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This paper examines the changing concept of the spatial and cultural/social boundaries in the historical context of early Madras (present-day Chennai) in South India. While Madras was known as one of the major port cities in South Asia under British colonial rule, it had been only a minor village when the English East India Company decided to settle there. The Company was required to set about establishing a town in addition to constructing a fort and factory in order to develop a city with the necessary facilities.

When focusing on the spatial structure of the new port city, we find boundaries both outside and inside of Madras. The outer limitation of the area granted to the Company by the local political authority was not so precisely defined, and the possibility was left open that the city could expand in due course. Within the city area, on the other hand, the two quarters were divided by walls which were completed in the early 1660s. The boundaries between the quarters were clearly visible thereafter. These inner spatial boundaries were closely related to the cultural/social boundaries among the groups of people as well. In this respect, “the Portuguese” —as they are called in contemporary sources— were the most controversial group of people in early Madras. Owing to insufficient numbers in the English population, the Company had to rely on “the Portuguese” to increase the number of inhabitants and secure indispensable personnel for the newly-built town and fort. The Company’s agents in early Madras invited “the Portuguese” from nearby environs and from San Thome, a port city to the south of Madras, in particular. In the latter half of the seventeenth century, the number of “Portuguese” living in the quarter surrounded by walls, which was called the “Christian Town” in those days, greatly increased. However, “the Portuguese” inhabitants, with their Catholic faith, were not regarded as easily acceptable in Madras under the English Company formed by anti-Catholic London merchants. Several disputes arose between those who insisted on the significant role of “the Portuguese” in this new port city, and those who were more cautious about their religious influence on Protestant Englishmen, and were strictly against their presence in “the Christian Town.” Here we can see different images held regarding “the Portuguese,” reflecting varied views on to what extent they were considered to be related to the Iberian Kingdom and/or Catholic Europe, though proponents of both views nonetheless considered “the Portuguese” as a
generic group of people.

At the end of the seventeenth century, however, a notion was introduced to divide “the Portuguese” into two different groups: one considered to be more “European” and another less. In addition, a new name, the “White Town,” started to be applied to the walled quarter in the early eighteenth century, instead of “the Christian Town,” which had been used previously. This implies that the concept of the quarter was changing. Around this time, intensifying hostility with the French East India Company promulgated a perception in the English Company that associated “the Portuguese” with the Catholic French. Such changing conceptualizations of “the Portuguese” and of the walled quarter in Madras were significant factors behind the resolution to expel Catholic inhabitants from the White Town in 1749. This case demonstrates that the conceptualization of boundaries around a group of people could be dynamic in fluctuating social contexts.
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The power of the nation-state is said to be in retreat in the face of globalization in the contemporary world, particularly associated with the remarkable role played by transnational economic actors within a global market economy. However, this “retreat of the state” has not been observed in all of the state’s functions. In particular, the nation-state continues to maintain exclusive control over areas relating to immigration policy. In controlling borders and the movement of people, each state draws on a complex border control regime based on interstate agreements for the purposes of controlling the movement of people across borders.

The first half of this paper will examine the specific functions of the European border regime that was put into place, in cooperation with various authoritarian North African states, before the events of the “Arab Spring.” This border regime had two aspects: the power to “let die” and deportation through readmission agreements.

In spite of the increasing ambiguity of borders between states, the nation-state continues to maintain a monopoly over the process for determining legitimate means of movement. Almost