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Abstract: This article challenges the claim that highly skilled international academics who have obtained advanced degrees and transnational identities are offered almost seamless mobility. The state border or territory is not the only line that highly skilled academics must cross as international subjects of mobility. They experience a range of insecurities to do with their immigration status. This includes, but is not limited to, the waiting and processing times associated with immigration rules and visa requirements, which could temporarily suspend mobility rights. The notion of a temporal border is enacted to explore the insecurities that highly skilled academics face. Border crossing for highly skilled migrants is not just a matter of entry passing through territorial lines of nation-states. The border has a ‘thickness’ that stretches through time. Simply put, it takes time to fully cross borders.
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Paper: Restrictive borders are normally accompanied and are a result of government response about public reactions to what is perceived to be an increasing immigrant population. Unfortunately, there is no differentiation between EEA/EU or non-EEA/UK migrants in what is usually perceived as a negative situation for a nation-state. This is made more poignant with the recent BREXIT outcome in the UK. Brexit refers to the 2016 EU referendum which indicates Britain’s exit from the European Union following a 51.9% electoral result. EEA/EU member states movement is not restricted due to Treaty obligations. However, for non-EEA/EU migrants, labour immigration policies legislate and
regulate state borders and an ‘entry clearance’ must be obtained. In 2008, there has been a change in immigration policy where high skilled migrants coming to the UK are regulated by a point-based system (PBS). How PBS and immigration policies are implemented within specific administrative processes and procedures define the border that needs to be crossed beyond territorial access. How the border is sustained and the role of the state in its control beyond spatial considerations have been relatively neglected in both labour migration studies (Mavroudi and Warren, 2013) and critical border studies (Axelsson, 2016). This article addresses this in an autoethnographic account of academic mobility, which is really a reading of myself within and in relation to the scholarly work around and about time, migration and otherness. It will do so by emphasising a temporal relationship with the border that appears to reveal a lot of the political mechanisms at work in the spaces of borders and border-crossers. It highlights the temporality of borders as knots (Ingold, 2015) that interweaves instead of border-lines. The reworking of borders, not only in space but also in time and how these changes the rhythms of the movements of people in a variety of ways is most interesting. In geography and border studies, there is a tendency to privilege space and spatialities in analysis. In migration studies and mobilities, particularly in terms of transnational identities and knowledge transfer the frictions of borders are rarely brought to bear in discussions and deliberations. The premise of the temporal border is first of all that borders are always in motion (Konrad, 2015; Brambilla, 2015). Hence, they are inherently multi-stable and multi-dimensional.

The border-blurring effects of internationalisation of education and the decline in the importance of borders as part of the very definition of globalisation have exposed the temporal border. The transnational phenomenon of academic mobility has redrawn the border-line in spatio-temporal or Lefebverian sense of rhythms. As a border-crosser, I would like to understand the ‘lines’ I have and will have to cross in spatio-temporal terms. One aspect that this article intends to analyse is the relationship between bordering processes and the ‘when’ of the border, that is the temporal dimension of the ‘where’ of the border.

In an auto-ethnographic account, the notion of a temporal border, drawing mainly from the works of Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) and Griffiths (2017), is enacted. For a more theoretical backing that give me ways to talk about my time and otherness and how the mesh and mess these have placed and timed me, I refer to Lefebvre’s notion of rhythms with a particular nuance on the tempo than space or place and Fabian’s denial of co-evalence (ie. differential inclusion). This temporal account does not by any means diminish or ignore the space that is created by time and the time that is stretched in the placing of the other inside national borders. Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) argue that there is a ‘temporal thickness’ (p. 133) through which pathways to permanent residence and conditions of indefinite leave to holders remain are changed (eg. the increase in salary for spouses of migrants, and the increase in salary of visa holders). Through Lefebvre’s rhythmanalysis, this account recognises that borders are rhythmic and are rhythms, that is, they are temporal and spatial all at once. However, the effect of time is the focus of this paper. To argue that academic mobility is inherently temporal may seem trivial, but the neglect of temporality in existing transnational and migration studies has been persistent and problematic. Generally, temporality is deemed an abstract concept to be empirically investigated. Consequently, ethnographic studies of academic mobility and migration have favoured spatial accounts. The need to attend to the questions of time and temporality has been asserted again in migration studies (eg. Cwerner, 2001; King et al., 2006; May and Thrift,
2001); Griffiths et al., 2013; Robertson, 2014) have considered the temporal dimensions of migration. This article will paint an autobiographic picture of the temporal dimension of bordering processes for highly skilled academic migrants like me. Its first task is to theorise and insist upon the importance of time in investigating academic mobility beyond the rise of global academic capitalism and transnational identity transfer. Time is theorised by drawing from the works of Cwerner, Adam and Lefebvre. In this article, I use ‘time’ in at least two senses: first, as kairos, which refers to the time of human activity and intentions, of seasons, of movement and transformation; and second, as chronos, which refers to time that can be measured, the time of linear succession, of past, present and future. Given my temporary status, time refers to the duration of how long I have ‘leave to remain’ in the UK based on my Tier 2 (General) visa. Temporality cuts through linear time. And yet, the timings of immigration rules cut through my lived time. In particular, differential inclusion is not a process about closing the physical national borders – not a spatial matter, but about creating borders within the nation – a temporal matter – through time and with time. In my case (and Filipinos like me), our racial subjugation began in the Philippines – a US colony for more than half a century and a neocolony long after that. The imperialist constructions of the Philippines and its citizens – an inferior, immoral and incapable – travelled with me without my awareness and grasp of its power and invisible representation. When I left the Philippines and as someone who came from the Philippines, I am shaped and encountered by the position of my home country within the racial order and economic or evolutionary position as a Third world civilisation. Imperialisation contributes to the differential inclusion of my identity as a colonised ‘Other’.