

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 20 No. 2
Fall 2005

Special Issue
*Borders for a New Europe:
Between History and New
Challenges*

Volume 20 No. 2

Journal of
Borderlands
Studies

Fall 2005

Borderlands

Journal of Borderlands Studies

ISSN: 0886-5655

Editors

J. Michael Patrick

Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and
Enterprise Development
Laredo, Texas

Henk van Houtum

and

Martin van der Velde

Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
The Netherlands

Production Editor: Baldomero G. García, Jr. (Texas A&M International University)

Assistant to the Production Editor: Jose Molina, Jr. (Texas A&M International University)

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Volume 20 • No. 2 • Fall 2005

Contents

Borders for a New Europe: Between History and New Challenges Ed Williams and Martin van der Velde	1
New Departures on the EU-Russian Border? Assessing Discourses and Policy Practices Vadim Kononenko	13
A Vision of a Twin City: Exploring the Only Case of Adjacent Urban Settlements at the Finnish-Russian Border Heikki Eskelinen and Juha Kotilainen	31
Bridge or Iron Curtain? Local Hungarian and Ukrainian Perceptions of a New European Union Border Istvan Balcsok, Laszlo Dancs and Gabor Koncz	47
A Border Regions Typology in the Enlarged European Union Lefteris Topaloglou, Dimitris Kallioras, Panos Manetos and George Petrakos	67
Bordering Labor Migration from New EU Member States: Socio- Spatial Exclusion and the 'Orderly' Geometrics of Migration Forecasts Roos Pijpers	91
To Be or Not To Be a Part of Europe: Appropriations of the Symbolic Borders of Europe in Slovenia Sabina Mihelj	109
Instructions for Authors	129

Editorial and Advisory Boards

Editorial Board

C. Richard Bath
The University of Texas at El Paso

James Peach
New Mexico State University

Gary S. Elbow
Texas Tech University

James Pick
University of Redlands

Niles Hansen
The University of Texas at Austin

Harry Polkinhom
San Diego State University

David Lorey
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

Refugio Rochin
The Smithsonian Institution

Oscar J. Martinez
The University of Arizona

Ellwyn R. Stoddard
The University of Texas at El Paso

Stephen Mumme
Colorado State University

Randy Willoughby
University of San Diego

International Advisory Board

Donald Alper
Center for Canadian-American Studies
Western Washington University

Pertti Joenniemi
Copenhagen Peace Research Institute
Denmark

Anthony I. Asiwaju
University of Lagos
Nigeria

James Scott
Institute for Regional and Structural Studies
Germany

Jorge Carrillo
El Colegio de la Frontera Norte–Tijuana
Mexico

Edgar Ortiz Calisto
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Mexico

Carl Grundy-Warr
National University of Singapore
Singapore

Sidney Weintraub
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Washington, D.C.

Board of Directors and Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies

Board of Directors

Terms for 2002-2005

Jorge Eduardo Mendoza, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana, México

Thomas Fullerton, Jr., University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas

Tamar Diana Wilson, University of Missouri-St. Louis, San José del Cabo, México

Terms for 2003-2006

Guillermo Alvarez de la Torre, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexicali, México

Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

Olivier T. Kramsch, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Terms for 2004-2007

Sergio Peña Medina, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, Texas

Kimberly Collins, San Deigo State University-Imperial Valley, Calexico, California

Henk van Houtum, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies (2005-2006)

President: Irasema Coronado
University of Texas at El Paso

President Elect: Christopher Brown
New Mexico State University

Executive Secretary: Vacant

Immediate Past President: David Stea
Southwest Texas State University

For a current listing of ABS Board of Directors and Officers, go to:

www.absborderlands.org

Journal of Borderlands Studies

Submission of Manuscripts

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* (JBS) is the primary publication of the Association for Borderlands Studies. Published semi-annually, it has for more than a decade and a half distinguished itself as a leading forum for borderlands research. The JBS is widely consulted by educators, practitioners, policy-makers, and researchers.

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* welcomes manuscript submissions from all social science, humanities, and business disciplines focusing on borderlands issues. The border emphasis is global. Work from any discipline that illuminates border problems, characteristics, issues, and realities in any part of the world is acceptable for manuscript review. **It is important that the manuscript deals in a substantive way with the border-related aspect of the topic.** Manuscripts should not just be the results of a study in a region near a border without significant consideration of border or trans-border influences and characteristics.

Manuscripts are blind reviewed by at least two qualified readers.

Manuscripts or inquiries should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

or

Henk van Houtum (h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde (M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Manuscripts with a clear geographical focus on the Americas should be sent to J. Michael Patrick, whereas the ones with a European or Near Eastern focus (including North Africa) should be sent to Henk van Houtum and Martin van der Velde. Other manuscripts can be sent to either address.

See "Instructions to Authors" for additional information.

Statement of Editorial Policy

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* is a refereed multidisciplinary journal focusing on borderlands issues and research. The views and opinions expressed in published articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the editors or officers of the Association for Borderlands Studies. Data and computer software used in published articles should be clearly and precisely documented and readily available to any researcher for replication purposes. If this condition cannot be met, the editors should be notified at the time of submission. Detailed instructions for authors are available on the Association for Borderlands Studies's web site at:

www.absborderlands.org/jbs/jbsmascriptstyle.htm

Authors' Contact Information

Borders for a New Europe: Between History and New Challenges

Ed Williams
University of Arizona
e-mail: edward@email.arizona.edu

Martin van der Velde
Radboud University of Nijmegen
e-mail: M.vanderVelde@ru.nl

New Departures on the EU-Russian Border? Assessing Discourses and Policy Practices

Vadim Kononenko
The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki, Finland
e-mail: vadim.kononenko@upi-fia.fi

A Vision of a Twin City: Exploring the Only Case of Adjacent Urban Settlements at the Finnish-Russian Border

Heikki Eskelinen
University of Joensuu, Finland
e-mail: heikki.eskelinen@joensuu.fi

Juha Kotilainen
University of Joensuu, Finland
e-mail: juha.kotilainen@joensuu.fi

Bridge or Iron Curtain? Local Hungarian and Ukrainian Perceptions of a New European Union Border

Istvan Balcsok
e-mail: balcsok@rkk.hu

Laszlo Dancs

Gabor Koncz

Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Debrecen, Hungary

A Border Regions Typology in the Enlarged European Union

Lefteris Topaloglou
e-mail: ltopaloglou@lga.gr

Dimitris Kallioras

Panos Manetos

George Petrakos

University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece

Bordering Labor Migration from New EU Member States: Socio-Spatial Exclusion and the 'Orderly' Geometrics of Migration Forecasts

Roos Pijpers
Radboud University of Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
e-mail: r.pijpers@fm.ru.nl

To Be or Not To Be a Part of Europe: Appropriations of the Symbolic Borders of Europe in Slovenia

Sabina Mihelj
Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom
e-mail: s.mihelj@lboro.ac.uk

Borders for a New Europe: Between History and New Challenges

Ed Williams and Martin van der Velde*

Introduction

In mid-2004, the European Union (EU) moved to a dramatic enlargement of its membership that significantly changed its character. The meaning of the enlargement evolved from several factors: adding 10 nation-state members to the 2004 membership of 15 for a total of 25 EU members; granting 80 million additional people citizenship in the EU and awarding them almost all of the rights of the previous 350 million; and advancing the EU's outer borders eastward. In the process, the enlargement encompassed territories in Russia's traditional sphere of influence and even approached the contemporary New East, the land of the Muslim faith.

The enlargement brimmed with splendid opportunities, but it also implied knotty challenges and difficult problems. Positive potential and negative dilemma ranged from the political fundamentals of decision making to socio-cultural nuances of differing customs and traditions. At a fundamental, structural level, ten new semi-sovereign entities implied even more complexity in consensus building. The issue especially haunts the powerful European Council. It is the final decision-making body of the EU, and significantly, the repository of the national veto. The veto is granted to every one of the 25 semi-sovereign nation-states in the EU, including the likes of Cyprus, Latvia, Malta, et cetera.

The aborted European Constitution anticipated the veto conundrum by extending the principle of Qualified Majority Voting to the EU's Council of Ministers and even to the European Council. However, there is no new EU constitution almost two years after the enlargement of 2004 and the EU may not have a new constitution in the foreseeable future. The EU agonizes in a semi-official period of contemplation on the stalled constitution.

At the other end of the spectrum of human affairs, more mundane, but equally intransigent, socio-cultural problems emerged or intensified with enlargement. Communicating in a host of new languages weighed upon the newly enlarged European Union. The European Parliament, for example, had to hire a passel of new interpreters and translators to deal with the esoterica of the likes of the Estonian and Hungarian languages, not to mention the several extrapolations of the Slavic tongue spoken in Central Europe.

*Williams is Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Latin American Studies at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona. Van der Velde is Assistant Professor in the Department of Human Geography at Radboud University Nijmegen in The Netherlands, Co-director of the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research and Co-editor of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*.

And, of course, the enlarged EU changed the character of its internal borders and borderlands and created a continuum of new external borders and borderlands on its northern, eastern and southern perimeter. The changes were consequential in every situation and profoundly important in many cases. Internally, the borders became more porous, permitting and encouraging more investment capital, consumer goods, services of all kinds, and, most dramatically, newly-minted EU citizens to pass relatively unimpeded from one country to another. For most purposes, Hungarians could now pass freely into Austria, Poles into Germany, and Estonians into Finland. In addition to people, capital literally rushed from Western Europe to Central Europe, much of it focused in the borderlands areas. Poland, for example, competed favorably for investment capital with the likes of Brazil, China, India, and Mexico. Less expensive labor and more amenable taxing regimes invited outsourcing industries throughout the area.

The new investment initiatives ranged from major industries to small businesses. The western Slovakian borderlands boomed with major investment from the auto industry. The western Czech borderlands spawned a thriving crematory business, attracting clients from the Eastern German borderlands, including densely-populated Metropolitan Berlin.

To a rather lesser extent, seasonal and temporary labor also moved more freely from East to West. Permanent migratory labor remained mostly prohibited until 2011 in 12 of the 15 pre-enlargement western and southern European EU members, but Ireland, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (UK) opened their doors immediately, triggering legal labor migration to the three countries—and, in the process, catalyzing exaggerated fear and foreboding for both East and West. Capturing a strain of the micro-level perspective in the East, Latvian Laima Muktupavela's best selling *The Mushroom Covenant* offered a poignant account of Latvians fleeing their homeland to pick mushrooms in Ireland. It captured the bittersweet ambivalence about migration of many in Latvia, in Ireland, throughout Europe, and beyond.

The newly defined outer borders and borderlands of the enlarged EU offered a different panorama, again mixing the positive and the negative. For example, some Western Europeans fretted that the EU's border security suffered when the enlargement moved the outer border from the Oder River, separating Germany and Poland, to the Bug River, separating Poland from Belarus and Ukraine. A relatively rich, sophisticated, and reliable Germany gave way as the EU's eastern guardian to Poland, supposedly less prepared to scotch the flow of migrants, drugs, and terrorists entering from the East. On the other hand, borderlands peoples on the outside close by the new border in places like Lvov in Ukraine and Zagreb, Croatia interpreted the outer boundaries inching further east and south as heralding the good news that they were on the cusp of gaining highly coveted membership in the EU. As the physical territory of the European Union approached them, they saw themselves as next in line to be accepted in the European fraternity. It is not exaggerating to claim that the sense of excitement and expectation in places like Croatia, Turkey, and Ukraine is quite palpable. Croats, Turks, and Ukrainians long to become Europeans.

The Graz Borderlands Conference and this Issue of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies*

As those trends, influences, and attitudes began to crystallize, a group of European borderlands scholars met in Graz, Austria to offer analyses of the significance of the

2004 enlargement. The conference, “Borders for a New Europe: Between History and New Challenges,” met in mid-September 2004, rather more than four months after the May 1st enlargement. About 40 participants represented a cross section of academic disciplines and came from a continuum of European countries from the UK to the Russian Federation. The conference featured a numerous representation from the several enlargement countries and from the European countries previously on the outer border before the 2004 enlargement. Scholars from other parts of the world also attended.

Several institutions and individuals combined to sponsor, fund, and organize the conference. The European section of the Association for Borderlands Studies formed the organizational umbrella for the meeting. Dr. Irena Sumi and Dr. Hannah Starman of The Institute for Ethnic Studies in Ljubljana, Slovenia conceived, organized, directed and chaired the meeting. Professor Friedrich Zimmerman (Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Karl Franzens University) and his staff assisted, hosted and made local arrangements for the meeting at Karl Franzens University in Graz. Ljubljana’s Institute for Ethic Studies and the Karl Franzens University provided financial support for the borderlands conference.

The editors of this special issue of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies (JBS)* invited six papers from the 40-odd presentations at the Graz conference. The selection process fastened primarily upon the quality of these six contributions, but it also considered other criteria: representation of differing scholarly approaches, innovative theory building and methodological initiatives, the significance of the public policy implications of the research, and varying geographic foci, encompassing differing countries and analyzing how enlargement affected newly-defined inner and outer EU borderlands.

The basic organization of this special issue of the *JBS* takes off from the final consideration. It divides into two parts: centering upon the outer and inner borders and borderlands created by the 2004 enlargement. Each part contains three articles. The distinction is sometimes a tad fuzzy, but the first part concentrates on the new outer boundaries. Vadim Kononenko utilizes policy and scholarly discourses to examine the new outer borders for Russia and Russian-EU relations. He is especially concerned with the implications of Russia’s response to the EU’s inclusion of Poland and the Baltic states: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Finnish scholars Heikki Eskelinen and Juha Kotilainen also touch the EU-Russian interface, but their focus is more on the micro level in wider EU context. Their case study analyzes public policy conflict and cooperation in two towns on the Finnish-Russian border. Cultural dissonance and economic asymmetry play an important role in this border relationship. The economic disparity at the Finnish-Russian border is wider than in any other EU border region and among the most unequal in the world. In the final contribution to the discussion of outer boundaries, Istvan Balcsok, Laszlo Dancs and Gabor Koncz, three Hungarian scholars, describe and analyze local perspectives in the Hungarian-Ukrainian border region. Their case study shares some similarities with the Finnish study, but centers upon a little known EU borderlands areas, historically one of the most tightly closed borders in Europe. Indeed, this new EU border located in the Hungarian-Ukrainian borderland has assumed rather more significance since 2004. It now touches the broader issue of the EU-Ukrainian interface within a complex EU-Russian relationship.

The second part of this edition of the *JBS* fastens upon the newly defined inner borders of the EU, an important theme in post-WWII European borderlands scholar-

ship and now including additional laboratories with the 2004 enlargement. A general typology of the entire, enlarged European Union's border regions is offered by four Greek scholars: Lefteris Topaloglou, Dimitris Kallioras, Panos Manetos and George Petrakos. The authors lament the absence of an appropriate methodological framework to study the impact on border regions wrought by the dynamics of the EU's integration and enlargement. They propose a typology designed to assess the relative position of every border region in EU space. Roos Pijpers gets to the passionate controversy of migration from the 10 new EU members across the EU's inner boundaries to the 15 established members in the wake of the enlargement. She analyzes migration forecasts prior to the 2004 enlargement that often contradicted subsequent policy prescriptions. She explains the denial of the obvious implications of the data by positing and scrutinizing subjective motivations in framing, implementing, and politically justifying policy that restricted migration from East to West in the expanded EU. Sabrina Mihelj offers a Slovenian perspective; Slovenia is the only Balkan country to gain admission in 2004. Other Balkan countries aspire to follow. Croatia is first in line. Like Pijpers, Mihelj treats the migration and asylum issue, but she is more concerned with how the Slovenian media fashioned a symbolic Slovenian geography and singular Slovenian socio-cultural, economic, and political self-definition to explain and justify its inclusion in the 2004 enlargement in front of its neighbors, and rivals, in southeast Europe.

Further Dichotomies

Although the first selection criterion has been largely geographical, either focusing on the (new) inner borders and borderlands or the new outer limits, other similarities and dissimilarities also characterize the several papers in this collection. They concern both the general approach as well as the way borders and borderlands are treated and envisioned. They also reveal a clear expression of the multifaceted character of the scholarly *study* of borders.

Perspectives

Micro or Macro Perspectives

Looking at the six contributions, the descriptive and analytical lenses clearly differ. The Finnish-Russian and the Hungarian-Ukrainian cases zoom in on specific circumstances in describing local and regional responses and consequences to the regimes with regard to the outer border of the European Union. The Slovenian case also focuses on a specific borderline, but puts the analytical emphasis more on the national scale when scrutinizing the symbolic role of the border in the identification process of Slovenians. This case is particularly interesting because the border involved may become an inner-EU border relatively soon. In the EU-Russian case, the focus shifts towards a more "continental" level, in analyzing EU-Russian relations especially as it concerns the interpretation of the northern border. Here the border is clearly interpreted as a demarcation between spheres of influence.

The contributions from Lefteris Topaloglou and his colleagues and Roos Pijpers do not focus on a specific region. Both articles cope with the recent dynamics with the EU induced by the latest accession round. The first contribution, starting from a more regional-economic point of view, develops a typology of (border-)regions that incor-

porates the (new) socio-economic map of a post-2004 EU. Roos Pijpers, when dealing with the numerous migration-forecasts and starting from a more policy-driven perspective, grapples with the socio-spatial characteristics of borders.

Idiographic Thick Descriptions or Nomothetic Synoptic Analysis

A second distinction amongst the papers reflects an age-old discussion that argues about the relative primacy of the peculiar or the correspondence. For a long time, there has been a tendency to treat every border situation as a singular case. As far as there was a spirit of looking for concordance, it was mostly done for reasons of comparison, or simply basic fact finding and data compilation. With regard to the transatlantic comparison, some North American scholars kept a close watch at the EU developments as a laboratory of cross-border integration (Hansen 1985). From a European perspective, the inner-NAFTA border between the U.S. and Mexico served as a benchmark for the outer EU borders (Van der Velde 2000).

When looking at the contributions in this issue, different attitudes and intentions can also be defined. The Hungarian-Ukrainian case is located more on the idiographic side of this continuum, providing a thorough description of the influence of the border on the daily lives of ethnic Hungarians in Ukraine's Transcarpathia. The contribution by Vadim Kononenko also grapples with the specific issue of the EU-Russian relationship, especially sensitive in their respective borderlands. In this sense, it is also more a case study. Sabina Mihelj's contribution and the Finnish-Russian Imatra-Svetogorsk case also provide instructive descriptions of particular cases, but they also explicitly extend these experiences to a more general level of analysis. The Finnish-Russian case seeks to "...provide an interesting laboratory for observing and assessing the objectives and practices of a 'Wider Europe' at a local scale" (Eskelinen and Kotilainen in this issue, p. 31). The Slovenian case analyzes "...the conceptualization of borders, especially the relationship between symbolic and institutional borders" (Mihelj in this issue, p. 109). Roos Pijpers and Lefteris Topaloglou and his colleagues do not explicitly offer a specific regional case. Pijpers tries to understand the aesthetics and ethics of migration forecasts, whereas Topaloglou et al. aim to develop a more or less general applicable border (regions) typology.

Policy Oriented (Applied) Approaches versus Methodological (Academic) Approaches

A third ordering principle for the articles in this issue of the *JBS* defines and distinguishes between applied and more academic contributions. The contributions that deal with the eastern outer border all deal explicitly with policy issues at differing levels of scale. The Finnish case takes the perspective of local cross-border cooperation. In the Hungarian case, the lens shifts to the regional scale. Vadim Kononenko assumes an almost continental perspective. He examines local and regional consequences of the EU-Russian relationship. The Greek scholars' efforts in developing a typology also explicitly, although not exclusively, serve a policy goal. They seek to provide "...a framework to assess the relative position of each EU border region in the EU space" (Topaloglou et al. in this issue, p. 67). The other two contributions do not consciously deal with policy as a dependent variable, although one of the methodologies of Roos Pijpers' paper is the use of a variety of forecasts within policy.

Linking Up to the Multi-Faceted Nature of Borders

Borders, in general, reveal a very Janus-faced character (Van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer 2005). This section touches upon the various ways this double-sided character manifests itself.

A first distinction is between interpretations of borders as stemming either from “nature” or “nurture”; as innate or learned phenomena (Storey 2001). It seemed that the “nurture” protagonists were gaining credibility in the final decades of the 20th Century, but in the wake of the 9/11 events it is more acceptable to again posit a kind of natural world-“order” that is accompanied by “natural” demarcations.

A second apparent contradiction involving the naturalness of borders, albeit on an individual level, is assessing the border with regard to its barrier effect on the one hand and its function as a “natural” demarcation of personal action spaces on the other (Van der Velde 1999, Van Houtum 1998). A paradox seems to exist in that negative correlations characterize these two interpretations. When a border is regarded as something that demarcates in a natural way, the border is not considered to be a barrier. That is, when natural limits of action spaces coincide with the location of territorial borders, there is less need to cross the border, and a barrier effect will be less intensely experienced.

This interpretation of the consequences of borders on an individual level relates to two seemingly opposing views from a functionalist approach. On the one hand, borders may be observed as guardians against threats from “the other side.” This functional interpretation of the border connects to the individual assessment of the border as something that is natural and logical. Conversely, borders can be regarded as creating differences between the adjacent territories. These differences, in turn, may create opportunities. In this sense, the functional view of an opportunistic border concurs with the individual assessment as a barrier, when utilizing these border-related opportunities is also obstructed by this exact border. The duality of borders logically follows. They are either the instrument to reach certain goals, or the final goal itself, or both simultaneously.

Yet another interesting reinterpretation sees a border as fuzzy or amorphous rather than binary. Since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, sovereign states demarcated with a definitive territorial line formed the sole reference for analyzing national borders, certainly in the Western world. In the final decades of the 20th Century before 2000, the omnipresent process of globalization chipped away the conceptualization of the binary character of national borders. Where borders used to be filters for all (or most) of the crossborder interactions, they are now more and more controlling and fencing of certain forms of interactions and processes yet not for others. For example, the U.S.-Mexico border in the wake of the NAFTA agreement lost part of its control function for goods, but for certain groups of people the control function was even reinforced, especially when entering the U.S.

This is related to another border paradox of dealing with (inter)national sovereignties and territories in a world that is increasingly cosmopolitan and transnational. With regard to possible futures for the EU, Zielonka (2001) foresees two development paths: the EU either as a Westphalian Superstate, with clear cut outer and eradicated inner borders, or more as a Neomedieval Empire in which loyalty and sovereignties can shift easily, not only in time, but also depending on the issue.

A final distinction is a more static interpretation versus one that stresses dynamic aspects. In the first interpretation, the border is used as a noun. It indicates the (more or less) stable outcome of demarcation practices. The border itself is much more in the centre of interest, compared to the more dynamic practices and processes. When the latter are put to the fore, the term border is interpreted as a verb—explicitly as dynamic and as process (Van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer 2005). Here the distinction is between *boundary*-studies, in which the “where” is much more stressed. The opposing focus is *border*-studies, in which the “how” is much more important (Van Houtum, Kramsch and Zierhofer 2005). The distinction that Paasi (1996) makes between borders as morphologies (*borders on the ground*) versus borders as representation or interpretation (*borders in the mind*), is similar to these two interpretations.

Implications for Future Enlargements

The six analyses in this special issue on the European Union’s 2004 enlargement also presage issues touching and troubling future expansion of the EU. The studies strike significant foci influencing the expansion of the EU as it contemplates additional rounds of enlargement to the east and southeast. Some of those nation-states will join soon; some in a decade or so; some may never gain or seek membership in the EU. Indeed, some may work to frustrate the future coherence and expansion of the Union.

The analyses offered in this special issue should inform EU theorists and strategists as they consider two inter-related questions: the EU’s defining characteristics and its geographic scope. The EU launched a period of reflection after the French and Dutch rejected the EU’s constitution in mid-2005. Future enlargement plays crucially in the debate on the EU’s nature and future. The six analyses inform the debate. They highlight and anticipate relations with and potential tensions and disputes between and about the EU and Russia, Turkey, and the Balkan countries. They also discuss internal Union tension as the EU moves to encompass or carry on relations with those countries and areas in the context of future enlargement.

Bulgaria and Romania are to gain EU membership in 2007 or 2008, but they promise essentially the same advantages and disadvantages as the 2004 enlargement. Both are as conventionally “European” as many of the 10 nations accepted in 2004. Indeed both may be easier to integrate and more cooperative than some of the countries included in the 2004 enlargement. Poland, for example, occasionally waxes truculent, and its postures causes concern because of its formidable population of 40 million and relatively large economy. Cyprus is also a sore spot, owing to its warring ethnic populations with ties to Greece and Turkey.

Russia, Turkey, and the Balkan countries are cut from a different cloth than Bulgaria and Romania. They define new departures for the EU, encompassing two dimensions of EU enlargement. Russia is not a candidate for enlargement, but its brooding omnipresence haunts and threatens the EU’s plans for expansion. The threat increases as EU territory approaches Russia’s traditional sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. The EU’s Turkey connection differs substantially from the Russian. As of the fall of 2005, Turkey is officially a candidate for EU membership and enthusiastically covets inclusion. Negotiations proceed. The Turkish profile varies profoundly from the 25 present EU members. Most ominous for many, it is a Muslim country; its people are also poorer than present EU members. In addition, Turkey boasts a population of 70

million—almost as many as all 10 countries of the 2004 enlargement and more than any of the present EU 25, save Germany with 80 million.

The five Balkan countries hoping for eventual membership (Slovenia entered in 2004) have somewhat differing profiles. All except Croatia suffer even more poverty than Turkey. Muslims form the majority in Albania. Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia have significant Muslim minority populations. Serbia's "autonomous province" of Kosovo counts about 90 percent Muslim. However, poverty and religion are not the primary issues that complicate the EU's accepting the Balkan countries. Rather, it is the Balkan nations' refusal to come to terms with the brutality of their ethnic cleansing during the 1990 wars, and their unwillingness or inability to evolve agreements and guarantees to integrate and protect the rights of their minority populations.

In every instance, the papers presented here pertain to these conundrums of the EU's enlargement policy. Firstly, an extrapolation of Topaloglou, et al. to include Bulgaria and Romania and, later, Turkey and the Balkan countries promises to assist policy makers and scholars to anticipate and plan for the expanded European Union's enlarged space and for its constituent borderlands. Indeed, Greek scholars are especially well equipped to offer cogent and valuable analysis of the sensitive Greek-Turkish interface; and they are close to the ongoing Balkan troubles.

It comes as no surprise that two of the six articles offered here deal directly with EU member states' relations and interface with Russia. Still a third article studies the EU's external border between Hungary and Ukraine. Moscow sees Ukraine as part of its security perimeter. Indeed, 13 of the 40 plus papers offered at the Graz conference analyzed EU-Russian relations directly or indirectly. Equally telling, 10 of the 11 scholars from the 10 enlargement states or from Finland offered papers on Russian themes.

Western, Central, and Eastern Europeans have long been wary of Russia and the former Soviet Union, and for good reason. Its history of expansion and imperialistic muscle flexing in Eastern and Central Europe worries the EU's thoughts of enlarging to the east and southeast. Moscow's iron rule of its provinces and its cavalier disregard for human rights and the rule of law also give pause. Vadim Kononenko's study in this edition of the *JBS* should be required reading for policy makers contemplating the inclusion of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova in future EU enlargements. From a rather different perspective, the study by Eskelinen and Kotilainen implies sound advice to borderlands peoples aspiring to cooperate with Moscow-controlled Russians across the border. Finns know of what they speak. The variation on the theme by Hungarian scholars Balcsok, Dancs and Koncz is equally valuable in understanding the Ukraine-EU borderlands interface in Hungary and Ukraine. The analysis is especially cogent as it touches Ukraine before its separation from the Soviet Union, and its subsequent ongoing complex and fragile relationship with Russia. For Russia's leadership, Ukraine is clearly the most important of the former satellite states. Moscow's attention fixes on events on the Ukraine-EU border.

The intrinsic tensions plaguing the Russian-EU relationship may also increase the EU's readiness to accept Turkey into the fraternity. Just as Turkey's NATO membership during the Cold War, an EU Turkey on Russia's southern flank promises the EU increased security. In the same way, Turkey's role as the EU's buffer against, and transition to, the volatile Near East also augurs well for Turkey's inclusion in the European Union.

Other negative influences may well weigh more heavily in the balance and lead to the EU's denial of Turkey's candidacy. Turkey's uncertain commitment to protecting

human rights and its lack of transparency catalyze opposition throughout the EU. Many depict its Muslim religion and culture as fundamentally different from the EU's "Western" cultural value system. The threat of terrorism also colors European attitudes against Turkey's gaining EU membership.

Above all else, migration forms the crux of the matter. Turkey's alien culture, its numerous populations, and its relative poverty combine to define the most trenchant focus of opposition in the EU—the fear of massive migration from Turkey flooding the EU countries. As in the United States, migration looms as the most passionate and divisive issue in Europe. The anxiety is grossly exaggerated, as Roos Pijpers, from the Netherlands, documents in her contribution to this edition of the *JBS*. The anxiety is often artificially confected, as Sabina Mihelj, from Slovenia, concludes in her paper in this edition. Pijpers' and Mihelj's papers make instructive reading for European (and American) policy makers and informed citizens.

The fear of migration is a searing political reality, a salient and significant factor obsessing the minds of European citizens and policy makers. The fear propelled twelve of the fifteen existing EU members to restrict labor mobility from Poland and the nine other enlargement countries in the 2004 EU expansion. The fear contributed mightily to the French and the Dutch rejecting the EU Constitution in mid-2005. The fear component of the migration issue will also play a central role as EU negotiators bargain with Turkish counterparts over the next decade.

The Balkan nations' ambition for EU membership forms the final issue touching EU enlargement in the foreseeable future. Again, the contributions of this special issue of the *JBS* anticipate arguments and controversies bound to surface as EU policy makers plot their course. Slovenia gained admission in 2004, and the remaining Balkan states covet membership. Croatia and Macedonia enjoy official candidate status, and negotiations proceed with Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Serbia Montenegro.

Several issues define the crux of the negotiations and several papers in this number of the *JBS* bear upon the arguments. The three issues include: 1) the Balkan nations' chauvinistic and destructive nationalism motivating their failure to cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia in The Hague; 2) the relative poverty of the Balkan peoples; and 3) the ever-present threat of increasing westward migration. The impending disintegration of Serbia-Montenegro adds even more complexity; both Kosovo and Montenegro move toward independence from Serbia.

The nationalistic Balkan governments' sheltering alleged war criminals from the 1990s Balkan wars defines the most controversial issue. Their intransigence reflects a profound suspicion of external influences rooted in extreme nationalism. Croatia's cooperation with the European Union and the Hague Tribunal contributed significantly to its achieving candidate status. Serbia has been the most intransigently uncooperative; it insists on protecting its putative war criminals.

Sabina Mihelj's essay in this collection informs the issue. It explains Slovenia's "complex reconfiguration of existing collective identifications...which included establishing new attachments and borders and dispensing with the old ones," (Mihelj in this issue, p. 109). Albania's, Serbia's and other Balkan countries' profiles of those "complex reconfigurations" and (and should) differ from the Slovenian experience, but the overall goals, forms, and processes described by Mihelj are instructive.

As with the Finnish-Russian interface, the EU's enlargement to the Balkans also promises to crystallize their relative poverty and catalyze concomitant tension, especially among borderlands people in the older EU borderlands and the newer Balkan

borderlands. While EU-Balkan differences will be less dramatic than between Finland and Russia, relative poverty in juxtaposition to relative wealth is quite significant in pairs like Hungary-Serbia and Greece-Macedonia. The borderlands relationship between Italy and Albania across the Adriatic Sea waxes even more striking. The analysis by Eskelinen and Kotilainen is this issue will assist policy formation for borderlands and for local elites as they grapple with the corroding differences in poverty and wealth in cross border relations.

Finally, the wisdom and efficacy of Roos Pijpers' policy implications may take hold by the time the Balkan states gain EU admission in the mid-teens or later. She shows the poisoned and divisive migration fears to be ill-founded. Cool, objective policy formation in mid-2006 begins to agree with Pijpers (Parker and Laitner). It may mature even more by the time the Balkans integrate with the EU in a decade or more.

In the last analysis, the EU's future enlargement should reflect some sense of the policy makers' and the people's conceptualization of "Europe." In a precedent-breaking tour of the Balkans in early 2006, EU Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso declared in Serbia: "You are a European country, and you should have a European future" (Wood). The words had an inspiring ring, but Barroso offered no hint of criteria informing his definition of "Europe."

Borderlands peoples and borderlands scholars personify two fundamental sources of the elusive definition. The meaning of Europe and the significance of the European Union has emanated from the perceptions and experiences of the peoples of Strasbourg and other Rhineland border communities. It will next reside in the minds and spirits of those who live on the banks of the Black Sea and the Oder River. And, this special issue of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies* demonstrates that borderlands scholars make ongoing contributions to the evolving definition and purpose of Europe and the European Union. They elucidate the borderlands, the embryo of the evolving European economy, polity, and society.

References

- Hansen, N. 1985. *Border Region Development and Cooperation: Western Europe and the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands in Comparative Perspective*. El Paso: Center for Inter-American and Border Studies, University of Texas at El Paso.
- Paasi, A. 1996. *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Parker, George and Sarah Laitner. 'Old' Europe Under Pressure to Open Its Doors. *Financial Times* (London), February 3, 2006, 2.
- Storey, D. 2001. *Territory, The Claiming of Space*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Van der Velde, M. 1999. Searching for Jobs in a Border Area: The Influence of Borders in a Dutch Euregion. In *Understanding European Cross-Border Labour Markets: Issues in Economic Cross-Border Relations*, eds. Peter de Gijssel, Manfred Janssen, Hans-Joachim Wenzel and Michael Woltering, 165-182. Marburg: Metropolis.
- Van der Velde, M. 2000. On the Value of a Transatlantic Dialogue on Border Research. *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 15 (1): 281-290.
- Van Houtum, H. 1998. *The Development of Cross-Border Economic Relations, a Theoretical and Empirical Study of the Influence of the State Border on the Development of Cross-Border Economic Relations Between Firms in Border Regions of The Netherlands and Belgium*. Tilburg: CentER.

- Van Houtum, H., O. Kramsch and W. Zierhofer, eds. 2005. *B/Ordering Space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Wood, Nicholas, Hopeful Words on European Union Expansion in the Balkans. *New York Times*, on line edition, February 19, 2006.
- Zielonka, J. 2001. How New Enlarged Borders will Reshape the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39 (3): 507-536.

New Departures on the EU-Russian Border? Assessing Discourses and Policy Practices

Vadim Kononenko*

***Abstract:** This paper looks at the dynamic aspects of the EU's and Russia's policies regarding their shared border in the North before and after the enlargement of 2004. The paper shows how discourses and policy practices of the EU changed over the enlargement period. In addition, the paper discusses the current problems of practical interaction between Russia and the EU in their respective borderland.*

Introduction: The 'Old' and 'New' EU-Russian Border

On May 1st 2004, the EU reshaped its eastern borders by taking on board ten new member states. Among the many neighbors the EU meets across its enlarged borders, Russia occupies a very specific place. With all the talk about the emerging new EU neighborhood, it is worthwhile asking whether and how this process has affected the EU's border with its "old" neighbor, Russia (EC 2003a). The European Union and Russia have had a common border for more than a decade since the accession of Finland to the EU in 1995. In this regard, the new border that emerged in 2004 can be seen as simply a continuation of the existing 1,300-km borderland in the north and as a result of the long-planned accession of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland to the European Union.¹

Yet it can be argued that the eastern EU-Russian border should not be regarded simply as an extension of the existing one; several factors suggest a change. By and large, the impact of the EU enlargement as regards the EU-Russian border has come indirectly through the emergence and development of EU's European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) towards the "new neighbors," particularly, Belarus, Moldova, and Ukraine. As these countries share an external border with the enlarged EU, it is logical that the border issues became part of the ENP's agenda. On the practical level, one can see that the EU is reorganizing its approaches towards its external border including, Russia. According to the Commission's plan, the design of various EU policy instruments of cross-border cooperation and assistance, such as INTERREG, Tacis-CBC and PHARE, will be re-shaped and a New Neighborhood and Partnership Instrument (NNPI) will be put in place from 2007 onwards (EC 2003b). This affects the EU-Russian border as well because although Russia's border regions are eligible to participate in the NNPI projects, Russia as such is treated separately from the other Eastern neighbors.²

This leads to the second factor of change, namely, the wider dynamics of the EU-Russian relationship, which has been affected particularly by the "Big Bang" enlarge-

*Kononenko is a researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs in Helsinki, Finland.

A Vision of a Twin City: Exploring the Only Case of Adjacent Urban Settlements at the Finnish-Russian Border

Heikki Eskelinen and Juha Kotilainen*

Abstract: *The article aims to illustrate through a case study the contingencies, complexities and paradoxes which characterize the external borders of the European Union. The study focuses on the only cross-border urban area along the Finnish-Russian border region, that of Imatra and Svetogorsk. Firstly, the peculiarities of this region are described by comparing it to other cooperating border communities in the EU. Next, the twin-town initiative by the local governments is analyzed, the development potential of the cross-border region is evaluated, and the motives for and obstacles to cooperation are examined for assessing the prospects of cooperation in a wider European context. It is concluded that the distinctive features of this highly asymmetric case have been taken into account by the local actors when they have defined the aim and scope of their cooperation strategy. Due to these contextual factors, it is also understandable that the concrete results of the twin city initiative have remained limited thus far. Although integrated cross-border structures are nearly nonexistent, the local cooperation activities provide an interesting laboratory for observing and assessing the objectives and practices of a “Wider Europe” at a local scale.*

Introduction

Cooperation across state borders is currently a well-established part of the activities of local and regional organizations in most border regions in Europe. Although political and economic support from the European Union is reconfiguring the nature of borders in its sphere of influence, and creating what can be called a European regime of cross-border cooperation, the concrete forms and intensity of this activity—and also its results—vary to a major degree due to the peculiarities of each case. The case-specific factors derive from issues such as the international political context, historical experiences, ethnic relations, socio-economic conditions, and relevant infrastructures in a particular border region (see e.g. O’Dowd 2002).

*Eskelinen is a Jean Monnet Professor in the Department of Geography and the Karelian Institute at the University of Joensuu, Joensuu, Finland. Kotilainen is a Research Fellow in the Karelian Institute at the University of Joensuu, Joensuu, Finland.

This article is an outgrowth of cooperation between the research projects Reconstitution of Northwest Russia as an Economic, Social and Political Space: The Role of Cross-Border Interaction (No. 208150) and Governance of Renewable Natural Resources in Northwest Russia (No. 203960), both funded by the Academy of Finland through its Russia in Flux Programme (see <http://www.aka.fi>). In addition, the article has benefited from the material collected for purposes of the EXLINEA project (Lines of Exclusion as Arenas of Cooperation: Reconfiguring the External Boundaries of Europe, Politics, Practices and Perceptions) of the EU’s 5th Framework Programme (see: <http://www.exlinea.org>).

Bridge or Iron Curtain? Local Hungarian and Ukrainian Perceptions of a New European Union Border

Istvan Balcsok, Laszlo Dancs and Gabor Koncz*

Abstract: *The purpose of this contribution is to describe the characteristics, intensity and the different forms of cross-border relations along the Hungarian-Ukrainian borderline, which became the external border of the European Union on May 1st, 2004. The article does not simply illustrate the current situation, but tries to present the main tendencies of co-operation after the change of regime in 1990. The study summarizes the effects of the EU enlargement based on the results of questionnaires and interviews completed on both sides of the Hungarian-Ukrainian border. In the course of research the authors concentrated on the opportunities of transborder connections of the people living near the border, especially focusing on temporal changes of cross-border traffic and its reasons, the legal and illegal spheres of commercial and other relations that basically determine the subsistence of the people in that region. Furthermore, the authors emphasize the main issues bothering the ethnic Hungarians in Transcarpathia, such as crossing the border or the radical changes of the regulation determining the conditions of residence, learning, employment, etc. in Hungary.*

Introduction

The Hungarian-Ukrainian border region (Figure 1) came more and more in the centre of interest both in Hungary and in the international scientific community in the past years. The new role as the external border of the European Union provided new opportunities but also new challenges for the inhabitants living in this area. The increased attention is also stimulated by the fact that this border section is one of the most underdeveloped areas of Hungary. Cross-border illegal trade, encouraged by the differences between price levels (e.g. for fuel and cigarettes) in the two countries, is an important phenomenon in the region. Furthermore, one of the main routes of smuggling people from Asia to Western-Europe crosses this area. From the point of view of the European Union the security aspects are especially important, but at the same time this is one of the eastern gates of the EU in the direction of enormous potential markets.

Also the fact that more than 150,000 ethnic Hungarians live on the Ukrainian side, mainly in the immediate vicinity of the state border, in a more or less homogenous

*Balcsok is Junior Research Fellow in the Debrecen Department of the Centre for Regional Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Debrecen, Hungary. Dancs is Junior Research Fellow in the Debrecen Department of the Centre for Regional Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Debrecen, Hungary. Koncz is Junior Research Fellow in the Debrecen Department of the Centre for Regional Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Debrecen, Hungary.

The essay is also connected to the research program called EXLINEA (Lines of Exclusion as Arenas of Co-operation: Reconfiguring the External Boundaries of Europe - Policies, Practices, Perceptions).

A Border Regions Typology in the Enlarged European Union

Lefteris Topaloglou, Dimitris Kallioras, Panos Manetos and George Petrakos*

Abstract: *The processes of European Union (EU) integration and enlargement have produced a new regional socioeconomic map in Europe. Border regions, in particular, have been put in a state of flux. The re-allocation of activities, opportunities and threats is changing their socio-economic role and significance. Thus, border regions have become an issue of great importance during the last fifteen years in both the areas of scientific research and policy making. The overall picture of the actual dynamics occurring at the border regions, however, when economic barriers have been abolished, remains rather unclear. The absence of an appropriate methodological framework for the study of the impact of EU integration and enlargement dynamics on border regions is evident.*

The paper proposes a typology for the EU NUTS III border regions, interpreting the socioeconomic dynamics occurring within the enlarged EU space. Primary and secondary data, incorporating quantitative and qualitative determinants for border regions, were elaborated with integrated factor and fuzzy clustering analysis techniques. The proposed border regions typology provides a framework to assess the relative position of each EU border region in the EU space.

Introduction

Border regions in Europe have become an important issue over the last fifteen years in the areas of both scientific research and policy making. The removal of the artificial barriers to interaction in the post-1989 European economic space, the EU eastward enlargement, the overlapping of national sovereignty by multinational corporations and organizations, the resurgence in nationalism and the “disappearing of distance” due to technological advances have established new grounds for discussion on border issues (Ohmae 1990; O’Brien 1992; Amin 1997; Giddens 1999, inter alia).

“Bridge,” “wall,” “tunnel,” “opportunity,” “threat,” “borderless,” “re-bordering,” “de-bordering,” are only some of the terms concerning borders and border regions, indicating that this discussion has only just begun. As a result of these processes and

*Topaloglou is a political scientist, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Planning and Regional Development at the University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece. Kallioras is an economist, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Planning and Regional Development at the University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece. Manetos is a rural and survey engineer, Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Planning and Regional Development at the University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece. Petrakos is Professor of Spatial Economics in the Department of Planning and Regional Development at the University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece.

The authors would like to thank the participants at the 2004 ABS “Borders in a New Europe: Between History and New Challenges” European Conference for their fruitful comments and the editors of the Journal of Borderland Studies for their valuable suggestions. Research work supported by the EU 5th Framework-Program for Research and Technological Development within the framework of the EXLINEA project.

Bordering Labor Migration from New EU Member States: Socio-Spatial Exclusion and the ‘Orderly’ Geometrics of Migration Forecasts

Roos Pijpers*

***Abstract:** The enlargement process of the European Union has resulted in a numerous series of migration forecasts, carried out from the late 1990s through the actual accession of ten new member states in May 2004. In the years and months prior to enlargement, national governments in most “old” member states, driven by fears of mass inflows of workers from new member states, consecutively decided to restrict east-west migration for a period of at least two years. In all cases, decision-making processes were informed by migration forecasts. This paper aims to scrutinize subjacent motivations of making and subsequently justifying policy on the basis of migration forecasts. Drawing on literature on the role of aesthetic order in model-based migration forecasts and their sub-structuring framework of neo-classical equilibrium theory, it will be argued that the “tangible” numbers produced by these studies provide a certain rationale for order-enhancing and fear-decreasing bordering policies of the kind currently taking place in the European Union. Methods, outcomes and policy influences of migration forecasts address and portray a latent desire to retain borders in the EU’s formally borderless member states.*

Some people are on the edge because that is where they want to be. (Sibley 1998a, 99)

Introduction

In times of economic slowdown, structural unemployment, backing welfare states and fierce political debate about minority integration and cultural identity, migration forecasts are in fashion across the European policy arena. Many of these quantitative “guesstimates” of future patterns of migratory movements are prepared for supranational and national governments, or large non-governmental institutions such as the OECD and the International Organization for Migration. The enlargement process of the European Union has resulted in an especially numerous series of migration forecasts, carried out from the late 1990s through the mid-2004 EU-enlargement. Because enlargement implied a breakdown of national borders for 75 million inhabitants from ten new member states with relatively low incomes per capita and high overall unemployment levels, many feared massive flows of migration from east to west. In the

*Pijpers is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Human Geography and in the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research at the Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

A first version of this paper was presented at the 2004 European Conference of the Association of Borderlands Studies in Graz, Austria, on September 15-19, 2004. The author would like to thank Ed Williams and Martin van der Velde for critical and encouraging remarks on the first and second versions of this paper.

To Be or Not To Be a Part of Europe: Appropriations of the Symbolic Borders of Europe in Slovenia

Sabina Mihelj*

***Abstract:** The post-Cold-War transformation of Central and Eastern Europe involved a complex reconfiguration of existing collective identifications, territorial attachments and borders, which included both establishing new attachments and borders and dispensing with the old ones. This article traces this reconfiguration by looking at the case of Slovenia. After briefly sketching the transformation of symbolic attachments and borders during the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the article analyses the appropriations of this new symbolic mapping in the public debates and immigration and citizenship policies related to the two major instances of immigration in Slovenia after the establishment of an independent Slovenian state in 1991: the arrival of Bosnian war refugees in 1992, and the increase in undocumented immigration in 2000-2001. Particular attention is paid to the conceptualization of borders, especially the relationships between symbolic and institutionalized borders. It is argued that state borders are far from being the sole institutional vehicle of the symbolic borders separating the Self from its Others. Policy measures regulating immigration function as an additional vehicle for these borders, and thus provide a complement to the institution of state borders: if the state border marks the perceived territorial borders of the Self, the immigration-related policy measures serve to maintain the perceived population borders distinguishing the Self from its Other(s).*

Introduction

As several works published over the course of the past few decades have demonstrated, virtually all of the European societies have a centuries-long record of constructing Europe as a spatial and socio-cultural entity starkly opposed to those parts of the world which are conceived as non-European or at least not sufficiently European: the Orient, Africa, Eastern Europe, the Balkans etc. (Said 1978; Wolff 1994; Delanty 1995, 1996; Lewis and Wigen 1997; Todorova 1997). While the majority of these studies focused almost exclusively on the ways Western European authors imagine the Balkans and the East, some scholars have pointed to the fact that these symbolic geographies are far from being an exclusively Western European product. Instead, they are often (re-)produced locally, within the despised regions themselves, whose inhabitants tend to internalize the categories applied to them by their Western observers, or use them to distinguish themselves from inhabitants of neighboring states (Gal 1991; Bakic-

*Mihelj is a Lecturer in Media, Communication and Culture in the Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom.

This paper draws upon the doctoral research project supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports of the Republic of Slovenia (1999-2003) and the Central European University Doctoral Support Grant (2002-2003), as well as upon research conducted within the frame of the European Science Foundation Changing Media – Changing Europe programme (2000-2004).

Instructions for Authors

Submission of Manuscripts

The *JBS* welcomes manuscript submissions from all social science and business disciplines, as well as border-specific manuscripts from other disciplines. The border emphasis is global. Work from any discipline that illuminates border problems, characteristics, issues and realities in any part of the world is acceptable for manuscript review. **It is important that the manuscript deals in a substantive way with the border-related aspects of the topic. It should not just be the results of a study in a border region without significant consideration of transboundary influences and characteristics.**

Manuscripts are blind reviewed by at least two qualified readers. Inquiries and manuscripts should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and
Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900
or
Henk van Houtum
(h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde
(M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

The editors will assume that submission of an article to the *JBS* indicates that the manuscript has not been published elsewhere. If manuscripts are accepted and published, all rights, including subsidiary rights, are assigned to the *JBS*. The author retains the right to use the article after it

has been published in the *JBS* without charge, for any book or anthology of which he or she is author or editor, and to reproduce copies for classroom or for other noncommercial use.

Notes and comments concerning articles previously published in the *JBS* are also welcomed.

Electronic Submission

Send an e-mail, with “JBS Manuscript Submission” in the subject line and include the manuscript as an attachment to the editors respectively. Manuscripts with a clear geographical focus on the Americas should be sent to J. Michael Patrick, whereas the ones with a European or Near Eastern focus (including North Africa) should be sent to Henk van Houtum and Martin van der Velde. Other manuscripts can be sent to either address.

In the body of the e-mail, include the name of the author(s), his/her institutional affiliation and college or department, position or title, academic rank, and the name, address, telephone, fax and e-mail of the contact person with respect to the submitted manuscript. Please include this same information on a cover page at the beginning of the manuscript. The electronic manuscript should be in either MS Word or WordPerfect (preferred formats).

Preparation of Copy

The electronic manuscript should be single spaced and include the cover page with the contact information at the beginning of the manuscript. Subsequent pages should include the title, abstract, introduction, the body of the manuscript (to include all indented material and tables), endnotes and references. Number all pages consecutively. A separate electronic file clearly

identifying and defining all mathematical symbols must be attached. All graphs and illustrations should be submitted in separate files (see Format of Graphs, Illustrations and Tables). Indicate clearly where graphs or illustrations should appear in the text. A note in the text in brackets will be sufficient, as in the following example:

[Figure 1 about here]

The *JBS* prefers the use of citations in parentheses within the text, and the use of footnotes is unacceptable. Endnotes may be used for substantive observations but not for the purpose of citing sources. Endnotes must appear separately at the end of the body of the manuscript prior to the references. There is no need to use *ibid.*, *op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*, and so forth. Each reference to the same source should appear in exactly the same format with the possible exception of different page numbers indicated.

JBS-preferred styles for in text citations and references follow the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th Edition unless otherwise indicated (see Format of In Text Citation and References).

Italicize all foreign words and provide their translation into English. When using acronyms, provide their definitions on the first use in the manuscript, and if in a foreign language, provide the translation.

Please do not use fancy fonts or formatting for manuscripts submitted to the *JBS*. Formatting complexities cause problems with the typesetting software used by the *JBS*. For the body of the text, use Times or Times New Roman 10 point font. Headings should be in all capitals and bold. Subheadings should be in initial capitals and lowercase. The page orientation should be set to "letter" and "portrait." Left and right margins should be set to 1.88 inches (4.76 centimeters), and top and bottom margins to 1.50 inches (3.81 centimeters). This will approximate the printable area of the *JBS* and will provide a guide for the sizing and orientation of graphs, illustrations and tables.

Format of Text

All references to monographs, articles, and statistical sources are to be identified

at an appropriate point in the text by last name of author, year of publication and pagination when appropriate—all within parentheses. Be sure that the year and the spelling of the authors' names within the parentheses exactly match those in the reference list.

Frequently, manuscripts have to be returned a second time to authors because the reference list and the parenthetical citations in the text (including endnotes) do not agree. Problems include the item referenced in the text not appearing in the list of references at the end of the manuscript, the year of the citation within the text not agreeing with the year listed in the reference section, inconsistent spelling of authors' names, and failure to include accents and other diacriticals for foreign-language references (due to some typographic limitations some diacriticals may not appear exactly as in the original text).

In Text Citation Placement*

An author-date citation in running text or at the end of a block quotation consists of the last (family) name of the author, followed by the year of publication of the work in question. In this context, "author" may refer not only to one or more authors or an institution but also to one or more editors, translators, or compilers. No punctuation appears between author and date. Abbreviations such as *ed.* or *trans.* are omitted (unless an original and an edited work by the same person appeared in the same year, in which case *ed.* would be added to the text citation where appropriate).

(Pacini 1997)

(U.S. Department of Transportation 1998)

Parenthetical citations are placed just before a mark of punctuation.

Recent literature has examined long-run price drifts following initial public offerings (Ritter 1991; Loughran and Ritter 1995), stock splits (Ikenberry, Rankine, and Stice 1996), seasoned equity offerings (Loughran

and Ritter 1995), and equity repurchases (Ikenberry, Lakonishok, and Vermaelen 1995).

If the author of a source referred to appears in the text, it need not be repeated in a parenthetical citation.

Litman (1983) finds that Academy Award nominations or winnings are significantly related to revenues.

Although citation of a source normally follows a direct quotation, it may precede the quotation if syntax permits.

As Edward Tufte points out (2001, 139), “a graphical element may carry data information and also perform a design function usually left to non-data-ink.”

Note: The source of a block quotation is given within parentheses at the end of the quotation and in the same type size. The opening parenthesis appears *after* the final punctuation mark of the quoted material. No period either precedes or follows the closing parenthesis.

...pertaining to the area. Additional studies concluded that there were inefficiencies in the system involving support services. (Gonzalez 2001, 234)

When a reference list includes two or more works published in the same year by the same author or authors, the text citations as well as the reference list must use the letters “a,” “b,” and so on.

(Beijing Zoo 1974a)

For works by two or three authors, all names are included. The word “and” is used, not an ampersand.

(Hollingsworth and Sockett 1994b)

(Yoskowitz, Pisanni, and García 2000)

For four or more authors, only the name of the first author is used, followed by “et al.” or “and others.” Note that “et al.” is *not* italicized in text citations.

(Zipursky et al. 1997)

In a study by Zipursky and others (1997), the data pointed...

Two or more references in a single parenthetical citation are separated by semicolons. The order in which they are given may depend on what is being cited, and in what order, or it may reflect the relative importance of the items cited. If neither criterion applies, alphabetical or chronological order may be appropriate.

(Armstrong and Malacinski 1989; Beigl 1989; Pickett and White 1985)

Additional works by the same author(s) are given by date only, separated by commas except where page numbers are required.

(Whittaker 1967, 1975; Wiens 1989a, 1989b)

(Wong 1998, 28; 1999, 475)

For further examples of citations consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

Format of In Text Citations and References*

At the end of the text, after the endnotes (if any), the full listing of all items included as references within parentheses in the text should appear in a section titled References. The *JBS* prefers that the full names of authors be used. Last name and first initials may be used, but the listing must be consistent. There should be no mixing of either format within the references. Headline style capitalization should be used and only book titles are italicized. For references in foreign languages, please translate parts of the reference such as month, volume, city of publication, and so forth.

Following are some examples of in text citations and their corresponding reference formats:

Book with One Author

(Martin du Gard 2000)

Martin du Gard, Roger. 2000. *Lieutenant-Colonel de Maumort*. Trans. By Luc Brebion and Timothy Crouse. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Two Authors or Editors

For two authors use the conjunction “and” (not an ampersand).

(Walker and Taylor 1998)

Walker, J. R., and T. Taylor. 1998. *The Columbia Guide to Online Style*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

(Brush and Clark 1983)

Brush, A. H., and G. A. Clark Jr., eds. 1983. *Perspectives in Ornithology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Three Authors or Editors

(Schellinger, Hudson, and Rijsberman 1998)

Schellinger, Paul, Christopher Hudson, and Marijk Rijsberman, eds. 1998. *Encyclopedia of the Novel*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.

More than Three Authors

For works by four to ten persons, all names are given in the reference list. In a note or text citation, only the name of the first author is included, followed by “and others” or “et al.” with no intervening comma. Note that these are not italicized in parenthetical citations.

(Sechzer et al. 1996, 243)

Sechzer, J. A., S. M. Pfaffilin, F. L. Denmark, A. Griffin, and S. J. Blumenthal, eds. 1996. *Women and Mental Health*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

For references with eleven or more authors, the first seven are listed followed by “et al.” The in text citation follows the same format as more than 3 authors.

Editor (Compiler or Translator) Instead of Author

(Kamrany and Day 1980)

Kamrany, Nake M., and Richard H. Day, eds. 1980. *Economic Issues of the Eighties*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Editor (Compiler or Translator) in Addition to Author

(Menchu 1999)

Menchu, Rigoberta. 1999. *Crossing Borders*. Trans. and ed. Ann Wright. New York: Verso.

Chapter in a Book

(Phibbs 1987, 122-24)

Phibbs, Brendan. 1987. Herrlisheim: Diary of a Battle. In *The Other Side of Time: A Combat Surgeon in World War II*, 117-63. Boston: Little, Brown.

Organization as Author

(British Standards Institute 1985)

British Standards Institute. 1985. *Specification for Abbreviation of Title Words and Titles of Publications*. Linford Woods, Milton Keynes, UK: British Standards Institute.

Contribution to a Multi-Author Book

(Wiens 1983)

Wiens, J. A. 1983. Avian Community Ecology: An Iconoclastic View. In *Perspectives in Ornithology*, eds. A. H. Brush and G. A. Clark Jr., 355-403. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Multi-Volume Work

(Wright 1968-78, 2: 341)

Wright, Sewell. 1968-78. *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*. 4 vols. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Particular Volume in a Multi-Volume Work

(Wright 1969, 129)

Wright, Sewell. 1969. *Theory of Gene Frequencies*. Vol. 2 of *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Electronic Book

(Sirosh, Miikkulainen, and Bednar 1996)

Sirosh, J., R. Miikkulainen, and J. A. Bednar. 1996. Self-Organization of Orientation Maps, Lateral Connections, and Dynamic Receptive Fields in The Primary Visual Cortex. In *Lateral Interactions in the Cortex: Structure and Function*, ed. J. Sirosh, R. Miikkulainen, and Y. Choe. Austin, TX: UTCS Neural Networks Research Group. <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/nn/web-pubs/htmlbook96/> (accessed August 27, 2001).

Scholarly or Professional Journal

In reference lists, the volume number follows the journal title without intervening punctuation and is not in italics. Arabic numerals are used even if the journal itself uses roman numerals.

(Terborgh 1974)

Terborgh, J. 1974. Preservation of Natural Diversity: The Problem of Extinction-Prone Species. *BioScience* 24: 715-22.

In reference lists, the issue number is in parentheses.

Allison, G. W. 1999. The Implications of Experimental Design for Biodiversity Manipulations. *American Naturalist* 153 (1): 26-45.

When a journal uses issue numbers only, without volume numbers, a comma follows the journal title.

Meyerovitch, Eva. 1959. The Gnostic Manuscripts of Upper Egypt. *Diogenes*, no. 25: 84-117.

When the year itself serves as volume number, it is an indispensable element and should therefore not be enclosed in parentheses. A comma follows the journal title.

Myers, N., and R. Tucker. 1987. Deforestation in Central America: Spanish Legacy and North American Consumers. *Environmental Review*, Spring 1987, 55-71.

Forthcoming Works

If an article has been accepted for publication by a journal but has not yet appeared, *forthcoming* stands in place of the year and the page numbers. Any article not yet accepted should be treated as an unpublished manuscript.

(Researcher and Assistant, forthcoming)

Researcher, A. A., and B. B. Assistant. Forthcoming. Article Title. *Journal Name* 103.

Newspaper Article (Printed and Online)

Newspaper articles are commonly cited in notes or parenthetical citations. A list of works cited need not list newspaper items if these have been documented in the text. No corresponding entry in a reference list would be needed for the following citation:

In an article on rampage killers (*New York Times*, April 10, 2000), Laurie Goodstein and William Glaberson describe...

If for some reason, an entry were included, it would appear as follows:

(Mitchell and Bruni 2001)

Mitchell, Alison, and Frank Bruni. 2001. Scars Still Raw, Bush Clashes With McCain. *New York Times*, March 25, 2001.

Citations to online newspapers or news articles posted by news services are identical to their print counterparts, with the addition of a URL and the date the information was accessed.

Mitchell, Alison, and Frank Bruni. 2001. Scars Still Raw, Bush Clashes With McCain. *New York Times*, March 25, 2001. <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/3/25/politics/25MCCA.html> (accessed January 2, 2002).

Unsigned Newspaper Article

Unsigned newspaper articles or features are best dealt with in text or notes. But if a reference list entry should be needed, the name of the newspaper stands in place of the author.

(*New York Times* 2002)

New York Times. 2002. In Texas, Ad Heats Up Race for Governor. July 30.

Working Paper and Unpublished Work

(Ferber 1971)

Ferber, R. 1971. Family Decision-Making and Economic Behavior. Faculty Working Paper 35, College of Commerce and Business Administration, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Thesis or Dissertation

(Schwarz 2000)

Schwarz, G. J. 2000. Multiwavelength Analyses of Classical Carbon-Oxygen Novae (Outbursts, Binary Stars). PhD diss., Arizona State Univ.

Paper Presented at Meetings, Seminars, or Conferences

(O'Guinn 1987)

O'Guinn, T. C. 1987. Touching Greatness: Some Aspects of Star Worship in Contemporary Consumption. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Letters and other Communications in Published Collections

A reference to a letter, memorandum, or similar communication in a published collection begins with the names of the sender and the recipient, in that order, followed by a date and sometimes the place where the communication was prepared. The word *letter* is unnecessary, but other forms, such as reports or memoranda, should be specified. The title of the collection is given in the usual form for a book.

In a letter to Charles Milnes Gaskell from London, March 30, 1868 (Adams 1930, 141), Adams wrote...

Adams, Henry. 1930. *Letters of Henry Adams, 1858-1891*. Ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Unpublished Letters or Personal Communications

In parenthetical citations the terms "personal communication" (or "pers. comm."), "unpublished data," and the like are used after the name(s) of the person(s) concerned, following a comma. Reference list entries are unneeded. The abbreviation "et al." should be avoided in such citations.

(H. J. Brody, pers. comm.)

(E. Simpkins, S. Warren, M. Turck, and S. Gorbach, unpublished data)

Government Document

(U.S. Bureau of the Census 1986)

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1986. Household Net Wealth and Asset Ownership. Current Population Reports, Series P-70, No. 3. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Internet Document

When referencing sources of information found on the internet, please include

sufficient information so that other researchers can easily locate the materials.

(Kameras 1996)

Kameras, David. 1996. NAFTA Hearing Exposes Sprint. AFL-CIO News. <http://www.aflcio.org/newsonline> (accessed March 8, 2002).

Interview

In whatever form interviews or personal communications exist—published, broadcast, preserved in audiovisual form, available online—the citation normally begins with the name of the person interviewed or the person from whom the communication was received. The interviewer or recipient, if mentioned, comes second.

Published Interview

An interview that has already been published or broadcast is treated like an article in a periodical or a chapter in a book.

(Bellour 1979)

Bellour, Raymond. 1979. Alternation, Segmentation, Hypnosis: Interview with Raymond Bellour. By Janet Bergstrom. *Camera Obscura*, nos. 3-4: 89-94.

Unpublished Interview

Unpublished interviews are best cited in text but they occasionally appear in reference lists. Citations should include the names of both the person interviewed and the interviewer; brief identifying information, if appropriate; the place or date of the interview (or both, if known); and, if a transcript or tape is available, where it may be found.

(Hunt 1976)

Hunt, Horace [pseud.]. 1976. Interview by Ronald Schatz. Tape recording. May 16. Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg.

For further examples of citations consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

Format of Graphs, Illustrations and Tables

The initial manuscript submission to the *JBS* may include graphs and illustrations within the text. Once a manuscript is accepted by the editors for publication, it is the responsibility of authors to submit all graphs and illustrations separately and in the proper electronic format. Authors may wish to provide graphs and illustrations to *JBS* specifications at the time of original submission of the manuscript in order to avoid delays.

If authors do not or cannot provide illustrations, the *JBS* will have these prepared and will bill the author for the cost of their production. The cost of a fairly simple full-page map, for example, would be approximately US\$40.00; a full-page table would be approximately US\$50.00.

Graphs and Illustrations

Graphs may be placed in the text for positioning, but a separate electronic file must be provided in its native file format (such as Excel —*.xls— or equivalent) with its accompanying data. At times, adjustments need to be made due to space limitations and/or grayscale issues, thus requiring corresponding data.

Illustrations may be placed in the text for positioning, but a separate electronic file must be provided in its native file format. Acceptable formats are JPEG, TIFF or AI (Adobe Illustrator). These illustrations should be 300 dpi or greater in resolution and may be submitted in black and white or grayscale.

Size

All illustrations and tables, including titles, legends and notes, must fit within the printable area of the *JBS*. The area is 4.75 inches (12.065 centimeters) wide by 7.75 inches (19.685 centimeters) high. The margins provided previously in the "Preparation of Copy," are a good approximation and should be used as a guide for orientation (portrait or landscape), size, readability and placement of these items.

Fonts

The preferred font for illustrations titles and legends is Helvetica/Arial at 8 point.

Frames

Graphs and illustrations should not be enclosed in frames. Appropriate framing will be done at the time of production editing.

Titles and Legends

Tables should be titled and numbered consecutively with Arabic numerals. The title should be in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point, bold, and in initial capitals and lowercase. The legend should be placed at the bottom in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point and in initial capitals and lowercase.

Punctuation should be as in the following example:

Table 1. Per Capita Income in Border Counties

All other illustrations (maps, diagrams, charts, and graphs) should be labeled as “Figure” and numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals.

For example:

Figure 1. The Russian-Finnish Border Region

The title should be located at the top of the illustration and centered in Helvetica/Arial at 8 point and in initial capitals and lowercase. The legend should be placed at the bottom in the same typeface and point size.

Questions Regarding Illustrations

For more information with regard to illustration requirements and formats, contact *JBS* Production Editor Baldomero G. Garcia (baldogarcia@tamiu.edu). Please review illustrations in recent issues of the *Journal of Borderlands Studies* for examples.

Spelling

Our spelling authority is Webster’s Third New International Dictionary. The Editors assume that all manuscripts have been proofed for errors, spelling accuracy, and consistency prior to submission. In addition, it is important that authors determine the proper use of accents and diacriticals and use these consistently in their manuscripts.

Languages

The *JBS* accepts manuscripts in English only.

*Examples derived from the *Chicago Manual of Style* 15th Edition.

The *Journal of Borderlands Studies* (*JBS*) is sponsored by the Association for Borderlands Studies. The *JBS* is published in the spring and fall of each year.

Individual annual membership dues for the Association for Borderlands Studies are \$35. Student membership dues are \$20. Dues include a subscription to the *JBS*. Membership dues should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick, Co-Editor
Journal of Borderlands Studies
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

www.absborderlands.org

Library subscriptions to the *JBS* are \$25. Library subscriptions should be sent to:

Journal of Borderlands Studies
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

Manuscripts submitted for consideration are welcome. For manuscript preparation, please consult "Instructions for Authors" at:

www.absborderlands.org/jbs/jbsmanuscriptstyle.htm

Manuscripts or inquiries should be sent to:

J. Michael Patrick (jbs@tamiu.edu)
Texas A&M International University
Texas Center for Border Economic and Enterprise Development
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041-1900

or

Henk van Houtum (h.vanhoutum@fm.ru.nl)
and
Martin van der Velde (M.vanderVelde@ru.nl)
Radboud University of Nijmegen
Nijmegen Centre for Border Research
P. O. Box 9108
6500 HK Nijmegen
The Netherlands

Manuscripts with a clear geographical focus on the Americas should be sent to J. Michael Patrick, whereas the ones with a European or Near Eastern focus (including North Africa) should be sent to Henk van Houtum and Martin van der Velde. Other manuscripts can be sent to either address.

Borderlands