



## Living in a globalised world

*Putting border issues into the course context*

Hello, I'm Penny Boreham. And I'm here with four members of the Open University's Geography Department. We'll be discussing issues that arise from one of your courses, 'Living in a Globalised World'. On that course, you start with the Mexico US Border. And that's what we're talking about today.

First of all please introduce yourselves.

Hello, I'm John Allan. A Professor of Economic Geography.

Hi. I'm Melissa Butcher. I'm a Lecturer in Cultural Geography.

Hello. I'm Clive Barnett. I'm re-doing human geography.

Hi. I'm Gillian Rose. I'm a Professor of Cultural Geography.

PB: First of all John Allen, Why the US Mexico border? I know it's one of the most contested in the globe. But why did you choose it.

JA: Well certainly partly because it was contested. But actually for us, the border is like a microcosm of some of the global challenges that face us today. So the border itself gives us a very sharp contrast. Between rich and poor. Between the more powerful, the less powerful. And also between abundance and scarcity, to a certain extent. So what you see with the border is the real contrast in equalities. And in terms of power.

But more than that, we felt that the border itself almost acting like a microcosm of globalisation. So it expressed in rather an intense way, some of the global challenges facing us. Say around migration. Say around cross border flows, in terms of trade. In terms of the cultural shake up of the whole border. When people are separated in terms of water wars. So a number of the real pressing issues around the globe today. You can actually see in a rather intense way, on the US Mexico border.

PB: Are there examples you could have chosen? Did you debate this amongst your all?

JA: The debate was endless. There were various choices. We were thinking for example at one stage maybe we would go with Hong Kong and China. We looked around various borders around the globe. But we came back to the US Mexico border, because we felt it covered more of the challenges that we were looking for. Because we wanted to use the border as a launching pad for the course DD205 as a whole.

PB: I understand that two of you John and Clive Barnett were involved in making the films for the course. Was this a fantastic experience for you both?

CB: Yes, it was. There was more than just the two of us. There were a series of people involved. Both academics and film makers. So it was certainly an interesting experience. In an entirely different way to think about the teaching that one's involved in. To actually think about how to translate the things one wants to address in a course, to visual material. And also to actually interact with film makers. Who have an entirely different sort of imagination of how to communicate. So it was a challenge, as a way of teaching.

PB: Looking at the clips, the films are very personality driven. Was this a decision that you took to try and find individuals who could actually articulate the issues that you wanted to cover in the course?

CB: Yes. I think so. I think that's one of the things which teaching through the film enables you to do. Rather than actually teaching abstract concepts. Making a film enables you to focus on particular people. And to have those embody a series of conflicts and issues. And it's also a way of actually making it clear that that particular part of the world, that border is actually where people live. And it's living on the border, and living through globalisation on the border is a lived experience for people who are migrating legally or illegally. People who are policing that process. The people who are working in factories. The people who are managing factories. These are real people. So that the processes which we're trying to address in the course, have actually lived through various particular people that they're real experiences. And those sorts of actors are important to understand. So that's one of the things that the film's enabled us to explicitly address.

JA: What Clive said there about lived experience, really is the key of it. Because text when you're reading. You can't bring to life the feeling of being there, and people's experiences. So actually interviewing and talking to people who are about to cross the border. Talking to security guards who are about to stop people going across the border. Really you get a sense of the dramatic effect of being there. You're talking about a border that's 2000 miles long. That goes from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That crosses different kind of terrains. Including desert and rivers. And unless you're there in that sense and you can see it visually and you can feel it. You can almost smell it at times. And it's that lived quality that allows you to teach that kind of experience.

PB: Gillian as the Manager of the whole course, did you get good feedback from the students about this way of teaching. Using this material in this way?

GR: The students who have taken the course have loved the DVD. I think partly because of that, the kind of things that Clive and John have just been talking about. I guess maybe when you start a University course, you might be expecting something dry and abstract perhaps. And instead you get this fantastic film that talks about really crucial issues that affect us all. You don't have to live on the US Mexico border to be affected by the kind of things that are also shaping that place.

And you're drawn into these bigger issues, in a very effective and compelling kind of way I think. But I think what students have also appreciated then is that we take them on from that. Because I guess you can turn on your TV in the evening and also see some fascinating films about great issues that would also intrigue you and interest you. But what the course does is then through other materials, mostly written. We then explore those issues, push them further. Raise more complicated questions. We hope to offer some answers,

But we hope to also give the students some ways of thinking how they can provide their own answers to these issues. Things that they might be confronting. They go to the supermarket to buy their television, and they notice that it's been built in one of the companies that have a Machala door on the US Mexico border. What do they do then? I think it's a fantastic way to start a course. But it's a starter that then takes people into more thoughtful ways of approaching issues very effectively.

PB: Was this an original step though? Using the film material prior to introducing any text? Was this one of the first times that you'd taught a module of a course in this way?

Male: It was certainly the first time for us. And I'm just echoing the previous point about lived experience. The point of using the DVD and starting with the DVD, separate from a book. Was a way to pull people in. To engage them with ideas. In that kind of facial sense that you part of something.

But it wasn't just about being on the border. As Gillian just said, the border is in a sense a springboard to other issues around economic inequality. Politics and power. Culture and nature and the environment. And those are all issues that we pull out of the border itself.

PB: Melissa, you've recently joined the department haven't you.

MB: Yes.

PB: Did it strike you coming in to this department using this material in this way, was an original way of doing it?

MB: Well I know in the past when I've been teaching students. Whenever you use audio visual material. And in the past I've used material that's been developed at Open University, in courses that I've taught in other universities. It's been really well received by students. And particularly when students, as you say you can turn on the news and see other parts of the world. But when you have this analysis that goes on behind it. It just give it that extra dimension. They start thinking critically about it. And I think that's what makes it an important tool, an important teaching tool with students.

PB: Is there a relationship between this use of visual material to field work in a way? In the sense that you can learn about a subject. And it's when you go on field work, as geographers do don't they. You then have a context for it, and it becomes.. it suddenly feels real. It comes off the page. Is there a relationship do you think between this use of material and field work?

MB: I actually think it's the carrying on and the talking about it afterwards that actually can make it more real sometimes. It's when students start relating what they've seen to their own personal experience. I think that's one of the things we can do as teachers. Is to make it relevant. So even though you're looking at what's happening in the border. You've brought back these images from the US Mexican border. You can use processes to get students to draw out how this is also relevant to their lives as well, here.

PB: Clive, is it somehow easier to understand all these issues when you look at them from a distance?

CB: I think what the hope is, that by using examples from different parts of the world. And this is a way of teaching geographically in general. What you're showing students is examples of various sorts of processes. Which as Melissa has already said, might sort of spark a recognition for students. So it's not necessarily a question of saying 'This is what it's like far away in other places'. It's more a question of saying 'It's like that as well over there'. But one can think about the sorts of issues which were in these film clips. Issues about the politics of migration. The location of jobs. Conflicts around those kind of questions. Questions of who belongs, who doesn't belong. Those are questions which if you're in the UK, and you're a student in the UK, well those are clearly current public issues. Questions about security. How do you police borders? The rights that people have to move against security concerns. These are questions which are of course current public issues. And all sorts of places. The purpose I think of using an example like the US Mexico border is precisely a chrysalises a whole series of those questions. One can kind of follow them through as you said, through particular people, in very dramatic sorts of ways. But the task beyond the films. The task of teaching in this way more generally is to then actually make those links and to encourage students to say 'what is the relationship between that thing that we've seen. That example we've seen there, and something going on closer to home'. Either in the UK or where I live in Reading, or in Bristol or in Milton Keynes wherever that might be.

Melissa?

MB: Just following on from what Clive was saying. There's an emotional quality in the films, which I think enables you to build up as an empathy with students. So and the film shows both sides of the argument. Both someone that wants to cross the border for all the opportunities that you get when you cross that border. But, also those on the other side that are trying to resist, or close down those flows. And migration globalisation is something that affects England today. These debates are happening in England today, about border flows and security, and how much control we have over who comes into the country and who doesn't. So I think just generating that sense of empathy, to hear someone describing why they would be willing to risk their life to cross a border, can help broaden students thinking about.. rather than just seeing the sort of faceless mass. Or feeling sort of threatened

perhaps by this movement of people. But to get a different understanding of the emotional drivers of migration as well.

PB: Just to talk a bit now about the border, as a symbol, as magnet. Very much brought up in the clips. John, these are words that are used a lot about the Mexico US border aren't they. Magnet. It just draws people to it. And it's become something sort of other than what it is. Almost some sort of idea. Even the people who are living it were talking in that way about it.

JA: I think that's a good way of putting it. Referring to the border as an idea. What borders do, is they both separate and divide. But they also connect people. And the distance across it. So when you put a line up between people, suddenly you have a notion of ours and theirs. You have a sense that people who are actually quite close to you, just on the other side of a fence, are far away. Because they maybe seen as culturally different. Or politically separate. So borders can dramatise distance, in ways that very few things in the rest of the world actually do.

PB: I was very struck by Christian Rameres, who was able to describe himself as an 'in between' person. What did he say? He said my US citizenship is just paperwork. But my culture and my traditions and my roots are the culture is like the air, it's something that just exists. He was extraordinary wasn't he. The way he summed that up.

MB: This means that the idea of the relationship.. migration and movement is really impacting on how we think about the nation's state. And ideas of citizenships. So and that was a really interesting example of that. And there's other research that looks at this idea of citizenships of convenience. Where you're seeing people that are able to.. particularly if you have capital. If you have the economic means to do so. Collecting citizenship in other countries as well, as a security blanket if you like. If something was to happen in Hong Kong for example, with the handover of Hong Kong to Chinese or business people. Applying for citizenship in other countries, but still maintaining their ties to China because it would become an economic powerhouse. So you're sort of hedging your bets in some ways. By splitting citizenship and cultural belonging. So we're seeing changes in that way. The notion of dual citizenship. What does that mean today? The borders are not just these lines on the map, or physical geographical barriers. But we're also seeing them as psychological borders. So if you're a second generation migrant, like I am for example. But English Australian with two passports. And I can move now through Europe. So you've got now another layer of identity, which is Europe. You're seeing examples from the US Mexican border or being Chicano, being American, being Mexican. Where do all these different identities fit in? Where do the borders lie between these? And for the second generation, being in between is something they live with daily. Moving across these cultural borders and trying to find a sense of belonging. It's not always easy. It can be quite a stressful process. But there's also opportunities with that as well. Cultures are never static.

PB: Gillian.

GR: To follow on from that. Certainly people move across borders. But I think we shouldn't sort of fixate the border too much I think if you like. Because borders also move. And as Melissa just mentioned in passing, the handover of Hong Kong back to China. That was a border that had stayed stable for a long time. But then shifted. With radical consequences for the people living there. For the people who could leave. Who wanted to go to other places to make a different kind of life elsewhere.

In one of the clips we saw that that's absolutely true of the US Mexico border. It shifted hugely. Hundreds of kilometres in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. When the political agreements that mark that border across the ground, also changed.

PB: That's when Mexico lost so much territory,

GR: Yes. Huge amounts. Which I have to say I didn't know that until John and Clive came back with that map. Because you know borders change. It's the fall of the Berlin wall. Hong

Kong. You've got plenty of contemporary example. The EU expanding more recently. But actually to see it like that on a map is really quite. Back to the impact of visual I suppose.

PB: And in the psyche of the people they sort of somehow know that's their land.

GR: Yes. Yes. And there's that very striking interview in one of the video clips with a woman who's ancestors had lost their land. And a generation later and this old later still determined to get that land back. And this returns again to the kind of emotional investments people have in place. And borders can cross them. But their senses of identity don't always align with borders. And identity is much more complex and complicated I think in a globalised world. People can feel that they belong in very different places. Have quite different senses of history, and how that feed into where they feel they belong.

PB: Clive?

CB: This really to follow on that same point. On the one hand borders can move, but it's also important and this is also something which comes out of those clips. To have a sense of the fact that borders aren't thin narrow lines at the edges of nation states. That borders can actually be quite thick and impenetrable on the one hand. So they can be very high walls or electrocuted fences. Or hazardous rivers. So borders can be thick in that sense. But another thing which comes through some of the clips, is the sense that actually the stakes involved at borders are actually kind of worked out, and enacted in all sorts of different places. Not only at the border. So there is an example of a road block 70 miles inside the United States. In which people are having their papers checked and their car searched. And one can think of more obvious examples. One could fly into the United States. One can fly to Kansas City slap bang in the middle of the United States. And one would be subjected to the same sorts of border controls, there in the middle of a territory. As one would do at the edge. And so one of the interesting issues which begins to emerge from some of those examples in the clips, is the idea that what a border is. Is actually a set of practices. Those practices might be about building higher walls. They might be about stopping people. Asking for papers or searching cars. And increasing perhaps in the globalised world, those sorts of practices are going on all over the place. Not simply at the border. An example of this would be the way in which employers are increasingly being asked both in the United States and elsewhere to take responsibility for actually checking the immigration status of the people they might hire. In the United States you have the example of a very contested issue of whether the agencies who provide driving licenses should similarly be responsible for checking the immigration status of people applying for driving licenses. What that implies is that suddenly the stakes which are involved in borders. Who belongs. Who has the right to work somewhere or not. Are suddenly being distributed all over a national territory and aren't only simply at the edge of the nation state.

PB: The migrants at the border were very clear, they wanted to go from one area to another. Because one area had jobs and one didn't.

CB: Yes. The recurring theme of when the migrants were talking. Is that sense that they might have moved. They may have become mobile in certain sorts of ways. And they've moved for very particular reasons. They all say we've moved for jobs. We need jobs. But they've also clearly left other people behind. So that it's not everybody who's become mobile. That they've moved created a sort of distance as it were, which they are actually bridging by sending money back, and various other sorts of means. But often actually living with very little contact with the people they've left behind. But they've also suddenly come up close, landed in the middle of communities who can support them in certain sorts of ways. So they're developing new forms of community. But they've also suddenly found themselves in context in which they're living up close with a whole series of people who might not like them being there. So that one of the features that comes again through the clips in that sense. That on the one hand there's some very real economic imperatives driving people to move. But the sort of broader political and cultural consequences of those movements. Both for people they've left behind and in the context they find themselves for. Are actually quite complicated ones. Of actually finding themselves in new bonds with new communities. But also in a much more vulnerable situation in various sorts of ways.

PB: Melissa?

MB: Just following on I guess from Clive's point. That borders are a set of practices. I think they are also a set of representations as well. So I think what we're seeing almost in opposition to the flow of globalisation. We talk a lot about flows, and movement and mobility of people and capital, and images and ideas around the world today. At incredible speed. But they also hit the wall of the local. There's stoppages along the way. Visas and airport controls and the physical nature of the US Mexican border is one example. But I think we're also seeing the state in some ways trying to reclaim borders, or redefine borders using representations as well. So you see in the clip, the idea of asserting American-ness. Or ascertain Mexican-ness within the Diaspora. Within the community, within America, in the US. And again you can see this happening globally. What is Englishness? What is Britishness? Trying to redefine what these borders are. Or Scottishness. Yes. That's the local debate. So again, there's the reaction against all this. the mobility of migration is this kind of reassertion of borders. Using representations and rhetoric as well.

JA: I had a quick point on that about the representation of borders, and Clive talked about them being enacted and the set of practices which sometimes don't always gel in the mind. But, when you are there, you actually see these security guards perform the border. And I mean perform. They actually act it out. The Rio Grande, Rio Bravo, the river on the Texas side, sometimes there's no water in it. so what do you do? People can walk across. But you've got people actually security guards driving around and actually almost in a militarised way. Actually securing the border for the state, as Melissa says. It's the government embodied and the border. And if you took them away, it's just a patch of land. But you have to see that kind of performance going on. It did really strike me being there, actually seeing that. And then imposing that on me.

MB: And again also just.. you can see this in other examples as well. I'm think of the Wago border between India and Pakistan. Where there's been a whole military ritual created to enact that border. Which was an artificial border created as a result of colonialism and then independence, for those two countries. But you had to create a border and that's done through this sort of ritualised dance that they've just invented. But which they had to create to make sure that this border is seen to be something that is real.

PB: Clive, the Mexico US border has become heavily militarised hasn't it?

CB: Yes, I think.. it's always been a heavily policed border. But it's become increasingly militarised and securitised. Which again is a feature of borders elsewhere throughout the world. I think one of the interesting things about that, is that it's sort of.. it kind of crystallises the coming together of two different dimensions of globalisation. One of which is an increasing concern with security of national borders, around concerns about terrorism and so on. Particularly in the United States after 9/11 on the one hand. But coming up against this different set of processes, embodied in the US Mexico border by NAFTA. The North American Free Trade Agreement. Which was signed in the 1990's between Canada, United States and Mexico. In which technically does away with borders for the purposes of trade. For movement of goods and services. Now the consequences of NAFTA have actually been to worsen living conditions and to worsen poverty in much of central and south America. So it's actually served as an impetus for more people moving to the border. And trying to get across the border. Thereby sparking politicised concern in the United States to police the border more effectively. So the militarisation of the border is really an expression of the coming together of these different sets of concerns. One set of process is actually which sort of seem to do away with borders, sparking a set of political responses. Which are actually are trying to actually police much more heavily movement of people across the border.

PB: And you have those individuals who have taken it upon themselves in the United States to actually film movement, migrant movement. That they felt their state wasn't handling well.

CB: Yes. One of the effects of the militarisation of the border, is that crossing the border has become much much more dangerous. It means that people are on the one hand, much more

liable to being exploited on the Mexican side. By the people who actually guide them across. It also means on the other side, because there's politics around immigration in certain parts of the south west United States. Those people once they get across, not only are they trying to escape detection by the federal authorities, and the formal authorities. But they are also being subjected to various forms of harassment, by citizen organisations. Self style citizen organisations. So crossing the border which again has always been a risky process. Has become much much more risky. Much much more hazardous. Partly because of the what people are negotiating as the real presence of states. The presence of police forces and militaries. Another consequence of the militarisation of the border, building fences and the high walls over more and more and of the border. Is that most of that flow of immigrants, or illegal immigration is now being channelled through particular parts of the border. Specifically through the Arizona sector.

PB: Is that what John Fife or the Presbyterian Minister referred to as 'The Corridor of Death?'

CB: Yes. Yes. What he is referring to, is that that's a desert area. So people are increasing having to move through that part of the border. Which involves a four, five or six day trek through a desert. Rather than a quick hop through a fence in the middle of a city. Therefore those people have become much more vulnerable to what's involved in being in a desert for six days. Which is dehydration. So the level of deaths in that part of the border has increased dramatically. And you have in turn a set of organisations. Humanitarian organisations involved in trying to reduce that consequence. But in various different ways what one sees then, is that crossing the border has become highly hazard experience for people who as you said before, are doing it because they're already vulnerable economically. They're being made more vulnerable to various forms of violence. And more vulnerable to actually the hazards of living and trying to survive in certain sorts of environments.

PB: Gillian, it's particularly hazardous for women. Am I correct?

GR: That's right. Yes. Not perhaps so much in terms of the journeys that migrants are making that Clive was describing. But, one of the cities on the US Mexico border, Whares, it is described as one of the most violent places to live on the planet. It's a place that's been put under enormous pressures from very rapid and are now changing once again economic development.

A lot of the big factories that some of the clips show you moved in ten, fifteen years ago to make use of cheap labour. And the labour there is paid very little. It's mostly women who work in those machiladora factories. And some of those are now moving on in fact to China. So a lot of the employment that was there, bad as it was, has now also.. it's now going. So the situation is worsening. But the pressures on the women have been particularly bad. And there are huge levels of violence against women in particular in those area. Well over 400 women have been murdered since the early 1990's in Whares. Very few, I think just two people have been jailed for some of those. So clearly there are a lot of murders at loose in the cities still. And there are arguments about why that is. But I think for me probably the most credible one is that this is an area that's been subjected to huge change very fast. And in particular the changes impacted on women, because they've been put into cheap jobs, their earning money which actually gives them a little independence now. A little more than they had before. So there's a sense in which in these rapidly changing cities, women are choosing to work in these places, machiladores. But are finding that actually that move for them is although they're earning money. It's not a move that seems to be valued or understood in that place more widely. And they're becoming extremely vulnerable to all sorts of violence. And they've been described as disposable women. That they are paid cheaply to do incredibly repetitive jobs that often destroy their health. Eye sight problems. All sorts of occupational health hazards that they undergo. And then when these sorts of violence starts to happen actually the state doesn't care very much and nothing is being.. certainly Amnesty International has been arguing this persistently. That the Mexican state at both local and national level, has done very little to try and stop this violence against the women. And it's perhaps one of the most disturbing aspects of all of this. That I guess is perhaps harder for us in the more wealthy countries to really identify with. The extreme, the costs of these

processes of globalisation, are actually people dying. And actually very few people in some places caring very much about that.

PB: It was interesting John Fife's point in one of the clips that struck me. That there should be a totally different attitude towards the border, that should be managed well. Rather than defended. Is this a very strong argument in this whole area?

MB: Well there is some research that has been done in the States actually. That if the border was more flexible in a sense, that you would have a greater flow of people. We have this idea now with migration, that it's trans national. It's more circular. And you can see this again in Europe with east Europeans working in England and going back. But what's happening with the border in Mexico. Because it's so militarised, is that when people cross, because of the cost of being smuggled across. Because of the danger if you do get across. The chances of you coming back are less likely. So there is an argument that if the border was actually more flexible, or managed rather than defended, you would have more movement. And you would be less likely.. particularly as it's mostly young men that are making this crossing. For them to stay and put down roots. And some of these problems would be resolved, if it was better managed in that way.

PB: John?

JA: It's interesting. There's a tension there between the politics of the border and the economics of the border. And if you manage it politically then as Clive was saying earlier. You have to see the government, the US government wishing to make the border more secure to keep people or certain kind of people out. But actually economically, the argument is that you need people to move across and migrate. And actually be part of a labour force. Particularly in California. But right across some of the major cities in the US. And those groups of workers come in not just from Mexico, but coming up from central America. Even further south. Who are coming across the border illegally. Actually run part of the US economy.

Now if they're not there, it would be a real problem for the US economy and the US government. So they're in a sense they're trying to manage that tension. And at different times it moves more towards the harsh side of the politics. But other times it goes more towards to kind of lousy fair the economics. It depends who's president really.

PB: Going back to Christian Rameres again. Who articulated this notion of being both one side of the border and the other. And being able to manage that identity. And saying the UK citizenship was the paperwork, and everything else was the real him in a sense. It occurred to me, do you think that's threatening to for example US people who it's not the paperwork. It's their culture?

MB: That is one of the fears that people have. I think it's important that we acknowledge that people have this fear. Change can be stressful. It can be a fearful process for people. So it's about the unknown. It's like what's happening to our culture. Where we are familiar with how things are done. We have a particular power structure and a hierarchy. And this is normal for us. And now we have these other communities coming in and things are going to change. And we need to try and control this. And there is this.. we've heard all these kind of arguments from groups. That would say that this is why we're seeing the state rhetorically at least, talking more about citizenship tests. If you come to this country you have to speak English. You have to prove that you have the same values as we do. That you are going to behave in the same way that we think is acceptable. So yes, it's certainly one of the.. I think the reasons why people become defensive of their own culture when they might hear something like that. But there's also a whole series of reasons why someone would articulate their sense of identity in that way. And what you find is that over time, people become.. This particular person is in a very interesting position, because he's right on the border, as it were. On that physical territorial border. But, you also find that over time, people's attitudes change. They adapt. It takes time and it can take one or two, or three generations.



PB: One of the things that always strikes me, looking at those series of clips. Are the incredibly different investments that people have around the border. That people feel so strongly about it, and in very different ways. And the obvious examples are one of those informal kind of vigilante groups, I guess we could call them. That Clive mentioned earlier. Verses the Presbyterian minister who treks out into the desert, carrying water supplies to rescue some of these dehydrated immigrants. And save them from a terrible death. And I have no answer to this. But it's extraordinary that in that same area, living a hundred kilometres apart perhaps. There are two people with such different views about those immigrants. One who will invest huge amounts of money it looked to me like. In great hi-tech technology, off his own back, to try and detect these migrants. And hand them back to the authorities. And get them back to where he thinks they belong in Mexico. And somebody else instead who will take water to those people to stop them from dying. I don't know how to explain that difference. But it's a fascinating one. And I think it's important though to think more about. Because it does strike me that certainly within the US and also within the UK political culture, I think a lot of arguments around migration, more broadly round other aspects of globalisation are increasingly conducted in these rather more emotional tones. So the debate is sometimes around the economic logics that John's talked about. It's sometimes around the political irrationalities of European union is a good thing because it will reduce the risk of conflict within Europe, or whatever. But increasingly, and particularly around migration. Governments in many places in the world seem to be latching on to these fears that a lot of people have around migration. Sadly I would say much less often, around the much more hopeful views around migration. I think Christian Rameres who you've mentioned a couple of times. Has a very moving vision for me about a world where borders don't exist. Now I kind of think being realistic, that's a little unlikely.

[Inaudible speech].

GR: Yes. Yes. Yes. Unusual. Well I wonder actually. His is a voice that we hear very little in contemporary debates about migration. You don't hear people standing up and saying I am sure if we went round the table today.. most of us are either migrants. Or we have close family who are. Or we know friends who are. Most people have experience of migration in their lives. And that actually doing everyday things. Going off on your cheap flights to see a friend or a relation somewhere. Or sending family photo's to your great aunt, who emigrated to Canada, whatever. They are very ordinary everyday ways in which in fact, we could think about us all being migrants in one way or the other. But that sense of being at ease with that crossing borders, is not an emotional stance that a lot of the politics of this seem to want to build on. And certainly at national political levels of debate. And I think for me that's quite disturbing. And partly because we don't really understand why it is that people side on one way or the other. For one way or the other on this issue. And it's a very powerful way to conduct debates as well. People get swept along with these emotional rhetoric's, without pausing perhaps to think about other logics. The political, the economic and so on.

MB: Just carrying on from the ease of movement as well. And one thing that struck me from the clips, was the ease that.. and I'm wondering if there's a class or an issue here, in terms of our responses to migration. But, you see the ease with which the manager can cross the border. The American manager can cross over to Mexico to manage the company. And the difficulty from going the other way, from the labourers side. And so we have now today, we tend to think of migration and the problems. And I'm putting inverted comma's which is not good for radio. But, around that idea of the problem of migration, or the challenges of migration. We tend to associate in these public debates that Gillian was just referring to. With this the low skilled unskilled migration. Because that's mass migration, we tend to feel. And one of the respondent's, the American respondent or Texan respondent, was saying, feeling that they were being overwhelmed. Feeling they were being flattered by migrants. And this is often again an emotional response that people have to migration. But we also have another class of migrants. Which is this highly mobile professional migrant. Which we just see briefly in the film. The manager class, the managerial class. Now for them this movement is easy. For us migration is easy. For me it was really easy. I don't have the same kind of issues. Because I come from a particularly educated or class background if you like. If you want to introduce those terms. And I think that's something else we need to be aware of in the debates. About our responses to migration. Some of us just disappear into

the system. Whereas for other groups of people, they are forced to take these illegal dangerous, dirty, degrading routes of mobility, and movement.

PB: John, a big actor in this whole drama is the natural world isn't it? in terms of borders. And this comes out in the clips through water.

JA: It certainly does. Water seems to play a number of significant roles in the border. Perhaps the most obvious one is that when you take the Rio Grande, Rio Bravo. It is, the water itself is the border. Back in 1848, in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, they actually decided that the border itself would be the middle of the river. Now at that time, they know that rivers move. So every so often when there would be a flood and there would be a detached piece of land say to the north or the south, they would allocate land. Some to Mexico and some back to the US itself. But of course at certain points in time, some of those chunks of land were extremely large. And it become a geopolitical issue. If the middle of the river is actually the border. And the borders move. In some cases it moves across people. And so water itself, something you think you can control, actually in this case shifts something that's geo political. But there are other things involved there as well. Because water itself as we saw in a number of the clips around the citrus growing side of things. Water is a scarce resource. And there's a conflict between the US side, and how they use that water. Whether they're using it not just for agriculture, but also for recreation goals etc. And on the Mexico side, where they are also using it for agriculture. But also there's a real scarcity in the shanty towns. In Whares in particular. So it's almost not a different cultural meaning of water, but a different set of practices about how water should be used. And there seems to be a real kind of sharp opposition. Almost black and white understanding how that should be. And because there are tributaries on both sides, that come into the Rio Grande and Rio Bravo. There's an issue about how you control water even further upstream. So you can see water coming into the picture geo politically, economically and culturally. Right across the border.

PB: Gillian Rose, as course Chair, what would you hope that your students who studied this course on the Mexico US border would take with them?

GR: Well the clips concentrate on the US Mexico Border and that's where the course starts. But as students move on through the course, we move away from that border. As we said at the beginning that we start at the border because it's an intense and compelling and exciting place to really bring some of the issues around globalisation alive. But of course globalisation by definition it's global. It stretches well beyond any particular place. And indeed it's all about linking different places. Different places, stretched relations between different places. Stretching around the world. Very long distances. All sorts of different relations. And we've talked about a lot of them already. Economic relations. Political relations. Questions of feelings of belonging and identity. Cultural identity and so on. That there are many others that if we'd had more time, we could have gone through. So I hope when students have worked through the course materials, and been taken to other places. Well beyond the US Mexico border. Some of those places will be connected to the US Mexico border, and others won't. But nonetheless they will have a sense of the range of ways in which the world is not inter connected. And indeed disconnected, because of course borders stop things moving as well as allow them to move. That what they will have is a kind of clearer understanding of why, just why it is that globalisation seemed such a huge and complex beast. That it's about a lot of different process. sometimes working together. But sometimes contradicting each other. And it's also about the ways in which those processes are practiced and carried out by individuals. Actually doing ordinary, rather everyday sorts of things. Whether that ordinary everyday thing is managing a macheladora. Going to fetch water in a shanty town in Whares. Landing in an airport and digging out your passport, and handing it to be able to cross over a border if you're lucky. To be hauled off to some interrogation room if you're not. And so on. All those things are part of globalisation. And I would hope by the end of the course, people will be able to have a better sense of why things are like that. And also possibly why things might be changed for the better.

PB: Gillian Rose, thank you very much. Clive Barnett, Melissa Butcher, John Allen, thanks very much for the discussion.

Thank you.

Thank you.