Introduction

As a result of the continuous fighting since 2011 between government forces and the armed opposition, more than 500,000 people left Syria for neighbouring countries.\(^1\) About 154,000 of them left for Turkey,\(^2\) and scattered to different camps maintained by the Turkish government and international agencies such as the UNCHR.\(^3\) A short distance away from Syria, the Islahiye camp, one of the refugee camps in Turkey, accommodates about 6,500 Syrians.\(^4\) This is unequivocally a camp for refugees. People coming to the camp seemed to satisfy the criteria for being qualified as refugees, leaving their country of origin for the fear of persecution and for ‘political’ reasons, and crossing the border of Syria. However, curiously, or perhaps understandably, this camp also serves for people who are simply taking an intermission from the on-going civil war in Syria. Some male Syrians go back and forth between the Islahiye camp and the northern parts of Syria, ‘fighting there, resting here’.\(^5\) Is the camp for the people called refugees or for fighters?

This double role of the camp is complicated by the fact that it is managed and maintained by the host government and international aid agencies. Their involvement generates various statist boundaries, suggesting
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1 The number is based on an estimation by the UNHCR on 16 January 2013. See <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php> [Accessed 22 January 2013].
2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
the political significance of categories. For instance, people are divided between unarmed population and the (part-time) fighters, making the former the refugees, the latter fighters. According to its mandate, the UNHCR, an international refugee agency which handles the daily management of the camp, is only to serve the civilian population, not ‘fighters’. This instantly depoliticises people categorised as refugees as ‘civilian’ population, making them merely the population in need of assistance and help. Unless unarmed, people will be categorised as ‘fighters’, not allowed to receive aid and use the facilities specifically provided for ‘refugees’.6

The categories also bear political significance because of the ways in which people in the camp take their parts in category-vocabularies. For the people cycling back between the camp and Syria, the category of refugee secures a safe place where they can rest. For this purpose, they become the people called refugees, a depoliticised group of people, leaving (or hiding?) arms outside the camp and simply receiving assistance provided by aid agencies and the host government.7 After a while, they become fighters, picking up arms and going back to Syria to fight. They vacillate between these two categories for their convenience.

The example of the Islahiye camp pithily illustrates the central claim of the thesis that categories are political because they are representational tools. The thesis critically engages in the parts played by the categories to demonstrate that categories are not just innocuous labels to be applied to
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7 The New York Times, ‘Syrians Find Optimism At a Tent City in Turkey’.
people, but generate power relations. They classify people into groups and impart particular subjectivities to them to produce different kinds of power relationships among categories, such as hierarchical and subversive relationships. Categories are, therefore, what bordering does. In order to categorise and generate specific power relationships, a line has to be drawn to demarcate one group from others, to produce groups, such as fighters, civilians, aid workers and aid recipients, for instance.

In this conclusion, I intend to bring together the main arguments of the thesis to reflect on the political significance of categories. I will do so by addressing five different types of translation, figuratively speaking, which were at work in the thesis. These translations are: translation between intellectual boundary and territorial boundary, between the concept of boundary and category-vocabularies, between what categories signify and what is signified by categories, between different languages and categories, and between Japanese examples and BM scholarship. Each translation summarises the key arguments presented at different stages of the thesis. These translations also address, some implicitly and others explicitly, the contributions of the thesis to BM scholarship. Among these contributions, I identify, in two areas, what I believe to be the major contributions of the thesis to the scholarship but not limited to it: advancing the understanding of territorial boundaries and reflecting the interwoven relationship between territorial boundary and intellectual boundary. In the concluding part of the chapter, I will discuss them together with my reflections on the limitations of the thesis and areas for future research.
Translation between Intellectual Boundary and Territorial Boundary

The first translation at work in the thesis was the translation between intellectual boundary and territorial boundary. As Walker continuously reminds us, boundaries are both ‘territorial and intellectual’. As I discussed in the Introduction to the thesis, the point of identifying these two different types of boundaries is to show how intertwined these boundaries are rather than pointing out how different they are. Territorial boundaries, such as state boundaries, cannot be clearly separated from intellectual boundaries, about the way we think about worlds around us, or to be more specific, the way we think about the world of dividing lines. In this regard, the thesis translated these two different kinds of boundaries to make a productive intervention into, primarily, the current debates on the boundaries of the state.

The thesis was able to address how these two different types of boundaries are intertwined with one another because it focused on the image of the boundary, and in doing so, combined an interrogation of the territorial boundaries with that of intellectual boundaries. An interrogation of the image of the boundary necessarily had to reflect what intellectual boundary the extant debates rely on. This reflection led to my argument on the tenacity of the boundary-as-a-line thinking. The extant debates suggest that the state boundary is no longer a line because it is complicated in terms of performance,
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perspective and place.10 Despite this suggestion, the debates make such claims through continued reliance on the image of the boundary as a line in their own thinking. To be sure, the debates propose the ideas, such as zone and borderland,11 to suggest what the boundary might look like if it is no longer a line. However, my frustration was precisely that these new ideas were discussed through a particular image of the boundary, which is a line. By addressing this frustration, the thesis demonstrated how Walker’s forceful observation, the tenacity of the boundary-as-a-line thinking, rings true in the debates on the changing characteristics of territorial boundaries.

If the territorial boundary no longer marks the territorial line of the state, as the extant debates suggest, what kind of intellectual image of the boundary corresponds with these shifting characteristics of territorial boundary? This question addressed at the beginning of the thesis ended with the suggestion in chapter 6 that the image of the boundary is a dot. By arguing this, the thesis unravelled the shifting image of the boundary, from a line to a dot, in discussing the complexity of bordering practices which take place beyond the territorial edges of the state.

Translation between Boundaries and Categories

The second translation at work in the thesis was translation between the concept of the boundary and categories. If any exploration of worlds
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without lines necessarily derives from the image of the world with lines, as Walker argues and as I assume to be the case, the image of the boundary as a line has to be the starting point for any exploration beyond something other than lines. Since the current debates on boundaries oppose the image of the boundary as a line, as I read it, the exploration of the image, other than a line, has to start from the image of the boundary as a line. Therefore, the thesis took the image of a line as the starting point and looked at categories as a manifestation of this image.

Considering that drawing a line is dividing people into different groups, the thesis regarded categories as embodying what bordering, drawing a line, did. By taking categories as the intervening perspective into the examination of boundaries, the thesis aimed to pay close attention to ‘what goes on at the boundaries’.\textsuperscript{12} In this way, the first translation, between intellectual and territorial, made it possible for the thesis to move on to the second translation between the boundary and categories.

In translating boundaries into categories and vice versa, the thesis was able to investigate the implications of bordering for migration from the perspective of categories. It critically engaged with the part played by categories in managing borders. To do this was to highlight the political significance of categories. I argued that it was through categories that previously unnamed movements become explainable in relation to the state. Categories use various statist boundaries to make people into the people as a part of specific groups. In this respect, categories are the language of the state.

\textsuperscript{12} Walker, After the Globe, Before the World, pp.2-3.
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They are vocabularies available to the state to make human mobility visible and legible to itself. I combined this understanding of categories with Bhabha’s idea of the pedagogical and the performative in order to problematise how these category-vocabularies were used by theorists and participants in activism. Putting it more simply, how do we use these categories in understanding state boundaries on our own? The assumption of the thesis was, therefore, that statecraft is not the monopoly of the state but is conditioned by how people take part in statecraft.

In chapter 2, I identified how a group of theorists, what I called BM scholars, use categories in relation to migration. I argued that they investigated categories in terms of their implications for control and resistance. One approach prominent in BM scholarship is to examine how categories are used as a tool to control human mobility. This approach is generally reflective of Agamben’s understanding of categories where sovereign power exercises its control over categorisation. The second approach prominent in BM scholarship is to examine how categories generate resistance against the control of human mobility. This approach is generally reflective of Ranciere’s understanding of categories where social order, which sustains categorisation, is susceptible to disruption.

Either way, these theories use categories to address the politics of categories in relation to control and resistance. By looking at the implications of categories on control, BM scholarship addresses the social sorting aspect of the language of the state and how such social sorting is a cardinal activity of sovereignty. At the same time, BM scholarship also shows that the language
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of the state is not just a tool for control management but also a target of resistance. With various examples where people resist categories given to them, BM scholarship highlights that people are necessarily implicated in the categorising process not only as the target of control but also in challenging such control.

Translation between boundaries and categories was crucial because it identified an important field of scholarship, BM scholarship, which examines categories in relation to state boundaries. As I discussed in chapter 2, the works referred to as BM scholarship in the thesis come from different sub-fields of IR such as border studies, citizenship studies and refugee studies, each of which is interdisciplinary. By examining how theorists participate in the politics of categories, that is, how they discuss categories in relation to state boundaries, the thesis was able to recognise otherwise scattered works as sharing similar interests and making important and unique contributions to an examination of boundaries.

The translation between categories and boundaries was also crucial because it highlighted the tenacity of category-vocabularies in BM scholarship, and hence corroborated Walker’s point of tenacious boundary-as-a-line thinking. The second approach to categories in BM scholarship, that is, resisting categories, suggested this tenacity most clearly. It inadvertently relies on a number of examples where categories were challenged only to be replaced by other categories. This resonated with Walker’s warning that going beyond the boundary-as-a-line thinking can be easily trapped within this very thinking. In the case of BM scholarship,
resisting categories is trapped in the very language of the state which makes this resistance possible to being with.

Having identified the tenacity of categories in BM scholarship, the thesis focuses on this tenacity as the next step of investigation. To do this, the thesis used migrant activism in Japan for examples where category-vocabularies, in this case, categories of citizen and foreigner, were persistently used by people involved in activism. Considering that the prime focus on chapters 3, 4 and 5 are the participants in activism, it can be also said that, in contrast to chapter 2, these three chapters demonstrated how in the context of migrant activism, instead of theoretical debates, people engaged in the parts played by category-vocabularies in the management of state boundaries.

**Translation between Languages and Categories**

The focus on migrant activism in Japan allowed the thesis to conduct the third and fourth translations. The third translation was to highlight the link between different tongues and categories. Following Anzaldúa’s idea of border language, the thesis demonstrated that production of categories is intertwined with linguistic boundaries. One characteristic of migrant activism in Japan was the lack of common language among the participants, who spoke different languages. Therefore, whether the participants have the ability to speak in citizens’ and foreigners’ tongues profoundly shaped the ways in which people relied on categories of citizen and foreigner in activism. This was manifested in two ways.
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Firstly, the ability to be heard politically paralleled the ability to be heard in Japanese, the citizens’ tongue. When people were identified as citizens and foreigners in activism, the former were associated with the domain of speech, while the latter were excluded from it. This separation was accompanied with linguistic separation. Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrated this with the examples of the government talk, the KCU activities and the independence of the Nambu FWC. On each occasion, people were identified as foreigners and made silent by the lack of translation services between Japanese-speaking demonstrators and non-Japanese speaking demonstrators who spoke languages such as Spanish, English and Chinese. Not being able to understand what was discussed at meetings and public demonstrations, the participants were unable to obtain the ability to be understood and to be legible to begin with. The lack of translation also produced foreignness attached to the people identified as foreigners. Since some protesters such as those from South America resembled Japanese in appearance, singing in foreign tongues for instance, indicated the silent presence of people called foreigners. Presentation of foreignness at demonstrations and meetings added authority to the people identified as citizens because the silence of ‘foreigners’ justified ‘citizens’ speaking on their behalf.

Secondly, the question of speech is also connected to who translates the voices of demonstrators and how they do so. With the examples of translators/interpreters, chapter 5 demonstrated that the realm of speech was controlled by people who had the ability to translate citizens’ tongues to foreigners’ tongues and vice versa. Since interpreters used in migrant
activism usually assumed another role, as negotiators working in the NGOs and labour unions, their ability to translate different tongues was understandably connected with their professional task of reaching a successful conclusion in negotiations. For this purpose, interpreters/mediators actively shaped the ways in which interactions took place between migrant workers and their Japanese-speaking counterparts. As a result, some voices of migrant workers remained untranslated, and hence, remained as mere sound to the ears of their counterparts; other voices were deliberately made provocative and/or tamed depending on whether interpreters/mediators saw the need to cause confrontation between migrant workers and their counterparts.

It might be a straightforward observation that linguistic boundaries are connected with the production of categories of citizen and foreigner in the context where people speaking different languages joined migrant activism. However, I think this connection points to the more crucial suggestion that there was a representational gap between what categories represent and what is represented by categories. In the case of interpreters/mediators, the possibility of a gap was particularly clearly shown because the voices represented with specific categories were necessarily manipulated by interpreters/mediators, and hence did not actually represent what these categories were supposed to represent. It was through interpreters/mediators and their involvement in interactions between migrant workers and their Japanese-speaking counterparts that the 'voices' were uttered by both parties. The voices of migrant workers and their counterparts were there thanks to
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interpreters/mediators, but they were not quite there because interpreters/mediators manipulated their voices and hence caused the slippage between what migrant workers and their counterparts uttered and what were represented as ‘their’ voices.

In chapters 3 and 4, the representational gap was hinted at by the simultaneous disappearance and appearance of people identified as foreigners. On the one hand, people called foreigners were present at demonstrations and meetings, since their foreign presence was produced by non-translated foreign songs, and translation services which served little, if any, purpose to the participants in activism. On the other hand, they were made invisible because they were not able to join the discussion held at meetings and speak at demonstrations. Their presence was there through the category of foreigner, but what exactly these people were, or what the category of foreigner actually represented, remained unclear because their ‘voices’ were represented by people called citizens. This hinted at the possibility of a gap between what the category was supposed to signify and what was actually signified by the category.

Translation between Categories as the Signifier and as the Signified

Since the production of categories of citizen and foreigner was intertwined with linguistic boundaries, it made sense that the representational gap indicated in the previous translation, between languages and categories, became quite palpable in the production of categories itself. The examples of migrant activism in Japan demonstrated
that there was slippage of representation between what categories signified and what was actually signified by them. The thesis investigated this translation to argue that this representational gap was produced for different reasons.

In chapter 3, the representational gap was shown in the category of foreigner. For some participants in activism, attending demonstrations served the purpose of realising their personal goals, which was to solve their labour disputes. Therefore, it mattered little to them to be excluded from the meetings through the lack of translation and to be assigned to a speechless status. What mattered was to show up at demonstrations and exhibit their pretended enthusiasm for the cause of migrant activism. For this reason, they played the role of foreigners, singing when they were told to sing and staying quiet when they were expected to be quiet. Consequently, they pretended to be foreigners, the category given to them, slipping away from what the category of foreigner was supposed to signify.

In chapter 4, the example of non-English speakers in Tozen demonstrated the representational gap between what the category of citizen was supposed to signify, and what was signified by it. In the Tozen, the break-away union of the Nambu, English was used as the working language and little translation was provided for non-English speakers. As a result, English-speaking union members dominated discussions, monopolising the domain of speech and becoming citizens. Meanwhile, due to their lack of ability to use English, non-English-speaking members lost their ability to be understood, and were assigned to the category of foreigner which rendered
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them speechless. Despite the speechless position relegated to them, these non-English speakers strongly identified as being part of the realm of speech, which in fact was monopolised by English speakers. In this way, non-English-speaking union members pretended as if they were citizens, who possessed voices to be heard, revealing the representational gap of the category of citizen.

In chapter 5, the CJVA members and immigration lawyers acted as if they were citizens and foreigners depending on the context of their work. The CJVA members pretended to be representatives of the citizens to teach Chinese people how to behave in Japan, while they became the representatives of foreigners to demand the Japanese counterparts to protect the rights of foreigners. They did so to achieve the organisational goal to bridge both Japanese and Chinese people in Japan. Immigration lawyers similarly identified themselves as citizens to convince their clients to adopt the proper Japanese legal behaviour. In front of judges and the employers, however, they became the representatives of foreigners, passionately advocating for the rights of their ‘foreign’ clients. As I discussed in the previous section, interpreters/mediators doubly represented the voices of citizens and foreigners by using their linguistic abilities to decide which voices were to be taken politically. Both immigration lawyers and interpreters/mediators acted as if they were citizens and foreigners to realise their professional responsibilities.

The key finding of the translation between what the categories signified and what was actually signified by categories was that categorisation was
realised in the slippage of representation. The initial reason to focus on categories was to evince the role of bordering, what the boundary as a line does, so that it might bring some useful insights with regards to the image of the boundary. Following this logic, it was necessary to use the insights drawn above for the exploration of the image of the boundary.

Therefore, chapter 6 drew on Badiou’s theorisation of the void to translate back this representational gap, which manifested what categories did, into boundaries. This move was vital to examine bordering in the slippage of representation and offer an ‘alternative’ image of the boundary. Using Badiou’s idea of the void, the thesis argued that the boundary represented in this slippage is a dot. I argued that a dot was a helpful image because it embodies two different movements taking place in drawing a line for categorisation. On the one hand, a dot tries to be the inception of the boundary, a line to be drawn from this point. This reflects the ability of categorisation to draw a sharp line to separate one group from the other. At the same time, the dot also tries to remain as a point, which reflects the failure of categorisation to clearly identify who is represented. Based on this, the thesis suggested that, when the current debates describe various bordering practices which challenge the simple line as the image of the boundary, they evoke the image of the boundary as a dot, reflecting such complex bordering practices.

Translation between Japanese Examples and BM Scholarship

The previous two translations, between different languages and
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categories and between categories as the signifier and the signified, were made possible because of the quiet yet necessary translation which was in progress behind these translations. That was translation between Japanese examples and BM scholarship. At various points of the thesis, the thesis addressed the situation of Japanese immigration and discussed implications of situating migration activism in Japan in the framework of BM scholarship.

In chapter 1, the thesis gave an overview of Japanese immigration policies to demonstrate how the Japanese government engaged in the politics of categories. For example, the government produces non-work related categories while using people under these categories as de facto manual labourers. As the previous two translations showed, not only the government but also the participants in activism produced the slippage of representation in their own ways. Despite different contexts where categories were produced, one by the Japanese government, the other by the participants in migrant activism, they both used the slippage of representation as a way to engage in the politics of categories. Together with a brief account of the Islahiye camp, it is tempting to argue that the representational slippage might be also seen in other contexts, beyond the contexts of Japan and activism, whenever people play their parts in categories of migration. Needless to say, this is a speculation which has to be taken seriously for future research.

In chapter 2, the thesis argued that one of the implications of using Japanese examples within the framework of BM scholarship was to enrich the examples available in BM scholarship. The example of Japan proved to be able to offer insightful perspectives for BM scholarship, specifically because it
highlighted the linguistic boundaries in parallel with the production of categories. As the thesis demonstrated, speaking the citizens’ tongues was linked with the ability to be heard and taken politically. In this respect, it seems to be an urgent task in BM scholarship to pay more careful attention to the linguistic boundary in analysing the migrants’ ability to speak. Many examples used in the scholarship at the moment are from countries where English, the ‘global’ language, is spoken, or where migrants tend to come from former colonised countries, such as Algerians in France. However, it might be too hasty to assume no linguistic barriers exist in these countries, considering the different social status of migrants which affects their abilities to master English and/or the former colonisers’ tongues. The findings on migrant activism in Japan clearly pointed to a need to analyse the connection of linguistic boundaries and production of categories in BM scholarship.

In chapter 2, I also argued that another implication of using Japanese examples within the framework of BM scholarship was to expand the scope of research in Japanese scholarship on migration, beyond the narrow focus on integration policies. In this regard, the analysis of categories used in migrant activism in Japan suggested further research on different categories and their political significance other than those of citizen and foreigner. Although the thesis exclusively focused on categories of citizen and foreigner, various categories were operative in different aspects of activism. These categories include the illegal and the legal, skilled workers and manual labourers, and workers and volunteers.

I especially speculate that an analysis of the categories of illegal and
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legal in the Japanese context might shed some light on the often assumed
distinction between irregular and regular in BM scholarship. As I mentioned
in chapters 1 and 5, the Japanese government as well as migrants themselves
use the representational gap of the category of trainees/interns. For the
former, the gap is critical in securing cheap expendable manual labourers,
whereas for the latter, the gap is essential for obtaining a de facto working
visa in Japan. Despite the legal status that trainees and interns obtain in
Japan, their de facto manual labour status without any legal basis means
that they are not treated as workers but, as some say, ‘slaves’,\(^{13}\) who are
exploited for the convenience of their employers. Their lives are heavily
monitored by their employers who constantly remind the trainees of the
possibility of sending them back to their countries of origin, a ‘deportation’
conducted by their employers.\(^ {14}\) This suggests that they are de facto irregular
migrants in the sense that they are made into invisible labourers. This
challenges the generally accepted assumption that the lack of legal status
tends to be associated with irregular migrants. The examples of
trainees/interns show that obtaining legal status can equally put migrants
into the irregular status. Other implications such as this might come out from
further examination of Japanese immigration in the framework of BM
scholarship.

\(^{13}\) Gaikokujin Roudousha Mondai to Korekara no Nihon Henshu Iinkai [The
Committee on the Issues on Migrant Workers and the Future of Japan] (eds.)
‘Kenshu-sei’ toiu Na no Dorei Roudou [The Slaves called ‘Trainees’] (Tokyo:
Kadensha).

\(^{14}\) Ibid. See also Gaikokujin Kenshusei Kenri Nettowaku [Network to Protect Rights
of Trainees and Interns] (eds.), Gaikokujin Kenshuusei Jikyuu 300 Yen no
Roudousha [Trainees and Interns Working With the Salary of 300 Yen per Hour ]
(Tokyo: Akashi Shoten).
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Reflections on Limitations, Contributions and Areas of Further Research

The thesis was driven by my interest in the works referred to as BM scholarship as well as my interests in migrant activism in Japan. The research question on the image of the boundary was formulated from that specific context. Therefore, as I stated in the Introduction, the thesis was primarily written for people who are interested in state boundaries and how these boundaries play roles in managing human mobility.

During the process of exploring the image of the boundary, however, the thesis used the perspective of categories and translated boundaries into categories to focus on what bordering does. This inevitably caused some limitations to my thesis. Although the perspectives of categories built the central arguments of the thesis, due to the primal area of interests in BM scholarship in particular, the thesis fails to engage in the on-going debates on categories beyond BM scholarship, such as the works of Kant, Weber, Wittgenstein and generally in poststructuralist thoughts.\(^{15}\) This restricts the implications of my claim to be explored beyond BM scholarship. Although the thesis drew on the works of Agamben, Badiou and Rancière to understand politics of categories I observed and studied in the thesis, it primarily engaged in their works with my specific interest in BM scholarship in mind. Therefore, one of the future research areas should be engaging in the wider literature on
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categories and seeking where the claim of the thesis might be situated within them.

The thesis also could have elaborated further on the implications of the boundary as a dot in relation to resistance and community. To be fair, chapter 6 did the job to make some preliminary investigations on how boundary-as-a-dot thinking might shed some light on the debates on resistance and community. However, this inquiry remained limited. As to resistance, the thesis only referred to Badiou’s understanding of the event and built an argument based on a particular understanding of resistance demonstrated in BM scholarship. As to community, the thesis only used Nancy’s idea of community, but this could have been expanded to include wider debates on political community in general. Given that BM scholarship is its primary target audience, the limitation does not undermine the arguments on resistance and community put forward in the thesis. However, in order to take the arguments of the thesis further, engaging in the wider literature on resistance and community will certainly be necessary.

However, these limitations should not overshadow what I believe to be two important contributions of the thesis in particular, potentially beyond BM scholarship: to advance an understanding of territorial boundaries and to reflect on intellectual boundaries. Firstly, the focus on the logic of bordering, that is categorisation, allowed the thesis to unravel what was going on when a line is drawn. Drawing on rich ethnographic materials on migrant activism in Japan, I demonstrated that bordering is not simply drawing statist boundaries but failing to draw them at the same time. People resorted to
category-vocabularies in various occasions such as at work, meetings and demonstrations. When bordering took place in these everyday contexts, a line revealed its complexity. Bordering was not simply to draw a line to categorise people as citizens and foreigners but also to fail to draw a line to separate them. It is in this gap between the ability and inability to draw a line that the participants in activism were made visible while becoming invisible. They obtained names as citizens and foreigners while losing these names and becoming nameless.

As the thesis unfolded, it became clear that this representational gap was not a deliberate expression of resistance to categories. Rather people became nameless in fully engaging in the state and its language. They projected their own understanding of categories and used them to serve their own purposes, which generated the slippage of what categories were supposed to capture and what they failed to capture. Situating nameless subjects in the representational slippage radically forces us to rethink resistance, if this is the right word, and its location within the state rather than outside of it. It is bordering and drawing a boundary that invite people to be nameless. It is in fully embracing category-vocabularies, embodied as the tenacity of categories, that the slippage is inevitably produced. The slippage emerges out of different ways for people to play their parts in producing categories.

Therefore, I argued that the state and its language are not to be opposed or challenged, like the extant debates on state boundaries suggest. Instead, although it might sound paradoxical, engaging in the activities of the state and participating in production of the state language offer an escape route
from this very language. The world with dividing lines entails worlds where lines lose their meanings and where the regime of representation fails to sustain the state language.

My argument can radically expand the scope of research on state boundaries. As I demonstrated in chapters 2 and 6, the extant debates on boundaries situate control and resistance in separate locations. The former is in the realm of the state (as a political organisation and the status quo), while the latter is outside of it. My thesis demonstrated that both are in the same realm, the state. This widens the focus of the research from any sorts of protests deliberately designed to oppose the state and its language to include more mundane daily practices where the language of the state is an indispensable part of these practices. They can be carried out by border officials who need categories to perform their occupational duties, by visa application officers whose work hinges upon categories and by immigration detention officers who justify their work based on the categories of the legal and illegal. Their occupations are not forms of resistance but are thoroughly embedded into the state and dependent on the state language. How do they engage in category-vocabularies in interacting with people who claim specific categories as their own and upon whom particular categories are imposed by others? The argument I put forward in the thesis, which situates both control and resistance in the realm of the state, opens up these kinds of new research areas for further investigation.

Bordering takes place not only to mark territorial state boundaries but also to create intellectual boundaries. By making the image of the boundary
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as the target of inquiry, the thesis offered a chance to reflect on how ideas are represented as ‘alternative’ and ‘different’ from ‘old’ ideas in making an intellectual boundary between the two. Although this was mostly quietly hovering in the background of my research, I believe this to be another important contribution of the thesis.

As it should be clear from the logic of my analysis, the image of the boundary as a dot is not an alternative image to be juxtaposed to the image of the boundary as a line. It comes out specifically from the boundary as a line image. To be more specific, the boundary as a line is a part of the image of the boundary as a dot, since one of the desires contained in the dot is to draw a line. As I stated in the Introduction to the thesis, an investigation into the image of the boundary was designed to find out what image(s) mirror(s) the extant debates which address complex bordering practices. In this respect, it is a logical conclusion that the image of the boundary as a dot is not an alternative image proposed anew, but merely verbalising and visualising what the extant debates are otherwise already indicating by relying on the image of the boundary as a line.

In a way, the image of the boundary as a dot is realised in the intellectual slippage between what the current debates do and what they fail to do. As I demonstrated in chapter 2, the debates are driven by the aspiration to show the changing bordering practices which challenge a line as the image of the boundary. They push our thinking forward by arguing that boundaries are not the geographical hems of the state and by offering ‘alternative’ new understanding of the boundary. This creates an intellectual line produced by
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the movement from the ‘old’ understanding of the boundary as the state territorial line to the ‘new’ and ‘alternative’ understanding of something else. Meanwhile, the extant debates fail to create this movement because, as I demonstrated in the thesis, they persistently rely on the image of the boundary as a line, the very image that they attempt to move away from. This was demonstrative of the ways in which they relied on category vocabularies in identifying resistance and seeking for possibilities of an ‘alternative’ world, the world without lines.

Between these two movements, drawing an intellectual boundary to distinguish ‘new’ thoughts from ‘old’ ones and failing to draw this boundary by resorting to the ‘old’ image of the boundary and the vocabularies stemming from it, lies the gap between what a rethinking is trying to do and what it fails to do. It is this gap that generated an intellectual space, as it were, to imagine the boundary as a dot. The thesis falls into this gap.

This gap might be also reflective of the research approach that the thesis took. It took the conventional research approach, that is, attempting to find out the limitations of the existing thinking about the boundary, and seeking the remedy, an ‘alternative’ idea, to modify this limitation. In producing this lined intellectual movement of looking for an ‘alternative’, the thesis got stuck in the combination of intellectual boundary and territorial boundary, as I explained it in various parts of the thesis, often with Walker. This ended up indicating that the image of the boundary as a dot came out from the image of the boundary as a line. A dot was not an oppositional or antithesis to a line but a line was a part of a dot. It was just that a line was
trying to form ‘a line’ from a dot while failing to do so. The boundary-as-a-dot, therefore, is not an alternative to the boundary-as-a-line, but necessarily derives from the image of the boundary as a line. In a way, the image of a dot has been present all along in my research which focused on categorisation, and hence, took a line as a starting point. This image, a dot, was waiting to be found out in my own language, in my attempt to draw an intellectual boundary of my own and failing to do so.

In *L'Oiseau Bleu*,¹⁶ Maurice Maeterlinck wrote of the journey of Tyltyl and Mytyl. The journey was about finding the blue bird, a symbol of happiness. Accompanied by a fairy, the siblings travel, in their dream, through the Land of Memory to the Place of Night, and attempt to find the blue bird to no avail. Not finding the bird anywhere, they are utterly dismayed. Returning from their journey, however, when they wake up in the morning, they find a blue bird waiting for them next to their beds.

With the idea of a boundary as a dot, the thesis advocated that ‘alternative’ subjects and ‘alternative’ thinking might be similar to this blue bird. They are not to be realised in the movement which entails a line, in the move from here to there.¹⁷ Rather, they are realised in a slippage between the desire to create this move, both territorially and intellectually, like a desire to find the blue bird, and failing to make this move by enacting the language of the state in our daily lives and by resorting to the image of the boundary as a


¹⁷ Elsewhere, Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and I examined the ways in which scholars engage with the academic works that offer an alternative thinking in the status quo. The manuscript, titled ‘Thinking about the Alternative, Talking about the Alternative’, is currently under review.
Conclusion

line. It was the slippage between what categories are supposed to capture by drawing a line and naming people (categories as the signifier) and what slips away from the representational regime of categories (categories as the signified) that generated nameless people, subjects as ‘an occurrence to the void’, in Badiou’s term. \(^{18}\) It was the slippage between what the extant debates on the boundary were trying to move away from (the image of the boundary as a line) and what they fail to make this move (the reliance on the lined image and category-vocabularies) that produced an intellectual space to imagine the boundary as a dot. Articulated in this slippage, the ‘new’ subjects and ‘alternative’ thinking are just here, in our own thinking and in our own participation in the state. They are here, like the blue bird, waiting to be noticed, rather than somewhere out there, waiting to be captured.