

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Nail Alkan

Borders of Europe

European Integration and South Eastern Europe

ISSN 1435-3288

ISBN 3-936183-xx-x

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Walter-Flex-Straße 3
D-53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1880
Fax: +49-228-73-1788
<http://www.zei.de>

**SEE 3
2002**

Contents

Preface	5
<i>Liam O' Dowd and Thomas Wilson</i>	7
Frontiers of sovereignty in the new Europe	
<i>Nail Alkan</i>	31
Borders in Europe	
Didactical questions	72
Basic literature	74

Preface

This publication is part of a series which was established in 2001 in order to make available teaching and learning material specifically for European Studies programmes throughout South Eastern Europe. The series makes public the results of research projects conducted in the framework of the “Network for ‘European Studies in South Eastern Europe’” which is one of the major undertakings of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe. The Network was founded in January 2000 and now comprises almost 40 universities and institutes both from South Eastern and Western Europe. It aims at establishing and strengthening interdisciplinary European Studies in the region by

- holding yearly conferences in the countries of the region
- organizing working groups on different topics
- giving advice in curricula development
- sending a Flying Faculty for teaching at European Studies Centers
- holding Train the Trainer seminars
- establishing Regional European Studies Centers
- providing a database of all programmes in the region, and
- publishing teaching and learning material.

These activities are mainly financed by the German national budget for the Stability Pact, in close cooperation with partners like the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the German Rector’s Conference, the German Academic Exchange Service and the Hertie Foundation.

Several publications of the series like this one have been designed as Readers. The goal is to support European Studies programmes in the region with easily accessible, academically profound literature on those topics of the European integration process, which have a special relevance for the region. The philosophy is based on the dual experience that only very few faculties in South Eastern Europe have sufficient literature on European

integration at all and that if they have such literature it reflects predominantly the West European viewpoint. Thus, there is a need for a new kind of literature, duly reflecting the needs and the experiences of the region.

The guiding principles for these Readers are as follows:

- The topics chosen are of major future importance for the region.
- Only topics with relevance for the region as a whole are selected.
- Renowned, trans-nationally respected experts are chosen as authors.
- Authors are asked to concentrate on basic knowledge for M.A. level.
- The Readers are designed for professors and students alike for practical use in seminars.
- The goal is to get authors from all countries of the region.
- The Readers are available for free on the Homepage of ZEI <http://www.zei.de/> for downloading.

The Readers all have the same format: They start with a text written by a well-known West European author. The text is selected by a distinguished South East European author who then offers a response reflecting the experience made in the region, some didactical questions which might be discussed in class, and finally a list of basic literature.

While there is a thorough review process for each publication by the two editors, the Reader nevertheless reflects exclusively the views of the author. We hope that these texts will contribute to a better understanding of the European integration process among the young generation in South Eastern Europe and to a more substantial dialogue among scholars from the region and from EU countries.

Dr. Rafael Biermann
Sundhaussen

Zentrum für Europäische
Integrationsforschung, Bonn

Prof. Dr. Holm

Osteuropa-Institut der Freien
Universität Berlin

Liam O’Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson

Frontiers of sovereignty in the new Europe

Border changes in the “new” Europe¹

There are many versions of the new Europe. The one which most concerns us is the new Europe of the changing European Union (EU) which is transformed every decade or so through expansion or further integration. But the formal process of EU-building has no monopoly on “newness“. Other new Europes include those of the post-Soviet Central and Eastern Europe, the new right of the Western European welfare states; the Europes of youth, of global consumer and popular culture, of new immigrants and asylum-seekers, or the Europe of those elites who increasingly see the continent as an economic space which can act as a powerful competitor to North America and East Asia. All of these Europes are interrelated – they find expression in the themes of state sovereignty, transnationalism and cultural adaptation which are central to a social science struggling to come to terms with a period of dramatic flux and transition. This volume’s case studies of politics and society at and beyond the borders of the EU seek to demonstrate that international borders are key vantage points from which to view the processes of building and redefining the states, nations and transnational networks which comprise the new Europe.

1 Reprint, slightly adapted, with the friendly permission of the authors. The article was first published as an introduction in Liam O’Dowd / Thomas M. Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*, Aldershot 1996, pp. 1 – 17.

In many ways, of course, the study of borders reminds us that there is much of the “old“ in the “new“ Europe. Borders, after all, are reminders of the past – they are “time written in space“², the product of previous conquests, invasions, population movements or treaties. Any redefinition or transformation of borders means engaging with the past. The coining of slogans and catchphrases such as a “Europe of the regions”; “a Europe without frontiers” or “fortress Europe” each in their own way raises questions of how the past is going to be reconciled with the present and married to the future. A “Europe of regions” has meant in part the rediscovering of the outlines of old states and nationalities long suppressed or subsumed within the inter-state system created in Europe over the last one hundred and fifty years. The slogan of the Single European Market, a “Europe without Frontiers”, implies, in the first instance, a radical altering of the economic significance of state borders within the EU. Finally, “fortress Europe” raises the perennial question of where Europe’s external borders are to be drawn while recalling the many versions of this border which we have inherited from history.

It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that over the last decade borders have become increasingly the focus of political, popular and scholarly attention. The issue of borders is one of definition and construction. In our view, the term “borders” includes both the legal borderline between states and the frontier of political and cultural contest which stretches away from the borderline. The frontier zone is by our definition much wider than the political line in the sand which demarcates state sovereignty, because it encompasses the economic, social and political landscape of borderlands’ people. This frontier transcends the borderline, and its width and depth within each state can best be determined through the understanding of border people’s behaviour and beliefs. As we suggest, the study of borders in the new Europe includes both the geographic spaces contiguous to the borderline as well as the boundary line itself. Some small European states

2 Rupnik, J. 1994, Europe’s new frontiers: remapping Europe. *Daedalus* 123 (3); 91-114, p. 103.

may even be borderlands in their entirety as they are demarcated on all sides by other states' borders.

Although the borders of Europe today are undergoing a series of transformations, it is not the first time this century that European borders have been at the centre of radical political and social change. In fact, the continent is currently experiencing its third major phase of border reconstruction this century. The first two phases followed the ending of two world wars and were at the disposition of a coalition of the victorious states. The current phase which dates from 1989 is somewhat different. It is not the outcome of an all-embracing inter-state war. No victorious states stand ready and willing to impose a "new world order" of national states³. Although regional wars play a substantial role in Eastern Europe, to understand what is happening at and to borders we must look more to long-term processes of economic, political and cultural change rather than to single and often cataclysmic events such as wars, invasions and major peace settlements.

Two somewhat contradictory processes appear to be at work in Europe. In the past, many existing national boundaries are being delegitimised and, in some cases, violently challenged and redrawn. In the EU, on the other hand, it seems that internal (member-state) boundaries, while remaining largely unchanged,⁴ are being devalued in the wake of the Single Market and the Maastricht Treaty. Events in the former USSR and Yugoslavia appear to confirm the new salience of borders and the powerful attraction of a bounded homeland for ethno-national groups. EU developments, on the other hand, seem to suggest the opposite, i.e., the diminishing significance of national borders, and by extension, the decline of the national state in a core region of advanced capitalism.

Such a contrast may be superficial, however. It obscures the interconnections and similarities between east and west as shown in the re-

3 Ibid, p. 94.

4 It is worth pointing out that there have been two substantial changes to the national borders of EU states since 1945, the incorporation of Saarland into West Germany and the re-unification of East and West Germany.

unification of Germany, the re-emergence of Central Europe and the debates over the nature and boundary of “fortress Europe”. Pressures exist for a form of “balkanization” or “regionalization” in western Europe also. These pressures exist even in long-established states such as the United Kingdom⁵, Spain⁶ and Italy⁷. Benedict Anderson⁸ has argued that this tendency to fragmentation may be seen by future historians as a long-term process of disintegration of the “great polyethnic, polyglot, and often polyreligious monarchical empires built up so painfully in mediaeval and early modern times”. He traces this process from the American revolution through the collapse of the Spanish Empire (1810-1830), the fall of the Hohenzollern, Habsburg, Romanov and Ottoman empires after the First World War and the period of decolonisation and “proxy wars” in many parts of the “Third World” after 1945.

Attempts to resist this disintegration have had mixed origins and results. They include Hitler’s failed attempt to unify Europe under German domination, the collapse of a communist world order under the leadership of the USSR, and the rather more ambiguous attempt to integrate “Europe” under the umbrella of the European Community (EC), now the EU. The latter is caught between two contending pressures: towards “ever closer union”, on the one hand, and towards dissolution or dilution by extension on the other. With the collapse of state socialism in eastern Europe, one of the main historical rationales for the EU, as a US-sponsored bulwark against the other major Cold War superpower, the Soviet Union, vanished. Advocates of European unity, on the other hand, see at least two alternative rationales: the long-term processes of global re-integration which are driven by economic and cultural globalization and the emergence of huge

5 See chapters by O’Dowd and Corrigan and Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*, Aldershot 1996.

6 Letemendia et al.

7 Strassoldo, R. (ed.) 1973. *Boundaries and regions*. Trieste: Edizioni and Strassoldo, R. and G. Delli Zotti (eds) 1982. *Cooperation and conflict in border areas*. Milan: Franco Angeli Editore.

8 Anderson, B. 1992. The new world disorder. *New Left Review* 193, 3-13, p. 3.

politico-economic trade blocs centered on North America and Japan. Their argument is that Europe, to compete, must unite.

The task of “building Europe” is difficult, however, given the history of internal diversity and warfare within Europe, and the lack of external threat. As Therborn⁹ observes “the unifying Other outside has been distant, weak or nebulous”, whereas “the divisive Other within has been close and strong, in many cases stronger and closer than in other parts of the world”. In most current debates over the future of the EU, enthusiastic advocates of a supranational EU see the national state (and its attempts to preserve national sovereignty) as the main “Other” of an integrated Europe. From this perspective, in the absence of a major and coherent external threat, the main opposition to a more integrated Union comes from within, from the jealously guarded sovereignties of its own member states.

The “Other without” and the “Other within” immediately raise the problem of borders and borderlands. In other words, where will Europe’s external borders rest and, more importantly, will they enclose a “fortress Europe” or one which encourages links with “non-Europe”. Alternatively, do the borders of member states and their own internal regional borders reflect a fragmentation or diffusion of sovereignty in the EU, or are they part of a restructured hierarchy of authority. These questions are addressed in a variety of ways by examining the development of cross-border cooperation across the external and internal borders of the EU, the re-appearance of old regional and ethno-national frontiers encouraged by transnational networks and the extent to which state (and EU) sovereignty is compromised or reinforced by the management of issues such as the environment, security and illegal immigrants.

Three propositions underlie the following chapters: (1) the old lack of coincidence between nations and states in Europe is manifesting itself in new ways in response to economic, political and cultural change; (2) boundaries are key demarcations of state sovereignty and its relationship to

9 Therborn, G. 1995. *European modernity and beyond: the trajectory of European societies 1945-2000*. London: Sage, p. 244.

the EU; (3) the border policies of the EU and what happens at the internal and external boundaries of the Community can reveal much about the current status and future prospects of the national state and the European Union.

A spectrum of social scientific interpretations can be constructed on the basis of these shared propositions. At the extremes, these involve contrasting notions of the importance of national borders and, by extension, of the state sovereignty which they de-limit. At one end of the spectrum, the new fluidity, permeability and transcendence of territorial boundaries is emphasized. In this view, the globalization of economic and cultural life, the revolution in mass communications, the increase in both elite mobility and mass tourism and the alleged transition from modernity to post-modernity all seem to devalue national boundaries both as markers of collective identity and of relatively self-contained and self-governing societies. A potential weakness of this approach is that it is forced to ignore, or to discount, the renewed salience of the politics of borders and identities in both Western and Eastern Europe. Within this perspective much of the research and theorizing on the globalization of economic life has stressed the mobility and increased flexibility of capital and the loss of the national state's economic influence. New forms of capitalism involve spatial differentiation enhancing multi-national strategies, regionalization and localization at the expense of state strategies¹⁰.

Applied to Europe, this analysis suggests that the EU is a recognition on the part of national governments that they can no longer effectively control a capitalist order characterized by the competition between large trading blocs, the global strategies of multinational corporations and financial markets. In a capitalist world system based on "free-trade", policy options open to national states are limited and they are forced to join in supranational blocs in order to establish economies of scale and gain competitive advantage. The Single European Act (1986) and its slogan a "Europe without Frontiers" represented the EC's response to competition

10 Harvey, D. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

from North America, Japan and the Far East. A revived neo-classical economics argues that borders are an impediment, a support for protectionism (at least within trade blocs) which hinders market forces and the maximization of prosperity.

Theorists of cultural globalization, such as Robertson¹¹, pay even less attention to the question of territorial boundaries. While recognizing the objective importance of economic and political inter-connectedness as a dimension of globalization, Robertson stresses the emergence of a global consciousness and a subjective and cultural dimension to globalization which is not based on the building blocks of the inter-state system and hence transcends territorial boundaries. Post-modern theorists such as Lash and Urry see global inter-connections less as structures than as flows. They argue that national structures are being replaced by immense transnational flows of capital, money, goods, services, people, information, technologies, policies, ideas, images, and regulations across national border. In this view, national governments have diminishing control over activities within their territorial boundaries because of global money markets, huge transnational corporations, new communications technologies and new forms of “sub-politics”¹². This “hollowing out” of the nation-state implies a radical diminution in the significance of national boundaries.

The “post-modern social order” does not necessarily involve the disappearance of territorial boundaries. It may actually lead to their proliferation and, consequently, to the relativization of all borders, especially those defining the national state. It becomes possible to contemplate, therefore, the proliferation of nationalisms and of new ethnic and regional sub-territories which float free of the sites of economic and political power. Baumann¹³, for example, argues that the durable marriage forged by the “nation-state” between the ethnic and the political nation is

11 Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization: social theory and global culture*. London: Sage, p. 183.

12 Lash, S and Urry, J. 1994. *Economies of signs and space*. London: Sage, p. 28.

13 Baumann, Z. 1995. *Life in fragments: essays in postmodern morality*. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 247.

now on the brink of divorce. Within the new Europe, it is no longer as necessary as in the past for prospective states to pass the “sovereignty tests” of economic, social and even military viability. These functions are now uncoupled and diffused to a wide range of transnational and subnational agencies. The result, according to Baumann¹⁴, is that the ongoing erosion of national sovereignty is allowing the forces of ethnicity to roam free and uncontrolled, no longer trammled by the burden of economic and social management. In this scenario, there is a proliferation of ethnic, military and economic borders, which overlap, co-exist with, and diminish the primacy of national state boundaries.

This image of border flux and volatility is captured well in a British magazine’s supplement to a Channel 4 programme, “Borderlands”. Referring to Europe, the authors observe:

As frontier-fixity dissolves, no neat pattern of region and/or nationality seems likely to replace it. Reality is outpacing theory. The feuds of to-morrow are likely to be far more various than has been anticipated: state-nations, long-buried nationalities, immigrants, new regional identities and rising city states are all jostling for house room inside the new Europe and its expanding outer rim¹⁵.

Many political scientists, sociologists and anthropologists are less ready to write the obituary of the national state, however¹⁶. At the other end of the spectrum of approaches to national sovereignty, they question the somewhat kaleidoscopic picture of borders, border disputes, and the emergence of embryonic national borders within existing states as evidence that nationalism and struggles over national sovereignty have retained their significance. Analyses of the alleged retreat of the state can still conclude that it retains immense resources and “an infinite capacity for external and internal adaptability” while remaining for most citizens “a primary source of welfare, order, authority, legitimacy, identity and loyalty”¹⁷. The main

14 Ibid.

15 Jones, D. and Platt, 1992. Introduction. *New Statesman*. Borderlands Supplement 19 June, p. 2.

16 see, for example, Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell; Anderson, B. 1992. The new world disorder. *New Left Review* 193: 3-13.

17 Muller, W. and Wright, V. 1994. Reshaping the state in Western Europe: the limits to retreat. *West European Politics* 17 (3): 1-11, p. 10.

potential weakness of this approach is that it fails to address adequately how underlying processes of economic and cultural globalization are restructuring (perhaps even diminishing) national sovereignty and the borders which delimit it.

One of the more durable priorities of states remains the monopolization of the legitimate means of coercion within fixed territorial boundaries¹⁸. To this Tilly¹⁹ adds two further reinforcing element: the monopoly of taxation and access to credit (for expenditure on soldiers, arms and other means of war). The post-1945 settlement in Europe left national borders secure for a time, but did not prevent erosion “from within”, from secessionist movements, disaffected regions and ethnic minorities. One explanation is that many Western European states moved from relying on mass legitimacy to emphasizing the control and surveillance of their populations²⁰ at the same time as they were advocating giving full rein to free-market forces. Arguably this process of control was even more marked in Eastern Europe, albeit without free-market capitalism. Nevertheless, the roots of destabilization can be seen in the treatment of minorities such as the Basques in Spain, Irish nationalists in Northern Ireland, the playing off of one nationality against another in Tito’s Yugoslavia, and the attempt to place a wall around Eastern Germany’s experiment in state socialism. Tilly²¹ has even argued that governments became more unstable as their borders became more secure. Not for the first time, state authorities begin to see whole populations as enemies (e.g., ethnic or religious minorities) which means that civil wars can generate huge refugee problems, frequently at or near borders. Widening the scope of the argument to EU level, it is worth asking if the lack of an external and threatening “Other” creates space for movements such as the neo-fascists and neo-nazis to

18 Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and society*. G. Roth and C. Wittich (eds.) London: University of California Press, p. 56.

19 Tilly, C. 1990. *Coercion, capital and European states AD 990-1990*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, p. 85.

20 Giddens, A. 1985. *The nation state and violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

21 Tilly, *ibid*, p. 203.

victimize illegal immigrants, gypsies, and other marginalized groups within the EU.

Of course, national boundaries themselves are rooted in coercion, in practices of forcible exclusion and inclusion. Border construction has seldom been a matter of popular democracy. Instead, it has been typically the result of the progressive incorporation of localities, through military conquest, invasion and colonization interspersed with periods of negotiation, secret manipulations and treaty-making. In other words, international boundaries are the outcome of state-building. Durable states have been able to develop ever more elaborate institutions and more intensive regulation of everyday life. They have been able to mobilize, to a greater or lesser degree, forms of collective identification with both the trappings of state power and with the “nation”, which the state purports to represent or which it may even have created. Only in recent times, and in some places, however, has the political *representation* of bounded national territory taken a democratic form.

More detailed studies of what is happening to borders and borderlands can reveal much about the forces impinging on the changing nature of the national state and national sovereignty. In the context of the European Union such studies can also provide clues to the complex processes of European integration. As Wallace²² observes: “the question of boundaries is central to any study of political systems, legal jurisdiction, or economic or social interaction.”

Borders, nations and states

A variety of social scientific perspectives informs our view of the relationships between nation and state at the internal and external borders of the EU. In his critique of the new myth of a “Europe without Frontiers”,

22 Wallace, W. 1992. Introduction: the dynamics of European integration. In W. Wallace (ed.) *The dynamics of European integration*. London: Pinter, p. 14.

the Swiss geographer Raffestin²³ insists that borders are a necessary constituent of social life. He argues that they perform four functions, translation²⁴, differentiation, connection and regulation. These functions suggest a dynamic social process which, in the case of stable geographical boundaries, becomes frozen in time. Max Haller²⁵ has noted the several meanings attached to the terms “borders” and “limits” in a number of European languages. He detects behind this variety a fundamental double meaning²⁶. On the one hand, borders may be seen as ends or barriers, on the other as passages, filters or gateways between systems contiguous to each other. This dual meaning is similar to the long-standing distinction made by political geographers between boundaries and frontiers – a distinction traced by Sahlins²⁷ as far back as thirteenth century France when the monarchy began to distinguish between boundaries (definite lines marking the limits of its jurisdiction) and “frontiers” which were zones which “stood face to” an enemy. Historically, frontier or border regions including those between nation-states have been the site of conflicts over territory and are frequently characterized by different ethnic, religious, linguistic or national composition than that of their respective national states – a reminder of the lack of coincidence between national boundaries and other socio-cultural boundaries.

Historically, the allocation and demarcation of borders has been an elite phenomenon where some degree of force or threat of force is usually present. This has meant the forcible inclusion and/or exclusion of several

23 Raffestin, C. 1993. Autour de la fonction sociale de la frontière. *Espaces et Sociétés: Identités, Espaces, Frontières*, 70-71; 157-164.

24 By “translation” Raffestin (ibid, p. 159) means the territorial expression or indication of the wishes and power of those creating the border. While Raffestin’s approach is somewhat abstract and functionalist in orientation, he does point to why borders may be a necessary constituent of social order.

25 Haller, M. 1990. The challenge for comparative sociology in the transformation of Europe. *International Sociology* 5 (2): 183-204, p. 201.

26 see also Strassoldo, ibid.

27 Sahlins, P. 1990. Natural frontiers revisited: France’s boundaries since the seventeenth century. *American Historical Review* 95 (5): 1423-1451, p. 1425.

minority ethnic groups or parts thereof. As Hansen²⁸ observes, “all the European countries created in the last 150 years have border region problems arising from the demands of minorities seeking to realize their ‘national’ values within the framework of an organized state”. Thus the drawing of national borders in Europe has led to the construction of national minorities many of them located in frontier regions. Of course, national boundaries or the states they enclose cannot be understood merely in terms of elite manipulation or the capacity to coerce. Donnan and Wilson²⁹, laying out an agenda for an anthropology of frontiers, point out that borders are “continuously negotiated and re-interpreted through the dialectics of everyday life among all people who live at them, but also, to a lesser extent, by those who cross them, and by those people within a state’s border who feel in contact with or threatened by outsiders.”

The chapters by Dressler Holohan and Ciechocinska and Driessen³⁰ underline the role that national borders can play in the everyday life of borderland people. Although in each case they deal with external frontiers of the EU in Upper Silesia and at the Spanish-Moroccan border zone, cross-border interaction is very different in each place. The EU’s border seems far more open to Poles of German nationality than it is to Moroccans, despite the latter’s strong historical links with southern Spain. In itself this provides clues to the way in which EU identity is being shaped in conjunction with two different kinds of national identity and state formation in Germany and Spain. As Wilson³¹ points out, borders are social constructions which are the products of interaction between powerful European and national elites, on the one hand, and people at borders, on the other hand.

28 Hansen, N. 1981. *The border economy: regional development in the southwest*. Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 20.

29 Donnan, H. and Wilson, T.M. 1994. An anthropology of borders. In H. Donnan and T.M. Wilson (eds.) *Border approaches: anthropological perspectives on frontiers*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, p. 11.

30 Liam O’Dowd / Thomas M. Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*, Aldershot 1996.

31 Ibid.

Drawing on anthropological literature, Grosby³² argues that nation-states have been able to draw on transcendental, primordial patterns of attachment which people in all societies (both pre-modern and modern) have to their homeland. He observes that “throughout history man [sic] has considered, albeit with variations, environments which are considerably more extensive than those of the family or home to be his ‘own’, hence integral to his life”³³. Bounded territories in this view are not simply a matter of control or access to resources, or of networks of interaction within fixed geographical limits, rather they denote *participation* in a collective consciousness (rituals, customs, traditions, laws, historical knowledge, and even language) associated with a particular territory. Territorial borders are thus sacralized typically *via* nationalism as is shown in the “willingness of millions of Europeans this century to sacrifice themselves for a land and country they believe to be their own”³⁴.

In sociological terms, therefore, it is as necessary to draw on Durkheimian as well as on Weberian perspectives to understand the combination of coercion and sacralization which underpins national boundaries. Of course, collective consciousness also includes the existence of a collective, if selective, amnesia, about the origins of borders, which can be a major resource for national institutions and powerholders. Identification with a particular bounded national territory is strengthened to the extent that the memory of shared sacrifice (in war, for example) and inclusion in the nation overrides memories of exclusion, exploitation and coercion which have attended the creation of borders. The prevalence of these latter memories often distinguish border regions from the rest of their respective states.

The political and cultural dimensions of national borders are continually confronted, however, by the universalizing thrust of economic

32 Grosby, S. 1995. Territoriality: the transcendental, primordial feature of modern societies. *Nations and Nationalism* 1 (2): 143-162.

33 Ibid, p. 144.

34 Ibid, p. 143.

development. Hansen³⁵, for example, notes that both “growth pole” and modern location theory stress the disadvantages that border regions experience because political boundaries “represent artificial barriers to the rational economic organization of potentially complementary areas and because both public and private sectors tend to avoid investing in areas where conflicts are likely to arise”. The pioneers of modern location theory, Christaller and Losch, assumed that in the case of borders, politics are detrimental to economics and that the political goals of the nation-state are inherently detrimental to border regions. For Christaller, border areas are likely to be subject to the “socio-political separation principle” where the “authority of stately and sovereign might” takes precedence over the “rationality of economic principles”³⁶. O’Dowd and Corrigan’s chapter³⁷ supports Christaller’s argument in the case of the UK-Irish border, despite the precedence given to economic development in border areas by the EU in the wake of the Single European Market.

Indeed, the rationality of economic principles was precisely the means employed by the founders of the EU to desacralize the historically volatile pattern of European national borders – lines that were reforged in the wake of the excesses of territorial nationalism in two world wars, and before that, in the long struggles between European powers in the course of imperialist expansion overseas. Europe has never had settled boundaries, and the borders of what might constitute Europe remain contested today³⁸. Only ten states (the largest being Spain) had the same boundaries in 1989 as they had in 1899 – “the nation-states which constitute Europe are themselves

35 Hansen, N. 1983. International cooperation in border regions: an overview and research agenda. *International Regional Science Review* 8 (3): 255-270, p. 256.

36 Hansen, *ibid*, p. 256; Ratti, R. 1993. Spatial and economic effects of frontiers. In R. Ratti and S. Reichman (eds.) *Theory and practice of transborder cooperation*. Basle: Helbing and Lichtenhahn, p. 37.

37 Liam O’Dowd / Thomas Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*, Aldershot 1996.

38 see also Haller, *ibid*; Lipietz, A. 1993. Social Europe, legitimate Europe: the inner and outer boundaries of Europe. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 11: 501-512; Pieterse, J.N. 1990. *Empire and emancipation*. London: Pluto.

almost all imprecise entities with moveable boundaries”³⁹. Germany, at the geographical centre of any definition of Europe, has had particularly fluid boundaries. In many ways the recent unification of Germany underlines the point. Austria, Alsace, Silesia (discussed by Dressler Holohan and Ciechocinska below), Bohemia and several other regions testify to the contingency of German boundaries and the implications of a citizenship regime which continues to be based on *jus sanguinis* rather than *jus soli*⁴⁰.

For the founders of the EU, however, a stabilized pattern of national boundaries was a necessary pre-requisite (what some saw mainly involving the containment of Germany) to generating patterns of economic interdependency which would eventually reduce the significance of existing borders, thereby permanently removing the threat of inter-state wars over territory. This strategy was pursued, however, along with a considerable growth in the economic, administrative and cultural capacity of the state. The new forms of total war had shown the mobilizing potential of the nation-state. Translated into peace-time, this potential manifested itself in the growth of what Mann⁴¹ has termed the “infrastructural power and penetration of the state”. Within infrastructural power, he includes the power of regular taxation, a monopoly over military mobilization, permanent bureaucratic administration, a monopoly over law-making and enforcement, the capacity to store an enormous amount of information, and influence over the economy.

More importantly, in the context of this volume, Mann also argued that growth in infrastructural powers also increased “territorial boundedness”, thus strengthening the boundaries of existing states. Tilly⁴² links the growth of “infrastructural powers” with the homogenizing strategies of state rulers. As the state’s sphere of operations expands beyond its military and law and order functions, it begins to employ direct rule and intervention in the

39 Wallace, *ibid*, p. 14.

40 Brubaker, W.R. 1990. Immigration, citizenship and the nation-state in France and Germany: a comparative historical analysis. *International Sociology* 5 (4): 379-407.

41 Mann, M. 1984. The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and result. *European Journal of Sociology* 25 (2): 185-213, p. 208.

everyday lives of its population. This can mean, imposing, *inter alia*, national languages, military service, a legal, welfare and educational system, even systems of economic regulation. Citizenship rights are deepened as the population can make claims on the state while sharing certain duties and obligations to state rules. Tilly⁴³ argues that from the 1850s onwards there was a substantial growth in the rule-making role of the state: “the welfare, culture and daily routines of ordinary Europeans came to depend as never before on which state they happened to reside in.” The differentiation and regulation functions of national borders were underlined as states introduced passport controls, employment permits, tariffs and customs as part of economic policy, began to distinguish foreigners within the state as worthy of closer surveillance and more limited rights.

Standardization of state rules and of the rights and obligations of various categories of people represented a form of social homogenization. In reflecting on the long rise of the nation-state in Europe, Therborn⁴⁴ points out that it involved a major ethnic homogenization within state boundaries, especially in the East but also to some extent in the West. This homogenization, however, seldom went far enough to ensure a coincidence between the boundaries of state and nation. Furthermore, although the infrastructural powers of states developed substantially after 1945 with the growth of welfare and education systems, the tendency towards intra-state homogenization was now being challenged. Western Europe was changing from its historic role as a source of emigration to becoming an area of net immigration. Old sub-national, ethnic and regional boundaries showed that they could be politically re-activated given the appropriate socio-economic, political and cultural conditions.

42 Tilly, *ibid*, p. 115-116.

43 Tilly, *ibid*.

44 Therborn, *ibid*, p. 43.

Immigration has become a major issue for most western European states⁴⁵. Driessen provides an anthropological insight below into the plight of North African immigrants at one point of entry to the EU. Immigration threatens some groups of citizens with increased competition for resources and also threatens the process of homogenization to which national identity is so closely linked. In arguing the case for open borders, Carens⁴⁶ recognizes that most people reject the idea on the basis that “the power to exclude aliens is inherent to sovereignty and essential for any political community”. Here the connections between national borders, sovereignty and identity are manifest. Carens⁴⁷ goes on to argue that the moral and philosophical case in favor of restricting citizenship, especially to “third world migrants”, is weak: “citizenship in western liberal democracies is the modern equivalent of feudal privilege – an inherited right that greatly enhances one’s life chances”.

Western European wealth and dominance, once linked to, and frequently dependent on, outward migration as part of imperial and colonial expansionism, is now protected by restricting or denying EU entry to migrants from the ex-colonies of the major EU states⁴⁸. At the core of the debates over EU borders is how the western European “inheritance” is to be protected, who should share in it and who should be excluded. Here, there is a trade-off between constructing common controls at the EU borders and the diversity of citizenship rules and controls which exist among the member states. EU activities directed at standardizing immigration and asylum controls have been criticized by human rights’

45 Baldwin-Edwards, M. and Schain, M.A. 1994. The politics of immigration: an introduction. *West European Politics* 17 (3): 1-16.

46 Carens, J.H. 1995. Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders. In W. Kymlicka (ed.), *The rights of minority cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 331.

47 Carens, *ibid*, p. 332.

48 see, for example, Wrench, J. and Solomos, J. (eds.) 1993. *Racism and migration in western Europe*. Oxford: Berg.

advocates for being secretive and democratically unaccountable⁴⁹. In this, however, they are squarely in a long tradition of border creation in Europe.

EU borders' policies

Despite the attempts of many European states to strengthen or maintain their sovereignty at borders, the EU's drive to greater economic and political integration has complicated these efforts. Evolving border policies within the EU have been shaped by three overriding considerations. The first two seem at first to be contradictory: the abolition of border controls in order to promulgate the "four freedoms" of movement for capital, goods, services and labor, and policing and security. The first suggests the transcendence and porosity of borders, the second leans towards their maintenance and consolidation. Underlying all borders' policy is a third consideration, the potential threat posed to state sovereignty by the lack of coincidence between nation and state. Advocates of a federated "Europe of the Regions", which allows subnational groups more freedom of expression, see "ever closer union" as the means of circumventing existing states without confrontations over territorial borders. On the other hand, proponents of a looser "Europe of the States" insist on inter-governmentalism as a means of preventing the emergence of independent regional voices and international regional alliances which might pose an alternative to the existing inter-state system.

The abolition of internal border controls marks a significant acknowledgement of the weakening infrastructural power of the national state arising from the globalization of national economies and the loss of state influence over production and over financial markets. With the growing multinational control of the global economy, states lost much of their power of initiation, if not of regulation. Singular national economic interest became more difficult to define, despite the pressures of the Brussels' bargaining tables. Disparities and conflicting interests began to

49 Bunyan, T. 1993. Trevi, Europol and the European state. In T. Bunyan (ed.) *Statewatching the new Europe: a handbook on the European State*. London: Statewatch.

grow between regions and economic sectors within states⁵⁰. These conditions prepare the ground for shifting some elements of economic regulation to the EU level as a way of influencing the continental strategies of multinational corporations. At the same time, by passing economic responsibility upwards, states can attempt to undermine the delegitimizing potential of radical economic restructuring and mass unemployment.

The Single European Act (1986) and its compelling, if somewhat misleading, slogan “a Europe Without Frontiers” provided a huge stimulus to European integration. Between 1986 and 1992, the European Commission issued almost 300 directives eliminating physical, fiscal and technical barriers to the Single European Market⁵¹. Significantly, however, national states were given the responsibility for implementing these directives, thus allowing considerable scope for the exercise of national sovereignty and discretion in the long and difficult process of removing internal border controls (i.e., economic and security checks)⁵². Majone has identified what he terms “the rise of the regulatory state” in the EU. Thus although the Single Market may have rendered borders more porous by de-regulation, re-regulation is also occurring which is carving out new roles for the national states within their own boundaries through the implementation of directives emanating from Brussels. The Single European Market provided the impetus for the Maastricht Treaty and its three-stage programme for closer economic and monetary union combined with its tentative steps in the direction of closer political union.

The abolition of border controls changed the context for existing regional cross-border cooperation and encouraged the formulation of a positive programme for border regions. As all member states had border regions with problems of adaptation to the new economic regime, this facilitated inter-governmental agreement to include a special initiative on border

50 see Dunford, M. 1994. Winners and losers: the new map of economic inequality in the European Union. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 1 (2): 95-114.

51 Williams, A.M. 1994. *The European Community*. London: Blackwell, p. 110-115.

regions (INTERREG 1 and 2) within the wider framework of the expanded Structural Funds. INTERREG opened up new opportunities for regionalists and federalists to test the limits of national sovereignty by building on cross-border networks⁵³. It also potentially accorded more space to regional and ethnic groupings keen to carve out more areas of economic and political activity in which they would have a greater degree of autonomy from the constraints of existing national borders and inter-state relationships.

The new proactive EU borders' programme was a belated response to the work of the consultative Council of Europe on borders over a thirty year period. The latter sought to develop a triangular borders' policy involving cooperation between European institutions, national states and border regions. From the 1950s onwards a tradition of cross-border cooperation had been developing along the Rhine Axis on the Dutch, German, Belgian, French and Swiss borders⁵⁴. These attempts were central to the formation of the Association of European Border Regions which was to later become involved in monitoring the EU's INTERREG initiative. The Council of Europe continued to stimulate interest and research on border areas and cross-border cooperation⁵⁵ and promulgated a Framework Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation in 1981 which advanced new models and juridical principles for cross-border links. However, this Convention had little practical effect as the EC/EU remained divided on the precise nature of the links between economic integration and national sovereignty.

INTERREG, which was specifically designated for internal and external border regions, had a dual purpose: to help integrate the economic space of the Community as a whole and to address the negative legacy of border areas, i.e., their isolation from the main centres of economic activity and decision-making, the separation of their commercial centres from their

52 Butt Philip, A. 1991. European border controls: who needs them? *Public Policy and Administration* 6 (2): 35-54; Lodge, J. 1992. Internal security and judicial cooperation beyond Maastricht. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 4 (3): 1-29.

53 see Baker's chapter in this volume.

54 Strassoldo, *ibid.*

natural hinterland, their inferior infrastructure, their generally poor natural resources, and the specific difficulties arising from having different legal, administrative and social welfare systems, and often different languages and cultural traditions, from their contiguous region across the border⁵⁶.

Overviews of cross-border cooperation, research at borders and EU assessments of the INTERREG programme raise a number of key issues about the changing nature of national boundaries and their durability. Border regions vary widely in terms of their origins, longevity, permeability and history of cross-border contacts, both formal and informal. Moreover, despite suffering in general from the negative economic effects of their marginal location, they nevertheless vary in terms of their potential accessibility to the core regions of economic activity in the EU, and in terms of the immediate benefits to be gained from cross-border links. Internal border regions closer to the geographical and economic centre of the EU may benefit economically to a greater extent by the abolition of internal borders under the Single European Market⁵⁷. Finally, the external borders of the EU face additional problems of possible consolidation with the deepening of EU economic integration and the widening of the economic and demographic gaps between the EU and its Eastern European and Mediterranean neighbors⁵⁸.

EU borders' policies are in flux, caught between forging links across the external border and policing it. Signs of internal challenges to the bordered sovereignty of member states co-exist with the dynamic and moveable nature of the EU's external borders. The re-unification of Germany, the recent incorporation of Sweden, Finland and Austria into the EU,

55 Strassoldo, *ibid*; Strassoldo and Delli Zotti, *ibid*, Anderson, *ibid*.

56 *Development of the Community's territory*. Brussels: European Commission, p. 169.

57 see, for example, Nijkamp, P. 1993. Border regions and infrastructure networks in the European integration process. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 11: 431-446; Jones, P.N. and Wild, T. 1994. Opening the frontier: recent spatial impacts in the former inner-German border zone. *Regional Studies* 28 (3): 259-273.

58 Therborn, *ibid*.

negotiations for Cypriot and Maltese membership, and German support for the inclusion of Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia illustrate the current dynamism of EU borders. Attempts to accelerate the process of creating a common borders' policy through the Schengen agreements have proved very troublesome to implement and have created new distinctions between citizens from EU states belonging to Schengen, those from non-Schengen EU countries, and those who are from non-EU countries⁵⁹.

Behind the current "official" borders of the EU, new informal borders are emerging, creating new "frontier" or "buffer" zones. As the Oder-Neisse line becomes more porous, the informal EU border is pushed towards Poland's eastern borders. Likewise, there are signs that as the Austro-Hungarian border becomes more permeable the Hungarian-Romanian border is being fortified with EU assistance. These "proxy" borders reflect the long-term strategy of the EU and of its major power-centre, Germany. If there is to be a "fortress Europe" its eastern line has yet to be settled. On this border, small states like Slovenia are seeking to reconcile their new national autonomy with an EU whose general inter-state rules promise to keep large states from arbitrarily controlling their smaller and weaker neighbors. Open borders with the EU, as Mlinar points out in his contribution to this volume, do not necessarily mean less autonomy.

The Norwegian-Swedish border currently marks the northern limits of the EU but here once again the official and informal borders may not coincide in the long-term, at least to the extent that the old Nordic links are maintained across the external EU border⁶⁰. To the South, the Mediterranean countries are getting EU assistance to fortify their maritime borders against immigrants. Despite the historic inter-penetration of Southern Europe and North Africa, today the latter seems to lie firmly outside the EU. As Driessen notes below, Morocco's admission for membership got scant attention as it was deemed not to be a European country. Similarly, Turkey's application for membership has been put on the long finger, although it straddles Asia and Europe. In the South, the

59 Smith, S. 1995. Borders fall to be replaced by queues. *The European* 24 March.

Mediterranean, once the maritime core of a “world economy” before the rise of north-west Europe, is now akin to a moat between rich Europe and the poor Afro-Asian continents. Within the EU itself a band of poorer peripheral regions including southern Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece acts a further “buffer zone” for the dynamic capitalist core economies, as do the post-socialist central European countries.

Clearly, the buffer and border zones of the EU remain “under construction”. With the end of the “Cold War”, the eruption of ethno-national border conflicts in the Balkans, and the shrinking of Russia to its seventeenth century boundaries, the designation of “Europe’s” external borders has become much more problematical. While the EU lays claim to be the foremost carrier and shaper of European identity, this claim can still be contested by European states which are not members.

The problem of defining Europe’s borders and identity remains as formidable as ever. As Pieterse⁶¹ suggests, the Islamic and non-white peoples are pressed into service to define “Europe’s Other”. Old fault-lines between Orthodox and Western Christianity and between the old lands of the Ottoman Empire and the rest, have begun to take on new meaning. Borders and borderlands throughout Europe are being re-sensitized in a variety of ways. For the moment, even the advocates of a unified Europe have veered toward emphasizing the exclusionary role of borders. Their dilemma is well summed up by the fear expressed by a journalist who is also a supporter of the Single European Market. In an article entitled: “Open borders have their limits”, he observes that “building a non-exclusive Europe is equivalent to constructing a home without doors or windows. Pretty soon there will be nothing worth having left”⁶².

Borders, like the nations and states they circumscribe, are Janus-faced. They look inwards as well as outwards; they are inclusionary as well as exclusionary. It is clear that the disposition of borders in the new Europe is

60 Smith, *ibid.*

61 *Ibid.*

62 Millar, P. 1995. Open borders must have their limits. *The European* 5 October.

far from settled, nor is it clear how functions and meanings will be apportioned to different types of borders within and without the EU. What the contributors do convey, however, is the existence of a sense of transition and change, even if European integration is more easily understood as an ongoing process rather than a set of outcomes. Crucial to the understanding of this process is an appreciation of the ways in which frontiers are zones of contest over sovereignty. It is here too that the changing nature and meaning of national sovereignty may be most transparent.

Borderlands manifest the ways in which inter-state and state locality relationships have been formed. Both sets of relationships are fundamental to the formation of a “new Europe”. Historians show us how the delimitation of national borders often results from great events such as wars, conquests and treaties. Social scientific approaches, while acknowledging the centrality of such events, reveal national borders to be, like European integration itself, a form of social process. This process is bound up with the interaction between power, coercion, citizenship, political representation and identity. In the long-term even great historical events can be read as expressions of this interaction. While the EU is likely to remain the decisive actor in shaping the new Europe, it is too early to judge the nature and location of its external border or to assume that its abolition of internal border controls will be permanent. It seems clear, too, that its borders’ policies will continue to be shaped by its most powerful member states. The study of borders and frontier zones can reveal much about the dialectic of fragmentation and integration which is currently reshaping the European continent.

Borders in Europe

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the decline of the socialist system, international debate has focused on the emerging nature of a possible “new world order”. In particular, the question which arises now regards the precise nature of this “new world order” and who will participate in this global arena.

Recent times have witnessed dramatic global transformations. Until 1989 the political landscape was characterized by two superpowers opposing each other in the Cold War, whereas now the academic community searches for new potential super and regional powers. Christian Hacke regards the United States of America as the only world power and he holds the opinion that Washington is therefore condemned to be a world power.¹ Equally, former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt currently considers the United States of America to be the only superpower.² However, he also defines China, Russia, India and Brazil as countries that have the potential to be superpowers in the near future.³

When we speak of new superpowers in the near future we have to ask ourselves what the role of Europe will be. Does Europe have the capacity to become a superpower in the future? Indeed, Europe can play a role in world politics. Not, however, in the form of single national states but in its entirety. The European Union has to reach a stage where it possesses the capacity to act in a much more unified manner. This is especially the case with respect to its foreign policy.⁴ However, nowadays the European Union is confronted with a host of challenges. It will have to tackle unprecedented challenges such as the widening and deepening of the Union.

1 Christian Hacke, *Zur Weltmacht verdammt*, Munich 2001, pp. 615-625.

2 Helmut Schmidt, *Die Selbstbehauptung Europas. Perspektiven für das 21. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart/Munich 2000, p. 24.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 24-27.

4 Egon Bahr, *Deutsche Interessen. Streitschrift zu Macht, Sicherheit und Außenpolitik*, Munich 1998, p. 30.

When speaking of Europe we have to keep one important fact in mind. Europe is not synonymous with the European Union. Not every country in Europe is automatically a member of the European Union, which means that we have to differentiate between the two. Nevertheless, many scientists and politicians do use the two terms interchangeably. One term is used for both because many people in Europe identify with the European Union regardless of whether their country is a member of this body or not.

Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission, supports the view that the new world that has emerged after 1989 has brought new problems and exacerbated old ones.⁵ The European Union now has to deal with new challenges such as the accession process of the European Union – and also with old problems, for example those of the member states with respect to Economic and Monetary Union (EMU).

The European Union, which started as the European Economic Community in 1957 with six members, today numbers 15 members while 13 candidates are waiting to join. These 13 candidates are: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Turkey. On the 31st of March 1998 accession negotiations commenced with Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia and Slovenia. In December 1999 the European Commission invited a further six countries to start accession negotiations, namely Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania and the Slovak Republic. In Copenhagen in December 2002, ten of them were invited to join the Union. So far, Turkey is the only country the European Commission has not started accession negotiations with.

The changing Europe is confronted with a multitude of challenges. The issue of European borders is one of the most controversial ones. In this essay we will try to answer some questions concerning national boundaries in Europe, such as: What is the function of borders? Do we need borders in the future? And is there a difference in the perception of borders in Western Europe and in Southeastern Europe?

5 Romano Prodi, *Europe as I see it*, Malden 2000, p. 2.

The importance of borders in Europe

In the English language there are four expressions that correspond to the term “Grenze” (German) or “frontière” (French): The first one is that of a frontier. This can be seen as an open, moving, onward frontier behind which lies no man’s land.⁶ The second expression is that of limits, which stems from the Latin word ‘limes’. Limits was originally used in the sense of barbarian limits, that is to say, the limits between one’s own civilization and the unknown barbarians. The third expression is that of a border. It is used in the sense of modern state borders, which separate equal nation states. The last expression is that of a boundary. This is an all-embracing concept of system boundaries. In this essay, we will use the expression borders because the topic we are dealing with is that of modern state borders.

On the whole, borders tend to be disliked due to the fact that they separate people from each other. Looking at the history of Europe, we will see that borders have always separated people into different parts. One half of a nation lives in the eastern part of the border and the other in the western part. It was especially the Iron Curtain, which symbolized the extreme separation among people of the same nation living in two different systems. In this sense, we can call the Iron Curtain an ideological border, which persisted until the peaceful revolutions of 1989.⁷

Many border lines in European history were arbitrarily drawn. However, none of them was so arbitrarily drawn as the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall of 1961, which separated the Germans into two different parts.⁸ The

6 Ulrich von Alemann, Grenzen schaffen Frieden. Gegen die Ungebundenheit in der Politik. Ein Versuch über das wohltätige Trennende, Die Zeit, 6/1999.

7 Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse, 19th and 20th Century Borders and Border regions in Europe: Some Reflections, in: Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (eds.), Nationalizing and Denationalizing European Border Regions, 1800-2000, Dordrecht 1999, p. 1.

8 Timothy Garton Ash, Im Namen Europas, Frankfurt a.M., 1995, p. 19.

Iron Curtain was not the first border to divide one nation into two parts but it was the first one in Europe to divide them due to its insuperability.⁹

The example of Germany has demonstrated that ideological borders are particularly unacceptable to the people who were subject to them. The Berlin Wall divided whole families for almost 30 years. Compared to nation state borders, ideological borders are of an inhuman kind. Therefore, the change of borders in Europe today and in European history is not comparable with the abolition of the Iron Curtain in 1989.

Analyzing the situation in Europe after 1989, we can ascertain that two events occurred concerning borders: "The borders inside the European Union lost their importance whereas Central and Eastern Europe saw the birth of a multitude of new state borders."¹⁰

The significance of borders within Europe changes from time to time but they never lose their importance entirely. Throughout history, starting in 1648, Europe has been characterized by frequent border alterations. Traditionally, the Peace of Westphalia is regarded as the starting point of the modern European state system. This peace treaty restored the old rights of the imperial estates, outlined the German emperor's regional cessions to France and Sweden and defined the future denominational position and responsibilities of the imperial authorities within the empire. The denominational regulations of the Peace of Westphalia bear a principle that still affects our time. The rule "cuius regio, eius religio" had stated that the populace of a given realm had to adopt the religious belief of its ruler. With the Peace of Westphalia, this principle received an important extension. The denominational status quo of the bishoprics and their seizing (feudal possession of an estate in land) was calculated in relation to the average of the year 1624 and frozen. Since then, the distribution of the denominations in Germany has hardly changed. Subsequently, religious quarrels were

9 Ibid.

10 Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (note 10), p. 1 (translation of the author).

settled diplomatically in Parliament by the denominational bodies of the *corpus catholicorum* and *evangelicorum*.¹¹

After the French Revolution (1789) and the Napoleonic Wars (1806-1813) it was the Congress of Vienna (1814-1815), which redrew the political map of Europe. Although the territorial changes brought about by the Congress of Vienna did not endure long on the whole, they represented a practical, if not always equitable, solution and an attempt at dealing with Europe as an organic whole. The Quadruple Alliance and the Holy Alliance, designed to uphold the decisions of Vienna and to settle disputes and problems by means of conferences, were an important step toward European co-operation.¹²

Since 1815, European state borders have changed several times with the next important date being World War I (1914-1918). World War I and the Russian Revolution reshaped the European state system, giving rise to new states such as Austria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Yugoslavia.¹³ However, not only did new states arise; others were extinguished altogether or subject to severe change of their territorial shape: The Baltic countries lost their independence. Romanian Bessarabia became the center-piece of the new Soviet republic of Moldova. Germany was divided and the borders of several other European countries, such as Poland, were changed.

World War II then once again redrew the borders in Europe profoundly. However, now the new borders remained very stable up until 1989. This time period, the Cold War, was one of the longest periods in Europe of territorial stability. The reason was the impermeability of European borders between the two blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This ideological border persisted for almost 45 years due to the Cold War. The countries of Eastern Europe did not have the opportunity for significant reform, for instance of their borders, without the permission of the Soviet Union. With

11 See http://www.muenster.de/friede/gb/02_friede/02_1_1.htm.

12 See <http://www.encyclopedia.com/articles/13469Consequences.html>.

13 Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (note 10), p. 5.

the collapse of the Soviet Union the period of being controlled by the Soviet Union stopped abruptly. The ideological border crumbled. But with it not only did the Iron Curtain vanish. Also, the former Union republics of the Soviet Union became independent states in 1991, just as the Czech and Slovak Republics in 1993. Yugoslavia fell apart to form Bosnia, Croatia, Macedonia, Slovenia and remaining Yugoslavia.

Considering the amount of negative experiences regarding European borders, it is nowadays not surprising that they are not liked very much by the people who suffered from them. It was especially the time during the Cold War with its ideological borders that separated the people. Therefore, borders are regarded with antipathy because they separate territories and people from each other, define nations and frequently have been the source of international conflict and war. In this way, separation in general highlights all kinds of differences such as political, social, economic, and cultural ones.¹⁴

Just as there are negative perceptions about borders, there are also positive ones. It is believed that borders are necessary for countries and the people living within them. Enclosure fosters a feeling of security and people prefer to live in secure and familiar circumstances. Ulrich von Alemann holds the opinion that we need borders to preserve our identity. He also gives the example of the former East Germany. Shortly before reunification with West Germany, borders of the old five “Bundesländer” were reconstituted within the GDR. People obviously feel a need to live within borders that facilitate orientation and identification.¹⁵ Everywhere where borders have been removed new ones have to be created, no matter whether this happens in Germany, in Eastern Europe or in the former Soviet Union. Keeping this in mind, borders have to be understood as boundaries enclosing a space of identification and orientation.

14 See Ibid, p. 1.

15 Ulrich von Alemann (note 6).

When analyzing borders in Europe, we have to note that the topic of borders is an interdisciplinary one. Therefore, it would be suitable to look at what, for instance, geographers think about borders:

”For many geographers the landscape was an important element to prove the unity of the nation and its boundaries. Boundaries must be natural, that means they must be proven by the geological and geographical circumstances. In practice, natural also means defensible. This way of thinking would lead to what at the end of the 19th century would be called geopolitics; a word taken from the Swede Kjellen, who used it for the first time in 1899. He used the term to define the branch of geography which was engaged with the political borders.”¹⁶

Another discipline which demonstrates an interest in borders is history. However, looking at the point of view of historians, we can determine that within history the subject was widely neglected during the 19th century. Historians were preoccupied with the nation state and its political history. This led to an interest in developments in the political centre and not with those located at the periphery:

“Not only for frontiers and boundaries, but also for border regions no interest existed. Of course, after 1871 interest remained in France in the history of the lost territories, Alsace and Lorraine. But this interest was more a defense of legal national rights (Lepage 1845) than an interest in the particularities of the transition area between two countries, that had suffered and would still suffer as a glacis, a field of fire between two antagonists.”¹⁷

Functions of borders

Looking at the political map of Europe, we can ascertain a multitude of borders. Today, countries are divided by borders, which were mostly drawn after conflicts and wars. The borders in Western Europe were redrawn for the last time after World War II and the ones in Eastern Europe have been realigned since the end of the Cold War. During the Cold War, borders

16 Henk van Dijk, *State Borders in Geography and History*, in: Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (eds.) *Nationalizing and Denationalizing European Border Regions*, Dordrecht 1999, p. 25.

between the two blocs were drawn on the basis of ideology. They served to protect one's own ideology from opposing ones. It was especially the Soviet Union, which was afraid that the other socialist countries, like Poland or Hungary, could be influenced by capitalist ideas. Therefore, the borders between the two blocs were highly salient. In addition, the borders, especially on the eastern side, were strictly controlled. Thus, borders had the function of maintaining and protecting one's own ideology.

However, after the end of the Cold War the function of borders between Western and Eastern Europe changed. During the Cold War it was especially the Berlin Wall, which became a most notorious symbol for the ideological divide. Until 1989, the borders of the individual countries within the socialist block were not very significant. Of importance was the Iron Curtain in its entirety, which symbolized the separation of the two blocs.

Borders also served as boundaries between religions. Borders have played an important role not only regarding the relationship of Christianity and Islam but also among Roman-Catholic and Orthodox Christians.¹⁸ The function of the borders between Christianity and Islam from the 15th to the 17th century was to keep Islam (i.e. the Ottoman Empire) at distance from Western Europe. During this period military conflict was frequent between the Ottoman Empire and the Western powers. It was the aim of the Ottoman Empire to expand the influence of Islam in Europe. Some centuries ago it was Christianity, which tried to expand its influence in the East by means of the crusades commencing in the 11th century. Therefore, borders historically had the function of blocking the expansion of Islam in the Christian world and vice versa.¹⁹

17 Ibid., p. 30.

18 Thomas Wunsch, Grenzen und regionale Gliederung, in: Harald Roth (ed.), Studienhandbuch Östliches Europa, Band 1: Geschichte Ostmittel- und Südosteuropas, Köln/Weimar/Wien 1999, pp. 14-15.

19 Helmut Schmidt (note 2), pp. 219-220.

National borders delineate the territories of states. Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse hold the opinion that the functions of borders are derived from those of states²⁰ Their functions may be summarized as follows:

- exercise of military power,
- management of the economy,
- construction and maintenance of national identities, and
- provision of a welfare state.²¹

From the 17th century onward, European states have gradually acquired the above functions, which have subsequently taken the lead as justifications for territorial statehood without erasing the former ones. Since the 19th century, the formation of nation states has enormously increased the volume of functional activity of states and has extended their influence and activity up to the boundaries of state territories.²² Especially after World War II, many formerly expansionist states were transformed into more saturated ones. Their war departments were re-structured into defense departments. They renounced the use of war to expand their territory. As a result, international borders have never been as stable as in the second half of the 20th century. At the same time, the geopolitical situation in Europe changed. This had consequences for the military function of state borders in Europe. The fact that NATO and the Warsaw Pact separated Europe strengthened the military function of the borders between them and diminished this function within them.

After 1989, due to the geopolitical upheaval, the military function of borders changed once again. After the Warsaw Pact dissolved, several former East Block countries applied for NATO membership. This truly marked the end of the Cold War. The importance of the military function of

20 Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (note 10), p. 6.

21 P.J. Taylor, The state as container territoriality in the modern world-system, in: Progress in Human Geography, 18/1994, pp. 151-162.

22 Hans Knippenberg and Jan Markusse (note 10), p. 7.

borders declined, at least in Central Europe (much less in South Eastern Europe).²³

A similar situation pertained to the economic function of the borders. After 1945, Europe was divided into two political-economic blocs, the European Community and the Comecon. This division strengthened the barrier function of the borders between the blocs, but encouraged the economic relations between the states within them. With the end of the Cold War, the former countries of the eastern bloc opened their borders in order to join in the economic integration of Western Europe. The socio-economic rift could now be overcome. Both the military and economic functions of European borders, thus, changed immediately after the collapse of socialism.

Another function of the borders is a cultural one. Particularly after World War I, it became a principle to draw new borders along lines of nationality. Therefore, state borders became cultural ones. In general, it was the aim of a state to homogenize its population in order to strengthen the identity of the state, for instance by making available a standard national language and national history. Especially education and media were used in this process. One adverse effect of this policy has been the deepening of cultural differences on both sides of state's boundaries.²⁴

A last function of the state is the provision of a welfare state. It is a moral obligation for every state to look after its people. In this context, state borders are to define a national society, a cohesive social grouping. Therefore, it is not surprising that people on both sides of the Cold War border developed quite different sociological patterns.²⁵

Borders in the European Union

In the 21st century we are confronted with a very interesting phenomenon in Europe. While the borders in the European Union have lost their

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid, p. 9.

importance, in Central and Eastern Europe new state borders have been established. The internal borders of the European Union lose significance on a daily basis. At the same time, the external borders of the European Union are still moving, which means that the re-drawing of borders, especially in Eastern and Central Europe, is still ongoing.

Internal borders of the European Union are those inside the European Union or between the member states, sometimes resembling a closed club. On the other hand, external borders are frontiers between the European Union and non-EU countries. There are three main external border regions of the Union:

1. regions bordering EFTA countries, some of which have joined the Union;
2. regions bordering Eastern and Central Europe;
3. regions on the Union's southern frontiers, including Turkey and North Africa.²⁶

Within the European Union, most of the border controls have been abolished as a consequence of the Schengen Agreement. In this agreement, named after a small town in Luxembourg, signed on the 14th of June 1985, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands agreed in principle that they would gradually remove their common border controls and introduce freedom of movement for all individuals who are nationals of the signatory member states, other member states or third countries.

The first step towards the Schengen Agreement was the Saarbrücken Agreement of 1984 between France and Germany, with a twofold purpose: "to make substantial progress towards the achievement of the so-called 'citizens' Europe' on a limited scale and, at the same time, to set an

26 Susan Baker, *Punctured sovereignty, border regions and the environment within the European Union*, in: Liam O'Dowd/Thomas M. Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*, Aldershot, Brookfield 1996, p. 25.

example for the European integration process.”²⁷ Soon, the Benelux countries displayed an interest in joining France and Germany. The Schengen Agreement was signed by the above five states on the 19th of June 1990 and entered into force on the 26th of March 1995. It lays down the arrangements and guarantees for implementing freedom of movement. It amends the relevant national laws and is subject to parliamentary ratification. Italy (1990), Spain and Portugal (1991), Greece (1992), Austria (1995), Sweden, Finland and Denmark (1996) have since joined the list of signatories, while Iceland and Norway are also parties to the Agreement.²⁸

One of the reasons why the United Kingdom and Ireland do not accept the Schengen Agreement is the fact that they have a different view on how far the “free movement of persons” should go. Furthermore, it is well known that the United Kingdom displays a certain distrust of the manner in which some Schengen contracting parties carry out immigration controls. One of the main problems is that of illegal immigration into the Schengen territory, which is often called “Schengenland”.²⁹ This illegal immigration will prove very problematic for the European Union if controls at the external borders of the European Union are not carried out strictly.

With the launch of the Single Market in January 1993, the European Union introduced three of the four freedoms according to Article 7a of the Treaty on European Union. The free movement of goods, capital and services has been introduced but the fourth freedom, that of persons, remained to be realized due to fears of terrorism, drugs and illegal immigration from central Europe and Northern Africa.³⁰

Nevertheless, the Schengen Agreement and the abolition of internal border controls do not mean that all controls are necessarily eliminated. With the

27 Kris Pollet, Free movement of persons and the issue of migration in EU-CEECS relations: Schengen as an example?, in: Marc Maresceau, Enlarging the European Union. Relations between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe, New York 1997, p. 211.

28 Ibid.

29 Bruce Barnard, Free movement in EU at last-almost, in: European Dialogue, July-August 1995, issue 3: Borders.

30 Ibid.

Schengen Agreement the border controls are merely transferred from the internal to the external borders of the European Union. However, Schengen also signifies a better cooperation between the participating states. This is especially the case with respect to the prevention of illegal immigration into the Schengen territory, the improvement of police and judicial cooperation, the harmonization of visa and immigration policies and of legislation on the control of illegal trafficking of narcotics and firearms, and the transfer of controls on the transport of goods from the borders to the interior of the Schengen territory.³¹

Schengen was a purely intergovernmental initiative without any significant participation of the Community institutions. After the negotiations commenced, some representatives from the Commission were invited to attend the meetings of the Schengen Central Negotiating Group and of the Ministers and the Under-Secretaries of State. Although the representatives of the Commission participated in the meetings, they played a marginal role. They took part in these meetings just as observers, without having the possibility of participating in the discussions or influencing the direction of the debates.³² This state of affairs changed with the Treaty of Amsterdam coming into force. The Treaty incorporated the “Schengen acquis” into the European Union acquis from 1 May 1999 onwards, since it relates to one of the main objectives of the single market, namely the free movement of persons.³³ For that purpose, the Council of Ministers first of all identified the measures, which formed the real Schengen acquis. According to that, in order to give them a legal basis, it established whether they came under the new Title IV (visas, asylum, immigration and other policies related to the free movement of persons) or Title VI (provisions on police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters) of the Treaty on the European Union. After some discussion, the legal incorporation of Schengen into the European Union was accompanied by an integration of the institutions. The

31 Kris Pollet, (note 40), p. 211.

32 Ibid, p. 212.

33 <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cig/g4000s.htm>.

Council took over the Schengen Executive Committee and the Council's General Secretariat the Schengen Secretariat.³⁴

The ultimate aim of the Schengen Agreement is to remove the last impediments for achieving free movement across internal borders. In accordance with Article 2 of the Schengen Implementing Convention, internal borders may be crossed at any point without any checks on persons being carried out. However, an exception can be made when public policy or national security so require. In such a case, a contracting party may decide that, for a limited period of time, national border controls will be reinstalled.³⁵

In accordance with Article 5 of the Implementing Convention, contracting parties may grant entry into their territories for visits not exceeding three months to aliens who fulfill the following conditions: being in the possession of a valid document or documents and a valid visa if so required, having sufficient means of support, not being reported as a person not to be permitted entry and not being considered as a person to be a threat to public order, national security or the international relations of any of the contracting parties.³⁶

Nevertheless, to fulfil those conditions does not necessarily permit an entry into Schengen territory. The conditions of Article 5 are just minimum standards. Therefore, contracting parties have the possibility of imposing other or stricter conditions for entry into their territories at any time. On the other hand, an entry into Schengen territory has to be refused if an alien does not fulfill the conditions of Article 5. The task of enforcing the conditions by the controlling state becomes ever more an extremely important function because the controlling state is regarded as the watchdog for all the Schengen members. This is due to the fact that the controlling state is forced to check the conditions of Article 5 in each Schengen state individually.³⁷ If an alien at the Schengen border is regarded

34 Ibid.

35 Kris Pollet, (note 40), p. 212.

36 Ibid, p. 213.

37 Ibid, p. 214.

as non-acceptable in one of the Schengen contracting parties, he no longer fulfils the conditions of Article 5. Therefore, in practice, the following rule applies: the most restrictive standard applied by one of the contracting parties becomes the common standard.

A last point concerning the Schengen Agreement pertains to visa policy. The aim of the contracting parties is to harmonise their individual policies by common agreement. For instance, a uniform Schengen visa has been introduced which is valid for the entire Schengen territory. An alien who wishes to enter the Schengen territory requires only one visa to travel through the whole Schengen area. As a result, the alien only has to cross the external border once.³⁸

Nevertheless, there are some deficits concerning the visa arrangements. The Schengen system sets out three lists of countries regarding the issuing of visas. First, the Schengen contracting parties agreed on a list of third countries, whose nationals are subject to visa requirements common to all the contracting parties (the so-called negative list). Secondly, there is a list of countries whose nationals do not need a visa to enter the Schengen territory (the so-called positive list). A third list contains those countries on which the Schengen contracting parties could not reach an agreement as to visa requirements (the so-called grey list).³⁹

A very interesting situation exists within the Schengen territory. There are some Schengen states who do require a visa from some countries, while others have abolished visa requirements for them. Today, the Schengen territory includes 15 states and it provides 326 million inhabitants freedom of movement in an area the size of India. Nevertheless, not all EU members are at the same time members of the Schengen Agreement. Great Britain and Ireland have opted against being included in this project of a Europe without borders.

38 Ibid, p. 215.

39 Ibid

Enlargement of the European Union

Since its inception, the European Union has been confronted with four enlargement processes. The first one took place in 1973, when the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland joined the EC. This first enlargement has also been called the “Northern enlargement”. The second enlargement process was the “Southern enlargement”, which consisted of two rounds. The first brought about the membership of Greece in 1981. The second part, also known as the third enlargement round, took place in 1986 with the membership of Spain and Portugal. The fourth enlargement took place in 1995 when Austria, Sweden and Finland joined the EU.

Each enlargement round up to now consisted of no more than three candidates. However, nowadays the European Union is confronted with an accession perspective of 13 candidates. “Never before”, argues Fraser Cameron, “had the Union envisaged an enlargement of such dimensions – it could add more than a 100 million to its population of 370 million – and in terms of the different economic and social situation involved.”⁴⁰

Although not all 13 candidates will become members at the same time, the European Union had to negotiate with all of them simultaneously. This raises the question of why so many countries are now interested in the European Union. Until 1989 the Eastern European countries did not have the opportunity to take part in the process of European integration. However, the situation has changed since 1989 and the transformation process in Central and Eastern Europe has brought these countries to the stage where they have all applied for EU membership.⁴¹ The European Union now finds itself in the difficult situation of not wanting to exclude anybody but at the same time not wishing to foster unrealistic expectations concerning the date of accession. The enlargement process must not be advanced too rapidly because there is not enough support for the entire

40 Fraser Cameron, *The European Union and the Challenge of Enlargement*, in: Marc Maresceau (ed.), *Enlarging the European Union. Relations between the EU and Central and Eastern Europe*, New York 1997, p. 241.

41 *Ibid.*

enlargement among the European population. In early 2002, 50 per cent of the EU citizens were in favor of Eastern enlargement whereas 30 per cent opposed it.⁴² Looking at the figures of the Eurobarometer, we can see that there is not only support for enlargement but also a good deal of opposition. Only a potential membership of Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Malta and Hungary are supported by 50 per cent or more of the EU population. The other 12 candidates are supported by 34 to 47 per cent of the European population.⁴³

In the years to come, this enlargement will pose a multitude of challenges to the European Union as well as opportunities and benefits for both sides. Javier Solana, the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union, considers the enlargement a highly significant process:

”Firstly, an enlarged Union can only help strengthen the stability of the continent of Europe. A Europe which was founded on peace and reconciliation is seeking to expand to many of the countries which were for so long regarded by many as potential adversaries. Secondly, the Union’s founding principles (...) provide a sure guarantee against any undermining of democracy or basic freedoms (...) The principles of course themselves contribute to stability and security for individuals and societies. Thirdly, enlargement will provide huge economic opportunities for both existing and new Member States. The accession process places a huge burden on the accession countries. This is frequently not fully appreciated by those outside Europe who tend to see enlargement simply as a political decision.”⁴⁴

Comparing the costs and benefits of the accession process, we have to acknowledge that the benefits outweigh the disadvantages. The disadvantages and challenges of enlargement can be regarded as the following: the cost of taking in poorer members and the difficulty of reforming Union policies.⁴⁵

42 Main Findings of the Eurobarometer 57 – Fieldwork March – May 2002, p. 6.

43 Eurobarometer 56 – Fieldwork October – November 2001, p. 78.

44 http://www.zeit.de/reden/Europa/200126solana_osterweiterung.html

45 Ibid, p. 243.

Nevertheless, the enlargement process will bring many benefits to the European Union. It will

- "support the newly liberalized market economies by further opening up markets in goods and services between East and West, North and South, stimulating economic growth in Europe and offering new trading opportunities for all;
- bind the countries of Central and Eastern Europe into Western European political and economic structures and thus enhance security and stability; both the US (and Russia) support enlargement for this reason;
- increase effective cooperation in the fields of Justice and Home Affairs, helping to fight crime and the menace of drugs, the effects of which are felt throughout our continent ..."⁴⁶

The enlargement process is particularly salient for the countries in Central and Eastern Europe. During the Cold War, relations between the European Union and these countries were minimal. This situation changed drastically after the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, when dialogue and cooperation commenced between the two parts of Europe. After the Cold War, the European Union possessed a mystical attraction for the countries in Central and Eastern Europe. However, this attractiveness did not suddenly spring up after the end of the Cold War. Up until 1989, the perception of the European Community in the countries of the Eastern bloc was some kind of combination of myths, stereotypes, anxieties and hopes. On this basis the reaction of 1989/90 has to be understood:

"There was considerable optimism concerning the prospects for an imminent return to Europe, and early EC membership became a central policy priority of the new CEEC governments. At this time the significance of the idea of rejoining Europe was very great. It denoted not only a desire for increased economic well-being, but provided a set of ideas and aspirations to fill the political and ideological vacuum created by the demise of the Soviet system."⁴⁷

With the end of the Cold War, many Central and Eastern Europeans believed that the situation regarding restrictions on the movement of people

46 Ibid. p. 244.

47 Charlotte Bretherton and John Vogler, *The European Union as a Global Actor*, London 1999, p. 144.

had taken a giant turn for the better. They regarded the end of communism with relief and believed that this new vision of a Europe “whole and free” would bring a complete freedom to travel. Although free movement is not the main reason for these countries’ wish to join the European Union, they expected to be granted this right upon accession.⁴⁸

It was also a time of considerable new instability in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in the Balkans, which gave more weight to the demands of the governments of Central and Eastern European countries that the European Union should do more to support the extremely difficult and painful process of transformation in the region. Yet this instability also reinforced fears that an early accession would run the risk of importing instability into the European Union.⁴⁹

Apart from the fear of importing instability there is also a second fear in Brussels regarding a possible massive influx immigration of workers into the Union. Taking into account the fact that almost 10 per cent of the working population in the European Union are unemployed, a migration of workers from Central and Eastern European countries would prove problematic for the European Union. Migration from the candidate states is often regarded as a dangerous potential source of job losses in the present member states. During the 1990s, there has been only very little migration from the candidate countries to the European Union. 19 million foreign citizens are living within the European Union. Less than 5 per cent of them originate from the candidate countries. However, this varies from country to country:

”Migration from the applicants has had a much greater impact on Austria than in any other EU member state. The number of people from Bulgaria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Romania employed in Austria totaled 43.300 in 1997 compared to 5.000 in 1981. The number of all foreigners legally employed in Austria doubled in the period from 1988 to 1997 from 151.000 to almost 300.000.”⁵⁰

48 http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/eur_dial/99i1a0s0.html.

49 Ibid, p. 146.

50 Ibid.

The growing number of illegal entries into the territory of the European Union exacerbates this problem. In Germany, between 25.000 and 28.000 illegal entries are discovered at the external borders of Germany year for year. Since 1995, almost 100.000 illegal entries have been reported.⁵¹

The border policies of the European Union

Following the latest enlargement round in 1995, the European Union now has almost 10.000 km of land frontier, and borders between member states account for some 60 per cent of this. Almost 10 per cent of the population in the European Union lives in border regions.⁵² In Schengen territory 326 million people from 15 countries have freedom of movement, which means that they can move freely within the internal borders of the Schengen territory. The question now arises as to what kind of a role the candidate countries, in particular in Southeastern Europe, play concerning the border question. Is it possible to integrate them into the process of Schengen?

First of all it is clearly defined in the Implementing Convention Article 140 that a preliminary condition for becoming a party to the Convention is membership of the European Union. Therefore, the accession of new members will create new potential signatories of the Schengen Agreement. With the Eastern enlargement the external borders of the European Union will expand to the East.⁵³ This will continue as the enlargement process proceeds. With the enlargement the EU territory will, thus, substantially increase. An internal market will be implemented within this border-less area.⁵⁴

However, the Schengen Implementing Convention will not immediately enter into force for the new members. They will have to improve and

51 Gerd Werle, Ein deutsch-französisches Pilotprojekt wird zur Erfolgsstory in Europa, in: Das Parlament, 12/2000.

52 Susan Baker (note 39), p. 22.

53 Liam O'Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson, Frontiers of sovereignty in the new Europe, in: Liam O' Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson (eds.), Borders, Nations and States, Aldershot, Brookefield 1996, p. 13.

54 <http://www.das-parlament.de/html/p-druckversion.cfm?ID=6015>.

intensify the cooperation in the fields of police and law. The Eastern border of Poland and of some other candidate countries will become the European Union's external border, which will have to satisfy the criteria of the Schengen Implementing Convention. It has to be the task of these countries to control their borders, to arrange for safety, and to develop and improve structures of cooperation. The European Union wants to protect itself against organized crime and illegal immigration at its borders. At the same time, no fortress-like borders should be established. Between border regions, communication and trade will have to be improved and cooperation promoted.⁵⁵

The fact that the external borders of the European Union will move eastwards with the enlargement taking place has motivated the Union to adapt itself to the new situation. The following two serve as examples. On the 29th of March 1991 the European Union and Poland signed the Agreement on readmission of persons in an irregular position. After the Cold War, Poland was becoming ever more of a transit country for clandestine migration towards the Schengen territory. The European Union and especially the Schengen contracting parties were very concerned about this situation. Therefore, this Agreement with Poland was a very important first step in a new direction. However, one main consequence of this Agreement was that the burden of migration was shifted towards the Eastern borders of the Schengen territory. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the Agreement with Poland places the heaviest burden on the Polish border authorities as the readmission obligation will in most cases be imposed on Poland.⁵⁶ This is also the reason why Poland is called the "frontier guard" of the Schengen territory:

"Nevertheless, Poland must take up its readmission responsibility towards any person who fails to meet the conditions for entry to the Schengen territory. An asylum seeker whose application for asylum has been rejected in the Schengen territory is after this rejection no longer an asylum seeker but a person who does not fulfill the entry conditions. Consequently, Poland will be obliged to

55 Ibid.

56 Kris Pollet (note 40), p. 227-228.

take this person (the former asylum seeker) back if he or she entered the Schengen territory through the Polish borders. In order to avoid this eventuality, Poland will most likely only allow those persons to cross the border who fulfill all the entry conditions.”⁵⁷

Other Central and East European countries can also decide to join the agreement on readmission of persons in an irregular position with the Schengen states. This is possible under Article 7 of the Schengen Agreement. In this way, an effective “cordon sanitaire” is established around the Schengen territory. Those countries who will sign such an agreement will then be held responsible for entries into the Schengen territory through its Eastern borders by persons who do not fulfill the cumulative Schengen conditions.⁵⁸

The second example concerning the European Union’s changing policy towards the countries in Central and Eastern Europe is the Visa Regulation number 539/2001. From 10th of April, 2001, Bulgarian citizens may enter the Schengen countries and stay up to 90 days during a six month period under the condition that they have sufficient means to support themselves during the stay and that they have not previously been deported and prohibited to re-enter the Schengen countries.⁵⁹ Bulgaria also acts as the frontier guard of the Schengen territory in the east. The European Union has not yet signed a readmission agreement with Bulgaria but due to the geographical position of Bulgaria it is only a matter of time until such an agreement is signed. As long as the negotiations with Turkey have not commenced, Bulgaria will have to play the role of the frontier guard. Bulgaria has a function comparable to Poland.

The Schengen countries invest considerable financial resources in the security of the external borders. That applies in particular to Germany and Austria bordering on Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary.⁶⁰

57 Ibid, p. 230.

58 Ibid, p. 229.

59 http://www.evropa.bg/en/press/pres_rel_en_2001.htm.

60 Gerd Werle (note 51).

Since the abolition of the internal borders within the European Union, Brussels has tried to introduce new programmes and policies to improve the economic situation of the Central and East European countries and in particular the border regions. Within this framework, the European Union first established the PHARE programme in 1989. Its original meaning lies in providing aid for reconstructing the economies of Poland and Hungary. Meanwhile, it extends to 13 Central and Eastern European countries (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia). For the period from 1995 to 1999, funding under the PHARE programme totaled roughly 6.7 billion Euro and covered 15 sectors. Amongst others these include: infrastructure (energy, transport, telecommunication), development of the private sector and assistance for business, education, training and research, environmental protection and nuclear safety, and agricultural restructuring. At the same time, PHARE is, besides ISPA and SAPARD, the main financial instrument of the pre-accession strategy for the ten Central and Eastern European countries that have applied for membership in the European Union. Since 1994, PHARE's tasks have been adapted to the priorities and needs of each Central and Eastern European country. The revamped programme, with a budget of over 10 billion Euro for the period from 2000 to 2006, now has two specific priorities, namely institutional construction and financing investments. Following the proposals put forward by the Commission in its Agenda 2000 communication in July 1997, new forms of pre-accession aid have been added to the programme. These are structural measures to bring the level of environmental protection and transport infrastructure development in the applicant countries to that of the European Union and aid to agriculture.⁶¹

Cross-border cooperation is another task of PHARE. In 1994 it was endowed with 150 million Euro, with 169 million Euros in 1995 and 180 million Euro being budgeted for the following years. The total for the

61 <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cig/g4000p.htm#p11>.

period from 1994 to 1999 was about 900 million Euro.⁶² The PHARE programme can be understood as trying to promote and improve cooperation, especially between the former socialist countries:

”The aim is to get regions to co-operate which for decades have been locked in a sullen historical antagonism, which found little expression during the years of official ‘socialist brotherhood’. A legacy of distrust and resentment has to give way to a genuine commitment to close cooperation.”⁶³

Within the framework of the PHARE programme, Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia are eligible for aid. The programme provides help in different fields such as:

- infrastructural improvements
- common waste management projects
- the promotion of tourism
- rural development measures
- health cooperation
- support for media disseminating cross-border information.⁶⁴

Another programme of the European Union in particular concerning the border regions is the INTERREG programme. INTERREG is especially designed to end isolation and to develop cross-border cooperation. However, it aims to do this not only within the European Union but also across its external borders. The INTERREG programmes commenced in 1990 with Interreg I between 1990 and 1994. The second programme was launched in 1994 and ran until 1999. The current INTERREG programme, INTERREG III, started in 2000 and will run until 2006. The main aim of INTERREG is to develop cross-border cooperation at both the internal and

62 Thomas Klau, Commission regional programmes help promote cross-border cooperation and ease nationalist tensions, in: European Dialogue, January-February 1997, issue 1 Cooperation between regions.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

the external borders of the European Union.⁶⁵ INTERREG I started in July 1990 with four aims defined by the Commission:

- “helping areas on the Community’s external and internal borders to overcome development problems linked to their remoteness from the centers of national economic activity
- encourage the development of cross-border cooperation networks
- help the Community’s border areas with non-member states adjust to their role as border regions of the single market
- co-operate with non-member countries on the EU’s external border.”⁶⁶

The Commission itself has adequately described the challenge ahead:

”The overall aim of the Interreg initiatives has been, and remains, that national borders should not be a barrier to the balanced development and integration of the European territory. The isolation of border areas has been of a double nature: on the one hand, the presence of borders cuts off border communities from each other economically, socially and culturally and hinders the coherent management of eco-systems; on the other, border areas have often been neglected under national policy, with the result that their economies have tended to become peripheral within national boundaries. The single market and EMU are strong catalysts for changing this situation. Nevertheless, the scope for strengthening cooperation to the mutual advantage of border areas throughout the Community remains enormous. The challenge is all the greater when the future enlargement of the Community is considered, as this will increase the number of its internal borders and, progressively, shift the Community’s external borders eastwards.”⁶⁷

In this framework, the INTERREG III programme considers its task to be the strengthening of economic and social cohesion in the Community by promoting cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation as well as balanced development of the European Union territory. INTERREG III

65 Anthony Anderson, Brussels recognizes power of Europe’s regions, in: European Dialogue, July-August 1996, issue 4: Regional development; Caroline Smrstik, Germany’s Länder hold onto traditional regional links, in: European Dialogue, July-August 1996, issue 4: Regional development.

66 Thomas Klau (note 78).

67 http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/lif/dat/2000/en_300Y0523_01.html.

pays attention to the borders and border areas between member states and between the European Union and third countries. Attention is focused on:

- the external borders of the European Union, in particular with respect to enlargement,
- cooperation concerning the outermost regions of the European Union,
- cooperation to further the peace process begun in the Balkans,
- cooperation concerning insular regions.⁶⁸

Regarding the primary topics of Interreg III we can discern the following:

- promoting urban, rural and coastal development,
- encouraging entrepreneurship and the development of small firms and local employment initiatives,
- promoting the integration of the labor market and social inclusion,
- sharing human resources and facilities of research, technological development, education, culture, communications and health to increase productivity and help create sustainable jobs,
- encouraging the protection of the environment, local and global, increasing energy efficiency and promoting renewable sources of energy,
- improving transport, information and communication networks and services as well as water and energy systems,
- developing cooperation in the legal and administrative spheres to promote economic development and social cohesion,
- increasing human and institutional potential for cross-border cooperation to promote economic development and social cohesion.⁶⁹

68 Ibid.

69 Ibid.

Since 1989, various cross-border regions have been developed with the help of cross-border projects. The Central and East European countries have not put so much effort into the question of border management and control. These countries obviously have more pressing matters to deal with.⁷⁰ Continuously, the EU is pressing the candidate countries to do more in this respect.

Especially within PHARE and INTERREG, many cross-border cooperations have been created, such as between Bulgaria and Greece, the Czech Republic and Germany, the Czech Republic and Austria, Hungary and Austria, Poland and Germany, Slovakia and Austria, Slovenia and Italy, and Slovenia and Austria. Regarding the funds for these projects, one should point out that all the projects are co-financed by the relevant bordering state, their contribution being met by the European Union's PHAND cross-border cooperation fund.⁷¹

In this respect, Austria provides a good example. When Austria joined the European Union in 1995 it did so with a unique set of geographical boundaries. Austria shares borders with five non-European Union countries, four of those in Central Europe (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia). Therefore, Austria is also called the gateway to the West.⁷² Within the cross-border projects of Austria, 40 per cent of aid will be spent on promoting economic cooperation, 31 per cent on developing new or existing infrastructure and the remainder on labor training and conservation.

Central and East European countries having common borders with European Union member countries profit from the aim of the EU member states concerning their external borders, which is to assist the common border areas adjust to European Union status. With the funds of the European Union and the relevant bordering state, Central and East European countries have the opportunity to modernize their borders and to

70 http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/eur_dial/99i1a0s0.html

71 Julius Strauss, Austria develops its regional ties, in: European Dialogue, July-August 1996, issue 4: Regional development.

72 Ibid.

bring them up to European standard. The German government, for instance, provided only up to 1999 40 million Euro to the Polish police and 30 million Euro to the Czech police to improve border control.⁷³ Countries bordering the European Union were confronted with problems such as illegal migration and asylum:

”They have to face the fact that many asylum-seekers are on their way to West European states and see Central Europe as a transit region. Central European states are pressured by their EU counterparts – especially those EU states which receive the majority of refugees such as Germany, the United Kingdom but also neighboring states such as Austria – to control migration and implement the very same restrictive measures that have been applied in Western Europe.”⁷⁴

The perception of borders in Southeastern Europe

While the importance of borders in Western Europe has declined and most of the borders within the European Union have been abolished, the situation in South-Eastern Europe is the opposite. Rudolf Joo, a leader of the Hungarian opposition remarks that: ”While borders are coming down throughout Western Europe, here they’re going up.”⁷⁵ The perception of borders in Southeastern Europe is not the same as in Western Europe. The ones in Western Europe lost their controlling function. Especially within the Schengen territory the abolition of internal border controls marks a significant acknowledgement of the weakening of infrastructural power of the nation state.⁷⁶ However, in Southeastern Europe the situation is quite different. In this region, nationalism plays a very important role, particularly between neighboring countries. Borders in Southeastern Europe signify that this country takes great pride in owning this territory. Borders in this region induce a feeling of nationalism, especially in the

73 Pavel Tychtl, Migration: Shifting Borders, Shifting Roles, in: Central Europe Review-Central and Eastern Europe: Shifting Roles and Borders, Vol. 1, No. 19, 1 November 1999.

74 Ibid.

75 Robert Kaplan, Europe’s Third World, *The Atlantic Monthly*, July 1989.

76 Liam O’ Dowd and Thomas M. Wilson (note 68), p. 11.

border areas. Andrew Purvis, a journalist writing for “Time” magazine who traveled through Southeastern Europe remarked:

”In conversations along the way I found that abstractions about a new borderless Europe seemed remote, while nationalism was alive and well – especially in the frontier areas where I spent most of my time.”⁷⁷

The conflicts and wars in Southeastern Europe of centuries past are the reason that in this region hate and distrust are feelings which are still alive in the 21st century. The Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 also had a significant impact on the countries involved due to the resulting post-war border changes. In 1912, Bulgaria, Greece, Montenegro and Serbia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and stripped it of most of its remaining European possessions. The second Balkan War in 1913 was also fought over national boundaries. Bulgaria attacked Serbia and Greece, leading to an invasion and partial dismemberment of Bulgaria by its former Balkan allies and Turkey.⁷⁸

Nowadays there are still lingering territorial and border issues which hinder reconciliation.⁷⁹ First of all there is the “Croatian question”. This is focused on the relation of Croatia to the Croats living in Bosnia and Herzegovina. During the Franjo Tudjman government (1990-1999), the support of the Croats living in Bosnia and Herzegovina was one of the main concerns of Zagreb. In fact, Tudjman’s policy came down to the attempted binding to the motherland of the parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina dominated by Croats, based on historical claims. However, after Tudjman’s death in December 1999, the new President Stjepan Mesic and the new Prime Minister Ivica Racan have significantly reduced the support to Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They began concentrating on the stabilization of the neighboring country.

The second question is the Bosnian one, which is concerned with the actual statehood (as opposed to formal) of Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, it

77 <http://www.time.com/time/europe/specials/ff/trip5/index.html>.

78 Robert Kaplan (note 93).

79 For the following see Magarditsch Hatschikjan, Die ”großen Fragen” in Südosteuropa, *Das Parlament*, Nr.13-14/2001.

is a fact that many Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Serbs are not interested in a functioning statehood. Rather, they are interested in special relations with their actual titular states. Regardless of the Dayton Agreement, Bosnia and Herzegovina is thrice divided according to multiple criteria including the army and the monetary system. A three-part division of the country is discussed with increasing frequency. It is impossible to ascertain how the territorial future of Bosnia and Herzegovina will develop but it is clear that three nations and three states are involved in this process.

The third question concerns the “Serbia question”. Historically, many Serbs were interested since the 19th century in uniting the scattered Serb settlement areas all over the “western Balkans”. These areas are located in Banat, in the Batshka, in Sylvania, Slavonia, in the Krajina, in Bosnia and Montenegro. Slobodan Milošević did not do everything to reach this aim of uniting the Serbs outside of Serbia under one territorial roof. The new leadership in Belgrade has not unambiguously up to now distanced itself from these aspirations and the legacy of the past decade. During the 1990s, however, the ethnostructural conditions experienced a fundamental shift. The number of Serbs outside of Serbia dropped considerably. Almost 570.000 refugees came to Serbia from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo. No matter how Serbia will continue its policy towards neighboring countries, many nations and their people will feel the repercussions.

The fourth question is focused on Montenegro. The arguments around the independence of Montenegro are primarily concerned with its relation to the Serbs and Serbia. Beyond that, two ethnic groups in Montenegro are also involved in this question, namely the Albanians, making up 6.6 per cent of the population in 1991, and the Muslims, representing 14.6 per cent of the population at the same time. These two ethnic groups partly live in the Sandzak Novi Pazar, which is divided between Serbia and Montenegro. Therefore, the future status of Montenegro touches the interests of Serbia, Albania and also Macedonia.

The fifth question in this region is the perennial “Macedonian question”. With respect to this a thorough modification occurred in the 1990s. After

2001, it is obvious that the stability of the Republic of Macedonia is endangered not primarily by external but by internal factors. In Macedonia, there is a problematic relationship between Slavonic and Albanian Macedonians (between 25 and 30 per cent of the population). In particular the developments in Kosovo have exacerbated the ethnic division in Macedonian society.

The Macedonian question is, however, closely connected with the “Albanian question”. Similarly, as in the case of the Serbs, many Albanians live outside of Albania. Most of them live in Kosovo, in the West and Northwest of Macedonia, in the South of Montenegro, and in the Northwest of Greece. Governing representatives avoid speaking of a unification of all settlement areas into a state but aspirations once in a while surface. The relationship between Albania and the Albanians living outside the borders has improved, especially after the change of the regime in Serbia. It is obvious that Serbia, Macedonia and Montenegro will be influenced by future developments of the Albanian question, also concerning the future status of Kosovo.⁸⁰

None of the above mentioned territorial issues can be solved to the complete satisfaction of all involved. Each solution completely in favor of one side would cause substantial loss and disadvantage to several other groups and states. In this respect, it is not important to solve just one question but to find a cooperative solution between the countries involved. There are three options to handle these questions, namely sovereignty, self-determination and a diplomacy that is interested in stable structures. Sovereignty and self-determination will have incalculable and, in the long run, uncontrollable conflicts as their consequence. Therefore, the third option seems most likely to adequately meet the challenges of this region.

Within this third option we again have three aspects. First we have the internal bracket. This is a solution between the Balkan countries, namely some kind of a “Balkan Union” with a cooperative foreign policy, a

80 Ibid. Klaus Hemmo, *Warum sie Feinde wurden. Völkerhaß vom Balkan bis zum Nahen Osten*. Düsseldorf 2001, p. 144-167.

common market, a coordinated external trade policy and a consulted minority policy. The second aspect is the external bracket. Its foundation is supplied by the European Union and its firmness guarantees the adequate integration of the whole region into the European Union. The third aspect is a connection of the internal and external brackets, namely a cooperation between the Balkan countries with the support of the European Union. It seems that the third aspect is the most likely to bring stability to the region.⁸¹ If economic recovery and the prospect of integration into the European Union do not materialize in the near future, an even stronger turn to nationalism will be anything but surprising. We have to face the fact that the words “enemy” and “nationalism” are still alive in Southeastern Europe.⁸²

Comparing this situation with that of the neighboring countries in the European Union, we have to say that the countries in the European Union have left feelings such as hate, distrust and hostility behind themselves. Since the Second World War, the neighboring countries in Europe peacefully live together in the European Union, rather than in hostility, in trust, rather than distrust, in friendship, rather than hate. Perhaps we can take the end of the Cold War to be a new start in Southeastern Europe for better relations between neighboring countries.

Now, some examples of borders and neighboring countries in Southeastern Europe might illuminate the scope of the challenges as well as the progress achieved. Romania and Hungary are two countries in this region belonging together for various reasons. Specifically, both of them are sharing a common border, both of them had to live under a socialist regime, and both of them are negotiating with the European Union on membership. However, there are also some differences. The Hungarians are Catholic whereas the Romanians are Orthodox. This difference seems to be very important.

81 Ibid.

82 <http://www.time.com/time/europe/specials/ff/trip5/index.html>.

”George Konrad ... suggests that the old fault line dividing East and West is changing in character: it now divides the East and the West not of the Cold War but of Byzantium and Rome – Orthodox Serbs and Catholic Croats, of Orthodox Romanians and Catholic Hungarians.”⁸³

Today, almost 2 million ethnic Hungarians live in Romania. These people are occupied with cross-border trade, exporting cheap Romanian goods to Hungary. Many of them engage in this trade illegally and they additionally find illegal employment in Hungary where the average wage is much higher.⁸⁴ Zsuzsa Bereschi, foreign affairs adviser to the president of the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in Romania, said: ”There are roughly 2 million ethnic Hungarians in Romania – all of them have ties to the motherland and many depend on seasonal work in Hungary.”⁸⁵ As Hungary will probably join the European Union ahead of Romania, this fact creates considerable anxiety, concerning the free movement of people. At present, Romanian citizens (including ethnic Hungarians living in Romania) are able to travel to Hungary without a visa for up to 30 days. Hungary is interested in a visa free regime for all Romanians. Nevertheless, under pressure from the European Union, Hungary has to impose visas and control illegal migration at her borders. The Hungarian government has decided to grant various privileges as well as financial and material help to ethnic Hungarians living abroad. According to a survey carried out by Budapest’s Tarki Social Research Center, 56 per cent of Hungarians stated that ethnic Hungarian children should receive free state education, 53 per cent affirmed that ethnic Hungarians should be granted health benefits and services, and 32 per cent hold the opinion that ethnic Hungarians should be able to settle in Hungary without any restrictions.⁸⁶ Jonathan Stein, a Prague-based political analyst, points out:

”Imagine that Hungary receives aid from Brussels to build hospitalsThe country’s health care system improves dramatically and the government says, ‘We are willing to share but only with our ethnic Hungarian neighbors, not

83 Robert Kaplan (note 93).

84 <http://www.time.com/time/europe/specials/ff/trip5/eumembership2.html>.

85 Ibid.

86 Ibid.

with our Slovak or Romanian neighbors.’ That can cause real problems ... The EU will say, ‘You can’t favor one group of Romanian citizens over another.’⁸⁷

The ethnic and religious diversity between Hungarians and Romanians, which dates back to the break-up of the Habsburg Empire, threatens the relationship between Hungary and Romania. The Hungarian Rudolph Joo of the opposition group “Democratic Forum” has gone as far as proclaiming: “If there are to be pogroms in Romania, this time they will be against the Hungarians rather than the Jews.”⁸⁸

Nevertheless, Hungary is interested in cross-border cooperation with its neighboring countries due to the fact that disparities will cause turbulence and worse. However, in the final analysis Hungary’s relationship with its neighboring countries can be positively evaluated. Michael Lake, ambassador and head of the delegation of the European Commission in Hungary, holds the opinion that the region will gradually become more integrated, just as it was under the Austro-Hungarian Empire up until 1918.⁸⁹ This will allay some of the problems.

The second example is Poland and its borders to the East. Like Hungary, Poland also has a large diaspora in neighboring countries. More than 600.000 ethnic Poles live in Belarus and Ukraine and 300.000 Belorussians and Ukrainians live in Poland. European Union enlargement will transform Russia, Ukraine, the Caucasus and the Middle East into immediate neighbors of the EU. With respect to this, Poland plays an important role for the European Union neighborhood policy. The ties between Poland, Ukraine, and Lithuania are centuries old and minorities in border regions have further strengthened these links.⁹⁰ The fact that a large number of ethnic Poles live in Belarus and Ukraine, while at the same time Belorussians and Ukrainians live in Poland, creates a problem for Poland’s border policy. People living in Ukraine and Belarus make money bringing

87 Ibid.

88 Robert Kaplan (note 93).

89 <http://www.time.com/time/europe/specials/ff/trip5/eumembership2.html>.

cheap alcohol and tobacco into Poland, where they buy consumer goods such as textiles, detergent and cosmetics to take home. Therefore, Poland is of the opinion that it is important for the European Union to remain open to countries like Ukraine, even though they have practically no prospect of membership in the foreseeable future. Witold Orłowski, director of the Independent Center for Economic Studies in Lodz, argues:

”Ukraine is important not because we believe that the welfare of Poland depends on trade with Ukraine ... But if Ukrainians feel they are denied access to the rich part of Europe, it may have a negative impact on their development. If we want Ukrainians to see the market economy and democracy, it’s better to let them visit and not create obstacles.”⁹¹

The third example is Slovenia and its border policy. Slovenia shares borders with two European Union countries, namely Austria and Italy, as well as Hungary and Croatia. In today’s Slovenia, one can find two different border policies. First there are the borders to Western and Central Europe, which are open. On the other side, we have the border to Croatia, which is just being fortified. On the one hand, free trade agreements with the Visegrad countries are concluded, while on the other hand new barriers are cropping up in trade with Croatia.⁹² The new border agreement between Slovenia and Croatia, pending ratification, might be able to resolve many of the problems arising.

In addition, in Austria, Italy, and Hungary there are Slovenian minorities, which are undergoing rapid assimilation. This was especially the case when the borders were closed. However, with their opening, the minorities acquired a new role, namely that of a mediating link between two language areas. Expanding cross-border trade has increased the need for German-Slovene and Italian-Slovene communication. Thus, the opening of the

90 Speech by Romano Prodi President of the European Commission ”Poland and Europe: building on the past, shaping the future”, Catholic University of Lublin Poland, 9 March 2001.

91 Ibid.

92 Zdravko Mlinar, *New states and borders: Slovenia between the Balkans and the European Union*, in: Liam O’Dowd/Thomas M. Wilson (eds.), *Borders, Nations and States*. Aldershot, Brookfield 1996, p. 139.

borders has resulted in the strengthening of the roles of minority languages.⁹³ Another aspect is that the business interests incline to not just tolerate but even learn the language of neighbors.

Although the Slovenes have always nursed a fear of dominating influences from abroad, they opened their borders. This signifies changing Slovenian attitudes because the opening of borders could lead to a loss of identity, especially in border areas. In this respect, the Slovenian attitude concerning borders is not too dissimilar from the European Union's. Public opinion surveys made in Slovenia between 1991 and 1994 clearly showed a trend of declining acceptability of immigrants from former Yugoslav republics.⁹⁴ Furthermore, Slovenians hold the opinion that mass immigration will be accompanied by probable negative effects:

- the crime rate will increase greatly (85 per cent of the respondents)
- conflicts between native born and immigrants will increase (83 percent)
- unemployment of native residents will worsen (83 per cent)
- worsening of housing situation (availability, price) (82 per cent)
- wages, working conditions will worsen (76 per cent)
- streets and railway stations will be dirty (65 per cent)
- gradually it will not feel like home (46 per cent)
- Slovene language will gradually be ousted (39 per cent).⁹⁵

No difference is found when comparing the attitudes of Slovenians with those of European Union inhabitants concerning immigrants. The Slovenians share the same values and threats that the Europeans do. In this way, they argue, Slovenia belongs to Central Europe by virtue of both its geographical location as well as its cultural traditions.⁹⁶

93 Ibid, p. 141.

94 Ibid, p. 145.

95 Ibid, p. 146.

96 Ibid, p. 140.

A fourth and last example is the border between Greece and Turkey. Nowadays, we can speak of a friendly relationship between Athens and Ankara but throughout history this was not always the case. Turkey and Greece are two neighbors with multiple historical problems. These problems have not been solved yet but a very important dialogue between the old enemies started at the end of the 1990s. Through this dialogue many problems could be solved. Perhaps this does not include the political ones, but rather the problems between the Greek and the Turkish population. Today, the relationship is improving and the words “enemy” and “hate” have all but disappeared from everyday language. Nevertheless, the borders between Turkey and Greece are for both countries the most important ones.

The reasons for this state of affairs between the two countries are historical, with the past wars and conflicts being particularly salient.⁹⁷ The former US Minister of Foreign Affairs Henry Kissinger described the Turkish-Greek relationship as based on one of the oldest, historical, hereditary enmities.⁹⁸ The borders between the two countries were always prepared for a possible conflict between Athens and Ankara. Therefore, it was not surprising to see an accumulation of soldiers on the borders. Particularly, when first signs of a conflict made themselves felt, troops were immediately stationed on both sides of the boundary. In the past, this situation occurred frequently. ”Not so long ago, these boundary waters and a few rocky outcroppings to the north brought NATO members Greece and Turkey to the brink of war.”⁹⁹ Although we can now speak of a good relationship between Greece and Turkey, it is a fact that none of the political controversies between the two countries have been solved. The Cyprus problem, for instance, is still on the agenda of both countries:

”Manned permanently by Turkish troops on one side, Greek Cypriot troops on the other, and U.N. peacekeepers in between, it is one of the most impenetrable boundaries on earth. Signs erected by nationalists and the Turkish military keep the memory of war alive. At the nearby Museum of Barbarism, gruesome

97 Klaus Hemmo (note 80), pp. 101-119.

98 Ibid, p. 102.

99 <http://www.time.com/time/europe/specials/ff/trip5/index.html>.

black-and-white photographs of mutilated children and a bathtub marked with the 37-year-old blood and brain tissue of a young family murdered by Greek insurgents memorialize Greek terror.”¹⁰⁰

Greeks and Turks experience the same feelings of excitement and fear when crossing the border to the neighboring country. Traveling from Greece to Turkey and vice versa causes an unconscious fear. However, this fear will disappear in future because increasing numbers of Greeks come to Turkey and vice versa. Although the dialogue between Greeks and Turks is very important, it is just as important to solve the political problems between Greece and Turkey due to the fact that one can never know how long this period of relaxation will last. It is especially the Cyprus problem, which calls for a solution because the border on this island proves very problematic. As one outside visitor described the odd travel conditions:

”I took the only route to southern Cyprus: I caught the Cyprus Turkish Airlines flight to Istanbul, spent the night, drove back to the airport for the early morning Olympic Airlines flight to Athens and just barely made my connection to Larnaca, in southern Cyprus, where I hailed a cab back to the green line in Nikosia Forty hours and 2.400 km later, I was 200 m from where I started.”¹⁰¹

All the four examples of borders in Southeastern Europe have shown that the borders in this region are charged with problems. Some of these will be solved when the countries concerned become members of the European Union but other border problems will continue. Therefore, it is important to improve cross-border cooperation in various fields. Another important step in this respect is the cooperation between the countries of Southeastern Europe themselves. Such cooperation commenced at the end of the 1990s with various projects, such as programs supporting the fight against organized crime, building infrastructural projects, developing traffic and

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid.

communication passages, pipelines and gas lines, as well as introducing confidence and security building measures.¹⁰²

Regional cooperation between the countries of Southeastern Europe has just started. In this region, the opinion prevails that while regional cooperation is always desirable it should not be politically institutionalized. Some argue that the West wishes to structure Balkan cooperation as an alternative to EU entry. Therefore, the Balkan countries regard Balkan cooperation not as an end in itself but as a necessary intermediate step on the way into the European Union.¹⁰³ In this context, all regional initiatives which started after 1989/1990 had the aim of preparing their members for integration into the European Union. Various initiatives including countries of Southeastern Europe have been started, such as:

- the Central European Initiative (1989)
- the Central European Free Trade Area (1991)
- the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (1992)
- the Balladur Pact (1993)
- the Royaumont Process (1995)
- the Regional Approach of the EU (1995)
- the Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (1996)
- the Southeast European Cooperation Process (1996)
- the Southeast European Defense Ministerials including the Multinational Peace Force in Southeastern Europe (1997)
- the Stability Pact and the Stabilization and Association Process of the EU (1999).

Although cooperation in Southeastern Europe seems impressive, there are only few concrete results in the region. The reasons are not only diverging

102 Marie-Janine Calic, Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, in: Magarditsch Hatschikjan/Stefan Troebst (eds.), Südosteuropa. Ein Handbuch. Gesellschaft, Politik, Wirtschaft, Kultur, München 1999, p. 286.

103 Ibid.

national interests, rivalries, and conflicts still existing in this region. In addition, there is the competitive behavior of external actors, frequently motivated by economic self-interest, who urge an improvement of Southeast European cooperation.¹⁰⁴ We can see that at the beginning of the 21st century the domestic and intergovernmental instabilities in the region have still not been eliminated. Large ethno-political conflicts and questions remain virulent around Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as in Kosovo, where the “Albanian question” has serious implications for the whole geopolitical architecture in the Southern Balkans.

Conclusion

The European borders, especially those in the European Union, are still of great importance, in all respects. Apart from the United Kingdom and Ireland, every member of the European Union has joined the Schengen agreement. With the Eastern enlargement the European Union will get new neighbors with Russia, Ukraine, in the Caucasus and the Middle East. This enlargement will present the European Union with a multitude of challenges, especially concerning its border policy. Within this context, the European Union has initiated border programmes due to the fact that the European Union has an interest in efficient, safe, and modern border controls, which meet the stringent Schengen standards in terms of technical equipment, procedures and man power.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, the European Union recognizes the importance of cross-border cooperation and therefore promotes a multitude of projects in Southeastern Europe. One main policy goal of Brussels regards the political stability and economic growth of the whole continent. Therefore, the new borders of the European Union must not and will not be a new dividing line, which restricts prosperity and stability to the EU side. Romano Prodi describes the European Union’s policy as follows:

104 Ibid, p. 288.

105 Speech by Romano Prodi (note 5).

”We will not let a new ‘iron curtain‘ be built between the Union and its neighbors ... In future, our neighborhood policy should be directed at creating a single strategic partnership with all the regions on our new borders ... For the first time in many centuries we have the opportunity to unite Europe on the basis of shared ideals and common goals.”¹⁰⁶

Both the European Union and the candidate countries express an interest in a new Europe, a Europe without borders. However, a Europe without borders can only be successful on the condition that all members and candidates of the European Union accept the EU’s border standards. The candidate countries still have a long way to go before they reach the standards of the Schengen Agreement.

106 Ibid.

Didactical questions

The topic of borders has become highly controversial in Europe following the demise of communism. The trends are contradicting and divergent, the views on the future significance of borders as well.

Thus, first of all we have to deal with the question concerning the importance of borders in Europe and their functions. Do borders in Europe separate people from each other or do they connect them? What is the perception of borders in Southeastern Europe? If there indeed is a difference in the perceptions between Western and Southeastern Europe. What exactly is the difference? Where does it come from and what can be done to overcome these differences?

During the Cold War an “ideological border” between the two blocs existed. Furthermore, during this period borders in Europe were highly stable. In contrast, the period following 1989 was marked by multiple transformations of European borders. With respect to this, it might be useful to consider the salience and function of ideological boundaries.

Analysing the function of borders, we will be confronted with their religious, cultural, economic and political functions. Particularly the religious function of borders has achieved new significance nowadays. Do borders in this century play an important role between Islam and Christianity as well as between Roman-Catholic and Orthodox Christians? Throughout history borders played a very important role between Islam and Christianity. It seems likely that we will encounter the same situation in future. However, time will show in which direction the relationship between Islam and Christianity will develop.

The European Union has both internal and external borders. What is their future? Especially the external borders will cause many headaches for the European Union. What are the challenges? What can be done to overcome them? It is a fact that in the near future the countries in Southeastern Europe will move closer to the external borders of the European Union. Which implications can be foreseen?

Another important issue is the Schengen Agreement. Does the agreement simplify the border questions? Additionally, is the Schengen Agreement likely to be a good solution for all the future members of the European Union? Will it help to find the right answers to the questions concerning borders? Will it prove to be feasible to integrate all of the candidate countries into the Schengen structure?

It is a fact that the perception of borders in Southeastern Europe is not the same as in Western Europe. In Western Europe, boundaries between the countries are decreasing in importance.. For many people, borders have lost their traditional functions. However, in Southeastern Europe borders are highly salient for each single nation. In this region they still often serve rather nationalistic purposes. Why did the borders in Southeastern Europe not lose significance as in Western Europe? Is it possible to learn from the experience of Western Europe with respect to national boundaries?

There is no doubt that the countries in South-Eastern Europe have to live with many conflicts. Therefore, it has to be the most important aim to reduce the conflicts between the countries in this region. With respect to this, we have to ask ourselves. Why are there so many conflicts in this region? What are the reasons for the conflicts in this century? It is high time that we find answers to those questions. Should it not prove possible to find adequate answers it will be difficult to speak about dialogue and cooperation. What can be done to tackle the problems that are responsible for these conflicts? What can especially be done to increase the level of cooperation between the countries in this region further? What can the young generation in those countries do to initiate a dialogue for better understanding and a better perception of each other?

Literature for further reading

Alan Mayhew, *Recreating Europe. The European Union's Policy towards Central and Eastern Europe*, Cambridge 1998.

Franz-Lothar Altmann/Wladimir Andreff/G.Fink, *The future expansion of the European Union in central Europe*, IEF Working Paper, No. 8, Vienna 1996.

Franz-Lothar Altmann, *The Accession of the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe into the European Union: Problems and Perspectives*, in: Werner Weidenfeld (ed.), *Central and Eastern Europe on the Way into the European Union*, Gütersloh 1996.

Malcom Anderson (ed.), *Frontier regions in Western Europe*, London 1982.

Malcom Anderson, *The political problems of frontier regions*, *West European Politics*, 5 (4), 1982, pp. 1 – 17.

J. Black, *Boundaries and conflict. International relations in ancient regime Europe*, in: Carl Grundy-Warr (ed.), *Eurasia. World Boundaries*, vol. 3, London/New York 1994, pp. 19 – 54.

A. Butt Phillip, *European border controls: who needs them?* *Public Policy and Administration*, 6 (2), 1991, pp. 35 – 54.

Joseph H. Carens, *Aliens and citizens: the case for open borders*, in: Will Kymlicka (ed.), *The rights of minority cultures*, Oxford 1995.

Commission of the European Communities, *The Elimination of Frontier Controls*, December 1990.

Russell King, *Migration and the Single Market for Labour: An Issue in Regional Development*, in: Mark Blacksell and Allan M. Williams (eds.), *The European Challenge*, New York 1994, pp. 218 – 241.

Marek Koter, Transborder 'Euroregions' round Polish border zones as an example of new form of political coexistence, in: Werner Galusser/Matthias Bürgin/Walter Leimgruber (eds.), *Political boundaries and coexistence*, Bern 1994, pp. 77 – 87.

O. J. Martinez, The dynamics of border interaction. New approaches to border analysis, in: Clive H. Schofield (ed.), *Global Boundaries. World Boundaries*, Vol. 1, London/New York 1994, pp. 1 – 15.

Peter Nijkamp, Border regions and infrastructure networks in the European integration process, in: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 11, 1993, pp. 431 – 446.

Liam O'Dowd/John Corrigan/T. Moore, Borders, national sovereignty and European integration, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 19 (2) 1995, pp. 272 – 285.

W. H. Roobol, The shaping of Europe, in: J. Th. Leerssen and M. van Montfrans (eds.), *Borders and territories*, Yearbook of European Studies 6, Amsterdam/Atlanta 1993, pp. 15 – 33.

R. S. Stoddard, Frontiers, Borders and Border Segmentation: Toward a Conceptual Clarification, *Journal of Borderland Studies*, 6, 1991, pp. 1 – 22.

Raimondo Strassoldo, Frontier regions: Future collaboration or conflict? *West European Politics*, 5 (4), 1982, pp. 123 – 135.

Assist. Prof. Dr. M. Nail Alkan, Director of the European Union Research Centre of Ankara. He studied Political Science in Bonn. Dr. Alkan has been working as an academic at Ankara University, Faculty of Political Science, Department of International Relations since 1994 and as an academic at the Ankara University European Union Research Centre since 1997. Dr. Alkan was appointed Director of the European Union Research Centre in 2000. In April 2002, he was appointed Erasmus Coordinator of the Turkish National Agency. He was published on Turkey-EU and on Turkish-German relations, on the image of nations in media and on the foreign policy of Germany.