Living on the border. European Border Regions in Comparison
Borders exist in almost every sphere of life. Borders are separating lines that are somewhat dividing; for this reason in most cases the term “border” has a negative connotation. Nevertheless, in everyday life, people often cross borders because they are fascinated by the unknown and the assumed new.

The awareness of borders in manifold spheres of our life, in the sense of mental and factual maps, means it is not surprising that they have become a topic of consideration in almost all scholarly disciplines – history, geography, political science, linguistics, anthropology, psychology and many others.

The seminar primarily incorporated an interdisciplinary and comparative approach. Historians, sociologists, anthropologists and political science scholars from Germany, Poland and other European countries analyzed historical as well as contemporary perceptions and perspectives concerning border regions – inside the EU, between EU and non-EU European countries, and between European and non-European countries. The seminar was continuation of the seminar that took place from 28.-30. September 2011 in Leck.
Seminar was organized together with:

Akademie Sankelmark
im Deutschen Grenzverein e.V.

For me as a bachelor-student it was very interesting to see what other researchers, way further in their academic careers, have developed in terms of both academic work and presentation skills. The seminar gave me the motivation to dig deeper into my interest in border region as I have realized that there are many more issues and problems to be discovered. On top of that, I have met many interesting people with different cultural backgrounds and I have been part of many fascinating conversations and discussions.

Laura Pelzmann
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Borders can be understood in a diverse way and thus, it was only appropriate to discuss the aspect of living on borders in an equally diverse group, allowing for an enriching exchange of information, viewpoints, discussions, and input. This was nicely integrated by taking a more indepth look into the Sonderjylland-Schleswig region, especially the border region itself.
Sebastian Zimmer
Programme of the Seminar

27.9.2012 (Thursday) until 15:00 

Arrivals

15:30-15:45 Welcoming 
Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Vestergaard 
Prof. Dr. Stephan Panther 
Dr. Christian Pletzing

15:45-16:10 Introduction to the topic 
Prof. Dr. iur. Charlotte Gaitanides: The Microcosm of European Integration: The functioning of EU-financed cross-border co-operations;

16:10-16:20 Coffee break

16:20-17:05 Panel I: European border regions 
(Chair: Dr. Christian Pletzing) 
Laura Asarite: From a look backwards to a look forwards – the way to the border agreement between Latvia and Russia; 
Dinara Apakidze: Borders in formation of regional identity: bridges or barriers? Case study: Euro-region SaarLorLux;

17:05-17:50 Panel II: The German-Danish border region (Chair: Prof. Dr. iur. Charlotte Gaitanides) 
Prof. Dr. Steen Bo Frandsen: History of regions; 
Prof. Dr. Martin Klatt: Sønderjylland-Schleswig – celebrating unity in diversity?

18:00 Dinner

19:15 Evening speech 
Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Gerhard Besier: West German and East German cultures of remembrance after the end of the Second World War: The ideological border as a cause of different memorial processes in a psycho-historical perspective; 
Dr. Christian Pletzing: Commuters in a border region – Jews in Kashubia;
28.9.2012 (Friday)

8:00-9:00  Breakfast

9:30-11:00  Panel III: European border regions
            (Chair: Prof. Dr. Katarzyna Stoklosa)
            Grätel Marksteiner und Nicolae Balc: Banat – Evolution
            And perspectives of a multicultural border region;
            Andrea Varriale: Tirol Euro-region: bridging the wrong
            border?
            Dr. Jaume Castan: The Spanish-Moroccan relationship:
            combining bonne entente with territorial disputes;

11:00-11:10  Coffee break

11:10-12:20  Panel IV: The German-Polish border region (Chair:
              Prof. Dr. Gerhard Besier)
              Dr. Elżbieta Opiołowska: History of the German-Polish
              border region and the Europeanization of border regions
              – a research paradigm;
              Prof. Dr. Katarzyna Stoklosa: Border in consciousness
              and narratives of the inhabitants of the German-Polish
              border region;

12:30-13:30  Lunch

13:30-14:40  Panel V: European border regions (Chair: )
              Jutta Bissinger: Project "Neighborhoods in Europe"
              MA/MSc Sebastian Zimmer: Borders in European
              Education;

14:50-18:00  Sightseeing in the region (Guide: Prof. Dr. Martin
              Klatt)

19:30  Dinner at the meeting of the German-Danish-Polish Club

Club, hosted by Elisabeth and Torben Vestergaard;
Evening speech: Prof. Dr. Torben Vestergaard:
    Cosmologies of Danish-German Difference;
29.9.2012 (Saturday)

08:00-9:00  Breakfast

9:00-11:30  Panel VI: European border regions (Chair: Laura Pelzmann)

MA/MSc Osama Salem: Fortress Europe. An overview on the EU asylum and refugee system;
MA/MSc Sophie Wulk: Educational Diplomacy beyond borders. The case of Turkey and the Jean Monnet Scholarship;
MA Nuri Tahir: Bulgarian-Greek Border Region: Cross-border Cooperation Under the Shadow of Minority Issues;

11:30-12:30 Seminar evaluation

12:30-13:30 Lunch

Departures

We are greatly indebted to the German-Polish Foundation for supporting our conference with a considerable sum.

The seminar „Living on the Border: European Border Regions in Comparison“ was a good platform for all participants to exchange their experience and knowledge in cross-border cooperation and come up with new ideas for further research through discussions that took place after each presentation. I personally enjoyed being in a friendly and professional environment of the seminar and left it with very useful ideas for my academic career. Many thanks to organizers and participants of the Seminar and looking forward to be a part of such a great company next year too.

Dinara Apakidze

The seminar in Sankelmark was, in my view, extremely positive and enriching for a wide variety of reasons. It was a great opportunity to meet colleagues from ‘the other side of the border’. It was interesting to hear about the different research topics and to interact with our fellow scholars. The seminar also opened the door to future collaborations between both sides, which I hope that we will be able to develop. Moreover, I value the fact that students were able to integrate and participate in the seminar. Finally, I would like to congratulate the organisers. I look forward to participating in the seminar next year.

Jaume Castan Pinos
A. Varriale

Foundation for the German-Polish cooperation; Willy Brandt Centre at the University Wroclaw (Poland); Universität Flensburg (Germany). Syddansk Universitet (Denmark); Technical University Dresden (Germany).

From 27-29 September 2012, the Foundation for the German-Polish cooperation; the Willy Brandt Centre at the University of Wroclaw (Poland); University of Flensburg (Germany), the University of Southern Denmark and the Technical University of Dresden (Germany) hold a seminar titled „Living on the Border: European Border Regions in Comparison“ in Sankelmark, on the German-Danish border. The seminar was thus structured: its core was constituted by two in-depth accounts of the Polish-German and Danish-German borders, offered by Opilowska and Stoklosa and by Klatt and Frandsen, respectively. A good half of the seminar has been devoted to contributions focusing on specific borderlands and minorities, such as the Eastern German-Western German, the Latvian-Russian, or the Moroccan-Spanish. A few more contributions have been devoted to borders in European higher education and in asylum policy.

The seminar was opened with a speech from Prof. Dr. Charlotte Gaitanides (Germany), director of a postgraduate program in European Studies at the University of Flensburg. By combining practical expertise and legal consideration, Gaitanides offered a disenchanted view on the functioning of EU-funded Cross-Border Cooperation projects (CBC) and an assessment of their purported role as drivers of European integration. The issue she addresses is whether border regions in the EU should be seen as “microcosm of European integration” or whether such an enthusiastic characterization is misplaced. Her position lies close to the realistic end of this range. Gaitanides makes her point by stressing that CBC projects are often little known by the very populations which they are supposed to target, which raises questions about their legitimacy and real aim. She also notes how this shortcoming reflects a top-down policy approach (i.e., European and national), which has more to do with the normative views of the member states or the European Commission than with the needs of the populations who live on the borders. Bottom-up initiatives are no panacea either, since they may well transform EU-funded CBC projects into financing platforms for unrelated projects. She finally notes that institutional and procedural reforms on CBS (such as the creation of the EGTS platform, within the Committee of the Regions) do not automatically ensure a leaner and more effective process. The success of CBC projects, she argues, ultimately relies on political will and cooperation between determined individuals. Gaitanides' contribution was a valuable warning not to indulge in a too complacent or idealized view on cross border cooperation in Europe.

The seminar continued with a panel on the Polish-German border, led by Prof. Stoklosa and Dr. Opilowska.

Dr. Opilowska has illustrated the life of the Polish-German border in its main phases by considering both the legal frameworks and the daily-life significance of the border. These were analyzed against the background of evolving political and economic contexts. Due to the border change in Poland, a fundamental feature of the borderland was that its inhabitants on both sides had moved there just recently and had little or no experience of each other as neighbors. The lack of regional identity, coupled with strict border controls from both communist states, meant that these bordering populations remained largely separated and unaware of life beyond the border. Another leitmotif in her presentation was the fact that the Oder-Neisse border, which had been agreed upon in 1945, never looked definitive. In this sense, a big contribution came from the Polish government’s habit to revive the threat of German revisionism as a warning against the discontent of the population. This in fact overrode the official rhetoric of friendship between the states in the communist bloc. Things changed with the opening of the border between 1972 and 1980, which resulted in a manifold increase of the number of people crossing the border in both directions. In the interviews she carried out, Opilowska found that the opening of the border helped to remove prejudices, and to lessen the fear of German
revisionism among the Polish population. But this would not last long. Economic difficulties in both countries and the offset of the Solidarnosc protest movement in Poland led to the eventual closure of the border until 1989. The following two decades have witnessed several CBC projects, town twinning, and examples of functional cooperation, lately also within the framework of the EU. Her main finding is that this cooperation has been largely an “elite game”, which has had no visible “trickle down” effect on the masses. This seems consistent with the claim made by Gaitanides at the offset of the seminar. Opilowska concluded by calling for more bottom-up initiatives (grassroots cooperation), not least to increase the legitimacy of high-level cross-border cooperation.

Prof Stoklosa’s presentation borrowed on the framework ironed out by Opilowska and focused on the changing perception of the GDR-Polish border among the two main groups in the divided town of Gorlitz/Zgorzelec. Stoklosa presented some of the results of her research original and third-party research on divided cities on the Polish-German border. The first finding is that the border was, and is still, perceived differently by different people: some feared it while others sought to cross it, some people were constantly reminded of its existence by guards and fences, while others only noticed it on special occasions. Another point highlighted in her research is that stereotypes still abound. Poles are still commonly depicted as car thieves, petty criminals and slackers. Conversely, one of the most common characterizations of Germans was the one of Nazi. Stoklosa also found a correlation between stereotypical descriptions and lack of either knowledge or long-term relation with those “on the other side”. As she noted in her closing remarks, however, one should come to the simplistic conclusion that, since lack of contact correlates with negative stereotypes, abundance of contact always generate positive attitudes. This, she stresses, would equal to assume that a person’s first experience of the other be a positive one, which obviously cannot always be the case. This mechanism is clear when comparing the different attitudes towards inter-group interaction in the older generations (generally more supportive) with the younger ones, who are more disenchanted about the possibility – today almost obvious perhaps – to live or simply meet people across the border. Meeting after a period of closed borders, it seems, carried for the older generations a much greater significance than simply passing the border without having experienced obstacles such as controls and checkpoints. She concluded that personal experience (e.g. direct, intensive or long-term contact) matters more, for overcoming prejudices, than education-based information about the other group.

The second panel concerned the border between Germany and Denmark and was presented by Prof. Dr. Klatt (Germany) and Prof. Dr. Frandsen (Denmark). Klatt briefly presented the history of the border in the last two centuries and then offered some considerations about the current situation, mostly in terms of inter-group integration. One of the leitmotifs was the question whether minorities can be seen as drivers of cooperation. For the case at hand Klatt found that, taken as a group, national minorities of both nationalities have long hindered cross-border cooperation, out of fear for hidden agenda (e.g. border revision) or of losing their minority identity. Conversely, individuals in the two groups are found to have benefited greatly from their ability to communicate in both cultures, especially in terms of education and job opportunities. This does not exclude that a significant number of people living on the border has little to no knowledge of the other’s diversity, and crosses the border mainly for cheap shopping. While the Schleswig/Slesvig region displays a comparatively high degree of tolerance and integration (minority parties on both sides collect votes also from the majority groups), inconveniences such as the reduction of public funding to Danish schools in Germany in 2011, have quickly dug up old prejudices. Depiction of Germans seeking Danish social aid and of Danish children being brought to school by taxi was promptly refreshed. However, Klatt noted that in general the identification of minorities with their kin state is fading away. He concludes with an intriguing remark on whether the “Unity” part of the slogan “Unity in diversity” is really a necessity for the two groups or rather a fossil of national normative thinking.
In his presentation, Frandsen offered a few “cartographic” considerations on how the notion of border is graphically and psychologically constructed: a neat line on the map, beyond which we find either a blank space or a different country marked with a different color. This clear-cut distinction relies (functionally, one might add) on the conception of countries as a homogeneous territory, a message, which is graphically conveyed by single-color countries on the map. Academia has not escaped this view, either: at its foundation in 1972, the Danish Institute for Border Studies was in charge to study only the Danish part of the borderland. In a methodological note, Frandsen claimed that border regions are best explored in comparisons, both within and without the national borders. Another useful conceptual tool is the centre-periphery dichotomy, which helps make sense of why border regions fall prey of their respective centers, as was the case with the conflict over the Schleswig region. This conflict did not start in the region, but was decided in Copenhagen and Kiel. Frandsen concludes with a thought-provoking claim (based on the effects of the border changes between Germany and Denmark on the importance of the town of Flensburg), that borders do not merely signal the presence of two peripheral areas, but rather create peripheries by their mere existence.

The conference continued with further localized accounts of life on the border. First was Prof. Dr. Besier’s (Germany) contribution about the border between the two Germanies. He made extensive considerations on the deep ambivalence of a recurrence – that of 8th and 9th of May 1945 – which has long been understood as either the liberation from Nazi rule by the red army and the inception of an anti-fascist state, or as the brutal occupation by a foreign power. One of the results was that both official celebration and mourn were avoided for a long period of time. Perhaps the most engaging part of Besier’s presentation was his psychological observations on how the war has been elaborated by German citizens in terms of pride, honor, and shame. Family allegiance has systematically overridden school-based education in Western Germany, whereas in the East the “anti-fascist liberation” rhetoric worked in a similar fashion.

The contribution of Dr. Pletzing (Germany), president of the Akademie Sankelmark (which hosted the meeting), focused on a previously unknown Jewish minority in Kashubia, a region near Danzig. The most striking finding is that the former Jewish community, which disappeared after WWII, has been entirely forgotten by the local population. Cemeteries and Synagogues had been destroyed during the German occupation, and some of these former sacred spaces have been transformed into parking lots. The only relic of the Karthaus Synagogue was a David’s star found at a local market by chance. His research project has later evolved into local initiatives and historical-touristic publications, both of which seek to revive the memory of the Jewish community.

The next panels saw a few short presentations on other cases of European borders. Dr. Castan (Spain) presented the case of the Spanish exclaves of Ceuta and Melilla on the Moroccan coast. These two small exclaves mobilize an arguably disproportioned rhetorical arsenal in Spanish political discourse, such as the idea that Spain is – just like Turkey – a “bi-continental state”. Similarly, Moroccan official statements never omit the definition “occupied city” before naming either Ceuta or Melilla. Obviously, this is at odds with the official “bonne entente” driving the Spanish-Moroccan relationship. This situation is further complicated by geopolitical issues involving Algeria and the Belisarius liberation movement in Western Sahara. He showed that territoriality, a seemingly outdated concept, “is still in good shape”.

MA. Asarite (Latvia) illustrated the border issue between Latvia and Russia with a clear-cut and solid argument that a shift has taken place in Latvia’s mainstream politics (and indeed in the same politicians). If previously regaining the small district of Abrene was a priority in the Latvian national political discourse, just few years later a much more pragmatic approach has prevailed, despite several protest had erupted for the preservation of the old border.

Other contributions covered topics such as the development of the Saarland-Lorraine-Luxemburg as a relatively integrated border region (Apakidze, Russia), the evolution of German-
Italian interaction and identification strategies in Tyrol (Varriale, Italy), the situation of a Turkish minority on the Bulgarian-Greek border (Tahrir, Bulgaria) and recent local projects on the German-Polish-Czech border (Bissinger, Denmark). All presentations focused on the questions of integration and inter-group interaction between the respective national groups.

A small group of presentations related to the question of borders in a more oblique way. MA Wulk and MA Zimmer both studied borders in relation with the European high education system. Zimmer favored an “internal market” approach, which stressed how the lack of standardization in diplomas hinders the free movement of students within the EU and, sometimes, within their country itself. Wulk presented her on-going PhD research on educational diplomacy in the EU. By bringing the case of several exchange students from Turkey (Jean Monnet program), she enquires whether this experience in the EU has had any impact on the way Europe is perceived beyond its borders. This research responds to the lack of studies evaluating the significance of EU’s educational diplomacy. MA Salem (Syria) instead presented the outcome of his Master’s thesis on asylum policy in the EU. He stressed the huge variance in EU countries’ asylum policy, and the lack, in practice, of a unified EU asylum policy. His conclusion is that, instead of a unified policy, all EU has achieved so far is a unified project.

The seminar has brought great minds together, we have talked about different border regions but came to a common point in addressing the role played by the state as the center in relation to the periphery.

Here I think about the idea brought up by Prof. Dr. Steen Bo Frandsen about the interest of the state towards the newly conquered areas, that used to be centers and became peripheries under the new state. The presentation of Andrea Varriale about Tirol, the Spanish-Moroccan territorial dispute, the Bulgarian-Greek border region presented by Nuri Tahir and the Banat presentation, all go roughly in the same direction.

The fact that all participants could choose their topic freely but still managed organically to refer to the same pattern makes me very satisfied to have been part of this conference.

Many thanks to Prof. Dr. Stoklosa and everyone else for giving us, young researchers, the chance to express ourselves in such a friendly and informal but still scientifical way.

Nicolae Balc
Danish-German Border Region Tour in the framework of the Seminar: Back in the History of German – Danish Border.

September, 28th, 2012.

Despite of the heavy rain we have still found our way into the “Fjord Area” thanks to Dr. Martin Klatt who also used to be a professional tour guide of the area.

“Istedt-Lion”

The first stop was in one of Flensburg’s parks where the rich history of the “Istedt-Lion” was presented. The monument was built in the remembrance of the battle of Istedt from 1850. Here, the fallen Danish soldiers where remembered. The shifting of the borders brought along the relocation of the monument and after 1864 the monument was taken by Prussian military to the Military School Lichterfelde in Berlin as spoils of war. After 1945 the statue was brought to Copenhagen and kept in the Tojhusmuseet. The monument returned back to its initial town Flensburg in 2011, this being a sign of Danish-German reconciliation in a long history from “against each other” to “towards each other”.

Personally I was very pleased with the outcome of the three-day seminar. The topic of a border region was somewhat a new area for me so I left with a baggage of knowledge on the different cooperation stages in several European border regions. The speakers delivered highly academic presentations and subsequent debates. It was a great opportunity to meet with people from different countries, different mentalities, fact which can only be attributed to the cross border thematic of the seminar. Combining the theoretical with the practical of Prof. Klatt’s tour around Sonderborg and Flensburg, it was shown in an almost “study case style” what turns life in a border region can take.

The remote location was fit for the seminar and the friendly welcoming was a plus. To finish off, I couldn’t say no to attending such a seminar in the future.

Gretel Marksteiner
The trip continued on the hills of Flensburg, where the Museumsberg Flensburg waited for us. The museum hosts the history of the old duchy of Schleswig, consisting of two massive buildings build by the Prussian administration after 1864. The stairs seemed the perfect place for a nice group photo.

Another place to experience a panoramic view of Flensburg was on the opposite hills to the Museumumsberg, the “St. Jürgen Treppe”. Here we have the possibility to take the stairs down to the city trough the small park positioned on the steep hill.
The first station after crossing the border to Denmark was the “Camp Froslev”, built in 1944. It was the place where caught underground resistance fighters where kept prisoners. The camp was built on Danish territory and aimed to prevent the deportation of caught Danish resistance members to German concentration camps. The German SS was only guarding the camp from the outside and the Danish prisoners were allowed to internally manage the camp. The camp is in present time used as an “Efterskole”, pupils both inhabiting the place and studying throughout the week.

One of the monumental places for the recent Danish history is DybbolBanke. Here in 1864 the bitter German-Danish battle took place. After the setting of the new border in 1920 and subsequent to the defeat suffered by the Danish side, DybbolBanke became a national symbol. Defining for this trauma of the Danish people was the expression: “what was lost outwardly can be won inwardly”. Today Dybbol is a place where every year Danish and German troops, dress as in the old times and march together in a sign of reconciliation.
The end of the evening was marked by the regular meeting of the German-Danish-Polish Club held this time at the house of Prof. Dr. Elisabeth Vestergaard, the head of the Department of Border Region Studies.

Material and pictures provided by NicolaeBalc.
Best moments of the Seminar: