border then appears inside ordinary life as a demand for evidence of lawful presence.

Digital systems join these decisions across time. The European Entry/Exit System began progressive roll-out on 12 October 2025 and became fully operational at external border crossing points in all 29 participating countries on 10 April 2026. For covered non-EU nationals making short stays, it replaces passport stamps with digital records of entries, exits and refusals, alongside travel-document data, facial images and fingerprints. A decision made at one crossing can shape another encounter elsewhere.

This completes the causal loop. The territorial state drew sharper lines to make authority exclusive and governable. Faster transport, commercial networks, legal claims and irregular routes then exposed the limits of control at one place. States responded by distributing classification among institutions that could act before or after the crossing. The attempt to perfect the geographical line produced an administrative network.

The network can be effective and still fail. Data may be wrong. A category can lag behind a life. Private actors may refuse defensively because the penalty for carrying the wrong person is clearer than the penalty for excluding one who might have a claim. Automated matching can increase consistency while attaching political rules to an appearance of technical objectivity.

Responsibility becomes diffuse. A border guard acts visibly under public law. A carrier, software supplier or employer may apply the same status rule through a commercial or administrative process with weaker explanation. Courts have had to ask when a state remains responsible for control exercised abroad, at sea or through another actor. The answer varies with facts and law; the institutional question should remain visible: who designed the rule, controlled its use and could remedy the decision?

The modern border is both precise and difficult to locate. It remains a legal

line between jurisdictions. It is also a sequence of decisions spread through documents, screens and organisations. Jurisdiction begins attached to geography. When it tries to govern movement that refuses to stay at one geographical point, the apparatus follows the movement. The line remains fixed. The border travels.

How It Actually Works

Before the continuous line

A ruler can know that power ends without being able to say where.

For most of history, control was concentrated around courts, towns, roads, ports, farms and garrisons. It weakened with distance. A tax collector might reach a settled valley but not the upland pasture beyond it. A fortress could command a crossing while mobile communities used routes that no official watched for most of the year. Authority often faded, overlapped or changed by season and purpose.

Ancient empires marked limits and defended approaches, but their edges rarely formed the complete territorial containers shown in a modern atlas. Rome maintained linear obstacles in places, but its frontiers also comprised roads, river lines, forts, settlements and broad military districts. Chinese states built, joined and abandoned defensive walls in different periods. These systems organised movement and danger. They did not state that every point within a continuous perimeter belonged to one exclusive sovereign authority.

Societies without a continuous state line were not indifferent to territory. Pastoral communities distinguished grazing grounds, wells and seasonal routes. Villages could defend fields or forests while sharing other resources. Indigenous polities maintained limits through kinship, tribute, alliance, ritual and use, often with different edges for different purposes. Such arrangements could be precise where precision mattered and flexible elsewhere. Calling the land empty or unbounded often reflected the later administrator's inability, or refusal, to recognise claims that were not written

as one exclusive perimeter.

Dynastic Europe remained untidy for similar reasons. Marriage, inheritance, conquest and feudal obligation produced scattered possessions and overlapping rights. A village might owe dues to one lord, answer serious cases in another court and recognise a church authority whose geography ignored both. Enclaves were common because political order had accumulated as relationships, not been designed as a clean shape.

The decisive change was a growing demand that public authority become exclusive, measurable and complete. The map would no longer show where control usually worked. It would define the area within which one state claimed the final word.

A state learns to see an edge

That demand gathered force gradually. Central governments expanded taxation, armies and record-keeping. Land registers connected ownership to location. Roads and postal systems tied distant districts to a centre. Censuses sorted residents into categories. Printed maps allowed rulers and officials to inspect their territory as one bounded object.

The image began to influence the administration. A vague frontier looked unfinished once a coloured state had a crisp outline on paper. An enclave looked like a defect. A scattered jurisdiction looked weak. Governments tried to make the ground resemble the map by surveying land, standardising local rule and converting customary arrangements into written boundaries.

The Pyrenees show how long that work could take. The Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659 settled dynastic and territorial questions between France and Spain, but it did not create every metre of the present boundary in one act. Mountain communities used paths, pastures and shared resources that did not fit a pure national division. Later treaties, commissions and local agreements made the line firmer over two centuries. Central authority advanced by negotiating with practices already there.

This is why the Peace of Westphalia cannot bear the role often assigned to

it. The settlements of 1648 mattered, but they did not invent territorial sovereignty in a single diplomatic moment. The modern border emerged through repeated changes in administration, warfare, measurement and recognition. Its power came from a package, not a birthday.

Surveying carried political decisions into the field. A treaty might refer to the source of a river, the highest ridge or a latitude that negotiators had never seen. Teams then had to locate the feature, choose instruments and decide what to do when the description did not fit the terrain. Measurement could narrow disagreement. It could also reveal that the disagreement had been hidden inside the words.

Empire partitions inhabited space

European imperial expansion exported this territorial format under severe inequalities of power. Administrators wanted districts that could be taxed, policed and compared. Diplomats wanted claims that rival empires could recognise. Surveyors, soldiers, traders and local intermediaries converted imperfect knowledge into lines whose consequences would outlast the governments that drew them.

The Berlin Conference of 1884 to 1885 became the symbol of the partition of Africa, but it is a poor single explanation. The conference addressed commerce and navigation, recognised the Congo Free State project and adopted limited rules around occupation. Most bilateral borders were formed or finalised later through treaties, military campaigns, surveys, revisions and negotiations among European powers and African rulers.

Recent systematic research makes the timing clearer. Across 107 bilateral colonial borders, the median initial formation year was 1891 and the median final formation year was 1908. Under the study's coding, historical political frontiers influenced 62 per cent of the cases, and major water bodies were common reference points. The continent was not divided by officials drawing at random on a blank map.

That correction does not convert coercion into consent. European powers controlled the wider project, possessed the military advantage and decided

which agreements would be recognised internationally. African rulers and political geography affected many negotiations, but influence within an unequal system is not authorship of the system. Some boundaries tracked older frontiers. Others cut through mobile societies, joined regions with weak prior connections or translated flexible zones into rigid divisions.

The 1916 Sykes-Picot agreement shows a related compression in the Middle East. Britain and France proposed zones of control in Ottoman Arab lands during the First World War. The secret agreement exposed imperial intent and influenced later expectations, but much of its arrangement was never implemented as drawn. War, Ottoman collapse, Arab politics, mandates and later British and French decisions produced the eventual state system. One notorious map cannot explain every present border.

Colonial administration gave internal divisions a second life. When empire ended, those district and provincial edges often became the most readily available boundaries for new states. A line designed for imperial management could become an international border without moving.

The passport enters the pocket

Territory could be bounded before every traveller was documented. The border became more intimate when states learned to connect a person to nationality through standard papers.

Passports and safe-conducts are old, but documentary control was uneven. During parts of the nineteenth century, travel within and across Europe could involve fewer formal barriers than the twentieth-century system that followed. Railways and steamships increased mobility while liberal governments removed some older restrictions.

The First World War reversed the direction. Belligerent states feared spies, deserters and enemy nationals. They imposed passport and visa controls, registered foreigners and regulated departure as well as entry. Emergency powers proved useful after the emergency. A League of Nations conference in 1920 sought greater uniformity in passports, and the document became normal enough that lacking one became an administrative condition in its

own right.

The change created a hard question for people without effective national protection. Revolution, war and the redrawing of Europe left refugees who could not rely on a state to document or receive them. The League of Nations developed the Nansen passport for certain refugees and stateless people. It did not grant citizenship. It supplied recognised travel papers for a world increasingly organised around evidence of national membership.

The passport joined two systems. The boundary said where state authority changed. The document said which state recognised a person and under what identity. The border could now travel in a pocket, long before it moved into a database.

Five weeks for Punjab and Bengal

In July 1947, Cyril Radcliffe arrived in British India to chair commissions dividing Punjab and Bengal. He had not visited India before. British rule was due to end in mid-August. The timetable left roughly five weeks to convert disputed political demands, religious demography, transport, irrigation and local economies into two territorial awards.

The impossible part was not Radcliffe's lack of a sufficiently sharp pencil. Punjab and Bengal contained mixed populations, linked markets, canals, railway lines, cities and sacred sites. Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs were not arranged in continuous national blocks. Any line would create minorities and cut practical systems.

Commission members advanced rival claims through census figures, maps and arguments about communications and other factors. The process had little time for field investigation. Radcliffe made the final decisions, then left. Independence came to Pakistan on 14 August and India on 15 August. The awards were published on 17 August. For two days, sovereignty had changed while communities near the new boundary still lacked an official answer about which state contained them.

Violence and political mobilisation preceded the publication. The line did not

invent communal fear or every cause of killing. It gave them a territorial direction. Families left homes to reach the side where they expected safety. Trains and roads carried people in opposite directions. Roughly 14 to 15 million crossed the new borders during Partition and its first four years, although totals vary according to the dates and populations counted. Estimates of deaths vary more widely and do not justify a neat figure.

The legal task was completed. The human geography was not. A boundary commission had converted a political settlement into a line, but millions of people then had to move, remain as minorities or rebuild relationships across it. This is what exactness can cost when the deadline belongs to government and the landscape belongs to everyone else.

The inherited map becomes international

Decolonisation after 1945 created states whose external borders had often been internal colonial divisions. Revising them could appear to repair injustice. It could also start an endless sequence of rival claims.

A state might demand a district because most residents shared its language. Its neighbour could cite an older kingdom, a river basin or a different census. Transfer could turn one minority into a majority while creating another minority in the same act. There was no historical date from which one uncontested map could be recovered.

African governments largely chose to preserve inherited borders. In 1964, the Organization of African Unity affirmed respect for the borders existing at independence. This did not praise colonial partition. It treated territorial stability as protection against a continent-wide reopening of claims.

International law expressed the approach through *uti possidetis*. Former administrative boundaries become international boundaries at independence. The International Court of Justice applied the principle in the 1986 frontier dispute between Burkina Faso and Mali, while recognising the tension between inherited lines and self-determination. The rule favours a known boundary over a competition to redesign the state around older identities.

The bargain can be effective and unjust at once. Recognition reduces uncertainty and can lower the incentive for interstate revision. It also freezes some coercive settlements and leaves border regions peripheral. A bad origin does not prevent a line from becoming useful. A useful line does not become fair through age.

A wall opens before it falls

On 13 August 1961, East German forces began sealing streets and routes between East and West Berlin. The German Democratic Republic was losing large numbers of people through the divided city. The barrier was built mainly to prevent departure, which already complicates the usual image of a border wall defending against entry.

Wire and blocked streets developed into a layered system around West Berlin, about 155 kilometres long. Concrete walls formed one part. Patrol roads, fences, lighting, alarms, watchtowers and cleared observation zones made the physical obstacle enforceable. Buildings on the boundary were sealed or demolished. Some rail stations beneath East Berlin became ghost stations through which western trains passed without stopping.

The system sharply reduced unauthorised departure through Berlin. People still tunnelled, hid in vehicles, used forged documents and attempted dangerous crossings. Some were killed. The wall worked by slowing movement, concentrating it at controlled points and attaching a threat to evasion. Concrete mattered because institutions maintained it.

On 9 November 1989, confused travel instructions were announced at a televised press conference. Crowds formed at crossing points. Border guards had no clear operational order for the pressure in front of them. At half past eleven, Bornholmer Strasse opened to all Berliners, and other crossings followed. The concrete remained in place. The enforcement system yielded first.

The same caution applies to contemporary barriers. Evidence from the United States-Mexico border shows that intensified enforcement altered routes, repeat crossing and settlement behaviour in that setting. Other

studies find that walls can reduce detected crossings at fortified segments while redirecting movement. Those results do not establish one universal effect. Terrain, surveillance, legal alternatives, labour demand and routes around the barrier matter. A wall is a component with local consequences inside a larger system.

Repairing lines without redrawing the world

Most boundary work is less dramatic than partition or collapse. Joint commissions replace pillars, clear sight lines, reconcile maps and decide which river channel carries the boundary. Courts interpret old treaties. States exchange land or adjust segments. The work is slow because a legal answer must be translated into roads, homes and public administration.

The Bakassi Peninsula dispute between Cameroon and Nigeria involved colonial-era instruments, state practice, resources and residents. In 2002, the International Court of Justice held that sovereignty lay with Cameroon. A judgment settled legal title between the states, but implementation required withdrawal, transfer of authority and arrangements for affected communities. A United Nations-backed process helped carry the decision from courtroom to peninsula.

The India-Bangladesh enclaves required a different repair. Before the 2015 exchange, India held 111 pockets within Bangladesh and Bangladesh held 51 within India, some nested again. Residents could formally belong to a state they could not reach without crossing another. Access to police, electricity, schools, health care and identity documents was often uncertain.

Agreements existed for years before political and constitutional obstacles were resolved. At the end of July 2015, the states exchanged the enclaves and implemented choices concerning nationality and residence. They did not abolish the international boundary. They removed a geometry that prevented public authority from reaching people cleanly. The map became less entertaining and the state more usable.

These repairs show why recognised borders persist. Roads lead to official crossings. Property systems assume a jurisdiction. Agencies learn to

cooperate. Residents organise lives around the difference. Changing the line carries new costs even when its origin was poor. Repair often succeeds by making the existing division liveable rather than pretending history can be reset.

The border leaves the border

The late twentieth century appeared to weaken boundaries in parts of Europe. The Schengen arrangements removed routine checks at many internal crossings. Commuters and freight moved faster. Former military edges became shared labour markets. Yet the participating states kept their courts, taxes, citizenship rules and territorial authority. Easier internal movement depended partly on cooperation over visas, policing, information and the external edge.

Control also moved earlier in the journey. Visa systems screened travellers abroad. Carrier-liability rules encouraged airlines and ferry companies to inspect documents before boarding. A person could encounter another state's admission rules at a check-in desk without approaching its territory. The border acquired private assistants.

It moved later as well. States linked identity to immigration records and, in some jurisdictions, required employers or other institutions to check status. Permission could expire after a person had crossed. The relevant decision then appeared in a workplace, application form or database query rather than at a fence.

The European Entry/Exit System completes the pattern in digital form. Its phased introduction began on 12 October 2025, and it became fully operational on 10 April 2026. At the external borders of the 29 European countries using it, the system registers covered non-EU nationals travelling for a short stay. It records entries, exits and refusals alongside travel-document and biometric data. A decision once left in ink inside one passport became information available to border authorities later and elsewhere.

The broad frontier became a line. The line acquired surveys, documents and

checkpoints. Movement then revealed how little could be governed at a single crossing. States spread control through consulates, carriers, databases and internal checks. The legal boundary still tells us where jurisdiction changes. The operating border is the chain of decisions that makes that change count.

How we know

Borders leave evidence in different registers. Treaties, judgments and official maps show what states agreed or claimed. Survey reports, boundary pillars and cadastral plans show how words were translated onto land. Passport rules, customs records and administrative files reveal how movement was classified. Oral histories, local newspapers and ethnography show what official records often miss: the routes, bargains and losses through which residents made a boundary liveable.

Each source has a bias. Maps make uncertainty look settled. Treaties preserve the language of actors with power to sign. Colonial archives describe societies through administrative needs. Enforcement statistics count detected events more readily than successful unseen ones, so a rise or fall can reflect surveillance as well as movement. Memories of partition and divided cities are indispensable but shaped by trauma, silence and later national stories.

The strongest account compares legal intention with physical and lived operation. A boundary is understood when the treaty, marker, checkpoint and household tell compatible parts of the story. Where they diverge, the divergence is often the important evidence.

What People Get Wrong

"Borders are natural"

Mountains, rivers, deserts and seas can make movement harder and provide convenient descriptions. They do not contain legal instructions. A river boundary still requires a choice of bank, median line or navigable channel, plus rules for islands and changes of course. A mountain range may contain several ridges and communities using both sides.

The myth became persuasive because physical barriers influence defence and settlement, and because maps draw political and natural features with similar certainty. Once a boundary follows a river for generations, the political choice disappears into the landscape.

The correction matters because calling a border natural closes questions that remain open. It disguises who selected the feature, which local routes were cut and why one legal rule prevailed. Terrain constrains boundary-making. It does not author it.

The label can also legitimise expansion. Governments have described mountains, deserts or rivers as a state's proper edge when political control and settlement did not match the claim. Nature then appears to demand a boundary that leaders wanted for strategic reasons. A programme of power becomes geographical common sense.

"Westphalia invented the modern border"

The settlements of 1648 ended major European wars and altered relations among rulers within the Holy Roman Empire. They did not create sovereign territorial states in one stroke, announce a complete modern border doctrine or eliminate overlapping authority.

The story became popular because fields like birthdays. International relations courses could begin with a date, while later states read their own order backwards into a famous settlement. The real change was slower: central administration, mapping, military finance, land surveys, diplomacy

and legal practice made exclusive territorial rule more workable over centuries.

Westphalia belongs in that history, but treating it as the switch hides variation across Europe and developments elsewhere. It also suggests that a legal idea produced the state system before states possessed the machinery to apply it.

The myth narrows the cast as well. It makes one European diplomatic settlement the source of a worldwide order and turns colonial expansion into transmission. The global border system was built through conquest, resistance, adaptation and local institutions as well as European treaties. Its workshops were many, although power within them was grossly unequal.

"Europe drew Africa at the Berlin Conference"

The delegates in Berlin set rules for commerce, navigation and the recognition of colonial claims, with the Congo project at the centre of the meeting. They did not complete the continent's present boundary network. Most bilateral lines took shape afterwards through occupation, military force, treaties, field surveys, revisions and dealings with African rulers.

The myth survives because it captures a moral truth in an inaccurate scene: outsiders divided territory under extreme inequality. Correcting the scene must not soften that fact. Colonial governments claimed authority without popular consent, manipulated agreements and built states for imperial purposes.

A 2025 study traced older political frontiers in nearly two-thirds of 107 bilateral colonial cases, while major water bodies also supplied frequent reference points. The result challenges the idea that officials drew most lines blindly and at random. It does not measure popular approval, prove that inherited borders fit communities, or settle every dispute about colonial state formation.

Shape alone therefore tells little. Some straight segments were administrative shortcuts. Others linked surveyed points or crossed sparsely

governed regions. The necessary test is historical: who negotiated, what information entered, which interests prevailed and how colonial government later made the boundary consequential.

"Sykes-Picot created today's Middle East"

The secret 1916 agreement outlined British and French zones of control and influence in Ottoman Arab lands. Its image became shorthand for every modern boundary and conflict in the region. Much of the proposed arrangement was never implemented in its original form.

Ottoman defeat, Arab military and political action, the mandates, later conferences, local resistance and separate British and French decisions shaped the eventual states. Iraq, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon and Palestine each emerged through different post-war decisions and struggles. Some current lines reflect imperial planning, but there is no clean tracing from the Sykes-Picot map to today's borders.

The myth is attractive because it gives a large history two foreign surnames. It is also politically useful: blame the line and avoid the institutions, rulers, wars and social divisions that followed. Imperial partition matters. It should not erase a century of regional agency and change.

Nor would redrawing the region along supposedly cleaner communal lines solve the problem mechanically. Communities overlap, cities are mixed and resources do not respect identity maps. Every proposed correction selects a date, population and scale. The history of imposed boundaries should make redesign more careful, not make it look effortless.

"Walls stop movement"

A wall can make crossing slower, riskier and easier to detect. The Berlin Wall sharply restricted departure through Berlin. Contemporary barriers can reduce crossings along the segment they fortify. None of this means a wall ends movement as a system.

People shift routes, use documents, pay smugglers, hide in vehicles, tunnel, climb, cross by sea or remain after a lawful entry. Effects depend on

surrounding enforcement, terrain, labour demand and available alternatives. Evidence from the United States-Mexico border shows altered routes and settlement behaviour in that setting. It does not establish one global response to every wall.

The myth persists because concrete is visible and a displaced route is not. Political credit attaches to construction. The better question is what movement changed, where it went and who paid the added cost. A barrier may achieve a narrow aim while increasing distance, price or danger elsewhere.

Measurement can mislead in both directions. Fewer detections near a new barrier may reflect deterrence, displacement or less observation on the new route. More detections may reflect increased movement or better surveillance. To judge a wall, compare the wider system over time and distinguish attempted, detected, completed and repeated crossings.

"Open borders mean no borders"

When routine checks disappear, the state does not disappear with them. Within the Schengen area, travellers often cross national boundaries without stopping. Different legal systems, tax authorities, police forces and citizenship rules remain. Temporary internal controls can return, while the common arrangement relies on external checks, shared visa rules and information exchange.

The confusion comes from treating the checkpoint as the border itself. Remove the booth and the line seems gone. In practice, governments recognise one another's controls and shift some enforcement to the outer edge or into databases.

This matters because openness is an institutional achievement, not an absence. It requires trust, common rules and dispute management. It can widen freedom for people inside the arrangement while making admission from outside more coordinated and demanding.

Even a frictionless crossing retains consequences. A worker may move

freely but owe tax or social contributions under rules linked to residence and employment. Police cooperation must determine which authority acts. Goods may face different controls from people. Removing one checkpoint exposes the institutions that kept the jurisdictions distinct.

"The border is at the border"

The territorial line remains legally decisive, but much control now occurs elsewhere. Consulates decide visas abroad. Airlines inspect documents before boarding. Maritime operations may stop a journey before the destination's coast. Employers and public agencies can check status after entry. Databases retain movement records across time and, in some systems, across states.

The old image survives because the passport booth gives power a location. Distributed control is less dramatic and can act earlier. It also makes responsibility harder to see. A person denied boarding may never reach the official process where a protection claim could be considered. A private employee may apply a public rule defensively because the company faces a penalty.

Finding the modern border therefore requires following the decision, not the fence. Wherever an institution determines whether movement is authorised, part of the border is operating.

This wider view changes legal scrutiny without producing one universal answer. Courts examine responsibility according to the facts, the degree of state control and the applicable law. The institutional questions remain: who designed the rule, who controlled its use, who could review the decision and who could prevent the harm?

Use It

Separate the line from the system

When a border becomes news, the camera usually finds the fence. Look past it. Ask which treaty, judgment, statute or claim defines the boundary; which agency operates it; which documents classify people and goods; which courts review decisions; and which institutions apply status before or after the crossing.

This prevents a common error. A new wall may be politically dramatic while adding little to a system already controlled through visas, patrols and employers. An unguarded rural line may look weak while databases and legal cooperation make unauthorised movement difficult. The visible structure and the operating border are related, but they are not identical.

Use the distinction whenever somebody proposes to strengthen or remove a border. Which layer changes? A fence, tariff, visa rule and citizenship law alter different mechanisms. The proposal may affect entry, trade, residence or nationality while leaving the territorial boundary untouched. Treating all of them as one thing produces slogans rather than diagnosis.

Ask who can cross, with what and at what cost

Do not label a border open or closed before naming the flow. It may be open to tourists and closed to workers, easy for capital and expensive for goods, routine for one nationality and dangerous for another. A road can carry thousands of authorised vehicles while stopping a person who lacks the required paper.

Then count costs beyond refusal. Time spent gathering documents, fees, uncertainty, travel to a consulate, lost work, searches and risk of detention all shape mobility. So do informal costs: smugglers, bribes and dangerous routes created when lawful access narrows. A rule can reduce one recorded flow while transferring cost to families, carriers, border districts or another route.

This lens turns a blunt argument into a distributive one. Which mobility does the state value, which does it tolerate, which does it tax, and which traveller must carry the risk of error? The answers reveal policy more clearly than the words open and closed.

Look from the borderland inward

National debates treat border regions as defensive edges. Residents may experience the capital as distant and the other side as nearby. Their jobs, relatives, hospitals, grazing land and markets can cross the line even when their national identity does not.

Test any policy against local geography. Where is the nearest service? Which road does a checkpoint interrupt? Do ambulances and fire services cooperate? Are property records compatible? What seasonal movements predate the boundary? A policy that appears clean at national scale can create absurd journeys and gaps in public authority locally.

This lens also prevents sentimentality. Borderlands are not natural zones of harmony. They can be centres of smuggling, militarisation, exploitation and hard nationalism. Their advantage is evidential. They show how the line works after people have adapted to it, which is often different from how officials imagined it.

Find the missing people in the boundary room

Every boundary decision has a table and an outside. Diplomats, military officers, surveyors and lawyers may be present. Farmers, pastoralists, minorities, traders and future refugees often are not, even when the line will rearrange their lives.

Ask who had standing to speak, what information counted and which costs appeared after the agreement. This matters when a border is defended as historically legitimate. An interstate settlement can carry legal authority while having been made under empire or without local representation. Legal title and democratic legitimacy answer different questions.

The exercise does not give every village a veto. Boundaries can require

decisions that no arrangement will satisfy fully. It is a way to predict consequences. People excluded from the room often reappear later as minorities, displaced communities, informal crossers or movements seeking autonomy.

Distinguish stability from justice

A border can be unfair in origin and valuable in effect. Once states, roads, property systems and public services have formed around it, reopening the line may cause more harm than preserving it. The principle of retaining inherited boundaries at independence rests on this danger.

The reverse is also true. A stable border is not proved just by surviving. Force, international recognition and the exhaustion of affected communities can preserve a settlement. Longevity may show that revision is costly, not that the original decision was sound.

Use two tests. Does the boundary reduce uncertainty and interstate violence? Can people living under it secure rights, services, representation and workable movement? Stability is a public good. Justice concerns what the stable arrangement contains. Confusing them makes one side romanticise redrawing and the other sanctify the status quo.

Trace where the border has moved

When a government says it has removed or strengthened a border, follow the control function. Internal checkpoints may disappear while visa screening expands abroad. A state may avoid a decision at the line by making a carrier refuse boarding. A digital system may replace a stamp while retaining more information and making it usable later.

Draw the journey as a sequence: application, booking, carrier check, departure, arrival, database query, residence renewal and any later status check. Mark where refusal is possible, which institution makes it and what review exists. At each point, ask what evidence counts, which error the system is designed to avoid, whether a reason is given and whether correction is possible. The result often reveals several borders applied to the

same movement, and several places where an error can become nobody's clear responsibility.

The lens extends beyond people. Rules of origin and product standards move customs decisions into factories, laboratories and certification bodies. Digital services may assign rights by location through account information. The legal foundation remains geographical while administration travels through networks.

The limits

Borders explain where public authority changes. They do not explain every conflict near them. A disputed line may be the object of war, a symbol used by leaders or the location of struggles driven by regime survival, resources and identity. Reading all politics from the map gives geography more agency than governments and people possess.

Exposing construction does not prove that a border can be redesigned cleanly. Populations move, institutions grow and expectations harden after a line is drawn. A more elegant boundary based on ethnicity, language or economic links can create fresh minorities and incentives for expulsion. There is no neutral scale on which every community becomes a majority.

The evidence has limits. States count authorised entries, detected violations and recorded trade. Hidden movement is estimated. Border residents may conceal informal practices that protect livelihoods or emphasise hardship to win attention. Findings from one wall, crossing or legal system cannot be transferred without checking terrain, routes, law and alternatives.

Finally, a line has no agency by itself. Saying that a border caused violence can hide the officials, parties, militias and crowds that acted. The line changes categories and incentives. Human beings decide how to use them.

The one thing to keep

Keep four questions: where does jurisdiction change, who produced the answer, which machinery applies it, and who bears the cost?

The first gives geography. The second gives history and power. The third reveals how a claim becomes a daily decision. The fourth returns the analysis to people, where the subtitle requires it to end.

Together, the questions prevent opposite mistakes. They stop you treating a river or mountain as if nature wrote a treaty. They also stop you dismissing a recognised boundary as ink when courts, police, property and citizenship have accumulated around it. They make a wall less impressive until you know what system supports it, and an open crossing less mysterious once you see where control moved.

Most of all, they restore thickness to the line. On a map, a border occupies no space. In life, it can extend through a farm, a family, a labour market, a passport, a memory and a database. Some people cross without noticing. Others remain organised by it without ever moving.

The world map looks finished because every state has an edge. It is better read as a record of continuing decisions about authority and belonging. Once those decisions are visible, they can be judged. Until then, the line does the thinking for you.

Terms

Border

The system through which political authority changes across space. A border includes the legal boundary, institutions, documents, crossings and enforcement that make the division operate. Its effects extend beyond the territorial edge.

Boundary

The legally defined line separating jurisdictions. It has no width in law, even where fences or patrol roads give the border a broad physical presence. Treaties, judgments and state practice help establish which line is authoritative.

Frontier

A zone where authority weakens, overlaps or remains unsettled. Frontiers are areas rather than precise lines and often contain exchange, conflict and mixed identities. They can persist even after a legal boundary exists.

Borderland

The inhabited region shaped by proximity to a boundary. Its economy, family networks and services may depend on both sides even when jurisdiction is separate.

Territoriality

The practice of organising power through control of a defined area. Modern state territoriality links law, population and administration to continuous bounded space. It turns location into a basis for public authority.

Sovereignty

The claim to final public authority within a territory and independence from another state's rule. In practice, recognition, legal title and effective control may not align.

Jurisdiction

The legal power to make, apply and judge rules. Borders matter because crossing them changes which courts, police, taxes and public authorities may act. Jurisdiction can also be shared, limited or disputed.

Delimitation

The description of a boundary in a treaty, map, coordinates or legal decision. It translates a political settlement into a line intended to be locatable.

Demarcation

The physical marking of a delimited boundary using pillars, fences, signs, cleared strips or buoys. Demarcation can expose ambiguities hidden in diplomatic wording. Markers require inspection and replacement.

Boundary commission

A joint or appointed body that defines, surveys, marks or manages a boundary. Its technical work contains political choices about maps, river channels, markers and local access.

Checkpoint

A controlled place where people, vehicles or goods are inspected. Checkpoints channel movement through sites where the state can classify, record, tax or refuse it.

Customs

The system regulating goods across a border through declarations, duties, prohibitions and inspections. Customs makes international trade selective rather than ending it.

Passport

A state-issued travel document recording identity and nationality or another recognised status. Its usefulness depends on the issuing state, recognition and destination rules. It does not itself guarantee admission.

Visa

Advance permission to travel for the purpose of seeking entry under stated conditions. A visa moves part of the border decision to a consulate or online system abroad, but final admission may still be decided at arrival.

Citizenship

Full legal membership of a state, carrying political rights and duties. Citizenship determines much more than travel, although passports often make it visible at borders.

Nationality

The legal bond between a person and a state in international law. Often used interchangeably with citizenship, though some domestic systems distinguish them.

Stateless person

Someone whom no state considers its national under the operation of its law. Statelessness can obstruct travel, education, work, property, registration and access to state protection.

Refugee

A person outside their country of nationality who has a well-founded fear of persecution for a Convention reason and is unable, or because of that fear unwilling, to use its protection. For a stateless person, the reference point is the country of former habitual residence and inability or fear-based unwillingness to return. The category is narrower than forced displacement generally.

Asylum

Protection given by a state to someone who cannot safely return. Procedures and legal statuses vary. A protection claim may require assessment even when the person lacked ordinary prior permission to enter.

Non-refoulement

Rules limiting return to danger. The Refugee Convention bars return to threats to life or freedom on a Convention ground, subject to its Article 33(2) exception. Human-rights law separately prohibits transfer to a real risk of torture and, in some systems, other grave ill-treatment.

Enclave

Territory surrounded by another state's territory. Enclaves can make access to public services and cooperation by the surrounding state central to ordinary life.

Exclave

Part of a state's territory separated from its main area by other territory. The same place may be an exclave from its owner's view and an enclave geographically.

Counter-enclave

An enclave located inside another enclave. Baarle retains seven Dutch counter-enclaves within Belgian enclaves, showing how nested territorial arrangements can persist when records and governments cooperate.

Buffer zone

An area kept between rival forces or jurisdictions to reduce direct contact. It may be demilitarised, internationally monitored or controlled under a special agreement.

Demilitarised zone

An area in which military forces or installations are restricted by agreement. The name does not guarantee peace or an absence of heavy forces nearby.

Partition

The division of one political territory into separate states or jurisdictions. Partition can create sovereignty quickly while leaving populations, infrastructure and property interwoven.

Secession

The attempted withdrawal of part of a state to form or join another state. Success depends on power, recognition, constitutional rules and the territorial line claimed.

Irredentism

A movement to annex territory claimed on national, ethnic or historical grounds. It challenges existing borders by arguing that a population and territory belong elsewhere.

Uti possidetis

The principle that a newly independent state's inherited administrative boundaries become its international borders. It favours territorial stability even where the lines came from colonial rule, and courts have applied it beyond its first Latin American setting.

Thalweg

The line following the principal navigable channel of a river, often used in river boundaries. It can help divide navigation rights but may move as channels change.

Go Deeper

These four books approach borders from institutional, lived, critical and technical angles. Each reveals something the others leave in shadow.

The overview

Malcolm Anderson, *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World* (1996). Anderson gives the cleanest compact route from broad frontier zones to the institutions of the territorial state. Read it for the distinction between a legal boundary and the wider political, administrative and social border around it. The examples lean heavily towards Europe and some contemporary discussion has aged, but the organising questions remain strong. It is the best first step for a reader who wants a comparative framework before choosing a region. Keep a map nearby because the argument moves quickly between states and periods.

The lived borderland

Kapka Kassabova, *Border: A Journey to the Edge of Europe* (2017). Kassabova travels through the region where Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey meet, gathering histories of Cold War escape, surveillance, smuggling, memory and survival. Read it for what a boundary looks like after it has entered landscapes and families. Its method is literary travel, memoir and oral history rather than comparative analysis. It restores atmosphere and ambiguity to mechanisms that legal accounts make clean. Read remembered stories as situated testimony, not as a technical manual or a representative sample of all borderlands.

The archival case

Lucy P. Chester, *Borders and Conflict in South Asia: The Radcliffe Boundary Commission and the Partition of Punjab* (2009). Chester reconstructs how the 1947 Punjab boundary was argued, decided and made consequential, using official records and the history surrounding the commission. Read it to see one line move from maps and legal instructions into uncertainty, violence and state-building. It is narrower and more demanding than a general history of Partition, but the narrowness is the advantage: it shows what hurried delimitation could and could not determine, while keeping responsibility broader than one official with a pencil.

The technical reference

J. R. V. Prescott and Gillian D. Triggs, *International Frontiers and Boundaries: Law, Politics and Geography* (2008). This is the serious reference for delimitation, demarcation, river boundaries, maritime questions, disputes and the relation between law and physical geography. Use it when a report says a line follows a watershed or a court has interpreted an old treaty and you want to know what work lies behind the phrase. It is long, expensive and written for specialists, so consult it by problem rather than from cover to cover. The diagrams and case distinctions repay slow reading when a particular boundary mechanism matters in practice.

Notes and Sources

Current and changeable sources were rechecked on 2 September 2026. The notes identify the evidence behind high-risk claims and the limits placed on them. Routine geographical and historical facts are supported by the works in the bibliography but are not documented sentence by sentence.

The Whole Thing in One Page and Why You Should Care

The operating model. The account of a border as legal boundary plus administration, documents, infrastructure and enforcement synthesises Malcolm Anderson on frontiers and state formation, J. R. V. Prescott and Gillian Triggs on technical boundary-making, Jordan Branch on cartographic statehood and John Torpey on documentary control of movement. The phrase "the line is the thinnest part" is the book's formulation. In law, a boundary is a line without width; the larger border system can extend through roads, restricted zones, offices and databases.

Partition sequence. Lucy Chester and wider Partition scholarship support the timing. Pakistan became independent on 14 August 1947, India on 15 August, and the Punjab and Bengal boundary awards were published on 17 August. The text does not claim that every resident lacked information or

that the unpublished awards alone caused the violence.

Sources for the Core Ideas

Jurisdiction, recognition and Baarle

The distinction among legal title, international recognition and effective control follows standard international boundary and state practice. These elements can diverge in occupied, disputed or weakly administered territory. The manuscript does not offer a formula for resolving current recognition disputes.

Official local material counts 22 Belgian enclaves and eight Dutch enclaves at Baarle, seven of the Dutch parcels being counter-enclaves. The front-door convention is described by the local tourism authority as a practical rule for assigning addresses where buildings cross the line. Baarle is used as an unusually clear illustration of jurisdiction without a wall, not as a representative borderland.

From frontiers to continuous territory

Anderson, Branch and Kerry Goettlich support the broad transition from frontier zones and layered authority towards continuous territorial boundaries. Peter Sahlins shows that the France-Spain boundary in the Pyrenees emerged through central treaties, local practice and later consolidation rather than one founding act.

Andreas Osiander is the main source for rejecting the claim that the Peace of Westphalia created the modern sovereign state system at once. The text retains the settlements' real importance and rejects only the single-birthday story.

The discussion of Roman and Chinese frontier systems remains deliberately general. Both combined fortifications, routes, settlements and military administration across long periods. Neither is presented as the direct ancestor of every modern border. The paragraph on pastoral, village and Indigenous territoriality is a broad corrective to the idea that land without one

continuous state perimeter was empty or unbounded. It does not propose a single premodern sequence or claim that these varied systems shared one form.

African colonial boundary formation

Jack Paine, Xiaoyan Qiu and Joan Ricart-Huguet provide the newest systematic study used. Their dataset covers 107 bilateral colonial borders in Africa. They report median initial and final formation years of 1891 and 1908, and code historical political frontiers as directly affecting 66 of 107 borders. Forty-seven cases involved at least one precolonial state. The article also identifies major water bodies as important reference points and documents African rulers influencing some negotiations.

The source supports a correction to the claim that most borders were created blindly at the Berlin Conference. It does not measure democratic consent, show that colonial borders matched local identities or remove European coercion. The manuscript therefore separates influence on line location from control of the colonial system. Contemporary conference documents and the study support a narrower description: Berlin addressed commerce and navigation, recognised the Congo Free State project and adopted limited rules around occupation, while most bilateral boundary formation came later.

David Siddhartha Patel supports the treatment of Sykes-Picot. The 1916 agreement was evidence of secret British and French imperial planning, but much of its scheme was not implemented as drawn. Present borders emerged through war, Ottoman collapse, Arab politics, mandates and later decisions. The book does not treat the agreement as irrelevant.

Building and maintaining boundaries

Prescott and Triggs support the distinction among definition, delimitation, demarcation and continuing administration. Specialist usage is not perfectly uniform, so the glossary gives common practical meanings rather than claiming one compulsory vocabulary.

River boundaries may follow a bank, median line or thalweg. The legal consequences of gradual movement and sudden channel change depend on the treaty and applicable law. No universal automatic rule is stated. The discussion of datums and coordinate transformation follows boundary-survey practice: numerical precision does not decide which legal source takes priority.

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea supplies the maritime figures. Article 3 permits a territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles from lawful baselines. Article 57 limits an exclusive economic zone to 200 nautical miles. The EEZ carries specified resource and jurisdictional rights; it is not equated with land territory or the territorial sea.

Passports, protection and openness

Torpey's *The Invention of the Passport* supports the history of modern documentary controls and the claim that states increasingly monopolised authorised movement. Passports and safe-conducts predate the twentieth century. The relevant change is the spread and standardisation of national documentation around the First World War and its aftermath. UNHCR's history of refugee travel documents supports the Nansen passport account.

The 1951 Refugee Convention and 1967 Protocol supply the refugee definition and Article 33 rule against return to threats to life or freedom on Convention grounds. Article 33(2) states exceptions where there are reasonable grounds for regarding a refugee as a danger to national security, or where a refugee convicted by final judgment of a particularly serious crime constitutes a danger to the community. The Convention against Torture separately prohibits transfer where substantial grounds indicate a danger of torture. The 1954 Convention supplies the definition of a stateless person used in the Terms section. The European Court of Human Rights Grand Chamber judgment in *Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy* is used only for the fact-bound point that jurisdiction and responsibility can arise when a state exercises control over people at sea. The narrative keeps these legal regimes distinct and does not present asylum as a general right to select any destination.

Official European Union material identifies 29 countries in the Schengen framework as of the verification date. Routine checks are removed at most shared internal borders, but Cyprus participates without yet having its internal controls lifted. The states retain separate jurisdiction and may reintroduce temporary checks under the rules. Openness is therefore attached to particular movements and institutions, not to the disappearance of borders.

Partitions, minorities and inherited boundaries

Chester is the principal source for the Radcliffe commissions. Yasmin Khan, Ian Talbot and Gurharpal Singh, and Vazira Fazila-Yacoobali Zamindar support the wider account of displacement, violence, state formation and the extended aftermath. Radcliffe arrived in early July 1947 and had about five weeks to complete the awards. Census reconstruction by Prashant Bharadwaj, Asim Ijaz Khwaja and Atif Mian records 14.5 million arrivals by 1951 and estimates higher out-migration. The narrative therefore uses roughly 14 to 15 million for people who reached another part of the new states while noting that the number driven from home may have been higher. Other totals use different periods and categories. Death estimates vary more widely, so no single figure is retained.

The manuscript does not attribute Partition violence to a line alone. Communal politics, imperial withdrawal, local organisation, fear and prior violence were already active. The boundary is treated as a territorial verdict that intensified uncertainty and directed movement.

The Organization of African Unity's July 1964 resolution affirmed respect for borders existing at independence. The International Court of Justice's 1986 *Frontier Dispute* judgment between Burkina Faso and Mali supports the account of *uti possidetis* and its stabilising purpose, while also recognising its tension with self-determination.

The International Court of Justice held in 2002 that sovereignty over Bakassi lay with Cameroon. The Greentree Agreement of 12 June 2006 set modalities for Nigerian withdrawal and the transfer of authority, including

provisions concerning affected residents. The United Nations Secretary-General's 2008 account documents the later transfer ceremony. Together they support the distinction between legal title and the work of implementation.

Borderlands and enclaves

Paul Nugent supports the argument that borderlands help make states rather than merely receiving decisions from capitals. Willem van Schendel provides the central scholarly account of the India-Bangladesh enclaves before exchange.

India's Ministry of External Affairs records the 2015 exchange of 111 former Indian enclaves in Bangladesh and 51 former Bangladeshi enclaves in India. Official and scholarly materials also document choices concerning nationality and residence. The text omits a resident total because sources use different census dates, categories and stages of implementation.

Distributed control and the Entry/Exit System

The account of externalised and internalised control draws on Torpey, European carrier-liability rules, refugee and human-rights law, and official EU material. It does not claim that every state uses employers, landlords, universities or banks in the same way. Those institutions are presented as jurisdiction-dependent examples.

Council Directive 2001/51/EC is one source for European carrier sanctions connected to passengers lacking required travel documents. The narrative states the mechanism without claiming that a check-in employee decides refugee status or that every refusal creates state responsibility under one rule.

The European Entry/Exit System began progressive roll-out on 12 October 2025 and became fully operational at external border crossing points in all 29 participating countries on 10 April 2026. The European Commission states that it registers covered non-EU nationals making short stays, replaces passport stamps and records entries, exits, refusals,

travel-document data and biometric data. The manuscript deliberately omits cumulative use and refusal totals because they change quickly and are unnecessary to the model.

Sources for the operating history

The Berlin Wall

The Berlin Wall Foundation gives the fortified border around West Berlin as about 155 kilometres and describes a changing system of walls, fences, patrol roads, lighting, watchtowers and cleared zones. The word wall in the narrative therefore refers to a layered border regime, not one uniform concrete structure. The Federal Government of Germany's historical account records that Bornholmer Strasse opened to all Berliners at half past eleven on 9 November 1989 and that other crossings followed. The episode supports a narrow institutional claim: the physical barrier remained, while the command and enforcement system ceased to make it decisive.

Evidence on contemporary walls is setting-specific. Douglas Massey, Jorge Durand and Karen Pren analyse how intensified enforcement altered routes, repeat crossing and settlement behaviour in the United States-Mexico migration system. Treb Allen, Cauê de Castro Dobbin and Melanie Morten analyse deterrence and displacement around border walls. These studies support the bounded claim that barriers can obstruct locally while redirecting movement. They do not establish one effect for every country, population or period, and detections are not treated as a complete measure of crossings.

Repair and implementation

The Bakassi judgment and India-Bangladesh exchange are used to show that a legal answer does not implement itself. Courts can settle interstate title; commissions, governments and residents must then translate the decision into withdrawal, documents, services and access. No claim is made that either process removed every local grievance.

What People Get Wrong, Use It and Terms

The seven misconceptions consolidate the disputes above. The Westphalia, Berlin Conference and Sykes-Picot headings reject single-event origin stories while retaining the events' importance. The wall correction explicitly limits transportability from particular enforcement settings. The final two corrections distinguish a boundary from the checkpoint through which it is most visibly encountered.

The practical lenses are analytical deductions, not universal policy rules. Their purpose is to identify scale, institutional layer, distributional effect and omitted actors before judgment. Terms involving refugee law, maritime zones, sovereignty and nationality are compressed for a general reader. A live legal dispute requires the governing treaty, national law and current case law.

Bibliography

Primary, legal and official sources

African Union. *Delimitation and Demarcation of Boundaries in Africa: General Issues and Case Studies*. Addis Ababa: African Union Border Programme, 2013.

Berlin Wall Foundation. *The Berlin Wall*. Official historical overview. Accessed 2 September 2026.

Cameroon and Nigeria. *Agreement between the Republic of Cameroon and the Federal Republic of Nigeria concerning the Modalities of Withdrawal and Transfer of Authority in the Bakassi Peninsula*. Greentree, New York, 12 June 2006.

European Court of Human Rights. *Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy*. Grand Chamber judgment, application no. 27765/09, 23 February 2012.

European Union. Council Directive 2001/51/EC of 28 June 2001 supplementing the provisions of Article 26 of the Convention implementing

the Schengen Agreement.

European Union, Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs. *Entry/Exit System*. Official policy and implementation material. Accessed 2 September 2026.

European Union, Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs. *Schengen Area*. Official policy material. Accessed 2 September 2026.

Federal Government of Germany. *9 November: A Historically Significant Date*. Official historical account. Accessed 2 September 2026.

India, Ministry of External Affairs. *Exchange of Enclaves between India and Bangladesh*. Press release, 31 July 2015.

International Court of Justice. *Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso/Republic of Mali)*. Judgment of 22 December 1986.

International Court of Justice. *Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea intervening)*. Judgment of 10 October 2002.

Organization of African Unity. *Border Disputes among African States*. Resolution AHG/Res.16(I), Cairo, July 1964.

United Nations. *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*. New York, 1984.

United Nations. *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. Geneva, 1951, with the 1967 Protocol.

United Nations. *Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons*. New York, 1954.

United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*. Montego Bay, 1982.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. *A Century of Mobility: A Glimpse into the History of Refugee Travel Documents*. Geneva: UNHCR, 2024.

United Nations Secretary-General. *Message on the Ceremony for the Withdrawal and Transfer of Authority in the Bakassi Peninsula*. 14 August 2008.

Visit Baarle. *30 Enclaves, 2 Municipalities, 2 Countries*. Official visitor information. Accessed 2 September 2026.

Modern works

Allen, Treb, Cauê de Castro Dobbin, and Melanie Morten. "Border Walls." NBER Working Paper 25267. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2018.

Anderson, Malcolm. *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Branch, Jordan. *The Cartographic State: Maps, Territory, and the Origins of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Bharadwaj, Prashant, Asim Ijaz Khwaja, and Atif R. Mian. "The Big March: Migratory Flows after the Partition of India." *Economic & Political Weekly* 43, no. 35 (2008): 39-49.

Chester, Lucy P. *Borders and Conflict in South Asia: The Radcliffe Boundary Commission and the Partition of Punjab*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.

Goettlich, Kerry. "The Rise of Linear Borders." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Oxford University Press, 2020.

Jones, Reece. *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move*. London: Verso, 2016.

Kassabova, Kapka. *Border: A Journey to the Edge of Europe*. London: Granta, 2017.

Khan, Yasmin. *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*. New ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Karen A. Pren. "Why Border

Enforcement Backfired." *American Journal of Sociology* 121, no. 5 (2016): 1557-1600.

Nugent, Paul. *Boundaries, Communities and State-Making in West Africa: The Centrality of the Margins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Osiander, Andreas. "Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth." *International Organization* 55, no. 2 (2001): 251-287.

Paine, Jack, Xiaoyan Qiu, and Joan Ricart-Huguet. "Endogenous Colonial Borders: Precolonial States and Geography in the Partition of Africa." *American Political Science Review* 119, no. 1 (2025): 1-20.
doi:10.1017/S0003055424000054.

Patel, David Siddhartha. *Repartitioning the Sykes-Picot Middle East? Debunking Three Myths*. Middle East Brief 103. Waltham, MA: Crown Center for Middle East Studies, Brandeis University, 2016.

Prescott, J. R. V., and Gillian D. Triggs. *International Frontiers and Boundaries: Law, Politics and Geography*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2008.

Sahlins, Peter. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Talbot, Ian, and Gurharpal Singh. *The Partition of India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Torpey, John C. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

van Schendel, Willem. "Stateless in South Asia: The Making of the India-Bangladesh Enclaves." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 61, no. 1 (2002): 115-147.

Zamindar, Vazira Fazila-Yacoobali. *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia: Refugees, Boundaries, Histories*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Notes and Sources

The Whole Thing in One Page

- 1 The book's institutional definition draws on Malcolm Anderson's account of frontiers, David Newman's work on continuing boundary functions, and the border-studies syntheses by Diener and Hagen and by Wilson and Donnan. Stuart Elden supplies the distinction between land and territory as a political technology.
- 2 The warning against treating states as naturally sealed social containers comes from John Agnew's account of the territorial trap. Lauren Benton's work on imperial legal geography and Charles Maier's history of territoriality support the contrast with layered and uneven authority.
- 3 The distinction between a territorial sea and an exclusive economic zone follows UNCLOS Articles 2, 3, 55, 56 and 57. The book deliberately avoids describing the exclusive economic zone as sovereign national territory.
- 4 The account of citizenship as a distribution of life chances draws on Ayelet Shachar. The account of borderlands as active social regions draws on Anssi Paasi, Anderson and O'Dowd, and Wilson and Donnan.

Why You Should Care

- 1 The dispersed-border examples are supported by John Torpey's history of passports, Peter Andreas's study of United States-Mexico border policing, and Matthew Longo's account of borders operating through databases, documents and delegated control.
- 2 Claims about trade friction are qualitative. McCallum's influential estimate used Canadian and United States regional trade data from 1988; Anderson and van Wincoop later showed how model specification changed the estimated border effect. No ratio from either study is presented here as universal or current.
- 3 The scope statement excludes adjudication of live territorial disputes.

References to asylum, nationality and maritime law explain concepts only and are not legal advice.

The Core Ideas

- 1 Core Idea 1: Osiander provides the principal challenge to the claim that the 1648 Peace of Westphalia created modern sovereignty. Maier, Elden and Benton trace longer, uneven developments in territorial rule. Agnew supports the discussion of jurisdiction extending through networks beyond the mapped edge.
- 2 Core Idea 2: The allocation, delimitation, demarcation and administration sequence follows Stephen B. Jones's classic handbook and later boundary practice. Sahlins is the source for Cerdanya and Llivia. UNCLOS is the authority for the twelve-nautical-mile territorial sea and the two-hundred-nautical-mile maximum exclusive economic zone.
- 3 Core Idea 3: Torpey supports the claim that states developed a documentary capacity to authorise movement. Andreas, Brown, Reece Jones and Longo support the treatment of walls as parts of wider regimes. The Berlin Wall Foundation's documentary chronology supports the dates, purpose and institutional character of the Berlin fortifications. No context-specific estimate of barrier effects is generalised.
- 4 Core Idea 4: Shachar supports the birthright-lottery formulation. The discussion of trade incidence states standard economic mechanisms without assigning a fixed pass-through rate. Article 33 of the 1951 Refugee Convention is the source for the non-refoulement description; the wording is narrowed to the Convention's terms and does not purport to summarise all refugee or human-rights case law.
- 5 Core Idea 5: Thongchai Winichakul is the source for the geo-body and the transformation of Siamese political space. Sahlins supports the Cerdanya account. Paasi and Wimmer support the wider argument that boundaries, state institutions and national identification can develop together.

- 6 Core Idea 6: Audra Simpson is the principal source for Akwesasne and for the need to treat Mohawk political life as more than a population divided by settler-state borders. Patrik Lantto supports the historical account of Sámi citizenship, borders and cross-border mobility. Nugent and the border-studies literature support the treatment of local trade, brokerage and state practice.
- 7 Core Idea 7: The OAU's 1964 resolution and Article 4(b) of the African Union Constitutive Act establish the inherited-border principle. The ICJ's 1986 Frontier Dispute judgment explains the connection between *uti possidetis* and independence. Michalopoulos and Papaioannou provide the partitioned-homeland evidence; Alesina, Easterly and Matuszeski, Englebert and colleagues, Green, Herbst, Nugent and Asiwaju provide contrasting measures and interpretations of African boundaries.
- 8 The account of the Berlin Conference follows its General Act and modern historical scholarship. It distinguishes principles for imperial claims and navigation from the later bilateral negotiation and conquest through which many boundaries were made. The wording rejects both the one-room myth and the opposite error of minimising colonial coercion.
- 9 Khan, Chatterji and Zamindar support the Partition discussion. The prose avoids a single death toll because estimates vary and records are incomplete. The Radcliffe awards and their publication sequence are treated as one mechanism within political mobilisation, imperial withdrawal, administrative failure and violence.
- 10 The Belfast or Good Friday Agreement is the authority for the consent principle, recognition of British and Irish identities, institutional cooperation and rights commitments. The reference to everyday openness is not used to claim that later trade and regulatory questions disappeared.

How It Actually Works

- 1 The sequence from territorial claim through delimitation, demarcation and administration follows Jones, Simmons, Carter and Goemans, and the

practice reflected in boundary treaties and commissions. It is an analytical sequence, not a claim that every border forms in four tidy chronological steps.

- 2 Benton, Elden and Maier support the description of layered authority before exclusive territorial rule. The mountain-valley example is illustrative rather than an undocumented scene: no named family, quotation or event is presented as fact.
- 3 The Berlin Conference discussion rests on the General Act and the African-boundary scholarship listed above. Evidence that some lines engaged rivers, existing polities and strategic routes does not entail that the partition was representative, consensual or benign.
- 4 The Radcliffe section uses the commission instructions, awards and the historical studies by Khan, Chatterji and Zamindar. It separates the documented time pressure and delayed publication from the stronger claim that the line alone caused Partition violence, which the evidence would not support.
- 5 The descriptions of passports, carrier checks, customs risk systems and delegated enforcement use Torpey, Andreas and Longo as institutional sources. Details vary by state and period; they are presented as mechanisms, not as one universal procedure.
- 6 The Schengen example is based on Regulation (EU) 2016/399 and its consolidated amendments. It supports the narrow point that routine internal checks can be removed while separate jurisdictions and a common legal regime remain.
- 7 The India-Bangladesh example is based on the 1974 Land Boundary Agreement, its 2011 Protocol and official records of implementation in 2015. The text makes no unverified claim about present-day conditions in every former enclave.
- 8 The Belfast Agreement supports the Northern Ireland settlement example. It is used as evidence that consent, identity recognition and

cross-jurisdictional institutions can reduce the load placed on a boundary, not as a template guaranteed to travel to other conflicts.

What People Get Wrong

- 1 The seven corrections synthesise the sources already identified. Osiander addresses Westphalia; the Berlin General Act and African-boundary scholarship address the conference myth; Sahlins, Thongchai and Paasi address identity; Brown, Andreas, Jones and Longo address walls; the Schengen Borders Code addresses low-friction crossing; Zacher, Wimmer and the ICJ material frame territorial stability and revision.
- 2 The heading "Borders are natural" rejects legal naturalisation, not the measurable effect of terrain on defence, transport and settlement. The distinction is supported by boundary-making practice and Sahlins's historical case.

Use It

- 1 The line, regime and borderland lens follows the conceptual distinctions in border studies. The sorting and enforcement lenses draw on Torpey, Andreas and Longo. The scale and counterfactual lens reflects the limits of transporting causal estimates across settings.
- 2 The incidence lens applies standard distributional analysis to tariffs, delays and movement rules. It makes no numerical claim about a current policy. The redraw lens draws on the inherited-border norm, work on nationalism and territorial conflict, and the institutional alternatives visible in the Belfast Agreement.
- 3 The limits section marks three boundaries of the framework: it cannot replace title-specific legal or historical work; it does not presume that every society begins from exclusive territorial sovereignty; and it does not treat fluid identity as evidence that state coercion is unreal.

Terms

- 1 Legal definitions of territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and baseline follow UNCLOS. Non-refoulement follows the 1951 Refugee Convention; statelessness follows the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. Boundary-making terms follow Jones and established international practice.
- 2 Passport, visa, citizenship, customs union and free-movement area are concise functional definitions. Their exact legal content differs among jurisdictions, which is why the entries avoid claiming a complete universal rule.

Go Deeper

- 1 Publication details and editions for Diener and Hagen, Sahlins, Elden and Anzaldúa were checked against publisher and library catalogues. Each work is materially used in the manuscript and serves a different purpose: overview, archival evidence, conceptual interpretation and lived borderland perspective.

Bibliography

African Union. *Constitutive Act of the African Union*. 2000.

Agnew, John. "The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory." *Review of International Political Economy* 1, no. 1 (1994): 53-80.

Alesina, Alberto, William Easterly and Janina Matuszeski. "Artificial States." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 9, no. 2 (2011): 246-277.

Anderson, James and Liam O'Dowd. "Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance." *Regional Studies* 33, no. 7 (1999): 593-604.

Anderson, James E. and Eric van Wincoop. "Gravity with Gravitas: A Solution to the Border Puzzle." *American Economic Review* 93, no. 1 (2003): 170-192.

Anderson, Malcolm. *Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern*

World. Polity Press, 1996.

Andreas, Peter. *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide*. Cornell University Press, 2000.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 4th ed. Aunt Lute Books, 2012.

Asiwaju, A. I., ed. *Partitioned Africans: Ethnic Relations across Africa's International Boundaries, 1884-1984*. C. Hurst, 1985.

Benton, Lauren. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Berlin Wall Foundation. *Chronicle of the Berlin Wall*. Documentary chronology, accessed 2 September 2026.

Brown, Wendy. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. Zone Books, 2010.

Carter, David B. and H. E. Goemans. "The Making of the Territorial Order: New Borders and the Emergence of Interstate Conflict." *International Organization* 65, no. 2 (2011): 275-309.

Chatterji, Joya. *The Spoils of Partition: Bengal and India, 1947-1967*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Diener, Alexander C. and Joshua Hagen. *Borders: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Elden, Stuart. *The Birth of Territory*. University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Englebert, Pierre, Stacy Tarango and Matthew Carter. "Dismemberment and Suffocation: A Contribution to the Debate on African Boundaries." *Comparative Political Studies* 35, no. 10 (2002): 1093-1118.

European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2016/399 on a Union Code on the Rules Governing the Movement of Persons across Borders, as amended.

Government of India and Government of Bangladesh. *Agreement*

Concerning the Demarcation of the Land Boundary between India and Bangladesh and Related Matters. 1974, with 2011 Protocol and 2015 implementation instruments.

Green, Elliott. "On the Size and Shape of African States." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (2012): 229-244.

Herbst, Jeffrey. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton University Press, 2000.

International Court of Justice. *Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso/Republic of Mali)*, Judgment. I.C.J. Reports 1986.

Jones, Reece. *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move*. Verso, 2016.

Jones, Stephen B. *Boundary-Making: A Handbook for Statesmen, Treaty Editors and Boundary Commissioners*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1945.

Khan, Yasmin. *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan*. Yale University Press, 2007.

Lantto, Patrik. "Borders, Citizenship and Change: The Case of the Sami People, 1751-2008." *Citizenship Studies* 14, no. 5 (2010): 543-556.

Longo, Matthew. *The Politics of Borders: Sovereignty, Security, and the Citizen after 9/11*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Maier, Charles S. *Once Within Borders: Territories of Power, Wealth, and Belonging since 1500*. Belknap Press, 2016.

McCallum, John. "National Borders Matter: Canada-U.S. Regional Trade Patterns." *American Economic Review* 85, no. 3 (1995): 615-623.

Michalopoulos, Stelios and Elias Papaioannou. "The Long-Run Effects of the Scramble for Africa." *American Economic Review* 106, no. 7 (2016): 1802-1848.

Newman, David. "The Lines that Continue to Separate Us: Borders in Our

'Borderless' World." *Progress in Human Geography* 30, no. 2 (2006): 143-161.

Nugent, Paul. *Smugglers, Secessionists and Loyal Citizens on the Ghana-Togo Frontier: The Life of the Borderlands since 1914*. Ohio University Press, 2002.

Organisation of African Unity. Resolution AHG/Res.16(I), "Border Disputes among African States." 1964.

Osiander, Andreas. "Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth." *International Organization* 55, no. 2 (2001): 251-287.

Paasi, Anssi. *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border*. John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

Sahlins, Peter. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*. University of California Press, 1989.

Shachar, Ayelet. *The Birthright Lottery: Citizenship and Global Inequality*. Harvard University Press, 2009.

Simmons, Beth A. "Rules over Real Estate: Trade, Territorial Conflict, and International Borders as Institution." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 6 (2005): 823-848.

Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press, 2014.

Thongchai Winichakul. *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.

Torpey, John. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

United Kingdom Government and Government of Ireland. *Agreement Reached in the Multi-Party Negotiations*. 10 April 1998.

United Nations. *Charter of the United Nations*. 1945.

United Nations. *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. 1951.

United Nations. *Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons*. 1954.

United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*. 1982.

Wilson, Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan, eds. *A Companion to Border Studies*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Wimmer, Andreas. *Waves of War: Nationalism, State Formation, and Ethnic Exclusion in the Modern World*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Zacher, Mark W. "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force." *International Organization* 55, no. 2 (2001): 215-250.

Zamindar, Vazira Fazila-Yacoobali. *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia: Refugees, Boundaries, Histories*. Columbia University Press, 2007.