Sudbury, J. (ed.) (2005) *Global Lockdown: Race, Gender, and the Prison-Industrial Complex*. New York: Routledge.

Thrift, N. (2000) It's the little things. In K. Dodds and D. Atkinson (eds.), *Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 380–7.

Wastl-Walter, D. and Staeheli, L. (2004) Territory, territoriality, and boundaries. In L.A. Staeheli, E. Kofman and L.J. Peake (eds.), *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography*. New York: Routledge, pp. 141–51.

Citation: Trudeau, Dan and Chris McMorran (2011) "The Geographies of Marginalization," in A Companion to Social and Cultural Geography, Vincent Del Casino, et al., eds., Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 437-453

Chapter 25

The Geographies of Marginalization

Dan Trudeau and Chris McMorran

Introduction

How is space fashioned to privilege some groups and marginalize others? How does space contribute to the social exclusion of particular groups? These questions have been at the center of much scholarship on the social geography of marginalization over the past four decades. Concern about social exclusion was excited within geography by multiple tears in the social fabric of societies throughout the world, including the end of colonization, the rise of civil rights movements, the arrival of third world migrants in first world locations, widening gaps between rich and poor, and the increasing feminization of labor. Anglophone social geographers initiated the academic journal *Antipode* in 1969, for instance, in order to provide a specific forum for discussion and debate about the role and effect of social relationships and geographic environments in the processes of marginalization. Geographers initially focused on illustrating the patterns and extent of social inequality and exclusion, often producing maps to illustrate such patterns. Studies of experiences, effects, and causal processes of exclusion were soon added to the growing literature on marginalization and subsequently contributed to theories of marginalization. In the case of racialized ghettos, for instance, social geographers have explored how members of racial groups in these areas experience forms of material deprivation that may result in a lack of access to services, food, or shelter, which may in turn affect individual's health. Since the 1980s, cultural geographers have added to our understanding of this instance of marginalization by documenting the discursive and symbolic ways in which the material conditions of ghetto environments influence the social labels and negative stereotypes that reproduce the marginalization of social groups. Extrapolating from this example, the broader geographic literature on marginalization has consequently produced multiple conceptualizations of

A Companion to Social Geography, First Edition. Edited by
Vincent J. Del Casino Jr., Mary E. Thomas, Paul Cloke, and Ruth Panelli.

exclusion and strategies to analyze it. Scholars working in social and cultural geography have together shown, however, that marginalization entails material and discursive relationships between society and space. In this chapter, we focus specifically on geographical scholarship on the production of landscape in order to trace ways in which geographers working within and between social and cultural geography frameworks have defined and studied marginalization. An important part of our tracing exercise is to show how scholars have drawn from other disciplines to theorize the geographies of marginalization and to highlight some unanswered questions that remain and to which scholars working in both social and cultural geography frameworks may potentially contribute answers.

On the Margins

Marginalization – as a process of becoming peripheral – has been a matter of substantial interest in human geography. Interest in understanding the foment that characterized revolutionary, rights, and reterritorialization movements in the decades after World War II brought the topics of marginalization and marginality (of diverse sets of social difference) onto research agendas in the academy. Descriptions of this process follow a center-edge analogy, in which actors at the edge are disempowered in comparison to actors at the center, who are privileged and socially dominant. Scholars have thus used this concept to describe the ways in which individuals and social groups are relegated to positions of low(er) and unequal standing in society. The study of marginalization is by no means unique to human geography. In fact, many disciplines across the social sciences and humanities have contributed to this field of inquiry. However, geographers' specific focus on the relationships between society and space has shown the ways in which labeling places as marginal and the marginalization of space compound and complicate the social inequalities that marginalization produces (Anderson 1991; Craddock 2000; Hanson and Pratt 1995; Tilly et al. 2001).

In the decades following World War II, scholars working in social geography in particular began to search for ways in which the academy and the discipline of geography could create knowledge relevant to understanding and, hopefully, resolving the systems of social inequality to which the movements were responding. Ironically, this enterprise was initially marginal within the discipline. For instance, the journal *Antipode* was created as a forum for discussion of radical theory and praxis in geography, and as a call to action to address processes of marginalization and their attendant injustices. While *Antipode* was decidedly outside the mainstream and arguably on the margins of academic geography when it was founded, the issues considered in its volumes – social inequality, injustice, marginality, and marginalization – are well within the purview of mainstream human geography today. Indeed, geographers working in a wide array of geography sub-disciplines contribute to what is now a vast set of literature that explores processes of marginalization. Moreover, in the past two and a half decades the interests of a resurgent form of cultural geography, informed by critical theory, have also expanded this literature. Such interests focus on cultural meanings and how these animate the production of space, social difference, and the ways people experience them in everyday life (Del Casino and Marston 2006). While there may be important nuances to distinguish

social geography from cultural geography, these two sub-fields together are vital to understanding the geographies of marginalization.

The geographical literature on marginalization thus draws on the wider traditions of social inquiry mentioned above and is as diverse as it is rich. This geographic literature explores patterns and processes of marginalization using a variety of theoretical lenses (e.g., Marxism, Feminism, Structuration theory, non-representational theory), and methodologies (e.g., spatial analysis, hermeneutics, ethnography), and it focuses on particular nodes of social difference (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and dis/ability) and their intersections. Some of the most recent productive discussions of marginalization in geography have cohered around particular concepts, which have served as analytical crucibles and provided theoretical insights about the spatiality of marginalization and empirical descriptions of the social experiences of marginality. Discussion around such interdisciplinary concepts as citizenship (Secor 2004), segregation (Johnston et al. 2007), neoliberalism (Leitner et al. 2007), and landscape (Schein 2006), among others, has enriched the geographies of marginalization and informed interdisciplinary study of these social processes. Reviewing the depth and extent of these contributions is beyond the scope of this chapter. Instead, we focus on the ways in which social and cultural geographers have used the landscape concept, once a fixture in apolitical approaches in American cultural geography, to generate a vibrant set of discussions on the relationship between the production of space and social exclusion.

Landscape and Exclusion

While landscape study has deep roots in cultural geography, recent work by both social and cultural geographers engaging with critical social theory has used the landscape concept to produce provocative and productive insights about marginality and marginalization. Since the 1990s, geographers have explored how particular social groups are excluded from landscapes and the ways in which marginalized groups experience exclusion. Indeed, the incorporation of social theories generated outside of the discipline of geography into landscape study has provided innovative ways through which to conceptualize the material and discursive roles landscapes play in producing marginalization.

This section discusses five exemplary works that investigate the relationship between geographic landscapes and social exclusion. These works focus on how landscapes serve political purposes. Our selection does not attempt to exhaustively or comprehensively analyze the ways in which geographers approach marginalization through landscape study. Rather, we deliberately select exemplars that illustrate some of the different ways social and cultural geographers have drawn on social theory in order to understand the socio-spatial processes of exclusion. Furthermore, our selection facilitates discussion of the ways particular conceptualizations shape understanding of relationships between geographical landscapes and exclusion. Toward these ends, the following discussion evaluates selected works for their conceptualizations of exclusion and landscape, as well as analytical strategies to study connections between them.

We begin with Mitchell's *The Lie of the Land*, which provides a theory of landscape that is both innovative and distinct in its approach to understanding exclusion.

In this text, Mitchell offers two interconnected goals. On the one hand, he seeks to synthesize two seemingly disparate approaches to landscape: the Sauerian approach to studying the processes that shape the morphology of landscape (Sauer 1925) and the iconographic approach to studying landscape as a visual ideology or "way of seeing" that naturalizes particular socio-spatial relations (Cosgrove 1985 [1984]). Indeed, Mitchell endeavors to show how these two approaches are integral to understanding the material and discursive practices that produce both the look of the land and ways of looking at it. On the other hand, Mitchell intends to balance material and discursive approaches to landscape on a point of political economy of place scholarship: nothing about places are "natural"; rather, places are produced through ongoing struggle between different social groups to control how a place appears, how it is represented in geographical imaginaries, who has legitimate access to it, and who benefits from it. Elaborating this point, Mitchell (1996: 34–5) offers a "labor theory of landscape" to conceptualize landscape as

> an uneasy truce between the needs and desires of people who live in it, and the desire of powerful social actors to represent the world as they assume it should be. Landscape is always both a material form that results from and structures social interaction, and an ideological representation dripping with power. In both ways landscapes are acts of contested discipline, channeling spatial practices into certain patterns and presenting to the world images of how the world (presumably) works and who it works for.

Mitchell (1996: 28) offers this cultural materialist approach to landscape in order to understand the labor that produces the shape of the landscape and that attempts to "naturalize a system of domination, order, and control that appropriates the labor." Mitchell thus generates a theory that focuses on the role landscapes play in reproducing conditions of alienation under capitalism.

Mitchell's theory progresses landscape studies of social exclusion in three distinct ways. First, it offers a compelling ontology of landscape as a moment of social reproduction that expresses the dialectic relationship between material and discursive processes. Second, exclusion is understood as a status of omission. The struggles, negotiations, and competing interests that produce the material landscape are not immediately knowable from the look of the land. Likewise, while there may be competing "ways of seeing" the landscape, visual ideology of the dominant class obfuscates relations of production and the alienation of workers from their labor. In this way the landscape naturalizes particular representations of the world. Mitchell draws attention to landscapes as necessarily omitting the material and discursive embodiment of these relationships (hence the *lie* of the land). The role landscapes play in reproducing these omissions leads Mitchell to argue that landscapes are neither neutral nor self-evident. This leads to the third contribution to the study of exclusion in the landscape. Mitchell's conceptualization of landscape generates an epistemology to trace the practices and struggles that engender such forms of exclusion. Mitchell thus offers an approach to puzzle out the lie of the landscape not only for the sake of better scholarship, but also to understand and ultimately rectify the ways landscapes marginalize workers.

Geographies of Exclusion, by David Sibley, offers a decidedly different approach to studying exclusion. Sibley (1995) too provides a conceptual framework for connecting discursive and material formations in the production of space. Yet, we highlight Sibley's attention to the processes that produce exclusionary landscapes. Sibley is concerned primarily with what he calls the "purification of space," which he defines as a process of social control through which a dominant social group constructs socio-spatial boundaries that contribute to the marginalization of groups judged as deviant and outside the mainstream. For Sibley, exclusion plays a part in the reproduction of social identity. Sibley thus focuses narrowly on the socially constructed boundaries that contribute to the marginalization of minority groups, especially in advanced capitalist societies. Sibley's thesis is similar to Cresswell's (1996) work on transgression in *In Place/Out of Place*, although Sibley's use of object relations theory to examine the social processes that produce boundaries is novel.

Sibley employs object relations theory to explain connections between individual and group behavior, and behavior and the geographical environment, which are integral to processes of exclusion. Scholars working in the fields of psychoanalysis and social anthropology developed this theory to conceptualize how the self is constructed through an individual's relationships with human and non-human objects in its wider environment. Sibley is particularly interested in the boundaries individuals create to construct the *self* as separate and distinct from *other* objects. These boundaries are created through a self-definition process of "abjection," which Kristeva (1982) refers to as an individual's attempt to distance oneself from objects that represent undesirable, non-conforming, and even antithetical characteristics. Sibley theorizes that abjection operates too on a social level to create boundaries around social groups – sameness and community on one side and the deviant and marginal on the other. Moreover, he draws on Mead's (1934) notion of the "generalized other" to conceptualize a connection between abject things, people, and places. This is all to say, Sibley uses object relations theory to explain why dominant social groups attempt to purify space of other marginal social groups and reproduce boundaries that separate the marginal places with which they are associated. As Sibley (1995: 11) explains it, "the geographies of exclusion, the literal mappings of power relations and rejection, are informed by the generalized other."

Sibley is careful to qualify that the purification of space occurs in limited situations and can take multiple forms. He notes that, in the west, there is a continuum of tolerance for difference and thus variation in response to it. Environments that are already highly ordered and purified of other objects, however, facilitate forms of social control that construct differences as out of place, deviant, and potentially abject. Highly organized homogeneous spaces thus can facilitate a variety of exclusionary practices to maintain conformity, purify space, and push non-conforming elements to the margins. Less organized and heterogeneous spaces are less supportive, if not thwarting, to forces of purification. Furthermore, exclusion can be symbolic as well as material. Exclusion can take the form of strong spatial divisions meant to separate people and places – take for example the construction of walls and highways to partition ghetto neighborhoods in urban places. Yet individuals and social groups may also employ measures that are more symbolic in nature in order to purify a place of abject characteristics – the case of prohibiting non-English language on commercial signage in the built environment of nativist municipalities in the United States illustrates the point that social boundaries may still be constructed in ways that do not manifest in stark spatial divisions.

Sibley's explanation of the purification of space makes an important contribution to the study of exclusionary landscapes. Most significant is his framework for examining the connection between group identity formation and the creation and enforcement of territorial boundaries. This certainly provides another conceptual path to imagine the connections between the discursive and material dimensions of landscape. Sibley (1995) does not, however, provide a clear ontology of landscape. In fact, space is only implicitly defined as Sibley gives more attention to critiquing the Cartesian conceptualization than generating a positive definition of space. Thus, while Sibley has used object relations theory to shed light on social processes that contribute to exclusion, his approach begs further question of how the social and spatial boundaries are etched into geographical landscapes, how they matter in social practice, and how they may be challenged by new inscriptions.

Duncan and Duncan's *Landscapes of Privilege* investigates a most interesting problem in landscape studies of exclusion. In the current global era, transnational flows of people, capital, land development, and ideas threaten to unsettle imagined communities and the imagined geographical boundaries that delineate places. Observing this process, Massey (1994) noted that some social groups work fervently to maintain such boundaries, establish coherence, and protect the imagined authenticity of places in an attempt to ensure the integrity of a place called home. As Duncan and Duncan (2001) have elsewhere discussed, this process of re-inventing places amidst and indeed sometimes against such unsettling changes is an important issue for social and cultural geographers to explore. In *Landscapes of Privilege*, Duncan and Duncan (2004) demonstrate that the attempt to preserve the imagined authenticity of places has important implications for geographies of marginalization and exclusion.

Landscapes of Privilege is empirically concerned with efforts of wealthy social elites to preserve the pastoral landscape of Bedford, a small town that is now a part of the commutershed for the New York metropolitan area. They examine the ways in which elites use environmental conservation and historical preservation to shape the look of Bedford's landscape and have it conform to an idealized notion of what the town (may have) looked like in the nineteenth century – a beautiful pastoral New England landscape unmarked by the development of industrial urbanism. Duncan and Duncan note that concern with the aesthetics of the landscape has unseen consequences for the exclusion of lower-income and racialized groups. Indeed, the effort to preserve a pastoral look to the landscape has been bolstered by land use zoning for very low-density settlement and ordinances to preserve undeveloped land to maintain a landscape rich in tree coverage. These strategies have the effect of making Bedford a highly exclusive place as they make it financially impractical for the development of affordable housing. Consequently, the labor that is essential for the maintenance of the pastoral landscape, which is provided primarily by Latino migrants who work as day laborers, is excluded from residing in Bedford. *Landscapes of Privilege* thus examines how the struggle to control the look of the landscape operates as a subtle yet effective mechanism of exclusion.

Beyond the study of Bedford, *Landscapes of Privilege* has two significant theoretical implications for studies of landscape and exclusion. One the one hand, perhaps the most novel contribution is to see landscapes through a lens of performance. Duncan and Duncan (2004) draw on Bourdieu's (1984) work on cultural capital to see landscapes as a positional good. Shaping the look of the landscape according to distinct tastes and styles is thus a way to perform social identities and show participation and membership in particular communities. Duncan and Duncan (2004: 7) follow Austin (1975) and Butler (1990) in understanding performance as a productive and everyday embodied practice and theorize that "identities are performed in and through landscapes." In their perspective, landscapes are aesthetic productions that provide a symbolic resource privileged social groups employ in the pursuit of social distinction. Prestige and material benefits can accrue to people whose residential location and property are associated with an authentic landscape. On the other hand, Duncan and Duncan point out that the aesthetic production of landscapes is made possible through various legal, political, and economic practices that shape material landscapes according to abstract ideas. "These practices tend to be exclusionary although they are not always acknowledged, or even recognized, as such ... In fact, the goal is not always social exclusion in itself but to preserve the "look of the landscape," which is central to the performance of particular social identities that depend on lifestyle, consumption patterns, taste, and aesthetic sensibilities" (Duncan and Duncan 2006: 159). Social identities that are considered abject or antithetical to the cultivation of particular visual aesthetics in the landscape and the material bodies and buildings with which they are associated are erased or expelled from the visual scene. Moreover, because aesthetics are often treated as apolitical, idiosyncratic taste and style preferences, the exclusive consequences of the aesthetic production of landscapes as well as the complicity in the connections that privileged groups have to such consequences are often overlooked or go unseen.

Lastly, *Landscapes of Privilege* raises a problem that is relevant to further study of exclusion and marginality. This problem concerns the ways in which elites are complicit in unequal, oppressive and otherwise exclusive sets of social relations. Duncan and Duncan (2004) focus on the roles of elites in the aesthetic production of Bedford as a pastoral place and note the importance of further inquiry about how locally and globally powerful groups are involved in producing geographies of exclusion in ways that they may not be individually accountable for. Tracing the web of complicity and placing it in the context of a global geometry of power will greatly contribute to understanding geographies of marginalization and enrich theories of landscape generally and its contribution to social exclusion in particular.

In important ways, Price's *Dry Place* incorporates theories from diverse sources to interrogate the political implications of particular landscapes and to advance landscape theory in general. Price (2004) weaves geographic notions of landscape and place with three threads of scholarship in the humanities – work on sacred places from religious studies, studies of the "New West" from history, and most adeptly, the use of narrative in literary criticism – to investigate the landscape near (and including) the US–Mexico border. She combines these ideas to investigate the tenuous and ever-changing relationships between place, nationalism, and globalization as they are powerfully expressed through landscape narratives.

Like other social and cultural geographers, Price interrogates the relationship between the material and discursive practices that shape landscape. However, she argues that Mitchell (above) and others tend to favor the material landscape over the discursive, implying that landscape representations are merely a veneer that must be stripped away to uncover the material landscape that lies beneath. She argues

that the stories people relate about particular landscapes are just as powerful, just as "real," as material practices, and she takes issue with the inherent gendering of research on landscape representations as female, and therefore less legitimate. For Price, the power and "real"-ness of landscapes comes from their essence as narrative constructs, the stories that people tell and retell about themselves and their relationships to place. As such, landscapes are "power constructs, always processual, usually contested, and deeply performative." Price insists that these stories can be "powerfully real and really powerful" (Price 2004: 22).

Price utilizes literary theory to examine the political use of landscapes by introducing the notion of the landscape as palimpsest, or a location of erasure and overwriting by successive groups. Instead of a single accepted reading of a landscape, Price reveals the narrative layering that constitutes all landscapes in politically significant ways and constantly alternates between inclusion and marginalization. Thus Price focuses on how place narratives accumulate over time, leading to a theory of landscape as "a layered text of narratives of belonging and exclusion" (p. 7).

Price's major contribution to the study of landscapes of marginalization comes through her examination of how these narratives of belonging and exclusion ebb and flow to shape particular landscapes. To do so she employs Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) notions of smooth space and striated space. Spaces that lack meaning within a particular narrative are considered smooth, while spaces imbued with meaning are considered striated. Importantly, Price notes that spaces often move between smooth and striated within different landscape narratives. The tendency to smooth certain narratives has led jungle, desert, ocean, and polar spaces to all be conceived as empty and meaningless, allowing them to be colonized without acknowledgment of prior claims to those landscapes. Price shows a similar trend when relating how the landscape surrounding and including the US–Mexico border has served as the centerpiece of national identity narratives by various groups since the mid-1800s. "The West" has been a smooth landscape to the United States throughout history, perceived as an empty space into which the country could grow, despite the fact that this narrative relied on the distinct striation that came from the creation of the geopolitical US–Mexico border in 1848. Price (2004: 41) summarizes, "The smoothing of spaces constructed a blankness that was at the heart of dominant landscape attitudes in colonizing societies more generally." In all cases, the landscapes were actively regarded as featureless and smooth, despite their necessary and inherent striations.

Price asserts that every nationalism attempts to write a narrative in the landscape that resists existing narratives, by implying uniform support among its members. Price (p. 97) refers to this as "homogenization-in-resistance," whereby resistance by a marginalized group is argued to be possible only when the group temporarily ignores (smooths) its internal inequalities and differences (striations) in order to present a unified narrative. However, these inequalities and differences of ethnicity, religion, gender, race, and sexuality naturally resist smoothing. The newly smoothed narrative leads to further marginalization, eventually leading to the narrative's implosion at the hands of the differences constructed as marginal. Such was the case with Aztlán, the utopian landscape encompassing the US–Mexico border that was central to Chicano nationalism of the 1960s and 1970s, which Price (2004: 82) concludes was "haunted by its own ghostly voices from the margins." Even contemporary advocates of globalization fall into this trap by claiming that the world is becoming increasingly borderless, a smooth space in which boundaries to trade and cultural differences continually fall away. However, such a smoothing narrative ignores the internal inconsistencies, the striations of more-heavily patrolled national borders, reinforced claims of cultural and ethnic identity, and increased gaps between rich and poor, all of which threaten to undermine the narrative. For Price, marginality that is constantly written out of the landscape always finds its way back in.

Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben has inspired a final collection of scholarship in the theoretical integration of landscape and exclusion. Cultural and social geographers have utilized Agamben's theories to describe the ways that political violence is enacted through the physical exclusion of marginalized groups from society. Gregory's (2004) *The Colonial Present* is one example. Gregory applies ideas from Agamben's *Homo Sacer* (1998 [1995]), particularly the notion of spaces of exclusion, to explain the imaginative geographies produced alongside the military campaigns of the United States in Afghanistan, Israel against Palestine, and the United States and Britain in Iraq. In each case, individuals and groups inhabiting each place have come to be regarded as outsiders "occupying a space beyond the pale of the modern," whose rights, protections, and dignities have thus been forfeited (Agamben 1998 [1995]: 28). Agamben refers to such people as *homo sacer*, or sacred man, living outside of both divine law and juridical law, and thus able to be killed with impunity. Agamben traces the notion of *homo sacer* to Roman times when sovereign power was exercised precisely through the process of exclusion, not inclusion. Thus, reminiscent of Sibley and object relations scholars, Agamben contends that the process of marginalization is vital to the formation of political communities.

Geographers have utilized Agamben's notion of spaces of exclusion to understand the state's denial of legal protections to marginalized groups, a condition that typically arises under a state of (perceived) emergency. When a state of emergency threatens to become the rule, it leads to "the enclosure of the subject, its transformation into the direct object of violence" (Secor 2007: 39). Most geographers utilizing Agamben's spaces of exclusion have focused on specific sites of social and political injustice, such as Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. For instance, Hyndman and Mountz (2007) have concentrated on would-be refugees caught in nonsovereign spaces, while Kearns (2007) has used Agamben to conceive of nineteenth century Ireland as a "camp," colonized by Britain and object of Britain's ceaseless violence.[1] Geographers interested in marginalization have readily adopted and adapted Agamben's theories in their continued explorations of the landscapes of exclusion.

Experiencing Exclusion

Geographers have also recently sought to understand marginalized groups' everyday experiences of exclusion, as well as the practices they may engage in to challenge in some ways, and reproduce in others, processes of social exclusion. In this section we begin by focusing on the importance of borders, both material and discursive, in creating landscapes of exclusion. We emphasize both geopolitical borders and the unmarked boundaries that separate the self and the other, to show how marginal groups experience exclusion through multiple nodes of difference that compound

and complicate their marginality. Second, we show how marginalized groups engage in subtle forms of resistance in order to contest exclusion in ways that offer mixed and often unpredictable results. The key to this second point is that members of marginal groups are often acutely aware of their exclusion and even engage its processes. This sort of engagement is important to understanding the production and reproduction of marginality. Third, we examine how the practices of marginal groups can lead to the creation of new spaces of exclusion that are at once unanticipated and integral to the processes that construct and relate privilege and marginality.

Borders produce landscapes of exclusion by their very existence, by separating groups, creating and pointing out differences. However, borders can also bridge divides and serve as meeting points, providing locations around which alternative inclusions can occur. This dual nature of borders makes them essential to understanding the complex experience of marginality. The violent materiality of borders can be seen in the fences, walls, and police forces along international borders, like that which separates the United States and Mexico. The effects of such a border can be far-reaching. Wright (2006) argues that the US–Mexico border not only encourages the construction of *maquiladora* factories essential to global capitalism, but also helps produce the myth of the third-world woman. This woman, like her labor, is considered "disposable," as evidenced through her recruitment and limited training, as well as her spatial marginalization from the center of factories themselves. More horrifying, though, has been the murder and disposal of hundreds of young women in the desert near factories in Ciudad Juárez since the late-1990s. Here, a discourse of female disposability produced in part by the US–Mexico border and the political and economic relations it signifies has become etched into a landscape that morally justifies the deadly exclusion of women from public space (see also Wright 2004).

On the other hand, one can also see the inclusiveness of the US–Mexico border, where artists, writers, and others have championed a notion of the border as a seam of commonality to parties on both sides. By reimagining the border as a unifying force, they have rewritten the narrative of the borderland landscape as one of inclusion instead of division. Price (2004: 90) calls this erasure of the geopolitical US–Mexico border "a transgressive, contestatory, liberatory gesture" that creates a landscape "where dichotomous constructions of belonging and exclusion are no longer viable" (see also Wright 2006: 95). This perspective raises a critical question for any geographer: how can one move beyond a simple dichotomy to see the messy realities of how inclusion/exclusion is experienced daily?

Marginality can stem from multiple sources of difference that separate the self and the other, including race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, nationality, citizenship, class, and religion, among others. The ways that people experience exclusion through these factors can vary immensely, as marginality is often complicated due to the intersection of multiple nodes of difference. Geographers have described the everyday lives of marginal groups, both to understand how these nodes intersect, and to complicate notions of marginality by questioning the simple division between inclusion and exclusion.

Pratt's (2004) work with Filipina domestic workers in Canada is a prime example of the inherent tension between inclusion and exclusion found among marginalized

groups. Filipina domestic workers are marginalized on a daily basis due to their nationality, race, and political status. Their professional training and educational attainment from the Philippines is devalued, while their political status as non-citizens on specific work visas provides few opportunities for career advancement, causing them to feel deskilled over time. However, their marginality is complicated by the fact that their labor is constructed as central to the career advancement of middle and upper-class Canadian women, as well as the fact that as domestic workers residing in their workplaces, many of their employers perceive them as "family members." These are significant expressions of the importance of Filipina domestic workers to Canadian society through their exploitation within the international division of labor, making these workers feel both included and excluded in concrete and incredibly intimate ways.

A similar convergence and complication of nodes of difference is found in Faier's (2009) investigation of Filipina migrants to Japan. Triply marginalized as racially and economically inferior (due to the assumed poverty of the Philippines), as well as morally suspect via their labor in bars, the women experience multiple exclusions everyday. Yet, those Filipinas who marry Japanese men become included into rural families in intimate and complicated ways. Many are referred to as *ii oyomesan*, or "good brides," because they dutifully care for family needs in ways refused by many contemporary Japanese women who increasingly delay or avoid marriage. Paradoxically, each Filipina's intimate inclusion in Japanese families re-inscribes a material and discursive landscape of a traditional, gendered, patriarchal Japan that is imagined as racially homogenous, which in turn re-excludes the Filipinas from popular ideas of the rural Japanese landscape in which they live. Like Pratt, Faier complicates marginality, showing the multiple ways that differences interact to create spaces of both inclusion and exclusion, as well as spaces that cannot be clearly delimited as one or the other (see also Chapter 12 this volume).

Borders are constantly being produced, negotiated, challenged, and redrawn. One way of conceptualizing this process is through de Certeau's (1984) theories of "strategies" and "tactics." De Certeau calls "strategies" the top-down meanings given by political, economic, and cultural elites, which are aimed to allow little or no room for differing interpretations. Consumers, on the other hand, employ "tactics," or processes that challenge the assumed meanings of things produced by others, such as books and even city streets. De Certeau calls tactics "the ingenious ways in which the weak make use of the strong" in everyday life (xvii; see also Scott 1985). De Certeau (1984: xvii) deals specifically with marginality in his work *The Practice of Everyday Life*, by first stating, "Marginality is becoming universal," then celebrating the multiple ways that people creatively use and manipulate the cultural meanings imposed on them from productive elites.

The experience of exclusion often elicits tactics that contest borders. However, marginalized groups also engage in practices that reproduce or even compound their exclusion. Literally crossing a geopolitical border can be an act of both resistance to and acceptance of a recognized border narrative. Wright notes the powerful role played by the US–Mexico border in marginalizing Mexican women within global firms. Ambitious women who retain markers of their Mexicanness, through clothing, makeup, and language, are accused of not knowing their proper place and are considered disposable. Others literally and figuratively cross the border to make

themselves more "American," and thus increase their value to firms. Here, Mexican women accept the landscape of exclusion created by the border, while also resisting the myth of their disposability by exploring possibilities for inclusion.

Discursive borders can also be resisted. Pratt shows that Filipina domestic workers employ a variety of tactics to challenge their marginalization by Canadian society. One example is the way they respond to such questions as, "Where do you work?" Through clever word play and avoidance of the response, "I'm a nanny," the women resist playing into stereotypes held by most Canadians that would justify their exclusion.

In some cases, these tactics may open liminal, or transitional, spaces between inclusion and exclusion. These are spaces of uncertainty and negotiation that are neither inside nor outside. For instance, Faier highlights the fact that many of Filipinas in rural Japan feel "stuck" between the Philippines and an idealized "America" that symbolizes their desires for economic opportunity, glamor, modernity, and mobility. For them, Japan represents a liminal zone on the way to a desired goal, but one in which some semblance of these desires can be fulfilled. Thus, while in some ways their experience excludes them from Japanese society, in other ways it also includes them in a more cosmopolitan and sometimes romantic life than they could have imagined in the Philippines.

Sometimes, groups excluded from particular landscapes wish to remain that way. Sibley's scholarship on the exclusion of Roma people in urban England speaks well to this point. Roma or Gypsy communities are often located on the margins of urban settlements in derelict spaces at the edge of cities. These communities are pushed to the margins in part because of stereotypes of Roma people as uncivilized: immoral, criminals, and vagabonds, who otherwise embody heresy to law-abiding and property-based assumptions of modern capitalist society. At the same time, Sibley (1995: 68) notes that Roma communities also seek out marginal spaces "in order to avoid control agencies and retain some degree of autonomy." The separation of Gypsy communities further reinforces the discursive boundaries that categorically associate Gypsies with defiled elements of society. The important point in this example is that groups may seek marginal locations as part of an effort to create and maintain boundaries separating the group from the larger society. Such an effort is also evident in the practices of some orthodox religious groups who voluntarily exclude themselves from spaces of mainstream society in order to maintain boundaries between the pure and the defiled.

Towards Inclusion

For more than four decades geographers have examined marginalization in order to understand the social processes and geographical representations that contribute to unjust relationships in society. Geographers have shown that marginalization is an inherently socio-spatial process: the term marginalization itself is a spatial metaphor that correctly draws attention to the geographical aspects of exclusion. As part of this endeavor, some of the best work on this topic has drawn productively on theories and concepts generated outside of geography. We have focused in this chapter on geographers' efforts to trace ways in which landscapes contribute to social exclusion as part of a strategy to illustrate on the one hand the contribution

of other disciplines to social and cultural geographies of marginalization and to critically examine on the other hand how this area of scholarship may be advanced, improved, and elaborated. We turn to this last point in this final section of the chapter by considering two issues. First, we describe several insights and an unresolved question concerning geographers' analytical approaches to understanding the production of exclusion in geographical landscapes. We present these primarily to point out pathways along which future work might travel to productively contribute to the literature. Second, we discuss a recent contribution to literature on marginalization that considers how geographical landscapes might be produced in ways that contribute to social inclusion and promote social justice. This is a nascent, but promising area of research that is poised to galvanize scholarship of marginalization in social geography.

Our discussion highlights several important theoretical insights about landscapes and exclusion with which future scholarship on the geographies of marginalization should be concerned. One insight has been discussed elsewhere (Mitchell 2003, 2008), but its importance merits repeating here: landscapes are not just local products. Landscapes may be experienced and imagined as a local phenomenon, yet agents working at a variety of scales produce them. For instance, the production of an authentic and pastoral New England landscape in Bedford, New York, is made possible by the labor of international migrants, the cultural and economic capital of elites who draw their wealth from transnational corporations located in New York City, and the activities of large-scale national institutions, such as the Nature Conservancy and the American Civil Liberties Union, all of which connect Bedford to the wider region, nation, and beyond (Duncan and Duncan 2006). Geographies of marginalization must attend to the ways in which relationships that operate at and across different scales inform, shape, and animate the processes of exclusion. Duncan and Duncan (2004) also raise a corollary insight: social exclusion in the landscape is *not always intentional*; it can often result unconsciously from efforts to construct a particular look of the land. However, social exclusion is *not incidental* in efforts to shape the landscape in particular ways. Duncan and Duncan therefore suggest that landscape theory should adopt a more nuanced understanding of complicity to trace the complex and multi-scaled relationships through which social exclusion operates. These are important insights to carry forward in future examination of exclusion in landscapes.

In addition to these two insights, we also point out that social and cultural geographers have begun to make productive use of boundary analysis in order to study the production and experience of exclusion in landscapes. Boundaries seem well suited to such scholarship, in part, because they highlight the spatiality of exclusion: boundaries are both discursive and material constructs; they operate across a variety of scales to mark the geopolitical borders of national states as well as the socially-scripted roles that men and women embody through gender, race, and so forth; and they remind us that processes of exclusion do not remove marginalized groups altogether. Price (2004) and Sibley (1995) have each theorized that boundaries are always in the process of becoming and that efforts to establish them reflect attempts to order the environment and stabilize particular meanings (e.g., purity, authenticity, community) in a changing world. Scholars utilizing Agamben's insights on spaces of exception also highlight the use of boundaries to create both imagined and real

spaces in which exclusion is practiced and justified (Gregory 2004; Secor 2007). Analyzing the production, use, and experience of boundaries by individuals and social groups thus offers an innovative approach to the study of exclusion in the landscape.

We suggest that further study of boundaries in the cultural landscape is poised to enrich our understanding of the geographies of marginalization. Tracing the ways in which boundaries make landscapes (meaningful), as well as how landscapes concretize boundaries constitute an important part of future scholarship on exclusion. Our discussion of geographical scholarship on landscape and exclusion has thus far emphasized the way it has drawn on theory and insight from other disciplines in order to understand the spatiality of boundaries. We further encourage that geographers emphasize how the spatiality of discursive and material boundaries that are concretized in landscape contribute to social relations and experiences of exclusion.

Geographies of everyday practice and social performance provide a useful entry point for further exploration of this research frontier. In his critique of landscape scholarship, Rose (2002) argues that geographers have privileged analysis of what landscapes mean at the expense of questions of how landscapes come to be meaningful. Rose (2002: 456) identifies a series of unanswered questions about landscape that also speak to the research agenda on boundaries that we highlight. Following Rose, we ask how are boundaries sustained in the mental and material worlds? How is it that we imagine and comprehend boundaries in the landscape, and how are these concretized in our everyday experience? How are boundaries called forth to affect social exclusion? And how are liminal spaces surrounding borders used to create new social formations? These questions draw attention to the everyday practices, stories, scripts, performances, and improvisations through which "individual agents [call] the landscape into being as they make it relevant for their own lives, strategies, and projects" (Rose 2002: 457) in ways reminiscent of de Certeau's (1984) assertions about everyday practice. Geographies of marginalization may thus find ontologies of landscape that emphasize human performance and practice (e.g., Duncan and Duncan 2004; Price 2004; Schein 1997) useful to trace the ways in which boundaries are understood, enacted, and inflected in everyday life to (re) produce social exclusion.

In light of this reminder, it is also important for geographers to consider how landscapes can be produced in ways that lead to the social *inclusion* of marginalized groups. Schein (2009: 823) explains, "The very 'everydayness' of the cultural landscape gives us the ability to intervene." Building on Price's (2004) idea of landscape as a palimpsest that accumulates narratives, discourses, and other attempts to stabilize meaning and order the environment, Schein (2009: 823) reminds us that landscapes can also serve as a point of intervention in which "we might seize the opportunity to enact a (slightly) different version of the world." Schein's hopeful suggestion is based on empirical observation of social action and change in Lexington, Kentucky, and not mere conjecture. He follows the efforts of a citizen's group in this racially segregated city to use the construction of a public art garden memorializing local African American citizen Isaac Murphy to interrupt patterns of racial injustice and enact a narrative of African Americans' belonging in Lexington society. The group has taken control of the design process in order to create a memorial art garden that represents the legacy of African American participation in thoroughbred horse racing in Kentucky and elsewhere in the United States. The garden's design is meant to interact with young people to both encourage an historical awareness of African American contributions to the city and support young African American's full membership in society. Schein sees the actions of the citizen's group as effecting change in and though the landscape by shaping its material form and symbolic meaning. In effect, the citizen group's intervention in the public spaces of Lexington may (incrementally) shift the boundaries separating margin from center to include African Americans as full members of society.

Social and cultural geographers have often explored exclusion and marginalization in order to understand their causal processes and find practical ways to work against them. We have discussed in this chapter several recent theoretical approaches specific to the study of social exclusion in the landscape through which geographers are pursuing this project. These approaches offer important insights to studies of landscape and exclusion and also represent new frontiers geographers might productively explore to enrich general understanding of causes and experiences of marginalization. More importantly, we have also highlighted the importance of studying the spatiality of boundaries to further geographical research on exclusion and landscape. We have suggested that one productive way to contribute to this agenda is to examine the spatiality of performances and practices that bring exclusionary boundaries into the theater of everyday life. Lastly we also suggest that additional work is needed that explores the potential for and processes through which landscapes can contribute to inclusion of marginal groups. Schein's (2009) work on belonging through landscape is an important contribution. However, this remains an underrepresented, yet incredibly important avenue of research in social and cultural geography. It is important precisely because it stands to offer new insights to landscape theory and outlines practical ways that geographical landscapes might be produced in order to contribute to social inclusion and promote social justice.

Note

1 Some geographers argue that one misinterprets Agamben when one topographically situates this "enclosure of the subject." For instance, Belcher et al. (2008: 501) argue that Agamben's work best reveals *how* exclusion works, not *where*; that for Agamben the exception is "spatializ*ing*, not spatializ*ed*" (see also Coleman 2007). It is noteworthy that following his explicitly spatial language in *Homo Sacer*, Agamben's 2005 book is titled *State* of Exception (not *Space*). These distinctions continue to be negotiated by geographers drawing on Agamben to understand marginality and exclusion.

References

Agamben, G. (1998) [1995]. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Tr. D. Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Agamben, G. (2005) *State of Exception*. Tr. K. Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, K. (1991) *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial Discourse in Canada, 1875–1980.* Montreal: Queen's University Press.
Austin, J.L. (1975) *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Belcher, O., Martin, L., Secor, A., Simon, S., and Wilson, T. (2008) Everywhere and nowhere: the exception and the topological challenge to geography. *Antipode* 40 (4): 499–503.
Bourdieu. P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge.
de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Tr. S. Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Coleman, M. (2007) Review: state of exception. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25 (1): 187–90.
Cosgrove, D. (1985) [1984] *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape.* Totowa: Barnes & Noble.
Craddock, S. (2000) *City of Plagues: Disease, Poverty, and Deviance in San Francisco.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Cresswell, T. (1996) *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Del Casino, Jr., V. and Marston, S. (2006) Social geography in the United States: everywhere and nowhere. *Social and Cultural Geography* 7 (6): 995–1009.
Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* tr. B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Duncan, J. and Duncan, N. (2001) The aestheticization of the politics of landscape preservation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91 (2): 387–409.
Duncan, J. and Duncan, N. (2004) *Landscapes of Privilege: The Politics of the Aesthetic in an American Suburb.* New York: Routledge.
Duncan, J. and Duncan, N. (2006) Aesthetics, abjection, and white privilege in suburban New York. In R. Schein (ed.), *Race and Landscape in America.* New York: Routledge, pp. 157–76.
Faier, L. (2009) *Intimate Encounters: Filipina Women and the Remaking of Rural Japan.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gregory, D. (2004) *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, and Iraq.* Malden: Blackwell.
Hanson, S. and Pratt, G. (1995) *Gender, Work, and Space.* London: Routledge.
Hyndman, J. and Mountz, A. (2007) Refuge or refusal: geographies of exclusion. In D. Gregory and A. Pred (eds.), *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence.* New York and London: Routledge, pp. 77–92.
Johnston, R., Poulsen, M., and Forrest, J. (2007) The geography of ethnic residential segregation: A comparative study of five countries. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97: 713–38.
Kearns, G. (2007) Bare life, political violence, and the territorial structure of Britain and Ireland. In D. Gregory and A. Pred (eds.), *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence.* New York; London: Routledge, pp. 7–35.
Kristeva, J. (1982) *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Leitner, H., Peck, J., and Sheppard, E. (eds.) (2007) *Contesting Neoliberalism.* New York: Guilford Press.
Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place, and Gender.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Mead, M. (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Mitchell, D. (1996) *Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Mitchell, D. (2003) Just landscape or landscapes of justice? *Progress in Human Geography* 27: 813–22.
Mitchell, D. (2008) New axioms for reading the landscape: paying attention to political economy and social justice. In J. Wescoat, Jr., and D. Johnston (eds.), *Political Economies of Landscape Change.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer, pp. 20–50.
Pratt, G. (2004) *Working Feminism.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Price, P. (2004) *Dry Place: Landscapes of Belonging and Exclusion.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Rose, M. (2002) Landscape and labyrinths. *Geoforum* 33: 455–67.
Sauer, C. (1925) *The Morphology of Landscape.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Schein, R. (1997) The place of landscape: a conceptual framework for interpreting an American scene. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87 (4): 660–80.
Schein, R. (2009) Belonging through land/scape. *Environment and Planning A* 41 (4): 811–26.
Schein, R. (ed.) (2006) *Race and Landscape in America.* New York: Routledge.
Scott, J. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance.* New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
Secor, A. (2004) "There is an Istanbul that belongs to me": citizenship, space, and identity in the city. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (2): 352–68.
Secor, A. (2007) "An unrecognizable condition has arrived": law, violence, and the state of exception in Turkey. In D. Gregory and A. Pred (eds.), *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence.* New York; London: Routledge, pp. 37–53.
Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West.* London and New York: Routledge.
Tilly, C., Moss, P., Kirschenman, J., and Kenneley, I. (2001) Space as signal: how employers perceive neighborhoods in four metropolitan labor markets. In A. O'Connor, C. Tilly, and L. Bobo (eds.), *Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities.* New York: Russel Sage Foundation, pp. 304–38.
Wright, M. (2006) *Disposable Women and Other Myths of Global Capitalism.* New York: Routledge.
Wright, M. (2004) From protests to politics: sex work, women's worth and Ciudad Juárez modernity. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (2): 369–86.

Wiley-Blackwell Companions to Geography

Wiley-Blackwell Companions to Geography is a blue-chip, comprehensive series covering each major subdiscipline of human geography in detail. Edited and contributed by the disciplines' leading authorities each book provides the most up to date and authoritative syntheses available in its field. The overviews provided in each *Companion* will be an indispensable introduction to the field for students of all levels, while the cutting-edge, critical direction will engage students, teachers, and practitioners alike.

Published

A Companion to Economic Geography
Edited by Eric Sheppard and Trevor J. Barnes

A Companion to Political Geography
Edited by John Agnew, Katharyne Mitchell, and Gerard Toal (Gearoid O Tuathail)

A Companion to Cultural Geography
Edited by James S. Duncan, Nuala C. Johnson, and Richard H. Schein

A Companion to Tourism
Edited by Alan A. Lew, C. Michael Hall, and Allan M. Williams

A Companion to Feminist Geography
Edited by Lise Nelson and Joni Seager

A Companion to Environmental Geography
Edited by Noel Castree, David Demeritt, Diana Liverman, and Bruce Rhoads

A Companion to Health and Medical Geography
Edited by Tim Brown, Sara McLafferty, and Graham Moon

A Companion to Social Geography
Edited by Vincent J. Del Casino Jr., Mary E. Thomas, Ruth Panelli, and Paul Cloke

Also available:

The New Blackwell Companion to the City
Edited by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson

The Blackwell Companion to Globalization
Edited by George Ritzer

The Handbook of Geographic Information Science
Edited by John Wilson and Stewart Fotheringham

A Companion to Social Geography

Edited by

Vincent J. Del Casino Jr., Mary E. Thomas, Paul Cloke, and Ruth Panelli

WILEY-BLACKWELL
A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication