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Eurolimes, where to?

Ioan HORGA

Abstract: Now that we publish the 10th issue of Eurolimes, the editors of the journal intend to sum up the contribution of Eurolimes to the examination of the notion of boundary corresponding to the border-limit in correlation with the notion of border as state boundary. Our journal also aims at showing the way in which the meaning of internal frontiers changes evolving from the national perspective to the community one. On the other hand, we seek to define the future editorial initiatives of the journal towards more punctual topics through the question "Eurolimes, where to?": EU position in an international context with strong mutations after 2010; the impact of policy on the construction of a formal or informal border; the impact of different types of borders on identities; the process of evolution of social borders within the EU Member States, etc.
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Five years ago, when we released the Eurolimes journal on the scientific market, a balanced optimism broke through in the opening article entitled Why Eurolimes?, when justifying the need for such a debate forum: "Nowadays, to dedicate a journal to the issue of borders in Europe – as Eurolimes is – seems to be an outdated question from both the point of view of the process of European integration, or enlargement, and from the point of view of the expectations of the Europeans, who wish to circulate, work, and live wherever they want to. But the issue of the border is much more complex than we assume from the viewpoint of its essence and of the different experiences of Europe as a whole. This scepticism envisages the complexity of the interpretations given to the notion of European border and its evolution in the context of phenomena of globalisation and integration.

1. Europe between boundary and border

At the time, we saw some complex elements of the border related issues that have come true; others only partly became a reality, while others are still a waiting to come true within the following five years. One of them was the examination of the notion of boundary, corresponding to the border as a limit in correlation with the notion of border as state boundary. This enterprise has been achieved in Eurolimes first from the perspective of Europe’s limits as political entity during its different stages of expansion. From the point of view of Europe’s political integration, Ernst Haas traces the coordinates of this political entity as the aim of the process of integration: “a new political community superimposed on the pre-existing ones” (Haas 1968: 16) with a new conception on the significance of the borders. Thomas Diez draws the attention on the identification of the European integration with the phenomenon of overcoming the borders-whether territorial or not, as this process has a reverse: establishing new borders, whether political (borders of the newly established body), economic (relation between internal market and third parties), or societal (building a new European identity would mean defining a new non-European alter). To him, the paradox of establishing new borders and abolishing the former borders is a reality that cannot be avoided. Yet acknowledging the existence of these borders does not have a negative aspect, as new governing areas are “constitutive for political action, that is they define political stakeholders and confer specific rights and obligations” (Diez, 2006: 236, 249; Ion 2010: 25-26). Following the same pattern, Etienne
Balibar speaks about Europe as a borderland (Balibar, 2004). Under such theoretical circumstances, *Eurolimes* aims at bringing to the foreground the action of different stakeholders in social construction of the European boundaries (Eder, 2006); Regions and Ethnonations in Europe (Gimeno Ugalde 2006/2); Cross-border Identity in Building a Regional Brand (Soproni, 2006/2); The Use of Cross-border Cooperation and Border Location in Place Marketing (Kozma, 2006/2; Komadi 2006/2); La politique eurorégionale au sein des nouveaux Etats membres (Hinfray, 2006/2); The Role of the Mass-media in Cross-border Cooperation (Soproni, 2007/3; Baranyi 2007/3); Workforce – Market Cooperation (Csapo, 2007/4); The Construction of Models of Cross-border Economic Cooperation: Euroregions, Eurometropolis (Penzes and Molnar, 2007/4; Suli-Zaakr 2009/8; Gualyas and Sisak, 2009/8); The Role of Educational Cooperations in Cross-border Cooperation (Teperics, 2007/4); The Role of Danube Region in the Transnational Cooperation as a Playground of the European Integration (Gal, 2009/7); The Construction of the Methods of the Analysis of Integration Effects on Border Areas (Czimre, 2007/4; Tagai, Penzes and Molnar, 2008/6). The role of actors in social construction of boundaries has been underlined in the case of important segments of the European Union eastern border: Cross-border Cooperation – a Strategic Dimension of European Neighbourhood Policy at the Eastern Border of the EU (Leuca 2006/2; Sturza, 2006/2; Dandis 2009/7); Investment Attractiveness of Special Legal Regimes of Economic Activity in Border Regions between Ukraine and the EU (Yehorova, 2009/8); The EU Relations with the Trans-Caucasian Countries with the Scope of the ENP (Kokamaz, 2009/7).

The optimistic dimension of the surveys mentioned above referring to boundaries or border is amended in the journal especially in the context of the economic crisis occurring worldwide and particularly in Europe as of 2008 and of worldwide geopolitical mutations repositioning EU on a more defensive and less dynamic place as compared to the period previous to the latest enlargement in 2007. The fact that in 2007 we dedicated an issue of the journal to *Europe from Exclusive Borders to Inclusive Frontiers* expressing a clear positioning in point of confidence in a progressive change of the European borders into an *eurolimes* (Nikolaidis, 2007; Horga and Pantea, 2007/4) bridging neighbouring areas has never excluded a certain reserve that things would not evolve in a simple and predictable manner. At the time, we had not experienced economic crisis (Soproni and Horga, 2009/8) or lectures on the possible European disintegration (Vollaard, 2008). Nevertheless, as early as the first issues of the *Eurolimes*, some authors expressed their reserve concerning the “European triumphal march” and showed the limits of Europe (Bideleux, 2006/1); or the fact that EU neighbourhood policy actions at its eastern borders would accommodate the Near Abroad Policy of the Russian Federation (Tacu, 2008/6); The Limits of Europeanness. Can Europeanness Stand Alone as the Only Guiding Criterion for Deciding Turkey’s EU Membership? (Paun and Cicco, 2010/9; Sumer, 2009/7). There are also the papers discussing on Europeanising a Border Problem (Griffiths and Quispel, 2006/1); Borders: Cause or Conflict or Catalyst for Peace (Pfetsch, 2007/4), Peripheries and Borders in a Post-Western Europe (Delanty, 2007/4) already foreseeing gaps in the European stability due to the issue of the borders. Other papers express their reserve concerning border optimism from the point of view of security (Balogh, 2006/2; Edelstam, 2007/4); Trafficking Human Beings in South-Eastern Europe (Gavrila, 2007/4); Legal and Illegal Migration (Quispel, 2007/4); Key Regions at the EU Eastern Border – the Case of Transcarpathia (Dimitrova, 2007/3).
2. Europe: “the new frontiers” versus identity

On the one hand, our journal aims at showing a way in which the changing meaning of internal frontiers occurs by evolving from the national perspective to the community one. Jacques Rupnik speaks not only about Europe’s frontiers, but also about the new frontiers “inside Europe” (Rupnik, 2003; Rupnik, 2007). On the other hand, *Eurolimes* aims at seizing the way in which the meaning of EU’s external frontier changes from an exclusive community perspective to a flexible inclusive one. Such a perspective is according to Thomas Christiansen who writes about fluid frontiers (Christiansen and all, 2000) or Olli Rehn, to whom the notion *next frontier* is more suitable than *border* for testing ground for the EU soft power (Rehn, 2006).

Should Europe stop before or beyond its margins which “are traditionally oriented more towards the exterior than towards the interior and are inhabited by peoples who have an incomplete feeling of belonging to the empire”? (Nicolaides, 2007: 287). Within the pages of the *Eurolimes* journal one can find different answers to the new meaning of the borders. The role of the economic factor in the dynamics of the EU internal borders changes and the relations with the EU neighbouring areas is brought to the foregroup by surveys such as: EU – Western Balkans Economic Relations – Experience Useful for New EU “Neighbours” (Trajkova, 2006/2); L’Europe élargie sans frontière monétaire (Kundera, 2007/4); The Role of the Tourism in the Intercultural Dialogue (Michalko and Illes, 2008/6); The Economic Frontiers of Europe (Soproni and Horga, 2009/8); L’évolution de la zone euro à travers de la plasticité de ses frontières (Burrinet, 2009/8); European Ecological Borders (Scichilone, 2009/8); The EU’s Mediterranean Policy. An Assessment over a Decade (1995-2005) (Santagostino and Fornari, 2009/8); Will the Financial-Economic Crisis of 2008–2009 Accelerate Monetary Integration in the EU (Mucha-Leszko and Kakol, 2009/8); État, marché et société. La question de l’équilibre dans la relation entre société et politique (Contogeorgis, 2009/8). The role of EU’s political role model in neighbouring countries has been stressed by authors in the *Eurolimes* journal: Approaching the Northern and Southern Neighbours of the European Union (Duna, 2009/7); The Assessment of the European Neighbourhood Policy in the South Caucasus: What the European Union can do? (Pop, 2009/7); L’Union européenne et ses voisins: une affaire de citoyens (Rouet, 2009/7).

Several editors have been concerned with borders from the point of view of identity elements. Consequently, they have suggested that seven out of the nine issues of the *Eurolimes* journal should be dedicated to these elements. For instance, the historical basis of the perception on the border has had special contributors in the first two issues and was a topic item in the following issues: Borders in a Changing Europe: Dynamics of Openness and Closure (Delanty, 2006/1); One City – Two Images – Two Communities: The Case of the Romanian Hungarian City of Satu Mare/ Szatmár vármegye (Blomquist, 2006/2); Jewish Inhabitants of the Pokuttya and Carpathian Region, as Seen by Their Neighbours Based on the Folklore Collection of Oskar Kolberg (Kutzreba, 2006/2); (Idel 2008/5, Sipos 2006/1, Nuzzille 2006/1); Problems of the Hungarian Minorities in Ukraine (Savchur, 2006/2); „In the State of Walachia, Near the Border” or: Was the Besht Indeed Born in Okopy? (Idel, 2008/5); The Romanians as a Border People during the Middle Ages. Between Slavonianism and Latinity (Pop, 2008/5); Narrative Fiction as a means of Crossing Borders (Istvánföy, 2009/7).

The media impact on borders is a less frequent issue in topic literature, yet it has a special place in the journal: The Role of the Media in Changing the Meaning of Borders (Horga 2007/3); Médias et minorités en Slovaquie (Folrichova and Rouet, 2007/3); Media and Interculturalism (Malovic, 2007/3); Mass Media Impact on the Democratization
Processes in Society Case of the Republic of Moldova (Rosca, 2007/3); Médias européens et la non-mention des racines chrétiennes dans la Constitution européenne (Bazin, 2007/3); Ignoring Radical Media in Communication Studies in Turkey (Koker and Doganay, 2007/3); Médias, dialogue interculturel et nouvelles frontières de l’Union Européenne (Maron, 2007/3).

There are several surveys on religious borders, such as: Religious Policy of the Russian Empire as Concerns the Confessional Minorities from Bessarabia in the 19th Century (Gumenai, 2008/5); Privatisation or Publicising of Religion in the Modern World (Marczewska –Rytko, 2008/5); Contemporary Religious Patterns in the Carpatho-Pannonian Area (Kocsis, 2008/5); Religion and Politics in the Nation State and the European Union (Contogeorgis, 2008/5); Considérations sur les frontières religieuses de l’Europe Centrale et de Sud-Est (Horga and Sipos, 2008/5); How Europe Can Dialogue with Islam ? (Santagostino, 2008/5); The Interreligious Dialogue in the Context of the New Europe: The European Ecumenical Movement (Brie and all, 2008/5); Religious Borders in Decomposition (Antes 2008/5); Mental Religious Borders in Europe (Banus, 2008/6).

Cultural borders as considered from the point of view of diversity have been the most present in the pages of the journal, as each issue has surveys relevant to the topic, even when debating economic borders. On the one hand, the pages of the journal discuss the multiple cultural borders: EU Enlargements and Its Linguistic Borders (Ferrando and Ugalde, 2006/1); The Cultural Relevance of the Borders (Banus, 2006/2); Why Was the 20th Century Warlike (Pfetsch, 2007/3); La culture de l’autrui dans la pensée de Denis de Rougemont (Dogot, 2008/6); Erasmus et la mobilité en Europe, vers un dépassement des frontières (Come, 2009/7); The Cultural Frontiers of Europe (Stoica and Brie, 2010/9); Rural Cultural Border (Stefanescu, 2010/9); Nourritures et territoires en Europe. La gastronomie comme frontière culturelle (Saillard, 2010/9); Klezmer “Revivalisms” to the Test of Real or Supposed Cultural Borders: the Stakes of Memory and Objects of Misunderstanding (Noel 2010/9). On the other hand, the active dimension of culture and intercultural dialogue have enjoyed attention not only through a special issue (Eurolimes 6), but also through pertinent studies published in other issues: Dialogue interculturel, diversité culturelle et régulation des médias (de La Brosse, 2007/3); Emigration, Immigration and Interculturality: The Meaning of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue in Portugal (Pinheiro, 2008/6); The First Step towards Intercultural Dialogue: Acknowledging the “Other” (Non)-stereotypical Representation of Migrants versus Ethnic Minorities Before and After the 2007 European Union Enlargement (Saptefrati, 2008/6); The Promotion of Intercultural Dialogue in the Carpathian Euroregion States (Involvement of Civil Society in the Implementation of a Cultural Policy) (Chabanna, 2008/6); Intercultural Dialogue and Diversity within the EU (Swiebel, 2008/6); The Roma Population in Slovakia: The Study Case of the Intercultural Dialogue (Moravkova, 2008/6); Re-defining Refugees: Nations, Borders and Globalization (Gemie, 2010/9); From the East-West Major Project (1957) to the Convention on Cultural Diversity (2007): UNESCO and Cultural Borders (Murel, 2010/9).

The image of the European culture is provided by the association of the concepts people – culture – history – territory. They confer a certain local specificity due to their features. From this point of view, we can identify besides a European culture, a cultural area of local, regional and national specifics. Thus, we identify at least two cultural identity constructions on the European level: a culture of cultures, that is a cultural area with a strong identity on the particular, local, regional, or national levels, or a cultural archipelago, that is a joint yet disrupted cultural area (Horga and Brie 2010/1: 157). Other authors who have published in the journal share the same opinion when speaking of: Les
nouvelles frontières de l’Europe: repenser les concepts (Maron 2007/4); Images of Openness - Images of Closeness (Banus 2007/4); De l’histoire des frontières cultures à l’histoire culturelle des frontières et à l’histoire des cultures frontalières. Pour une rupture de perspective et de nouvelles approches (Francfort 2010/9).

The European identity seen as a “house with many rooms” does not exclude the existence of the “house” or the “rooms”. The natural question arising from this perspective is as follows: are specific identities completely integrated in the general European identity? The answer seems natural. Our European identities refer to shared representations of a collective self as reflected public debate, political symbols, collective memories, and elite competition for power (Checkel and Katzenstein 2010: 4). Besides, the particularity of the European culture is provided by diversity and multiculturalism as means of expression on the local, regional or national levels. Consequently, in the pages of the *Eurolimes* journal, this perspective has been present through the Image and Identity of the Frontiers of the New Europe: Multilingualism as a new EU-strategy and the Impact of European Political Border Shifts on Languages (Gimeno-Ugalde 2007/4); Cross – Border Politics and Its Image in the European Union (Pantea 2007/4); Psychological Preconditions of Totalitarianism and Their Effect on Democratic Transformations in European States (Chabana 2007/4); The Cultural Frontiers of Europe: Our Common Values (Reszohazy 2007/4).

Another analysis perspective on the values of the European identity is comparing these values with the values of “the other”: L’Europe et les religions (Dufulon, 2008/5); Muslims in Spain. The Case of Maghrebis in Alicante (Cabre, 2008/5); Christianity and the Limits of Europe. A Social - Theological Approach (Preda, 2008/5); New Spatial Theories and Their Influence on Intercultural Dialogue Observing Relational Space in Oradea (Hoffman, 2008/6); Culture et civilisation. Images et représentation des concepts (Contogeorgis, 2008/6); Islam and Islamism in Europe. Representations of Identity and Projects of Action (Lazar, 2009/7); Europe: Utopia and Reality. Essence, Meaning and Value of an Idea (Pacheco Amaral, 2009/7); The Migration of Poles to the European Single Market (Kundera, 2009/8); Turkey and the European Union: a Never-Ending Story or an Irrevocable Membership (Ozkale, 2009/8); Democracy as Form of Life (Marga, 2009/8); Cultural Europe and Geopolitics (Contogeorgis, 2010/9); Europe of Cultural Unity and Diversity (Tavares Ribeiro, 2010/9); Georgia and Europe in the Context of Cultural Communications (Vekua, 2010/9).

**3. Eurolimes, where to?**

From this brief analysis of the background, we can try to formulate certain ideas which represent the consensus of the editors and contributors to *Eurolimes*.

In the current context of economic-financial crisis, many European societies develop a strong “self-protection” feeling not only of economic origin. There is also a kind of preservation of their own identity, including the cultural one. Crisis or exaltation moments can easily lead to nationalist feelings diluting the “Europeanist” perception of the border. This dilution occurs at the same time with strengthening identity-community and the feeling of ethno-cultural appurtenance to a nation. There is a time when many European peoples come to the foreground and “re-find their identity” by turning to the national trend despite the “unity” and solidarity stated by the Member States officials at European institutions (Horga and Brie, 2010/9: 158).

From this point of view, as of the 10th issue, the editorial policy of *Eurolimes* focuses more and more on punctual topics. In the context of contesting globalisation and debating supranational forms of organisation, such as the European Union, dedicating an
issue to the *Geopolitics of the European Frontiers* is more than a need to ponder more coherently on the limits of Europe and its repositioning in an international context with strong mutations. The appearance of the emergent powers (BRIC = Brazil, Russia, India, China) in 2008, South Africa’s interest in this power centre, as well as a change of position from Turkey in the security strategy places Europe in a situation to reconsider its place on the international scene. There is a need to strengthen the reactive ability of EU’s hard core (outlined more and more around Germany leaving to the background the French-German couple on which the European community has been built), as well as a reconsideration of the countries at the limits of the EU in point of territoriality in close connection with the idea of sovereignty and the idea of border (Berezin and Schain, 2003: 5).

The second direction of the *Eurolimes* editorial policy relates to the impact of policy on the construction of formal or informal borders. Considering the statement that EU “is not a future state”, yet “the most ambitious and successful multilateral organisation” (Moravcsik and Schimmelfennig, 2009, p. 84), we will start the series with the paper entitled *Leaders of the Borders. Borders of the Leaders*. Here, the authors will make reference to the role of the “toxic” and/or the “charismatic” leaders in the transformation of the borders. This section proposes the challenge concentrated on the potential possibility of the “charismatic” leaders being “toxic” leaders simultaneously. We will proceed with issues focusing on the impact of certain border regions on the stability or instability of the European borders.

In the third place, attention will be paid to phenomena with impact on the future European borders and identity. On the one hand, this development of ideas is necessary since the concept of the identity of Europe is dominated by “ambiguous territoriality”, where the quality of being an EU member is based on nation-state, and where European citizenship necessarily passes through the quality of being a citizen of a European State, where trans-European mobility for work does not always find a common language within the Schengen agreements. On the other hand, Europe as a cultural space is dominated by an “emotional attachment” (Berezin and Schain, 2003: 5). There still are a lot of obstacles to the effective development of a European public area, because there are many *Communicational frontiers in Europe*. Therefore, there still are several discourses to be resolved before we can bring ourselves to establish a solid coherence over the internal borders of the EU and a closure of its external borders.

Finally, *Eurolimes* considers that there are trends contradictory to the process of evolution of the social frontiers inside of Member States of EU. Also with the demographic decline within the EU, the migrational frontiers will be preserved yet much relieved.

The European nation-states are obliged to ensure the replacement of the population that has left the labour market in order to support the need to maintain a constant labour force, as well as to contribute to the pension funds for aged population. Certain politicians have a desire to create the image that the borders still work on our continent. This seems to turn Europe into an area where the regime of public and private freedoms are a subjective factor solely dependent on a decision-making political group, and which might look in a few years from a historical point of view to be a new *form of deportation*.

This shows that there is a crisis of communication and information between political leaders and public opinion, which works as a new type of border within the EU. This border is determined on the one hand by the level of expectations of political leaders who wish to pass quickly to a transnational perception of European realities and the population where public opinion wishes to preserve national political mechanisms within the European area. On the other hand, the barrier is determined by the level of understanding of the EU political area as a new type of transnational community that no
longer guarantees (and often is in contradiction with) the ideas of the national public body. The EU is a vast area which includes the citizens of the Member States and European and non-European immigrants. The emergence of the European area is related to multiple and complex interactions between States and collective identities expressed through groups of immigrants. Likewise, other transnational participants (such as leaders of volunteer associations, businesspersons, or activists in development strategy) expand their activities outside the nation-state.

At the same time, Eurolimes will show an open interest – due to the reviews carried out by the members of the editorial committee and other collaborators – in individual and collective opinions in the field of borders and cross-border cooperation present in books and magazines in the Eurolimes library. Scientific meetings in the field of borders and cross-border cooperation to which the members of the board of Eurolimes participate will also be presented.

Of course, this is the result of a teamwork of the editorial staff of Eurolimes and especially of the people who have decided to lay the bases for an Institute for Euroregional Studies as a Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence oriented towards the study and research of the issue of the European borders, both internal and external, and to train specialists in the border-related issues.
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