

Walls to Keep People Out? Or Keep People In? An Analysis on the True Motivations Behind Physical Political Boundaries

Sonia Rodriguez Ruiz
Monmouth College

Abstract

Building a Wall on U.S. American border was one of the most significant promises made by President Trump to his supporters. In this paper I examine the political motivations behind building walls. Are these walls simply impressive architectural features with practical purpose of keeping 'undesirable' people out? Or are these walls meant to symbolically construct a nation? The politics of walls is far less recognisable and hidden. This research is to determine whether walls are used as political tools for defensive measures or whether there are also symbolic functions achieved by building walls. I argue that Trump's Wall is meant to symbolically construct a nation that does not include immigrants from its historic neighbours. I use content analysis from Trump's speeches and audience reactions to those speeches to show that the Wall is meant to keep 'undesirable' elements out of American nation.

The term wall is simple in its nature but when the idea of a wall is used in a political sense it is either reflected in a positive light or demonized. Walls are current debatable topics in political and also hold historical importance. Leading to the research question being '*Are Politically Established Physical walls used to keep people in or keep people out*'. Throughout this paper walls will be *looked* at from both sides and analysed as such. The relevance however is spoken through by not just modern day examples and on-going problems but also through historical context.

While the research question sounds simplistic and obvious, whether walls are to keep people in or keep people out. It is the finer details that this uncovers, it is not simply a yes or no answer as to whether or not these established walls are to keep people in or out, and it is uncovering their deeper meanings through research and analysis. Therefore while the research question poses a simple approach, the complex nature of uncovering the true motivation of

these walls, their true purpose, and their subliminal message that this paper is more intent and focused upon.

Through the earliest examples of medieval castles that had multiple fortifications and differing designs, castles had walls, as a protective measure to ensure safety and adding to the defensive structures. This then was primarily to keep people out, protecting lords, kings, peasants and resources. The matrix of walls, built by the warring states in China, eventually leading to the creation and extension of the Great Wall of China; originally set out to be protective physical boundaries, much like castle walls. Hadrian's Wall in what is now the United Kingdom is yet another example of a protective wall to keep people out and maintain order, control and to ensure safety. Hadrian Wall was built by the Romans to ensure safety, maintain order and control and to establish a frontier against the barbarians further north.

The Berlin wall is the historical outlier, a major political and physical wall that was used as a means of enforcing control within rather than preventing outside influence, an example then that will be discussed deeply within this paper. The Berlin Wall was built at a time of two conflicting political ideologies sharing an occupied city, with the then Soviet Union erecting, in stages, a wall that stopped migration out of the Soviet controlled area. An effort to, protect the political ideology, social constraints and economic policies of the region. A contrast to the walls used to keep people out.

Two other main examples that will feature throughout this paper are the Israel-Palestine wall and the US Mexico border wall, including Trumps future plans. The Israel-Palestine wall was erected in order to maintain a boundary between Israel and Palestine in an effort to protect the state socially, economically and politically. While Israel is continuously looking to reinforce and expand its territories, Palestine is constantly vying for autonomous statehood and is continuously gaining ground on achieving that, with the UN recognizing it as a single state.

The US border wall was erected in an attempt to decrease the flow of migration into the United States and therefore protecting the economy, society and culture and also the political stability of the USA, a wall to keep people out. These historical contexts show that walls are structures used to enforce political ideologies, protect social structures and economies.

Research Question

The term wall is simple in its nature but when the idea of a wall is used in a political sense it is either reflected in a positive light or demonized Walls. However walls are current debatable topics and also historical landmarks. Leading to the research question being, 'Are Politically Established Physical Walls Used to Keep People In or Keep People Out'. Throughout this paper walls will be looked at from both sides and analysed. The relevance however is spoken through by not just modern day examples and on-going problems but also through historical context. There are historical walls that are still parts of countries cultures and heritage, from the Mayan fortifications being discovered to Hadrian's Wall in the United Kingdom.

Walls have become even more apparent in modern day politics, the Berlin Wall for example, that fell in 1990 did not only serve a purpose of containment, but it is also part of the history of the two separated parts of Berlin, a reminder of political divisions, not just globally but also on a more internal scale.

The Israel-Palestine wall is the center of ongoing international concern, as is the United States border with Mexico, where a wall currently stands but could be increased in size and security. There is also the Migrant wall in Calais, a wall built to stop the flow of migration into the United Kingdom, which is also the center of ongoing international concern. To add to this, the world is constantly becoming more diverse, nations becoming more multicultural and economies dependent on global stability; yet walls are being planned and constructed and continuously defended, by nations trying to protect their national identities.

Walls then are ever relevant in today's political climate. This idea of walls being a relevant topic forms the research question for this topic: '*Are Politically Established Physical Walls Used to Keep People In or Keep People Out?*' Research on the topic of walls is both vast and slim, while this may seem confusing, walls as a physical boundary is a broad topic, without a lot of different approaches and aspects to consider. For example, are walls simply physical boundaries or elements of control, are they protective or restrictive or can it be said that walls are merely defensive in their motivation. Walls in their structure have also found to be discussed greatly throughout the research for this paper and boundaries in metaphorical instances account for a portion of the literature surrounding walls. Despite this, the issue concerning walls in relation to the research question, results in little literature, especially in comparison to the rest of the literature on walls. However, this research has uncovered key points of discussion and highlighted the gaps throughout previous writings and research on the politics of walls.

The starting point is the historical context provided. Walls have advanced from ancient civilizations to the uses in the modern day, therefore in order to highlights how this advanced and how walls are used the way they are, research was needed in order to gather information on the early stages of walls. The articles showed uses of walls as defensive measures with the primary use of keeping people out in order to protect those who live within the walls.

Joel Palka looked at the uncovered Mayan walls and foundations and highlighted their strategic and defensive components. The technology used allowed for an easier defence for the civilizations and it provides important information about the purpose of the walls. This is not the only historical contextualization of walls uncovered in the literature; Hadrian's Wall is also referred to, especially in Mohammad Chaichian's *Empires and Walls*.

This book includes a large amount of valuable literature relevant to this research but in terms of historical context it provides in depth knowledge. Directly on the Hadrian's Wall the book

explains that the wall was built by the expanding Roman Empire in order to keep out the Northern Savages, of what is now mostly Scotland. Hadrian's Wall still stands in part and one of Europe's largest walls, and although partly redundant at the time the wall in itself shows yet another historical example of a wall used primarily to keep people out. The book also speaks to the motivation behind the wall. Although the wall was built defensively it was built by an expanding empire that wanted to stake a claim on the area they had conquered and preserve their advancement. This is similar to some writings on the motivation for Israel's building of their wall, the idea that Israel is expanding and protecting what it claims to be rightfully theirs.

Continuing with the Israel Palestine wall, the Article, *Walls and Fences: Consequences for the Israel and Palestine* Israel is focused on preventing migration from Palestinians into Israel suggests to the idea that the wall separating the two factions is to keep people out. This is reasoning through many of the articles for the motivations behind the building of walls. Gershon Baskin mentions however in his writing the purpose of the division between Israel and Palestine is one that is meant to prevent the influence of Palestinians on the culture, society, and economics of Israel, this is a motivation that is more complex and leads to a greater understanding of the true motivations behind the building of the Israel Palestine wall.

Susan Brannon details Israel's want to keep the Palestinians out from Israel. Instead of focusing on the potential influence Palestinians may have on Israel. Brannon looks at the Israeli wall and how it is used in order to claim land confiscated from the Palestinians, more directly Qalqilya land (Brannon, 2002). The wall is then built in order to enforce the claim and prevent Palestinians from re-entering this land.

Although the land grab by Israel is condemned by some on the international stage the article maintains that the practice is used and the wall is built in order to keep people out. Staking claim to the land by building a wall is not a modern practice, this is mentioned in

Empires and Walls through the Roman Empire using Hadrian's Wall as a marker to create a boundary between what they had conquered and what they hadn't. Graham Usher in *The Wall and The Dismemberment of Palestine* writes extensively on the potential motivations behind the Israel Palestine dividing wall.

Although this particular wall it was meant to keep people out, the motivation according to Usher is more than just territory control. Usher highlights that the motivation behind creating the wall is to create a dismembered Palestine by breaking it up into separate unconnected areas in addition to destabilize Palestine. With Palestine aiming at gaining international recognition and being classed as State of its own, Israel strategy of only giving Palestine provisional boundaries prevents this. With Israel changing the boundaries of Palestine with walls, it does so through keeping Palestinians out, separating them from the population of Israel because of their ideological and cultural differences. Cultural differences are not the motivation for separating states or areas in just this example.

When looking at modern examples such as the Calais Migrant wall in France and whether it's meant to keep people in to keep people out. Although this wall separates a small part of France, it is paid for by the British Government in order to prevent the influx of migrants into both France and the United Kingdom. The BBC details the reasons for the United Kingdom funding this wall, and does so by noting that the financial burden and the social burden migrants have on the United Kingdom has reached a tipping point, especially in the current European political climate. The migrant wall then is another example of walls being built to keep people, and what they bring with them, out. Baskin looks not only at the wall in keeping people out but also alludes to the fact that in a way the Israel Palestine wall is used by Israel to prevent Israelis from trying to enter into Palestinian land. It was deduced from the information provided by the article *Walls and Fences: Consequences for the Israel and Palestine*, even though it is not directly mention Israel is trying to prevent the idea of marriage and networks established either side of the wall which in

turn the wall potentially is to keep people in. Marriages between Palestinians and Israelis allows for Palestinians to gain influence into Israel and as does economic ties and other societal aspects, therefore creating a wall and using it as a way of creating a separation from both sides meets the requirements for Israel.

Although the extent of the literature follows on this track, that walls are there for keeping people out for whatever motivation behind it, there is one major outlier to this theme. As an outlier it was important to gain as much information as possible in order to keep a balanced discussion throughout this paper, therefore a balanced amount of research was done on this outlier. The one major example of people being primarily kept in by a wall is the Berlin Wall. Chaichian in *Empires and Walls* points out the distinction between other walls that keep people out and the Berlin wall by saying that “The Berlin wall was a symbol of the refusal to allow ideologies to interact and in doing so refused to allow citizens from one part of the world from freely moving to another.” (Chaichian, 2014)

Through saying this, the author is pointing out that Berlin was indeed preventing the movement of people beyond its wall. Much of the research surrounding the Berlin Wall is not obvious in pointing out whether or not the wall was to keep people in or out. In fact the majority of research on the Berlin Wall looked at the surrounding politics, the period of history and the effect it had on the citizens of Berlin on both sides of the wall. From this, there is a lot of valuable writing relating to the research question of, Are Politically Established Physical Walls Used to Keep People In or Keep People Out, of this paper. Otto Frei looks closer at the historical context of the wall, and in fact portrays the wall in its origin as a way of preventing the movement of people from West Berlin into the East. This however is not the significant result of the wall in accordance with the rest of the research. On the other hand, Frei acknowledges that by comparing the situation to that of people waking up in a concentration camp. This refers to the people in East Berlin, waking

up in an area of Berlin where they could not freely leave or interact with those on the other side of the wall.

This is where acknowledging the structure and development of walls is important. As the earlier points of the literature suggest, walls were built as strong and strategic points of defence, the Berlin wall was different. The research suggests that the Berlin wall was built in stages, originally checkpoints on roads to ditches and barbed wire fences. This shows that the original effort was not to completely restrict movement, but to simply contain it. The later stages with wire fences, guard posts, spotlights and patrols, suggest that movement was to be completely restricted and people were forcibly being contained. The effect the Berlin Wall had on people and on the political climate is well established through the literature on the Berlin Wall. Wole Soyinka portrays this through the personal details included in the article, *Beyond the Berlin Wall*, as does Marianne Boruch. While these personal accounts may not hold as much valuable quotable evidence to find an answer to the research question of this research paper, of whether physical walls are meant to keep people in or out, they do attribute of the effects that the wall had on the people, were a result of constricting movement.

From this it is also highlighted that the movement was restricted in one direction in most instances. This would be a restriction of movement from the Soviet Berlin to the rest of Berlin, therefore making the wall a tool to keep people in. James McAdams continues this particular research by adding that the wall was to restrict the flow of movement but it was in order to stabilize the region. This takes the purpose of the wall further by suggesting political motivation for the wall. The East of Berlin is mentioned as having less freedom, stricter laws and more communist ideological control, whereas the west seemed more free, had a stronger economy, and better employment (McAdams, 1990) Therefore McAdams suggests that the wall was in order to prevent a flow of the workforce from leaving the East.

Returning to the more personal consequences of walls in the literature allows an insight into the Mexico-United States border wall. This wall will potentially play a large part in the answering of the research question, along with the other walls mentioned in the literature. Elisabeth Vallet's book contains a lot of valuable literature on the topic of walls. The first being the comparison between the Berlin wall and the United States border wall. Vallet talks about the perils of crossing the border wall. Detailing that in fact, "The fortified border between the United States and Mexico has been ten times deadlier over the last nine years for those attempting to enter the United States without permission, than was the Berlin wall to those attempting to leave East Germany" (Vallet, 1991) This does not only highlight the human dangers in moving across the border, trying to reach the United States. It also highlights the direction of movement of those trying to cross the border. This would be migrants from Mexico trying to reach the United States and the United States preventing them from doing so, resulting in this wall being a wall to keep people out.

The second important part to this research is in her analysis that explains the motivations behind the wall US border wall, saying that the wall is there in order to protect the United States from the outside influence and impact of those trying to gain entry into the United States. This is reflective of the deeper meanings of walls, and relevant information central to this research. The people trying to enter the United States would negatively impact the economy and social structure, the wall is there to prevent that. This is a theme found in other pieces of research concerning other walls.

The social structure and economic reasons were the motivation behind the Israeli wall in Baskin's views, the Calais wall was to prevent migration and the burden of migration on the United Kingdom and the Berlin wall was highlighted by McAdam's as being a method to prevent the workforce leaving the East of Berlin.

These specific political Motivations are a key part of this research paper, although walls can be seen on the surface to keep

people in or keep people out, the underlying motivation gives a deeper understanding to these political physical boundaries. David Carter and Paul Poast use data analytics to look at the motivations behind walls. Their article, '*Why Do States Build Walls? Political, Economy, Security, and Border Stability*' includes a large combination of facts, figures, variables and analysis in an attempt to explain the true motivations behind walls, not so much the defensive or containment policies, but whether or not internal protection of society, culture and economy is the main ingredient.

Carter and Poast do conclude that economic stability and security is the major political motivation behind walls. Whether this is through economic differences between the two neighbouring systems that cause conflict or the extent to which migration is a result of economic disparities. While a lot of the research agrees with this on some note, some of the research also picks up on the idea that walls are there to protect the political systems and culture on one side of the wall from the other. Frei offers this opinion when he concludes that the motivation behind the building of the Berlin wall was not only East Berlin flexing its muscles and trying to intimidate the western powers, but it was also a decision made that would have economic and social effects on the whole of Germany.

Some of the Literature furthered these ideas, Amani Ismail's article, '*Making Sense of a Barrier: U.S. News Discourses on Israel's Dividing Wall*,' looked at the effects the media have on the walls, more specifically the Israel Palestine Wall. Francisco Leon also looked at the effect that walls have on science and scientific advancement. These two articles add to the research by showing the wider context of walls and how even though walls may affect the border between two countries, or two systems, there is a wider consequence. This consequence is the result of a globalizing world where movement, politics and economy is more global and access to different cultures and markets is increasingly important.

Theoretical Underpinnings

In order to conclude on the hypothesis stated, the method of research will be a Content Analysis and Case Studies mixed method approach. This allows for a greater depth to the discussion on the purpose of walls and their effectiveness. This method provides the opportunity to conclude through the insights and theories as discussed by others. This method has strength through its vast depth of previous writings in general terms and on specific examples.

The peer-reviewed nature of the articles that will be used adds strength to the use of secondary sources making them more reliable to use in discussion. The use of this method also allows for use of items such as speeches, specific case studies, pre-existing surveys, media and its output as well as journals and document analysis.

The collection of data and information will be done through the this mixed method approach and other than theoretical standpoints and historical information hard facts will also be collected and analysed after being drawn from previous literature. Patterns of migration, dates, economic facts, polling data from regional elections will all be collected along with other relevant information. This will be used as the evidence testing to the effectiveness of walls and stating the outcome of these politically motivated structures. Therefore a combination of both ideologies and statistical data will provide evidence and information for a discussion that allows for a conclusion to be drawn on walls and whether they are to strengthen borders or to protect state identities, cultures and political ideologies.

There are other research methods that could potentially add value to the topic and this research paper; however, most of these methods do not lead to a more valuable conclusion on the hypothesis. The experimental method for example holds no value for this type of research, there is not much quantitative data being used and the data collected from an experimental method would not be relevant to the way in which the hypothesis will be tested. It would also not be a practical method for this topic. The survey method

again would add little insight as it would only gather qualitative facts focused on opinions.

Focus groups would show some understanding from diverse populations onto the subject but would not add to the testing of the Hypothesis. One other method that could be considered is the interview method. This face to face approach with possibly fellow students who have experienced or been in circumstances surrounding the walls mentioned in this paper may add value to the research. Ultimately though, it would not add a significant amount to the overall testing of the hypothesis.

Missing from Previous Work

The previous literature that was researched and reviewed lacked a few key elements to it, especially when related to the current topic of research. The first point that was missing was a direct relation and answer to the hypothesis. The literature provided insights into the topic and alluded to whether or not walls were to keep people in or keep people out but there was never a direct discussion on the exact nature of walls when relating to this specific question. Although many of the articles mentioned the political motivation behind walls at most this gave an inclination of their reasoning, but that made gathering theoretical insights into previous work difficult. In part then the previous literature lacked a direct link to this research question, but the political motivations aided this research. The second area in which the research fell short was in quantitative data. The majority of the research previously done had no quantitative evidence to add, only a few pieces of previous work did, even then it was always specifically related back to this question.

The main gap in previous work was that no-one had answered the research question previously. It may seem simple in its nature but questioning whether or not walls are to keep people in or keep people out contains many different elements that provide relevant information, especially to today's current political climate. This is somewhere this research aims to pick up on, to fill in the void and answer the seemingly simple question, are walls to keep people in

or keep people out, while looking at the political motivations behind the building of these physical walls.

Hypothesis

The concentration of this research is the physical wall that is used by states in order to control movement and protect borders. The hypothesis of this research is as follows: *Politically established physical walls are used to keep people out in order to protect political structures social status and economic systems.*

The previous work that has been reviewed has led to this hypothesis as most established physical walls throughout history have been used as a method for enforcing territory and protecting resources and in doing so they have been built as a way of keeping people out. This can be seen in the examples of Israel and Palestine, Calais, the United States and Mexico border, Hadrian's Wall and other historical fortifications. This is the theme that the research expects to uncover throughout. That walls that are physical in nature and established politically are done so as a way of stopping people and their influences from entering certain areas. The research however does not expect this hypothesis to be completely true, there is the outlier of the Berlin Wall.

While this was built to prevent entry of ideologies and culture the wall was built to prevent people leaving and to contain them. The Berlin wall then is expected to fit within the hypothesis but also to lie outside of the hypothesis.

Testing the Hypothesis

To fully conclude on the hypothesis of this research paper and to understand the desire of half of America wanting to have a wall separating the United States and Mexico we have to understand why people fundamentally want to build walls in the first place. One theory is that people build walls in order to feel protected from their surroundings. Everyone lives within walls, Homes are built traditionally with four surrounding walls, they are built for people to feel safe and secure within the surrounding of their own home, to protect themselves and their possessions. The same principle applies

to fences around a property. They are meant to keep the outside out and to keep others out, to keep the people inside the fence and the possessions safe.

The Oxford Dictionary defines walls as continuous vertical structures that enclose or divide areas of land; a high vertical surface, especially one that is imposing in scale; it is regarded as a protective or restrictive barrier. Overall walls are meant for protection, privacy and to prevent movement but the prevailing question falls onto whom a wall actually protects and how effective they are in doing so. Walls can be seen as to keep people out and to keep what is within the wall contained and protected. Walls however, are temporary, no wall will last forever; history and science has proven that. A wall will always fall, either by natural causes and disasters, time or by the hands of human destruction.

Walls then may be effective foe, but for a short amount of time, as a wall will eventually lose its effectiveness, look at the Berlin wall for example, destroyed by people after political change, or Hadrian's Wall, a crumbling row of stones, nothing in comparison to what it once was. While we all have a protective nature, wanting to protect what is ours, our families, our friends and our possession a wall may not always be the best solution, especially when considered in a wider perspective, political physical boundaries. Walls to separate nations and to control borders are not necessarily the best option, walls are made out of fear and aggression, reactive to what is on the other side. The border between the United States and Mexico for example, already has a border fence, but President Trump's wall will be made from fear, fear of a changing America

Hadrian's Wall

Hadrian's Wall was a defensive wall built in Great Britain on the orders of Roman Emperor Hadrian. Hadrian's Wall was built around 122 A.D because Emperor Hadrian wanted to separate the Barbarians in the North from the Romans. The wall was ordered to be from coast to coast and took an army of fifteen thousand men and roughly six years to complete. The walls main structural material was

stone with some turf sections and when completed, measured seventy-three miles in length. If we take a closer look at the time and man-power and compare that to the proposed Trump wall, while technology has advanced the facts are still there.

Seventy three miles, fifteen thousand men and completed in six years. The Trump wall is expected to be completed in four years, so that it is completed while Trump is President, if not completed on schedule there are suggestions trump may become a dictator or possibly leave it up to the next president to finish the expensive and aggressive wall.

One lesson from Hadrian's wall however, is that it has not stood the test of time, the elements weathered down parts of it, it was taken apart by man to build structures such as homes and roads. Therefore walls do not stand forever, they can be adapted and changed in order to face new opposition, such as the Great Wall of China, but historically walls are not permanent features.

The Great Wall of China

The Great Wall of China is not one superstructure, it is a matrix of multiple walls built at different times and connected later by a different controlling Dynasty. The parts of the Great Wall were built within four different Dynasties. The first was the (pre-) warring states period, 770-221 BC. The second was during the Qin Dynasty period, 221-207 BC, the third Dynasty to add to the wall was the Han Dynasty, 206 – 220 AD and the final contributing period was during the Ming dynasty much later in 1368 to 1644.

Before the Seventh Century, B.C, and before the unification of states that we now call China they were numerous states that were constantly fighting each other in order to increase their territory and power. As a result of these frequent battles and conflicts Duke Huan of Qi, of the Qi State was the first to build a wall, in 656 B.C.

As a result of its defensive success princes began to build high walls to keep others out of their land. It was not until the Qin dynasty that the walls became unified in order to secure China's northern border. This unification of the walls was the start of the

now known The Great Wall of China. The emperor, Qin Shin Huang was the first emperor of a unified China. The wall had fallen and risen over the previous years and in 202 B.C. Han Gaozu, who became the emperor in that period, ordered the strengthening of the Great Wall. Later it was further expanded to protect the Silk Road because of the Silk Road trade that provided valuable exporting opportunities and held economic value. During the Ming Dynasty period the Great Wall was continuously improved and restored, leading to what the Great Wall of China is today. The major influence on doing this was the threat of Japanese Pirates and Qi Jiguang saw strengthening the wall as the best form of defines from this threat.

The Qing dynasty had an opposing viewpoint on the wall, the ruling powers did not improve or modify the wall, instead forbade it. Historians believe this is down to the fact that the ruling powers were in fact representative of what the wall was originally built to keep out. Emperor Kangxi believed that the era of the building of a Great Wall was over, instead believing that international support and alliances was the only way to protect China, not border battles. The Construction of the wall also consumed large amounts of funding and manpower, which was believed to be better, served in different areas.

While the Great Wall of China never truly became effective in preventing invaders from entering China it did serve as psychological and political barrier between the Chinese civilization and the rest of the World. It was used as a protective measure in its created purpose but not in a physical sense, it in turn kept outsiders and their influences out. One reason for this could be explained through its constant additions and never really forming a single wall until later periods, another could be that it is in turn so vast. The Great Wall, however did aid in the efforts of keeping the western ideologies away from Chinese borders, representing a barrier maintained by the Chinese state to repel foreign influences and exert control over its citizens, possibly through its official purpose as a protective wall used to reassure those inside they are safe from the bad outside the wall.

The changing Dynasty's ideas on the wall reflect this, the original wall building dynasty's wanted to keep power and hold influence and territory, but the later periods in a unified China wanted to protect their trade allowing a small amount of outside influence, while even later periods who completely opened their intellectual borders disregarded the wall completely. Showing that the wall represents a need to contain and control while portraying an idea of effective defensive strategy.

These two cases of historical walls are relevant, they may not hold as much wealth in terms of finding the true motivation behind walls, but they represent the changing political landscape over time and with that the changing nature of walls. No longer are walls seemingly obvious defensive structures, they hold greater significance and meaning. As political systems become more complex and contrasting, such as communism versus democracy rather than simply warring factions led by monarchs or unelected rulers.

Therefore these walls are the backbone to the research, they hold the truest meaning of what walls are in their simplest form, physical barriers used to protect and defend. The following three examples of walls in more modern times expand on this. That is because of the contrasting cultures and political ideologies surrounding the walls, but without the historical knowledge the understanding of this would be weakened.

The Berlin Wall

From the Conclusion of World War Two to the end of the Cold War Berlin was the centre of attention, worldwide and significantly in Europe. Berlin was the centre of an ideological and political conflict between two political systems, the Communist ideal and the Capitalist system of Democracy. The Berlin Wall was built early on during the period of tensions between the USSR and the USA. It was as a simple fence and border control point originally, to prevent the movement from East to West. This purpose however is representative of what the wall truly was, no matter what form it took, it was a method of control and containment within. Many on

the inside of the wall saw the freedom and opportunities just a stone's throw away tempting, represented in the literature of the time.

This intrigue from the depressing conditions in the East and the excitement of the west resulted in movement out of the communist controlled area. The Berlin Wall was built to prevent this, to stop the movement out of the Communist region of Berlin, to keep its own population from leaving. No matter what imposing or dangerous form of the wall its main motivation is clear, it was to keep population from leaving.

While there are other theories relating to purposes of the Berlin wall, such as to influence the political tensions surrounding the era, or to react to American and its allies aggression or simply to show the West that the Soviet Union that it was a nation of power not afraid of a fight, flexing its muscles as Frei described. The Berlin walls' advancing strength and continuous development was done to control a population within its borders. Throughout the research it is the only true example of this, an anomaly in the motivation behind political physical barriers, but truly significant nonetheless. Significant because it carries an opposing reasoning, while the Berlin Wall protected the political ideology within, attempted to control the society and culture within and build a resilient economy different to the one on the other side; it did it differently to the other walls this paper has focused on. It did it through containment and control, preventing migration out of its borders rather than stopping migration in.

The Israel-Palestine Wall

The Israel-Palestine Wall, on the West Bank, separates Israel from the newly United Nations classified state of Palestine. The Background of the Israel Palestine conflict can be traced back to the separation of states and breakdown of British and allied controlled territory after the First World War and the Second World War. Israel a stated influenced by Judaism is surrounded by Islamic faith led countries. One of which is Palestine, and the two states continuously disagree on territory and border placement.

Israel has a history of encroaching on land and claiming it as their own, this land grab leads to heightened tensions and the political tensions are still on going. One outcome is of course the wall separating the two. The wall has had media attention focused on it, had symbolic murals and artwork displayed on it and has been the centre of conflict between the two states.

The wall in itself is symbolic; Israel uses the attacks on the wall as a way to symbolize a protective nature of the wall, protecting Israel from the dangers on the other side. Potentially even damaging the reputation of Palestine globally, allowing for further gaining of territory as suggested by Usher. The motivation behind the wall is seemingly obvious, keep the Palestinians outside the wall and protect the territory within the wall. When considering the motivations behind the wall however there are elements of further or true motivation, to protect the ideology and society within the wall from being mixed with outside influences and to prevent Palestinian through the Israeli border, by stopping marriage, political weakening and economic changes. While this deeper meaning to protecting what's inside the wall from outside influences is common in the purpose of walls it is more relevant as the Israel land grab is encroaching on Palestinian settlements and Israel is surrounded by countries of different faiths and political systems as suggested by Brannon.

The article by Baskin mentions that the walls purpose is also to stop the influences of Israeli-Palestinian marriage and cultural integration, which would either see Israel become more sympathetic to the rights of Palestine or see Palestinian influence entering Israel. Therefore this physical political barrier has the major motivation of preventing entry and protecting borders, however there are elements of not wanting those within to leave and influence the future of Israel representing the true motivation of the wall.

US-Mexico Wall (“Trump’s Wall”)

The relationship between the United States of America has always been strained to a certain degree, but since the election of

Donald Trump these relations have severely worsened. Donald Trump won his election based on false information and disregard for political correctness, his anti-immigrant rhetoric and his attacks on immigrants. Some of his attacks focused on Muslims, blaming them for terrorist acts and calling them a danger to America's borders. The majority of his attacks however focused on the Mexicans, calling them rapists, drug dealers and using the Mexican immigrants as the scapegoat for America's problems. This allowed Trump to push for his Mexican wall, a wall so vast and impenetrable no-one will be able to get past it. This wall and the hate on immigrants has split the United States and the wall itself is vastly complicated, not just in its costs and finding where the money is coming from, but also in its motivations.

The Trump Wall would supposedly end illegal immigration into the United States from Mexico and other Southern American countries, creating a barrier that would be heavily patrolled and protected. Yet while the given reasoning behind the best and biggest wall ever is simple, the undertones are slightly more elusive.

It could be said that this simple reason is the only reason, but if we look further, America is a country built on immigration, through generations and with a timeline that stretches back to its origins. The closing of its borders is moving back to the lack of freedom faced just before American independence. America was once the land of opportunity, many moved there to better their life chances and live the American dream. America is also now home to over an estimated eleven million undocumented migrants, according to the Department of Homeland Security.

In some respects the economy relies on these low skilled underpaid workers, ranging from farming, to meat-packing, to hotel workers to chefs. There are undocumented immigrants in all low paid industries, which raise a concern over who takes on these roles once all the immigrants are gone. This is a concern of many Americans, and probably rightly so, but this is the apparent need for a wall, to

give these jobs back to Americans that didn't want them in the first place.

This then gives a possible insight into the real meaning behind the wall, to strengthen the racial background of the US. This may seem like a strong statement to make, but throughout the immigration history of the US there have been backlashes, the Irish faced religious hatred, the Germans faced discrimination and the Eastern Europeans were shunned from mainstream society. Then we also look at the African-American history, a race brought to America against their will and sold as slaves, their rights to some extent aren't equal.

It is with the History and the intentions of a white businessman who seems determined to remove any liberal thought in a country, to assume that the wall is to make America white again. It cannot be forgotten however that there is a physical political barrier between the USA and Mexico already, albeit a simple fence in comparison to Trump's plans, but it is already there. It has not truly effected illegal migration but was instilled to do just that.

With this wall however the low security measure and at times weak enforcing of the border leads to the conclusion that this wall was in all intents and purposes to keep people out rather than to keep people in. In relation to this, there are two motivations behind the future Trump wall that links to the hypothesis of this research paper, one is that yes this wall is to keep people out, but it also to keep people in. While the line between keeping people in and secured from outside influences and keeping people out to protect a country from outside influences is rather thin, this wall crosses into the keep people in area for similar reasons to the Israel-Palestine wall. Its strict enforcement and its dangerous undertones result in the idea that people and ideas from America should be contained.

Mexican Nationalism

When looking at the Trump Wall it is important to consider all nations affected. As we have with the other walls. Therefore looking at the Mexican reaction to Trump's wall is imperative in gaining a full

understanding of the wall. Mexico has not been the best friends of the US for a long time, but Trump's bigoted views and scapegoating of the Mexican people living in the US worsened tensions. Therefore in the presidential campaign, the news of a border wall payed for by Mexicans was not well received on the other side of the border.

Mexicans living both in the United States and in Mexico were not happy with the rhetoric from the now President of the United States. During the presidential campaigns Donald Trump said, "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best... They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with them. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists...." -- implying that every Mexican that enters the United States is a criminal. This bullying attitude has not just affected the mentality of Mexicans but also nations sympathetic to the way in which Trump has treated Mexico, ranging from Latin countries to European.

With constant verbal attacks to the Latino community Mexican feel that the new administration is belittling them not only in their heritage but as human beings (Grillo 2016). Ex-President of Mexico, Vicente Fox, has been one the country's biggest advocate in defending the Mexican community and reassuring every Mexican living in Mexico or in the United States that they are his heroes because Mexican do not give up, are hard workers and above all we are honorable (Univision). Vicente Fox has not only been on interviews both in English and in Spanish, has taken to social media to inform the world and Donald Trump that neither he nor Mexican people are going to pay for a wall.

While Mexico may not be a first world country, Mexican do have a strong sense of pride and Nationalist strength which is why they would like to see the country rise to all of its potential. The pride of being Mexican is making Latinos, to perhaps, take Donald Trump's demand of paying for the wall seriously only if the border wall respects the map from 1830, before the Mexican-American war. This movement is used especially by Presidential Candidate Gerardo

Fernandez Norona who is a candidate in the 2018 presidential race. The Rhetoric of Trump, his views on Mexicans and then demanding they pay for the wall, mixed with the national pride Mexicans, and the Latino culture, has for itself, has created a sense of hostility. The wall is a representation of that anger. This wall would be the end of many people's livelihoods in the agricultural industry, the manufacturing industry and other personal ventures.

There is evidence to suggest that there is an economic supply and demand, where there is demand for low skilled workers, and a large supply of them in Mexico as a result of NAFTA and US intervention in Mexico, the wall will ultimately curtail this along with the intended undocumented movement that Trump intends to stop. But that doesn't make those on the other side of the Wall any happier, not only have they been insulted, used as scapegoats for a country that needs them, but they are apparently being made to pay for a wall that symbolically labels them as terrorists, criminals and unworthy of walking on American soil.

Discussion

Walls are around us day in and day out, from houses, to buildings to garden fences. Walls have been present throughout history. While there are structural walls the focus of this paper is on walls that are physical political boundaries. While these types of walls have been built, improved and modified for thousands of years, like mediaeval castles that have shaped the landscape of Europe, the Mayan defensive structures and military fortifications.

To answer the question as to what the real political motivations behind building walls are, to keep people in or keep people out. The way in which this paper set about doing this is by looking at the most imposing and significant examples of political physical boundaries, comparing them with identifying themes behind walls there are some points on which this paper can conclude.

The first of these points is that the majority of political motivated physical boundaries are built with the motivation of keeping people out. Historically we can look at the research on

Hadrian's Wall, built to keep the barbarians of the North out; The Great Wall of China, a defensive matrix that after globalization and opening boundaries to the world was forgotten about. The Berlin Wall is the only wall that had containment as its principle motivation. It was designed to keep people in and protect the ideologies inside the wall through containment.

While the Israel-Palestine Wall and the United States-Mexico wall have the primary motivation of keeping people out, the idea of containing the ideas and influences has some influence on the motivations behind these walls. It is at this point that this paper can conclude that the majority of political motivation behind physical boundaries is to keep people, political ideologies and cultural influences out rather than to keep them in, apart from a few exceptions.

There is admittedly a secondary motive to this research paper and that is to discuss the findings in relation to the future of the border between Mexico and the United States of America.

With the above sections referring to Trump's envisioned border wall, this paper has highlighted a few historical and political instances that relate to the true purpose and nature of the Trump wall.

Anti-immigrant sentiments are growing across the world, The Calais migrant wall used to enclose immigrants trying to enter the United Kingdom, The United Kingdom's decision to leave the European Union, also known as Brexit, had freedom of movement of Europeans in and out of the United Kingdom as one of its main motivations. Trump is the biggest focus of this anti-immigrant ideology because of the political strength and international power the United States holds. The irony however is that Trump is president of a country founded and grown by immigrants, it is a country that relies on the immigrant he wants to keep out with his wall, it is therefore suggestible that the wall is a strategy of containment, containing and restricting the movement of the political ideas and social integrity within the United States.

We can see historically that walls have been primarily built to protect and prevent. Protecting from the outside dangers, the dangers that lie beyond the boundary a wall is placed on, and to prevent the dangers from entering the wall and influencing the culture, society and political ideologies of the state behind the wall. The future could hold numerous more examples of walls that could fit into this research; however the ending note of this paper is that walls never last forever.

The dramatic scenes of the tearing down of the Berlin wall, the crumbling of Hadrian's Wall, the Great Wall of China only serves as income revenue through tourism. The Israel-Palestine wall is still young in comparison to other walls and the Trump wall is still in its planning stages. Therefore whatever the motivation behind walls, cultures, societies and politics changes time and as they do the walls built to protect fade into history.

References

- Baskin, Gershon. "Walls and Fences: Consequences for Israel and Palestine." *Palestine- Israel Journal*. N.p., 2002. Web. 12 Dec. 2016.
- BBC News. "Calais Migrants: Work to Start on UK-funded Wall." BBC News.
- BBC. "Q&A: What is the West Bank barrier?" *BBC News*, 2005, news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3111159.stm.
- BBC. "Trump orders wall to be built on Mexico border." *BBC News*. BBC, 26 Jan. 2017. Web. 4 Feb. 2017.
- Boruch, Marianne. "The Berlin Wall, 1966." *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1991, pp. 195–195.
- Bornstein, Avram. "Military Occupation as Carceral Society: Prisons, Checkpoints, and Walls in the Israeli-Palestinian Struggle." *Social Analysis*, vol. 52, 2008, pp. 106-30.
- Brannon, Susan. "Qalqilya and the Wall." *The Electronic Intifada*. 2002.
- Carter, David, and Paul Poast. "Why Do States Build Walls? Political

- Economy, Security, and Border Stability." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2015, pp. 1-32.
- Chaichian, Mohammed. *Empires and Walls: Globalization, Migration, and Colonial Domination*. Boston, Hotei, 2014.
- China Highlights. "Who Built the Great Wall of China — When It Was Built and Why." *China Highlights*, 2017.
- English Heritage. "History of Hadrian's Wall." *Englishheritage.com*, 2017, www.english-heritage.org.uk/visit/places/hadrians-wall/history/.
- Frei, Otto. "The Barrier across Berlin and Its Consequences." *The World Today*, vol. 17, no. 11, 1961, pp. 459–470.
- Grillo, Ioan. "What Mexico Thinks About Trump." *The New York Times*, 2016.
- Hirschfeld Davis, Julie, David E. Sanger, and Maggie Haberman. "Trump to Order Mexican Border Wall and Curtail Immigration." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 24 Jan. 2017. Web. 30 Jan. 2017.
- Ismail, Amani "Making Sense of a Barrier: U.S. News Discourses on Israel's Dividing Wall" *Journal of Communication Inquiry* January 2010 vol. 34 no.1 pp. 85-108
- Leon, Francisco. "Scientific Activity Should Have No Borders." *Science*, vol. 313, no. 5784, 2006, pp. 170–170.
- McAdams, A. James. "An Obituary for the Berlin Wall." *World Policy Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1990, pp. 357–375.
- Oxford Dictionary. "Wall." *English Oxford Dictionary*, 2017, en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/wall.
- Palka, Joel W. 2001. "Ancient Maya Defensive Barricades, Warfare, and Site Abandonment." *Latin American Antiquity* 12 (4): 427–30.
- Soyinka, Wole. "Beyond the Berlin Wall." *Transition*, no. 51, 1991, pp. 6–25.
- Univision. "Vicente Fox: 'Trump es mentiroso, no puede autorizar la construcción de un muro porque no tiene el dinero.'" *Vicente Fox: 'Trump es mentiroso, no puede autorizar la construcción de un*

muro porque no tiene el dinero," 2017, www.univision.com/shows/noticiero-univision/vicente-fox-trump-es-mentiroso-no-puede-autorizar-la-construccion-de-un-muro-porque-no-tiene-el-dinero-video.

Usher, Graham. "The wall and the dismemberment of Palestine"

Race Class January vol. 47 no. 3, 2006, pp. 9-30.

Vallet, Elisabeth. *Borders, Fences and Walls: State of Insecurity?*
New York, Routledge, 2014.