Approved Sessions of IGU Commission on POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

No.	Session Titles	Contact (Session Chairs)	Outline
C33 Political Geography			
1	Sociocultural Encounters in Geography: Borders, Borderlands, Grassroots Non-State Actors And The Southern African Integration Project	Christopher Changwe Nshimbi csnzed@gmail.com Inocent Moyo minnoxa@yahoo.com	The geographical and socio-economic landscapes of the contiguous border areas in Southern African suggest de facto processes of regional integration. The historical, socio-economic and cultural interactions, enhanced by geography, that characterise these borderlands form sub-regions that not only defy border controls but also achieve alternative processes of regional integration. This has not received much scholarly attention and recognition from policy makers. Therefore, this session takes, as its point of departure, the debates around borders, borderlands, sub- and regional integration and aims to interrogate the place of local, grassroots non-State actors and their rich historical, socioeconomic and cultural interactions facilitated by geographic proximity in Southern Africa's borderlands, in the SADC's regional integration project. Hence the questions; do "spaces of flows" replace "spaces of places" in Southern Africa's borderlands? Are economic regions outside formal state organisation likely to emerge in these contiguous border areas? Contrary to top down approaches to regional integration, the session will explore alternative approaches to regional integration in the SADC and advance perspectives that question current thinking and conceptualization of regional integration in the Southern African region and in Africa, in general. Several questions shall, therefore, be explored such as: how does the role of grassroots non-State actors in the Southern African region compare with other parts of the world?
2	The Eurasian Pacific – geopolitical moments and unfulfilled promise	Sergei Golunov sergei.golunov@gmail.com Akihiro Iwashita	In what appears to be a time long past, the early part of the current decade seemed to herald the possibility of an epoch-making geopolitical transformation. The United States proclaimed a new "pivot to Asia", most explicitly in Hilary Clinton's October 2011 *Foreign Policy* article on "America's Pacific Century". Meanwhile, the Russian Federation's hosting

		iwasi@slav.hokudai.ac.jp	of the APEC Summit in Vladivostok in 2012 was held to mark a new era of engagement with the Pacific, putting flesh on longstanding 'Eurasianist' bones. The continuing rise of China, frequently perceived as the prime motor behind American engagement in the region, was sparking ever more intense reactions among neighboring powers, while practically every state in the region was involved in revanchist territorial claims with one or more of its neighbors. Fast forward five years, however, and the attention of the world has once again turned to the Middle East and Europe's own borderlands. How has this marginalization of such "a key driver of global politics" been felt within the region? This panel seeks to examine the perceptions held by the states of this region of their relations with one another within a global context within which such relations have been significantly 'downgraded'. The term Eurasian Pacific is adopted to refer to those states forming the East Asian end of the Eurasian continent, and the goal here is to discuss these relations in the context of the much-touted focus on the 'Asia-Pacific' region. What material and discursive effects were engendered by the proclamation of a 'pivot' and to what extent have they been muted or transformed by the subsequent downgrading of the region over the time? In so doing, it shall seek to understand the relations between the geographies of the individual states themselves and their mutual imbrication with aspects of the globalized 'geo-graphed' world within which we all reside, one which can only be of service in comprehending the often fraught relations among the states of the region.
3	Scales of politics and policies in Latin American borders	Adriana Dorfman adriana.dorfman@ufrgs.br Alejandro Benedetti alejandrobenedetti@conicet.gov.ar alejandrobenedetti@outlook.com	States are not alone in the management of territorialities at their borders. Traditional actors go along with other actors (local and regional governments, profit and non-profit economic organizations, multinational and supranational organizations, and civil organizations) in a context of neoliberal paradiplomacies and social movements. They are engaged in negotiation at distinct scales in processes at borderlands, even though nationalism remains as a resource to be instrumentalized and limits still act as spatial discontinuity. Conflicts generated by the uses and abuses of natural resources and

			commons reconceptualize frontiers. How can we understand and theorize such processes at Latin America?
4	Autochthony, Allochthonyand Belonging: Migration, Xenophobia and Social Cohesion in the Southern African Region	Inocent Moyo minnoxa@yahoo.com Christopher Changwe Nshimbi csnzed@gmail.com; christopher.nshimbi@up.ac.za	Migration is not new in the Southern African region. Its long history dates back to the late 19th century into the colonial, post-independence and post-Cold War eras, and into the late 1980s and early 1990s when most economies in Southern Africa underwent neoliberal economic reforms and structural adjustments. The economic reforms coincided with the end of apartheid in South Africa. South Africa's emergence as the economic hub of Southern Africa coupled with the long history of migration across Southern Africa makes South Africa a destination of choice for various categories of migrants including labour, informal traders, medical, education and training, cultural and kinship relations, etc. The post-reform and post-apartheid period has thus witnessed increased immigration into South Africa from Southern and other parts of Africa. The increase in numbers of immigrants in South Africa has created tensions and hostilities directed towards immigrants. The African immigrants in South Africa have thus been constructed as the problematic new comers who take away jobs from South Africans and strain the national socioeconomic infrastructure, pressuring government and limiting its ability to provide essential socioeconomic services and employment to its citizens. This social topography, which has elevated South African citizens and led to the relegation of immigrants to the subaltern, with calls for their evisceration and interpellation, partly explains the so-called xenophobia and discourse around xenophobic attacks currently prevalent in South Africa since the early 2000s. While foreigners and agencies such as the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) brand targeted attacks on foreigners and their businesses by South African citizens as xenophobia, South African authorities rather brand such attacks as acts of criminality, or even 'Afrophobia', and not xenophobic. Against this background, this session proposes to (a) gain a proper understanding and conceptualisation of the notion xenophobia and (b) deliberate ways in which social

			cohesion can be promoted to encourage harmony between foreigners and South African citizens. The dearth of scholarly engagement in academia and policy attention in government circles around regional migration, xenophobia, local integration and social cohesion in Southern Africa makes engaging in this discourse imperative.
5	Rethinking Carcera Geography in 'Harmonised Societies'	Claudio Minca Claudio.minca@wur.nl Chin-Ee Ong Chinee.ong@wur.nl; ceong.geography@gmail.com	In recent years, geographers have contributed to the understanding of spaces of surveillance, violence and control (Moran, Pallot, & Piacentini, 2011; Philo, 2012) and have located such geographical inquiries in camps (Felder, Minca & Ong, 2014; Minca, 2015), prisons (Minca & Ong, 2015) and inmate transportation (Moran, Piacentini, & Pallot, 2012). This session first seeks to rethink the role of carceral geography within the context of discourses endorsing and promoting reconciliation and harmony in society. Specifically, we ask the question of whether carceral spaces and the notions and practices of control, discipline and punishment have a place in what may be termed 'harmonious societies' historically, at present and in the future. While the notion of 'harmonious societies' may have found currency and usage in discourses articulated by politicians, its tendencies towards non-antagonistic consensus presents critical questions for carceral spatialities. Should a harmonious society preserve and remember its past spaces of discipline and violence? What role do current and future carceral spaces play in a harmonious society (if at all)? Are control, discipline and violence key functions for a harmonious society? Beyond such specific intellectual provocations, we are also keen to on works that take stock of, document and chart the terrain of carceral geography inquiries and the following sub-themes reflect some key areas of our concerns: *Reconceptualising the 'carceral' and 'carceral spaces':* - The biopolitics of detention; - Technologies of incarceration; - Spaces of violence, custody and care; - Control, surveillance and society;

			- Prisons, asylums, camps and quasi-carceral spatialities.
			'Carceral spaces' after the prison:
			- Post-carceral politics of memory, forgetting and representation;
			- Post-carceral geographies of tourism;
			- Post-carceral heritage;
			The power of place: cultural histories of past spatialities of violence.
6	Politics of Environment and People	Anjana Mathur Jagmohan dr.anjanageog@gmail.com	The session aims to amass the studies related to politicization of resources, environment, pollution, 'Green Judgment' and 'Green Laws', depredation of environment in the garb of development, matters related to Environmental as well as Developmental Refugees, People's Right to safe Livelihood, Right to Information, Right to Resources, Right to Health and Right to Education, Right to Equality and contravention of these rights; Indigenous people's rights, corporatization of national resources, People's agendas, Political ecology, Wars against subjugation , exploitation, injustice and discrimination, violence and the war itself. Through this session, it shall become clear how politics is affecting, upsetting and altering the nature, development, natural processes and people. The session shall also give future directions, subterfuge and political out-manoeuvers fora clean and clear, politics- free conservation and development of environment and people.
7	The Transformation of Political Space and Prospects for New Governance in the Contemporary Phase of Globalization	Takashi Yamazaki yamataka@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp	Socio-economic globalization that accelerated the flows of capital, information, and labor at the end of the 20th century has intensified inter-national/regional/urban competitions and enlarged socio-economic disparities in this century in parallel with the promotion of neo-liberal structural reforms in many countries of the world. Politically the coherence of state sovereignty, nation, and territory has been disintegrated, and the reconstruction of inter-regional relations across borders and other political boundaries has been under way. Such transformation and reconstruction of global and local political spaces (loosening, hardening, merging, overwrapping, etc.) are accompanied by political

			issues such as asymmetrical wars, ethnic/religious conflicts, territorial disputes, and trans-border environmental problems. On the other hand, the formation of new political agents (actors) have been recognized such as SNS promoting the deterritorialization of democratization movements, NGO coping with globalizing environmental problems, human rights organizations reconstructing the concept of citizenship through the issues of immigrants and refugees, border municipalities trying to clear the way for trans-border exchange. Thus the transformation of political space promoted by globalization is posing new threats and opportunities to human lives, societies, and environments, which indicates that globalization has entered a new phase. Based on the above-mentioned understanding, this session explores the multi-scalar transformation and reconstruction of political space in theory and practice and discusses the new political space and form of governance that political agents create in the face of various problems brought about by the contemporary structural shifts. Possible paper topics may include but are not limited to: * The re-theorization of border and territory in the contemporary phase of globalization * The methodological reexamination of political geography from multi-scalar and agent-centered perspectives * The politics of rescaling and the reconstruction of governance * The inter-scalar tensions and globalization of social movements * Transnational migration and the re-/de-territorialization of citizenship * Territorial disputes and trans-border cooperation
8	A Reexamination of Militarization and "The Space Of Occupation": a	Takashi Yamazaki yamataka@lit.osaka-cu.ac.jp	"Occupation" generally means "to place a country or countries under one's own control with force" and indicates a form of territorial control by means of military force. "Occupation" also implies a transitional form of control before it turns into a form of

| | Comparison Perspective | Rassem Khamaisi
khamaisir@gmail.com | governance based on the international law, whether it is complete transfer of state/territorial sovereignty (e.g. independence or annexation) or partial transfer (e.g. mandate). In other word, "occupation" emerges as a result of an exercise of force, represents an unestablished state of sovereignty in the occupied land, and occupies a political space such as (part of) a territory.

Previous studies have shown that the concept of "absolute sovereignty" or "territorial sovereignty" as a supreme sovereign right based on territory was established in the seventeen-century Westphalian system. However, from historical and geographical points of view, the exercise of sovereignty has not necessarily coincided with the span of territory. As Agamben (2005) argues on "the state of exception" and "concentration camps", there are cases in which the incomplete state or space of absolute sovereignty allows political control to maximize its effect. Agnew (2005) calls this type of sovereignty "effective sovereignty."

While such "space of occupation" causes the occupied to struggle for self-determination, international human rights, and legal justice, it gives rise to various political and cultural practices at the level of daily lives of the occupied that attempt to go through porous walls of effective sovereignty exercised by the occupying. Conversely, the heterogeneity of "the space of occupation" provides the occupied with the socio-geographical conditions in which they can create such active resistance.
Hence, drawing on the concept of "militarization" by Enloe (2000), this session pays attention to various political and cultural practices in "the space of occupation" produced through multi-faceted militarization across the world (Yamazaki 2001). By doing so, this session will explore the structural mechanism that perpetuates the "occupation" and open up the prospect for a way to its dissolution through bottom-up processes. This session would like to compare case studies across the world, investigate the legal and structural aspects of the mechanism of the "occupation" in each case, and explore various political |

			and cultural practices of the occupied in each "space of occupation" to find possible ways to the end of occupation.
9	Changing Geopolitical Imaginations of Asia	Alexander Murphy abmurphy@uoregon.edu	The end of the Cold War, the break-up of the Soviet Union, the rise of China, and territorial disputes in Pacific Asia have challenged dominant assumptions about the Asian geopolitical order. How have Asian-oriented geopolitical imaginations evolved over the past quarter century? What has changed and what has not? What are the implications of shifting geopolitical ideas and assumptions for peace and stability in twenty-first century Asia? This session explores these questions with a view toward enhancing understanding of the role geopolitical ideas play in the international relations arena.
10	China's Geopolitical (Re) Positionings in a Changing World	Chih Yuan Woon chihyuan@nus.edu.sg	Recent popular and academic discourses have speculated much on "China's rise" and its implications for the future geopolitical order. Representations of China, which oscillate between a positive 'rise' or negative 'threat', bestow on the Chinese state, explicitly or implicitly, the power to make the world over according to its own desires. Such perspectives in turn neglect the ways in which China's interactions with the world often have to negotiate with broader geopolitical conditions, processes and actors. This session invites both theoretical and/or empirical papers to critically reflect on China's 'rise' and its contemporary external engagements, to investigate the images and imaginaries generated through these various global projects and the ways in which they are significant in understanding how Chinese elites, individuals and organizations see China, how they hope to be seen by others and how they are symptomatic of China's negotiations of its shifting position in the world. Possible themes/topics include but are not limited to: i) The projected images of China and its significance and consequences ii) China's 'rise' and its implications for changing geopolitical landscapes iii) China's contributions to issues of global concern (e.g. development, governance) iv) China's geopolitical engagements with different regions such as Africa, Asia, North

			America, Europe, etc. (i.e. how does China engage differently with different geographical regions?) v) China's soft power and/or cultural diplomacy Concepts, ideas and theories to explain and understand China's 'rise' and its engagements with the world
11	China Looks South: Development, Infrastructure and Culture on the Border with Myanmar, Laos and Vietnam	Jussi Laine Jussi.laine@uef.fi Victor Konrad Victor.Konrad@carleton.ca	As China has grown rapidly during the last decades, also the relationships that the country shares with its neighbors have become increasingly complex. China's ever-stronger regional assertion reinforces a broader trend of new dynamics in terms of spatial development, infrastructure but also culture as an inherent part of South East Asia's increasing globalisation largely driven by China. The present situation has made the role of borders, their changing significance and symbolism increasingly prominent. The concurrent global and regional integration processes and contention push for a dual process of de-bordering and re-bordering where the traditional role of borders as barriers is being replaced by more bridge-like borders seeking to connect, not separate. Taking a regional perspective on Chinese border reveals however that the function of borders is not just simply transforming one way or another, but due to the dual movement of integration and securitization, borders are simultaneously both opening and closing. This panel delves into Chinese borders particularly with Myanmar, Laos and Vietnam and looks at how an emerging China and especially its effort to engage Southeast Asia is affecting those closest to it. The panel draws from the border in seeking to illustrate how previously marginal and remote border areas in Greater Mekong Subregion have become important nodes of various flows and zones of cultural continuity and discontinuity.
12	Postcolonial Literary Geographies	Patricia Noxolo p.e.p.noxolo@bham.ac.uk	This panel engages with the postcolonial geographical politics of literary works. The spatialities of fiction have been addressed by a range of literary geographers in recent years (e.g. Sheila Hones, Angharad Saunders, JD Dewsbury), not only in terms of the description of place in the content of novels, but also in terms of the theorizing of space

			and spatial relations, both in the content and in the form of literary texts. Literary geographers have also been concerned with the extratextual and intertextual geographies of literary work, focusing on the geographies of reading and interpretation, as well as on the ways in which books as material and electronic objects flow and are distributed in space. Geographers' work on postcolonial fiction inevitably takes on the politics of these spatialities, in a highly unequal world and a highly uneven literary terrain. Postcolonial literary criticism has tended to focus on temporal politics, challenging colonial historical narratives by recognizing how postcolonial writers interrogate time, picking up the 'scraps, patches and rags' of lived experience in order to re-stage and splinter the linear historical narratives of, for example, national development strategies or modernization more broadly. Postcolonial literary geographers have built on these insights to theorise the ways in which novels interrogate the spatial relations that are deeply embedded within colonial, racialized and gendered politics, both within individual texts' content and form, and in the context of broadly metropolitan-biased global publishing, and the changes being wrought by new publishing technologies. This session explores this growing terrain of postcolonial literary criticism, and elaborates it as a terrain for political debate, rather than as a bounded area of internal coherence. What are the relationships between anti-colonial and postcolonial literary criticism for example? Is postcolonial literature defined as a genre by its politics, or is its politics defined and developed by the literary genre? How are writers not only describing but also defining and theorizing spatial relations and the built environment? How does postcolonial literature circulate within global and local publishing and consumption regimes, and how do these flows inter-relate with the ways in which they are read and interpreted? Ultimately what are the politics of literary writing in a postcolonial world, and what are the particular tools that geographers can bring to their study?

| 13 | Conversations Between Gender and Political Geographies Key Concepts, Methods and Themes (Joint session between Commission on Political Geography & Commission on Gender and Geography) | Virginie Mamadouh v.d.mamadouh@uva.nl Marianne Blidon Marianne.blidon@univ-paris1.fr | Feminist political geographies and feminist geopolitics have demonstrated the fruitfulness of an encounter between political geography and gender geography, two sub-disciplines of human geography unequally developed across the world. The interface of gender and political geographies is even richer, as these two subdisciplines of geography have many common objects of research. Since the 1970s, feminists have highlighted that "the personal is political ', putting the focus of gender studies on the political stakes of relations between men and women. Conversely, politicians have legislated on sexual and gender issues in a broad arrays of domains, these questions are even be used to legitimize military engagements abroad like the American led Western interventions in Afghanistan...) foregrounding gendered 'othering' processes in geopolitical representations. This session is jointly organized by the Commission on Political Geography and the Gender and Geography Commission to establish a dialogue between researchers from these subdisciplines around three topics: key concepts, key methods and key themes. The objective of this joint session is to enable a dialogue between researchers working in different academic contexts, in different fields and in different parts of the world but also to promote an original comparative and dialogic approach that opens the debate between these two geographical sub-disciplines that have a lot to contribute to each other with regards to theoretical, conceptual, epistemological, methodological and/or thematic issues. Here is a (non-exclusive) list of the dialogues that we would like to encourage: • Dialogues around core concepts in gender geography and/or political geography; most specifically engagements with space / place / territory / border and boundaries / scale / nation / power; • Dialogues around methods, tools and approaches in gender geography and/or political geography; more specifically multiscalar analysis, the uses of maps, GIS, big data, the importance of fieldwork, work with focus groups, image analysis, cultural analysis; |

			• Dialogues around central themes in gender geography and/or political geography, more specifically the place of the individual; the body; safety, violence, war; home, inequality; globalization; borders; and mobility; • Dialogues about the diversity of academic practices: What kinds of gender geographies and/or political geographies across the world, more specifically how do practices evolve inside and outside Anglo-American geographies? And how do with academic traditions differ across the world, more specifically in national contexts where both gender geography and political geography are (still?) marginalized sub-disciplines? Case studies and comparisons are welcome. We strongly encourage co-authored papers or coupled papers in which participants from different academic background (disciplinary or national) address a similar topic. (NB: if you submit separate but coupled papers please inform the convenors about the linkage between your abstracts, so that we can make sure that the presentations are scheduled in the same time-slot of the session).