

Chapter 15

On the Border with Deleuze and Guattari

Keith Woodward and John Paul Jones III

Introduction

Perhaps the most influential aspect of postmodernism's introduction into geography in the late 1980s was an interdisciplinary engagement with the humanities, particularly with American literary theory, British cultural studies, and French poststructuralism. Out of these interactions a growing cadre of geographers came to reject their traditional model of mimetic representation and the certainties it insured. In its place they came to highlight the indeterminacy of meaning and the inescapably social entanglements of discourse within systems of power/knowledge. These insights led to an emphasis on the textual character of space and everyday life over the brute force of underlying social structures, particularly the capitalist political economy.

It was no simple task to incorporate new theories that privileged the contingencies of epistemology over the ground truth of ontology into a field that had largely been materialist in both subject matter and methodological orientation. The stakes behind this shift became more pronounced following the publication of David Harvey's (1989) classic analysis of postmodernism. Following a materialist critique of new theories of representation, Harvey showed how post-Fordist economic restructuring and its attendant 'space time compression' could account for the cultural formations and epistemological uncertainties of postmodernism. In spite of his criticisms, over the next decade numerous books and articles continued to explore the representational aspects of social space under the general impetus of the cultural/linguistic turn (Benko and Strohmayr, 1997; Deutsche, 1991; Doel, 1999; Duncan and Ley, 1993; Harley, 1989; Keith and Pile, 1993; Olsson, 1991; Ó Tuathail, 1996). Such works led some, such as Richard Peet (1998), to conclude with a variety of critics in other fields that the postmodern/poststructuralist movement was at base idealist and relativistic. By the end of the 1990s, some would claim that the division between materialist analyses and those focusing on representation and discourse constituted one of the primary theoretical cleavages in geography (Jones and Natter, 1999).

A relatively recent response to these congealed positions is found in the geographic literature addressing the work of French theorists Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (Doel, 1999; Bonta and Protevi forthcoming). These two theorists offer what might be best described as a 'post-structuralist historical-libidinal materialism' (Protevi, 2001, p. 199), so named because their ontology rejects the verticality of structuralist thought but retains an emphasis on the 'real' productive

effects of flows and interruptions. Marcus Doel a leading interpreter of Deleuze and Guattari in geography, counters the idealist critique thusly:

‘Contrary to popular opinion, *we have no special (some would say ‘unnatural’) interest in language*. We are not besotted with texts, writing, signs, images, and such like. We do not believe that since reality is only accessible to us through language, then reality *itself* must be lost to us in language: that all we have are *signs* of things, rather than the things themselves; that having been emancipated from their bondage to an élite band of actually-existing real-world referents (such as people, places, events, and objects), signs will at last be free to float in the void, enjoying untroubled and halcyon days’ (forthcoming, p. 2, emphasis in original).

Instead, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari, he asserts the materiality of everything:

‘*As fanatical materialists, we are struck by everything* – nothing will be set aside from the play of force; nothing will be spirited away onto a higher plane or exorcized into a nether-world It is true that we take up signs, words, images, quantities, figures, maps, photographs, money, hypertext, gardening advice, lipstick traces, the exquisite corpse, and so on and so forth – but we take them up as force: as strikes and counter-strikes; as blows and counter-blows’ (forthcoming, p. 10; emphasis in original).

From our perspective, Deleuze and Guattari’s work bears directly on the theoretical status of borders – parts of ‘everything’ that are both signs *and* lines: ‘constraining enclosures’ produced by border words (e.g., woman, straight, white: see Kirby, 1996, p. 13) and stubbornly ‘real’ boundaries that ‘refuse to melt in the heat of a post-modern world’ (Valins, 2003, p. 160). This paper is thus an effort to rethink the border outside of the ideational/material preoccupations, a rethinking that should be welcome in the interdisciplinary field of ‘border studies’ (e.g., Arreola, 2002; Fox, 1999; Hicks, 1991; Jay, 1998; Johnson and Michaelson, 1997; Saldívar, 1997; van Houtum and van Naerssen, 2002; Welchman, 1996). For, on the one hand, there are those theorists who draw on Derrida, Butler, Foucault, and Bhabha, among others, in stressing the theoretical, abstract, metaphoric, and discursive aspects of social and spatial categorization. For example, John Welchman, in affirming Ernesto Laclau’s theory of the border, asserts that:

‘No longer a mere threshold or instrument of demarcation, the border is a crucial zone through which contemporary (political, social, cultural) formations negotiate with received knowledge and reconstitute the “horizon” of discursive identity’ (Welchman, 1996, pp. 177-178).

While, on the other hand, there are those who remind us not to neglect the material effects of specific borders, such as the fence separating the U.S. and Mexico:

‘I am not critical of the philosophical formulations of such postmodern theorists ... I am saying that the level of abstraction that seems to be the nature of such formulations sometimes distances the reader from the lived reality ... of the U.S.-Mexican border. As we negotiate the intellectual twists and turns of

such musings it is easy to forget the border on which millions of people live and the border that is traversed daily – both legally and illegally – by thousands of women and men’ (Tatum, 2000, pp. 96-97).

A premise of this paper is that border researchers should address these sorts of divisions with theories that are both open to new ways of thinking about socio-spatial demarcations and sufficiently capable of addressing the violence of everyday life on the border. As Neil Smith and Cindi Katz note regarding spatial concepts more generally: ‘if a new spatialized politics is to be both coherent and effective, it will be necessary to comprehend the interconnectedness of material and metaphoric [i.e., ideational] space’ (1993, p. 68). Our discussion of Deleuze and Guattari’s border theory goes directly to the mediations called for by Smith and Katz. We begin by discussing Deleuze and Guattari’s dismissal of metaphor – the conveyor belt *par excellence* of representation – placing it in relation to their productive materialism of ‘becoming’. We then theorize the becoming-border through their concept of (de)territorialization. A brief empirical discussion concludes the main body of the paper. In it we describe the deterritorializing activism of *La Resistencia*, an anti-border group with offices throughout the U.S. southwest.

The Limits of Metaphor: Becoming as Materiality

The collaborative works of Deleuze and Guattari, particularly *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987) and *What is Philosophy?* (1994), are replete with the language of borders (for introductions to their work, see Boundas and Olkowski, 1994; Delanda, 2002; Hardt, 1993; Massumi, 1992; Patton, 2000). In these and other works, border terms are accompanied by references to a host of other geographic concepts, such as plateaus and milieus, zones and landscapes, latitudes and longitudes, and tracings and mappings. So infused is their writing with the language of space that at one point they invent the term ‘geophilosophy’ to announce their investment in geography (see Bonta and Protevi, forthcoming). Yet, as we noted at the outset, when critics and theoreticians turn to the concept of borders as an apparatus for articulating various lines of difference and subjectivity in social and cultural studies (e.g., Anzaldúa, 1999; Kirby, 1996; Welchman, 1996), the term may slide into metaphoric usage. According to Smith and Katz, this maneuver can introduce absolutist and Euclidean versions of spatial thinking that may de-materialize and therefore de-politicize social space, as if borders did their work solely within the nether-land of abstract neutrality (1993, also Tatum, 2000).

As thinkers who invoke the language of borders to understand all manner of topics, Deleuze and Guattari risk inviting similar accusations. Take, for example, their popular concept, ‘lines of flight’, a phrase that signals an escape from an institutionalized apparatus of capture. The term has been invoked as an experimental resistance to the ‘order words’ of linguistic systems that limit alternative conceptualizations – just the sort of spatialization that might hover over material borderlands. For us, however, Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptual spaces – and their political leverage – are anchored in a resolutely materialist understanding of spatiality.

Key to overcoming the division between metaphor and materiality in Deleuze and Guattari's work is their explicit rejection of the former term. They maintain that metaphor belongs to an idealist realm of relation that, like the evolutionary natural sciences, uses strategies of 'series and structure' to produce degrees of resemblance and difference between a set of terms: 'In the first case, I have resemblances that differ from one another in a single series, and between series. In the second case, I have differences that resemble each other within a single structure, and between structures' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 234). In both instances we find the organization of a closed system that assembles terms and relations according to likenesses, imagining for itself a prior, transcendental Ideal form to which all other terms speak (also Derrida, 1972). Locking these terms into a form of progressive development, each following from the previous in an arboreal series of increasingly different likenesses, produces a hierarchical model that uses the supposed unity of the first term in the series, the Ideal subject or object, as a grounds for producing the individual (individuated) unities of subsequent subjects/objects, each of which differ in varying degrees of perfection, but find their wholeness through a hierarchy of likenesses:

'either in the form of a chain of beings perpetually imitating one another, progressively and regressively, and tending toward the divine higher term they all imitate by graduated resemblance, as the model for and principle behind the series; or in the form of a mirror Imitation with nothing left to imitate because it itself is the model everything imitates, this time by ordered difference' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, pp. 234-35).

If the border metaphor is problematic for dealing with moments of heterogeneity because it tends to presuppose and fall back upon a unified transcendental identity on either of its sides, where, so to speak, do we begin? Deleuze and Guattari's response is that we start with the fragmented pieces *as they are already assembled*, 'in the middle', as Doel often says (1999, p. 164). For Deleuze and Guattari, the pieces, whatever and wherever they may be, produce a whole that is *immanent to* the multiplicities that constitute an assemblage. This whole appears and disappears with the transformation of the multiplicities. Such a whole points not to Identity or essence, but is rather a temporary stabilization, a contingent consistency of the parts within the space upon and with which they assemble.

In their discussion of Kafka, Deleuze and Guattari celebrate the abandonment of metaphor in favor of metamorphoses, actual *transformations-out-of* that they call *becomings*:

'Kafka deliberately kills all metaphor, all symbolism, all signification, no less than all designation. Metamorphosis is the contrary to metaphor. There is no longer any proper sense or figurative sense, but only a distribution of states that is part of the range of the world. The thing and the other things are no longer anything but intensities overrun by deterritorialized sound or words that are following their *line of escape*. It is no longer a question of a resemblance Instead, it is now a question of a becoming that includes the maximum of differences as a difference of intensity, *the crossing of a barrier*, a raising or a falling, a bending or an erecting, an accent on the word' (1986, p. 22, emphases added).

Kafka's metamorphic becomings create new possibilities, new actions, and new affects that take lines of flight from the structuring that overcodes the collected parts (what Deleuze and Guattari call 'Bodies without Organs') and produces them as organisms. Such organisms parade as transcendental, as if they precede the assemblage while organizing its serial similarities into categories that elide difference: Oedipalized infant, productive worker, illegal immigrant, capitalist state, nation, and so on. To metamorphose or become is, by contrast, to have a productive relationship to the multiplicities of difference, to rediscover 'what a body *can* do' (Deleuze 1986, p. 39), something that is often forgotten when thought is organized according to series, structures, and systems. Taking a line of flight from these organizing processes and the instituted bodies they cohere (Massumi, 1992) requires us to retest bodies at molecular levels and to create new strategies for making connections, affecting, and being affected. As such, becoming is never a matter of imitating some other organism, but is rather a metamorphosing out of organization.

The processes just described are determinedly material. Indeed, for Deleuze and Guattari, even concepts are material and productive, forms of and vehicles for becomings (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994). For, by invoking questions, concepts constantly transform our engagement with the world (Olkowski, 1999, p. 91), creating lines of flight for new assemblages. The lengthy compendium of generated and borrowed concepts in the work of Deleuze and Guattari is not word play, but one part of a larger project that rejects the structured categories handed down through the history of philosophy (e.g., metaphysics, ethics). These systems have only served to keep materiality at a distance, held in abeyance through a language that has us looking for the world in all the wrong places. And this explains the political value of spatial terminologies for Deleuze and Guattari, for their efforts to unhinge calcified language regimes is aimed at remapping the terrain of thought so as to welcome in a host of new becomings.

(De)territoriality and the Many Sides of the Border

The above suggests that the concept and process of bordering – a key aspect in Deleuze and Guattari's ontology – can be understood as an event of becoming. As dispersed events of productivity, bordering generates, transverses, and potentially opposes all structures of organization. Bordering describes a vast array of affective and transformative material processes in which social and spatial orders and disorders are constantly reworked.

Consider first how bordering produces an escape from institutionalization. It does so by producing affects that operate outside of the influence of extant organized assemblages. Such lines of escape are productive of new bodies that are capable of any number of new affects. Bordering, passing the limit of stable organization or exhausted connections, is an intense bifurcation that sends bodies into flight and, subsequently, increases their singularities through a process of heterogenesis, 'an active, immanent singularization of subjectivity, as opposed to a transcendent, universalizing and reductionist homogenization. Heterogeneity is an expression of desire, of a becoming that is always in the process of adapting, transforming and modifying itself in relation to its environment' (Pindar and

Sutton, in Guattari, 2000, p. 99, n. 49). The bordering event thus does not sit inertly between sets of ideational categories (Ideas, Subject, and Nature), but rather is active at the event-limit of multiplicities constituted by the affects exchanged between subjectivity and milieu. To deterritorialize an organized body means to make it into a body without organs (BwO), a body that is reawakened to its numerous affective capacities rather than divided up into functions and categories. The body becomes a multiplicity of possible new connections, affects, etc., with other bodies and, more broadly, with the Earth itself.

Thus, although Ó Tuathail (2000) criticizes the invocation of the term 'deterritorialization' because of its apparent reference to a borderless world that lacks any sense of spatial distinctiveness or complexity, it is important to note that Deleuze and Guattari's use of the term does not in any way imply that the deterritorialized body is losing its real spatial complexity. Rather, deterritorialization and the heterogenesis it produces are processes that bring forth socio-spatial complexity that was disguised by the functional and categorical divisions of institutionalization. In this use of the concept, then, deterritorialization facilitates new, inventive forms of bordering.

Although accessing lines of flight and creating new bodies helps in the escape from the 'resentment and bad conscience' that tend to accompany the instituted body (Marks, 1998, p. 31), Deleuze and Guattari caution that there are always forces of stratification attempting to capture the BwO in order to re-organize and re-absorb (reterritorialize) it into a serial order of like bodies. These are 'mechanisms of capture and containment [...] that] induct the outside into a system of interiority. That system consists in a grid of identities abstracted from actually existing bodies and transposed onto another dimension: from the here and now into the great beyond' (Massumi, 1992, p. 111). Deterritorialized bodies are always (at risk of) falling back under the influence of organization, falling from the continual present, actualized through continuous becomings, into an elsewhere of transcendent identity structures.

We can ground this dual-sided disordering and ordering by reference to the worldwide expansion of capital under globalization. If the process of bordering is concerned with the passage of multiplicities through or across their saturated condition in order to create new assemblages and creative possibilities, capital is content to always be present at the limit of those transformations. '[C]apitalism is continually reterritorializing with one hand what it is deterritorializing with the other' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 259). The political potential of any deterritorialized smooth space is therefore always at risk of a capitalist overcoding of social relations and the creation of new hierarchies of labor and production. Thus it is with the neoliberal alliance between capitalism and the state apparatus: all numbers of smooth flows have been territorialized and institutionalized (legally and otherwise) through regimes such as NAFTA on the U.S., Canadian, and Mexican borders.

But this is only one side of becoming-border. Global capital also works by deterritorializing networks and flows across national borders. Building upon the conclusions and political-economic forecasts of Deleuze and Guattari, Hardt and Negri have suggested that, given the 'global expansion of the U.S. constitutional project' – a project 'constructed on the model of rearticulating an open space and reinventing incessantly diverse and singular relations in networks across an

unbounded terrain' – 'a border place no longer exists' (2001, pp. 182-83). The resulting smooth space, while potentially a site of resistance against State striation, is overtaken by capital as a site for connecting several networks of control at once:

'From the economic point of view, the wage regime is replaced, as a function of regulation, by a flexible and global monetary system; normative command is replaced by the procedures of command and police; and the exercise of domination is formed through communicative networks. This is how exploitation and domination constitute a non-place on the imperial terrain' (Hardt and Negri 2001, p. 211).

In response to capital's malleable operations, Hardt and Negri reject any return to striated state spaces. Instead, they call for a new global citizenship in which:

'The movements of the multitude designate new spaces, and its journeys establish new residences. Autonomous movement is what defines the place proper to the multitude. Increasingly less will passports and legal documents be able to regulate our movements across borders. A new geography is established by the multitude as the productive flows of bodies define new rivers and ports' (2001, p. 397).

The borderless space of the multitude affirms its autonomy, finally, through a 'widespread, transversal territorial reappropriation' (2001, p. 398). It is just such new appropriations that are the focus of the anti-immigration law group, *La Resistencia*, to which we now turn.

Todos Somos Ilegales: La Resistencia in the Southwest U.S.

La Resistencia is an organization dedicated to fighting the criminalization of immigrants by the U.S. Border Patrol (*La Migra*) and by police and vigilantes who enforce control over the U.S.-Mexican border. Founded in 1987, the organization has continuously planned and participated in demonstrations and information dissemination activities aimed at disrupting the physical violence, imprisonment, and deportation experienced by immigrants. Rejecting the order word, 'illegal', *La Resistencia* grounds its opposition in the guarantee that 'All persons have a right to work' (*La Resistencia*, 2003). This right, which is held to supersede any government dictate, is asserted to protect workers and their families from any sanction as they move across the border. In asking readers to judge their commitment to the organization's goals, the *La Resistencia* website poses the following questions:

Do you believe that:

- People are driven from their homeland and come to the U.S. to survive?
- All people have a right to survive regardless of legal status?
- Being an immigrant is not a crime? Human life is more important than laws?

Figure 15.1

La Resistencia's* Blue Triangle Deleuze and Guattari's Bodies without Organs (BwO) take flight from the instituting processes that would organize them as, say, 'illegal'. By appropriating the term selfreferentially, *La Resistencia* aims to deterritorialize 'illegal' and evacuate its organizing potential. Shirt courtesy of *La Resistencia



- People with legal status have the responsibility to defy and resist unjust laws, struggle alongside our brothers and sisters who have been deemed illegal, and protect them? (La Resistencia, 2003).

As part of its activism, the organization opposed California's Proposition 187, an anti-immigrant law that attempted to deny illegally-designated immigrants access to health care, housing, and education, and which 'would force people working in education, health care and social services to become "junior Migra agents" or risk losing their jobs and their licenses to work, and possibly jail time' (La Resistencia, 2003; Mains, 2000). In response to Proposition 187 and its national counterpart, Federal 187, *La Resistencia* has engaged in a multipronged strategy of resistance to 'unmap the borders in the world' (van Houtum and Strüver, 2002, p. 23) organizing and demonstrating against border blockades and INS detention centers, confronting and exposing acts of violence on the part of *La Migra*, providing sanctuary for the persecuted, encouraging anti-discriminatory hiring practices on the part of employers, and defying laws that disallow immigrants access to health care and education (La Resistencia, 2003). Members of *La Resistencia* are recognizable by the blue triangles adorning their clothing and by their banners reading, 'Todos Somos Ilegales/We Are All Illegals'. The blue triangle is appropriated from its use in Nazi Germany, where it identified 'stateless people'. *La Resistencia* distributes the emblem as a sign of solidarity with 'illegal aliens', the complex body of people categorized through contemporary constructions of Statehood and personhood (Figure 15.1). 'Todos Somos Ilegales/We Are All Illegals' is aimed at disrupting State territorializations of subjectivity (Figure 15.2). Inasmuch as 'illegal' serves as an ontological legitimation for violence committed by both vigilantes and the State (from murder to laws such as Federal 187), refrains of 'Todos Somos Ilegales' flattens or smooths the border by delegitimizing exclusivist nationalisms. This border-disordering phrase is simultaneously ordering, encompassing all bodies living within it and offering a new transcendent body, a new 'We', that no longer identifies with the State.

La Resistencia's website demonstrates an acute understanding of the spatial territorializations and deterritorializations noted in the previous section. In response to the increasingly militarized and striated social space encountered by migrants, *La Resistencia* explains:

'The recent anti-terrorist law, the new welfare law, the group of legislation known as "Federal 187", plans to make "English Only" the law of the land, the millions of dollars spent to militarize the U.S./Mexico border...these moves work to drive immigrants further underground, to set the stage for more raids and round-ups, jailings and beating [sic], deportations and warfare at the border, and to create an anti-immigrant climate which creates a class of "illegals" against whom no crime is unthinkable' (La Resistencia, 2003).

As Spener and Staudt (1998) note (also Mains, 2000), while these territorializations work against immigrants, other borderings serve the interest of capital. At the present time we have 'a border open to capital but closed to workers': the arrival of NAFTA and the accompanying clampdown on the border [through Operation Blockade] were quite explicable: before free trade, U.S. capitalists did not have unfettered access to cheap Mexican workers. It was necessary, therefore, to 'import' Mexican workers into the United States. Now, with the Mexican state opening its territory to unfettered foreign investment, U.S. capital had a greater interest in keeping Mexican workers in Mexico, which constituted something of a low-wage labor reserve for manufacturing. In fact, at the



Figure 15.2 *Todos Somos Ilegales* (We Are all Illegal). This image is from a 1997 march of 20,000 on the town of Watsonville, California, where immigrants mainly work in large strawberry fields. Photo courtesy of Monica Praba Pilar (www.prabapilar.com).

time of the blockade, some cynics speculated that the Border Patrol was actually in cahoots with the operators of *maquiladoras* in Ciudad Juárez, who complained that they had a shortage of assembly workers at the going rate of pay (Spener and Staudt, 1998: 235-36).

The duplicity of this capital-state alliance is subject to a stinging critique by *La Resistencia*:

‘It is extreme hypocrisy for the government to state that people may not cross borders to survive. U.S. corporations send investments anywhere they want. The U.S. sends armies all over the world to bomb and kill people and sponsor death squad governments. All these create the very conditions that make survival impossible’ (La Resistencia, 2003).

None of the above is to suggest that the border is somehow exhaustively organized according to a neoliberal capital-state alliance. For example, Patricia Price’s discussion of the ‘aesthetics of Aztlán’ deconstructs the supposed binary solidity of the southwestern border of the U.S., suggesting that it is instead a fragmented, ‘spatial schizophrenia’ (2000, p. 104) where signs constantly disrupt the nationalized order of things. As with the slogans of *La Resistencia*, Price explains that the presence of tattoos and murals inscribed upon bodies and walls invoking the imagined geography of Aztlán and its attendant counter-nationalizing discourse rupture the apparent stability of spatial identity instituted throughout the border region. The solidity of the border as an ordering and organizational principle of identity is disrupted through minor deterritorializations of bodies and spaces that are transformed to signal associations with other people who *nevertheless occupy the same territory* (‘We are all illegals’). When understood as an event that deterritorializes the body, such forms of sign-based resistance can produce a disruptive affect, or what Deleuze calls ‘a shock to thought’ (1989, p. 156), upon their witnesses. Price cites a San Diego resident who exemplifies the disorientation inherent in such shocks:

There are a whole lot of portions of Los Angeles city...if you didn’t know where you’re at you’d swear you’re in Tijuana. *You cannot tell the difference*. You cannot tell the difference. The *barrio* that exists in Tijuana looks exactly the same as the one in Los Angeles. As an American, I’m offended by that’ (Price, 2000, pp. 103-4; emphasis in original).

Price suggests that such utterances are the result of ‘anxieties at being lost or overrun’ (2000, p. 104) on the part of members of the homogeneous majority. We see an additional complexity that operates in such moments of spatial disorientation. Note that the speaker’s account of the spatial similarities between areas in Los Angeles and Tijuana (captured entirely through his own gazing practices) is fraught with invocations of transcendent spatial identity categories that he cannot seem to map onto his experience of space. No doubt, these order words, ‘Los Angeles’, ‘Tijuana’, function as a first step in his thought, one that precedes the experience of the space itself. Such a problem is compounded by the speaker’s intense investment in his own (categorical, organizational) spatial identity (‘American’ no less). The invocation of transcendental organizing names has some

effect on the way that space is organized in thought, but it is at the cost of ignoring the particularities of space. In the present instance, such particularities are exactly those that disrupt the difference posited by the category of the border, a category in which the speaker remains invested in order to stave off the sense that he is himself an alien in a territory that he has misunderstood.

What the San Diegan is missing in his interactions with space, a finding that is at the heart of *La Resistencia's* oppositional strategies, is recognition of the various becomings that unfold through the interactions of bodies and space. His deployment of order words that attempt to reterritorialize the Earth in spite of itself speak to that micro-fascist desire for the transcendental that offers an ideational security blanket in the face of the world's immanent uncertainty. The dichotomy that he invokes between spatial transformations and his own national identity is an attempt to solidify and prioritize the border and the logic of spatial organization that should proceed from it. We witness here a necessary component to the striation of space; namely, the ordering of thought in a manner that takes itself to be prior to the materiality of space and its becomings, and that reads inconsistencies between thought and space as problems surfacing in the realm of the gap (c.f. above: 'looking for the world in all the wrong places'). This procedure speaks to the development of discourses of immigrant 'invasion', where national 'natives' panic at the discovery that flows of bodies in search of work, education, medical care, etc., seem to disregard ordering strategies in favor of care of the self and the community. *La Resistencia's* revolutionary cry, 'Todos Somos Ilegales', reverses this ordering, deterritorializing 'native' and setting the border off on a new line of flight.

Conclusion

The concept of borders developed in this paper is strikingly different from a conception that understands them to be stable, permanently situated objects. On the contrary, 'at the limit, all that counts is the *constantly shifting* borderline' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 367, italics added). The movement of the borderline that marks the horizon of the multiplicity is perhaps more akin to the borderlands that are said to surround state borders as sites of intensive marginality and creativity. As such, the smooth spaces generated by assemblages (e.g., *La Resistencia*) that resist both the striating forces of the state and the smooth reterritorializations of capital are not metaphorically *like* borderlands, but are themselves borderlands constituted by the bordering activity of becoming. In this sense, borderlands can appear and disappear at any point within striated space (and not simply along the State border). As Anzaldúa notes, 'when I capitalize Borderlands, it means that it's not the actual Southwest or the Canada-U.S. border, but that it's an emotional Borderlands which can be found anywhere where there are different kinds of people coming together and occupying the same space or where there are spaces that are sort of hemmed in by these larger groups of people' (1994-95, p. 77).

Assemblages such as *La Resistencia* take their lines of flight from what they are bordering against: striations, organizations, institutions that want to close the escape hatches and fold these fleeing aberrations back into the order of things. The

group's strategy seems to speak to the solution proposed by Deleuze and Guattari: 'it is by leaving the plan(e) of capital, and never ceasing to leave it, that a mass becomes increasingly revolutionary and destroys the dominant equilibrium of the denumerable sets' (1987, p. 472). If capital has indeed erased international borders, leaving the plan(e) of capital requires something that Massumi has encouraged from the outset: that you carry your borderings with you. The erasure of national borders (which is itself always an imperfect concept and an incomplete project: see Paasi, 2003; Yeung, 1998) would not mean the end of borders. Following Johnson and Michaelson, we can 'trouble the place of the border' (1997, p. 31) in order to see it distributed across various diverse spaces, and not simply constituted by capital or state striations, but as emerging from the assemblages of bodies becoming-other upon it. *La Resistencia's* 'transversal territorial reappropriation' (Hardt and Negri, 2001) embraces the perpetual end point proposed by Massumi: 'To achieve the goal that has no end means ceasing to seem to be what you are [legal] in order to *become what you cannot be*: supermolecular forever. The goal is a limit approached, never reached' (1992, p. 106, emphasis in original). The practice of reappropriation of space by the multitude, the minor (Katz, 1996), manifests becomings-other by assembling in and with space, by bordering against the surrounding smooth spaces of capital. But even the term 'reappropriation' may be problematic: becomings can never really re-appropriate, they cannot return ownership, capture, or repossess a space. Rather, these moments of becoming merely reawaken what was always there: the ever-existing capacity for mutual transformativity and inter-affectivity.

References

- Anzaldúa, G. (1994-95), 'Working the Borderlands, Becoming *Mestiza*: An Interview with Gloria Anzaldúa', *disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 4, pp. 75-96.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1999), *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, 2nd ed., Aunt Lute, San Francisco.
- Arreola, D. (2002), *Tejano South Texas: A Mexican American Cultural Province*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Benko, G. and Strohmayr, U. (eds) (1997), *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Bonta, M. and Protevi, J. (forthcoming), *Deleuze and Geophilosophy: A Guide and Glossary*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Boundas, C. V. and Olkowski, D. (eds) (1994), *Gilles Deleuze and the Theatre of Philosophy*, Routledge, New York.
- Delanda, M. (2002), *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*, Continuum, London.
- Deleuze, G. (1986), *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Trans. Hugh Tomlinson, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Deleuze, G. (1989), *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1983), *Anti-Oedipus*, Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1986), *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, Trans. Dana Polan, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus*, Trans. Brian Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994), *What is Philosophy?* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Derrida, J. (1972), 'Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences', in J. Macksey, E. Donato and J. Hopkins (eds), *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, University Press, Baltimore, pp. 247-272.
- Deutsche, R. (1991), 'Boys Town', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. Vol. 9, pp. 5-30.
- Doel, M. (1999), *Poststructuralist Geographies: The Diabolical Art of Spatial Science*, Rowman & Littlefield, New York.
- Doel, M. (forthcoming), 'Poststructuralist Geographies: The Essential Selection', in P. Cloke, P. Crang and M. Goodwin (eds), *Envisioning Human Geographies*, Arnold, London.
- Duncan, J. S. and Ley, D. (1993) (eds), *Place/Culture/Representation*, Routledge, New York.
- Fox, C. (1999), *The Fence and the River: Cultural Politics at the U.S.-Mexico Border*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Guattari, F. (2000), *The Three Ecologies*, Trans. Ian Pindar and Paul Sutton, Athlone, New Brunswick NJ.
- Hardt, M. (1993), *Gilles Deleuze: an Apprenticeship in Philosophy*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2001), *Empire*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Harley, J. B. (1989), 'Deconstructing the Map', in T. Barnes and J. Duncan (eds), *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape*, Routledge, New York, pp. 231-247.
- Harvey, D. (1989), *The Postmodern Condition*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Hicks, D. E. (1991), *Border Writing: The Multidimensional Text*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Houtum van, H. and Strüver, A. (2002), 'Where is the Border? You are here', *Journal of Creative Geography*, Vol. 4, pp.20-23.
- Houtum van, H. and van Naerssen, T. (2002), 'Bordering, Ordering and Othering', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 93, pp. 125-136.
- Jay, P. (1998), 'Border Studies and the Literature of the Americas', *Arizona Quarterly*, Vol. 54, pp.165-192.
- Johnson, D. E. and Michaelson, S. (1997), 'Border Secrets: An Introduction', in S. Michealson and D. E. Johnson (eds), *Border Theory: The Limits of Cultural Politics*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. 1-39.
- Jones, J. P. and Natter W. (1999), 'Space and Representation', in A. Buttimer, S.D. Brunn and U. Wardenga (eds), *Text and Image: Social Construction of Regional Knowledges*, Selbstverlag Institut für Länderkunde, Leipzig, pp. 239-47.
- Katz, C. (1996), 'Towards Minor Theory', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol. 14, pp. 487-99.
- Keith, M. and Pile, S. (eds) (1993), *Place and the Politics of Identity*, Routledge, New York.
- Kirby, K. (1996), *Indifferent Boundaries: Spatial Concepts of Human Subjectivity*, Guilford, New York.
- La Resistencia (2003), <http://www.laresistencia.org>.
- Mains, S. (2000), *Contested Spaces: Representing Borders and Immigrant Identities Between the U.S. and Mexico*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington.
- Marks, J. (1998), *Gilles Deleuze: Vitalism and Multiplicity*, Pluto, Sterling, VA.
- Massumi, B. (1992), *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

- Ó Tuathail, G. (1996), *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Ó Tuathail, G. (2000), 'Borderless Worlds? Problematizing Discourses of Deterritorialization', *Geopolitics*, Vol. 4 (2), pp.139-54.
- Olkowski, D. (1999), *Deleuze and the Ruin of Representation*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Olsson, G. (1991), *Lines of Power/Limits of Language*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Paasi, A. (2003), 'Territory', in J. Agnew, K. Mitchell and G. Toal (eds), *A Companion to Political Geography*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 109-122.
- Patton, P. (2000), *Deleuze and the Political*, Routledge, New York.
- Peet, R. (1998), *Modern Geographical Thought*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Price, P. (2000), 'Inscribing the Border: Schizophrenia and the Aesthetics of Aztlán', *Social & Cultural Geography*, Vol. 1 (1), pp. 101-16.
- Protevi, J. (2001), *Political Physics*, Athlone, New York.
- Saldivar, J. D. (1997), *Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Smith, N. and Katz, C. (1993), 'Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics', in M. Keith and S. Pile (eds), *Place and the Politics of Identity*, Routledge, New York, pp. 67-83.
- Spener, D. and Staudt, K. (1998), 'Conclusion: Rebordering', in D. Spener and K. Staudt (eds), *The U.S.-Mexico Border: Transcending Divisions, Contesting Identities*, K. Lynne Rienner, Boulder, pp. 233-57.
- Tatum, C. (2000), 'On the Border: From the Abstract to the Specific', *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies*, Vol. 4, pp. 93-103.
- Valins, O. (2003), 'Stubborn Identities and the Construction of Socio-spatial Boundaries: Ultra-orthodox Jews Living in Contemporary Britain', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 28, pp. 158-75.
- Welchman, J. C. (1996), 'The Philosophical Brothel', *Rethinking Borders*, in J.C. Welchman (ed.), University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Yeung, H. W. (1998), 'Capital, State and Space: Contesting the Borderless World', *Transactions of The Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 23, pp. 291-309.