Bordering Eastern Europe: European Union's Integration and local impacts

Christoph WAACK*

European Union's Enlargement caused several impacts to border regions on the respective external border in Eastern Europe. Bordering the EU is defined in this context as a spatial strategy to produce a place of reifying power, displacing others and contains space with an order that makes a difference to other places. The modern world is characterized by evident border demarcations between national states. Disputed border areas are exceptional single cases. This paper looks to such disputed border areas at the edge of the EU. The thesis of the paper is that disputed borders between national authorities affecting the border regions negatively related to increase cross border cooperation. The EU's integration process can develop under certain circumstances a solution finding on a national level what can be characterized as applying the method of jumping scale. To overcome mutual distrust between neighbouring countries border lines must be clearly fixed. Only then a cross border cooperation process with success for the regional development to the people living in border regions can be introduced.

1. European Union Integration process: Between ordering and bordering

The EU-Integration process is a success story. The EU Integration process came to a temporary end in 1st of July this year with the accession of Croatia to the EU as the 28th member state. The accession process of the EU in Eastern Europe started with the application of the new independent states of the former socialist country club. Hungary was the first country issued his application for accession to the EU in 30t^{h} of March 1994, followed by Poland in 5th of April 1994. The countries I will have a closer view in my paper on border relations (Estonia, Romania and Croatia) issued their applications on the 24th of November 1995, 22nd of June 1995 and 21st of February 2003. Estonia took part in EU on 1st of May 2004, Romania on 1st of January 2007. So the accession process takes time, in our case studies round about between 9 and 12 years.

* Professor, University of Jena, Germany

The engine of cooperation is the economic development of the model of growing markets. Economic growth depends on one side on growing productivity in the existing member states and on the other side, regarding to the experience of the last enlargement of the EU, in the integration of new member states with a growing economy. Another important aspect of integration is the building of a common "area of freedom, security and justice" produced by the Schengen aquies and the common space of the Schengen states. Thus two requirements of the integration process have especially different influences to the respective border regions of the enlarging European Union on the shifting external border of the EU. This is the first aim what I am looking for in this text. Next to changing border regimes, every step of inclusion of the border regions on the external border of EU causes a step of exclusion from border regions and countries outside the EU. We can call the process of integration into the EU "ordering" and the process of producing exclusion from the EU "bordering" (van Houtum & van Naerssen 2002). The impacts of these two sides of one coin I want to explain with a focused view to two case studies along the shifting external border of the EU. The paper is dealing with the different interests and strategies of the involved levels of administrative and political scales like the local/regional, national and supranational. The view to different levels of administrative units whose boundaries lie on top of each other on the outer border of the EU and their influence to inhabitants of the border regions in the process of producing place related identity is another focus the paper carried out. In contrast to many other papers discussing this question by prospecting the efforts of the EU in establishing cross border cooperation (CBC) and adopting treaties on good neighboring relations this paper starts with a view to recent border disputes on the external border of the EU on a national level and their influences to the processes of bordering the EU.

2. Recent border disputes in Europe

It is one main interest of the EU that new member states have no border conflicts with their neighbors. Nevertheless there still exist border disputes in the EU, on the EU external border between member states of the EU and non-member states, and also outside the EU in Europe.

Table 1. Recent border disputes in Europe

No	Disputed territory	Claimants	Related to break-up of YU or SU	Sea/land border	Function of border in relation to EU
1	Mont Blanc summit dispute	France - Italy	No	Land	Internal border
2	Carlingford Lough boundary dispute	Ireland - United Kingdom	No	Land	Internal border
3	Lough Foyle boundary dispute	Ireland - United Kingdom	No	Land	Internal border
4	Ems estuary and Dollart Bay (western part)	Netherlands - Germany	No	Sea	Internal border
5	Olivenza (including the municipality of Táliga)	Spain - Portugal	No	Land	Internal border
6	Rockall	United Kingdom - Ireland – Denmark - Iceland	No	Sea	Internal/external border
7	Gibraltar	United Kingdom - Spain	No	Land	Internal border
8	Aegean dispute	Greece - Turkey	No	Sea	External border
9	An area near Montalmus peak	Andorra - Spain	No	Land	External border
10	Gulf of Piran	Slovenia - Croatia	Yes	Sea	Internal border since 1st of July 2013
11	Military complex near Sveta Gera, in the area of Žumberak/Gorjanci	Slovenia - Croatia	Yes	Land	Internal border since 1st of July 2013
12	Island of Šarengrad	Croatia - Serbia	Yes	Land	External border
13	Veliki Školj and Mali Školj (near Neum)	Croatia - Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Land	External border
14	Prevlaka	Croatia - Montenegro	Yes	Land	External border
15	Parts of Osijek and Sombor districts, areas by the Danube	Croatia - Serbia	Yes	Land	External border
16	Island of Vukovar	Croatia - Serbia	Yes	Land	External border
17	Sastavci	Serbia - Bosnia and Herzegovina	Yes	Land	No border with EU
18	Ivangorod and Pechory District	Russia - Estonia	Yes	Land	Outer border
19	Tuzla Island and Strait of Kerch	Ukraine - Russia	Yes	Land	No border with EU
20	Sarych	Ukraine - Russia	Yes	Land	No border with EU

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_territorial_disputes#Europe, 22.7.2013, modified

In 11 of the 20 cases the break-up of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union is the background of the recent border disputes. Four of the 20 cases refer to sea border disputes, 16 cases are land border disputes. I singled out here two different border disputes following the break-up of former so called multi ethnical states like Yugoslavia and Soviet Union. The case studies carrying out here in a deeper way are No. 10 Gulf of Piran, a sea border dispute between Croatia and Slovenia, and No. 18 Ivangorod and Pechory district of the Russian-Estonian border as an example of a land border dispute.

What I want to show is the impact of these disputes to local and regional level. As Paasi pointed out border disputes arising with different constructions of identities, often depending by different levels of scale (Paasi 1995). Mostly indicated as a dispute on a national level, border disputes have deep influences on other scales as well, i.e. to bottom up in regional development or to the top influencing negotiations between candidate states, member states and neighbouring states of the EU with the European institutions and their political representatives.

Border disputes are not only influencing factors on political processes, but also have impacts on economic and social interrelations. Heeg & Oßenbrügge (2002:87) argued in this context for a "third way" in regional development between Fordist welfare and a deregulation ideology. They discuss a "relativisation of scales" (Jessop 1998) where a special geographical scale is no longer privileged. They pled for connecting "political projects and spaces across variety of political scales and social life" (Heeg & Oßenbrügge 2002). This strategy of "jumping scales" are most effective and would make possible new forms of solidarity and alternatives to neoliberalism. The authors see the EU as an actor who can manage this challenge. I will try to show how this strategy has influence to border regions on the external border of the EU. The strategy of jumping scales means in relation to border disputes the way to find a solution on a national level by entering the supranational scale of the EU or UN.

3. Politics of scale

In an analytical context of a critical Political Geography we have to distinguish different scales of interest in the production and reproduction as well as destruction and demolishing of space. In our case studies we have to look at least at three different scales. We can identify the

a. EU with its political and administrative bodies,

b. National state level in terms of EU member states and neighbouring states of the EU, and

c. Local/regional level in terms of local and regional governments on both sides of the EU external borders.

We argue according to Cox (1996: 668) that scales are "expressions of the geographical extents of particular structures of social relations that are continually being reworked and transformed". The interests of the EU is to build up an "area of freedom, security and justice". We have to conceive it as a process of bordering that will mention below. Reactions of national level actors on the introduction of a common EU border regime observed O'Connell (2008:120) who pointed out that "some member states are more inclined than others to pursue the implementation of such a regime especially where access to former territories, ethnic diaspora or seasonal labour may be at stake". Border management is a main focus of the EU politics what can stay in conflict especially with local and regional interest. "It is these very specificities of local economies and labour markets (which may depend on high rates of daily cross border mobility for employment), which are not always taken into account in EU level decision-making debates and processes on border management" (Carrera et al. 2013: 31).

4. Bordering and ordering

Ordering means that the EU has to realize the utopian dream of ordering unity to control access of people without economic resources to its territory.

The ordering process is more visible with the introduction of the Schengen agreement. The Schengen agreement was signed in 1985 by Belgium, France, Germany, Luxemburg and the Netherlands on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders. Today it consists 26 European countries, thereof three Non-EU-member states, covering over 400 Mio. People and an area of 4.3 Mill. square kilometers. The Schengen Agreement was incorporated into the Amsterdam Treaty as Schengen Aquies into the main body of EU law. The Schengen area covering 22 EU-states and 4 EFTA-States. Bulgaria, Cyprus, Croatia and Romania not yet a member of the Schengen area, Ireland and Great Britain maintained opt-outs. The Schengen regime is a special ordering process to include a common asylum-, migration- and visa regimes. Some

dilemmas of governments in new member states emerged by their orientation on EU-policies. The historical burden of inheritance with eastern neighbours, their national sovereignty and identity, and nevertheless the handling with their national minorities in the neighbouring states are not overcome. The integration into the EU means symbolically an integration into the western system. In this system the territorial strategy based on frictionless movement of money to have most public benefits in its long run. Ordering is the regulation what allows all inhabitants of the Schengen Area to cross the border anywhere between member states without any control. Bordering is the connected regulation on a common control system on the external border of Schengen member states.

Bordering Eastern Europe means in this context to demarcate symbolized the border between EU and non-member states of the EU in Eastern Europe. Van Houtum and van Naerssen pointed out 2002 that "bordering processes do not begin or stop at demarcation lines in space. […] the word 'borders' […] should rather be understood in terms of bordering, as an ongoing strategic effort to make a difference in space among the movements of people, money or products." (van Houtum; van Naerssen 2002: 126). Bordering means to make a place by using practices of inclusion and exclusion, "searching for a justifiable, bounded cohesion of people and their activities in space, which can be compared and contrasted to other spatial entities" (ditto). De Certeau calls such processes a spatial strategy (de Certeau 1980).

In 2011 the EU commission re-opened the debate over the functioning of the Schengen system by adopting new legislative proposals as the so-called Schengen Government Package. This was in answer to the fact that some member states put temporary reintroduction of internal border controls back on the agenda what is a step backwards in the ordering process mentioned above.

In early 2013 the European Commission introduced the "next steps in border management" by announcing a "Smart Border Package". The Smart Border Package included two different systems:

- The Entry Exit System (EES) will contain an electronic registry, recording the time and location of entry and exit of all third country nationals admitted to the Schengen Area for a short stay (up to three months) and
- The Registered Traveller Program (RTP) that will facilitate border crossings for frequent, pre-vetted and pre-screened TCN travellers at the Schengen external borders.

Some questions raised by discussing this package which cannot go into force without agreement by European Parliament and other stakeholders (i.e. Committee of Regions). Carrera et al. (2013), in a paper ordered by the Committee of the Regions, stated that "The mechanism [of the Smart Border Package; CW] allows people living in the border communities to keep social, commercial and cultural contacts and has been found to have a notable economic impact on border regions where it is applied. However, there is little indication as to precisely how the new Smart Borders systems will integrate with, and accommodate, existing arrangements for local border communities, including Local Border Traffic regimes. There is no reference in the legislation or accompanying impact assessments on Smart Borders to this issue, although there are indications that data concerning the entry - exit of those holding local border traffic permits may be entered into the future EES." (Carrera et al. 2013: 31).

The main interest of the EU is to respond to irregular immigration in the EU. This interest of the centre stays in conflict with the interest of most of the peripheral regions of the external border of the EU to bring regional development to progress by raising cross border cooperation. A similar procedure by introducing the smart border package to all external border regions of the EU could cause negative impacts to some of these regions.

Another part of the bordering process of the EU is the installation of the EU Neighborhood and Partnership Initiative (ENPI) with the neighbouring countries. These neighboring countries are typically non- EU member states like Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and other countries without an accession perspective of the EU in a long run. The EU Neighborhood Policy (ENP) framework is devolved in different programs, i.e. the Eastern partnership concerning Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. The ENP is designed to imply association agreements on a state level, "allow for easier travel to the EU through gradual visa liberalization, accompanied by measures to tackle illegal immigration" (European Union External Action website, 27.7.2013).

Important for this paper is the fact that there is no ENP agreement with Russia yet. The current basis for cooperation with Russia is the Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA) signed in 1994. Nevertheless among others EU supports five CBC-programs with Russia, i.e. on the Estonian/Latvian-Russian border. The program fund cooperation between local authorities on either side of the Russia-EU border. The aim of the program is to promote economic and social problems in border areas and to support cross border contacts.

Cross border cooperation influences the identity building processes of the people take part in economic and social development programs of the EU. Cross Border Cooperation (CBC) is a key priority of the European Neighborhood and Partnership Initiative (ENPI). For CBC programs among member states and partner countries along the external border of the EU there is approx. 950 Mio. Euro available between 2007 and 2013, of them about 130 Mio € for the CBC-programs between EU and Russia (European Union External Action: Russia 2013).

Bordering rejects and erects difference. The function of borders is to unify territorial or individual distinctions inside the area the border controls. On the other hand, and that is a paradoxical function, borders create or reproduce differences in space and identity.

The main focus of this paper is to have a look to this difference in space and identity of the people living next to disputed borders and the special relation to the paradoxical function of disputed borders by producing homogeneity and difference simultaneously.

5. Slovenia-Croatia border dispute: Gulf of Piran

The border dispute in the Gulf of Piran is following the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1991 between the new independed states of Slovenia and Croatia. The issue is following the decision of 1954 to divide the area of the Gulf between Italy and Yugoslavia, fixed by the treaty of Osimo in 1975. Nobody was looking at the regional level, because the borders of the sea are managed by national agreements. A first delimitation proposal in 1991 fixed the border in the Gulf of Piran's centre. In 1992 Slovenia declared its sovereignty over the entire Gulf. Both states claim that the boundary has to be fixed by Article 15 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Article 15 assigned, "where the coasts of two States are opposite or adjacent to each other, neither of the two States is entitled, failing agreement between them to the contrary, to extend its territorial sea beyond the median line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial seas of each of the two States is measured. The above provision does not apply, however, where it is necessary by reason of historic title or other special circumstances to delimit the territorial seas of the two States in a way which is at variance therewith" (United Nations Division for Oceans and Low of the Sea 1982).

Croatian claim is based on the first sentence, which is the regular term. Slovenian favours the second sentence, pointed out that Slovenia is a geographically disadvantaged state without access to international waters. Slovenian argues that Croatia could limit passage to its ports what could cause economic damage to Slovenia. The Drnovsek-Racan agreement in 2001 included a Croatian "maritime exclave" between Italian and Slovenian waters, because of a Slovenian corridor to international waters. The Parliament of Slovenia ratified this agreement, but the Croatian parliament never voted for the ratification.

Another agreement achieved in 2007 to solve the border dispute applying the International Court of Justice in The Hague. Slovenia never officially give a feedback to Croatia about abandoning the agreement, but strengthen a blockade against Croatia in their accession process to the EU. In 2008 Slovenia blocked 14 chapters referred to the border dispute. In this way Slovenian government pushed the bilateral border-dispute to the European scale. The reaction of the European Commission was an announcement to create a three-member committee to mediate the border dispute. Helpful to end the blockade was the circumstance of a newly-appointed Croatian Prime Minister in 2009. The prime ministers of both states decided to decouple the border dispute from the accession process of Croatia. In May 2011 Croatia and Slovenia submitted an arbitration agreement to the UN to start an arbitration process (IBRU 2011). The solutions could be a condominium - an area with shared sovereignty and joint governance structures.

Along with the territorial dispute of the border there arises a dispute of giving a name to the Gulf of Piran as a whole. According to Kladnik, D; Pipan, P (2008) the name "Bay of Savudija", originally used as a name for part of the bay, in 2000 came into use for the whole bay. First used by Croatian fishermen in the whole bay, Croatian journalists, local authorities and finally politicians on a state level adopting it quickly, ultimately leading it in official maps. This usage of a name as pars pro Toto correspondence with the history of the settlements of Piran and Savudrija on the land side. It is the history of a divided city. Savudrija was for a long time part of the Piran municipality, came to Croatia in 1947 without implications in the daily lives of the inhabitants inside Yugoslavia. The paradox of borders (van Houtum & van Naerssen 2002: 126) struck out in 1991 when the border shifted from an administrative line to a line for producing different identities between Slovenia and Croatia.

6. Estonian- Russian border dispute: Ivangorod and Petschori region

In this case study the collapse of the soviet empire and the socialist system evoking historical territorial traps. The Tartu Peace Treaty in 1920 between the first time independent Estonia and the Soviet Union located the city of Ivangorod in the north and the Petchori region in the south of Lake Peipus in Estonia. After the occupation of Estonia in 1940 these territories merged into the Soviet Union without a new contract between the two states because Estonia didn't yet exist as juridical person between after the occupation.

In 1991 the administrative boundary between Estonian SSR and Russian SSR switched to a state border without discussing the differences of existing and historical boundaries between Estonia and Russia. Only when the accession process of Estonia to EU starts the border dispute was discussed between Estonian and Russian government but never came to a solution.

A technical border agreement was signed by the heads of both, the Estonian and the Russian, delegations already in 1996. Although there exist no signed and ratified border treaty between Estonia and Russia when the accession negotiations with the EU could start in 1997. The Estonian side assured the EU member states that they have done everything in its power to sign the border treaty with Russia.

In 2005 after finishing the negotiations of a new border treaty the Estonian Parliament ratified the border treaty mentioned in addition to the results of the negotiations the Tartu Peace Treaty of 1920. Thereon Russia revokes its signature from the border treaty because they feared that Estonia caused of this mention could claim territory from Russia, which went to Russian SSR in 1945. Estonian politicians rejected this allegation and posed the problem of the European scale. The deputy chairman of the Estonian foreign relations commission explained 2005: "Russia does not have the will to normalize relations with Estonia and, I would say, even with the European Union and NATO. This is because here, indeed, we are talking about Estonian-Russian border, which is not only a border between the two states but also a border between the European Union and Russia" (Wikinews 27.6.2005). In June of 2013 after three consultations with Russia the Estonian Government gave the information to the public that the border treaty will be signed in the next few months.

The draft of the border treaty of 2005 included in Art. 6, sentence 2 the following regulation:

"In the course of carrying out its demarcation activities, the [joined demarcation; CW] Commission will take into consideration, on the basis of a mutual agreement, the circumstances of the economic activities of the residents, including land usage, peculiarities of the locality, as well as the necessity of creating conditions appropriate for the guarding of the border" (Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

In article 8 there is a wider regulation what will be done in the water bodies on the border:

"Issues relating to the activities of Border officials, water usage regulations, shipping, the common usage of bridges and hydro technical facilities located at the Border, fishing conditions, and other economic activities in bodies of water on the Border, as well as the various aspects of the Border regime, will be regulated by separate agreements."

That means, that all details with local impacts will be regulated by a joined demarcation commission or by separate agreements. The annexes shows that the border line will be corrected in several cases because of strange situations in accesses of small villages like Saatse. To reach this village by travelling the official road you have to cross the Estonian-Russian border (that is the outer border of the EU as well) three-times without control on a border control point but observingly watched by border guards of both parties. It's forbidden to walk or to go by bicycle and it's not allowed to stop the car in the Russian area. A border treaty will make it much easier for the inhabitants of the last villages in front of the Russian border to go to more central places of the region. On the other hand fixing the border by a final demarcation will interrupt the last arrangements of free movement of village people, who lost their Sauna on the Russian side when Estonia was re-established in 1991 with the border lines, following the less important administrative borders of the Soviet Union. This story the village people of Saatse told me in March of 2013. This kind of "very small" border traffic must be seen in a wider context of cross-Border Co-operation between Estonia and Russia

Estonia-Russia cross-border cooperation is embedded within the framework of the new European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument program (ENPI). Projects will be implemented in sectors such as social and economic development with a focus on small and medium-sized businesses, business and trade, transportation, information and communication technology, technology in general, research, and tourism.

The ENPI program in the Estonian-Latvian-Russian triangle border region included

in the period of 2011 to 2014 altogether 25 projects in progress with a sum of 24 Mio. Euro (Estonia-Latvia-Russia cross border cooperation program 2013). The programs itself are important for regional development of the border regions on one hand. On the other hand because of the short duration of the projects (up to a maximum of 36 months) the sustainability of the projects for the regions in a social relation can't be ensured. Nevertheless for developing the infrastructure in 2011 some large-scale Estonia-Russia projects (for example reconstructing the Narva-Ivangorod border crossing point; renovating the Narva and Ivangorod fortresses, etc.) were approved by the European Commission.

A special case is the minority of Setu in Setomaa, a cross border region in the south of Lake Peipsi. Estonia's Setomaa Townships Association and the district of Petseri in Russia promote projects based on local cultural traditions in Setomaa, in order to preserve and strengthen the Seto cultural identity in both Estonia and in Russia.

In the second edition of the toponymic Guidelines for map and other editors in Estonia from 1997 in the chapter about the place name in minority languages there is laid out, that "the new Law on Place Names (...) states (Articles 14 and 16) that place names of Estonia's historical minorities shall be entitled to official approval and use on maps, road signs, etc. In certain cases two parallel names are allowed, one in the language of the local majority, the other in the language of the local minority."

Especially dedicated to the Russian language the guidelines pointed out: "Russian (...) is spoken as a minority language by the descendants of Old Orthodox believers on the north and west coast of Lake Peipsi, also by New Orthodox Russians in some border areas with Russia. Villages inhabited mainly by Russians include Permisküla (in Russian, according to the 1987 UN romanization system: *Verhnee Selo*), Vasknarva (*Syrenec*), Alajõe (*Olešnicy*), Kolkja (*Kol'ki*), Varnja (*Voron'ja*), Piiri (on Piirissaar, Meža), Beresje (*Berez'e*), Kuksina (*Kuvšinovo*). (...)

Since 1940, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, large numbers of people have immigrated into Estonia from parts of the Soviet Union. Their *lingua Franca* usually is Russian and they make up the vast majority of the present-day non-Estonian population. They have mainly settled in the big industrial cities of the North-East (Narva, Sillamäe, Kohtla-Järve, Jõhvi), the capital Tallinn and the town and peninsula of Paldiski. The toponymic has not been much influenced by the population" (Place Names Board of Estonia 2013).

So we can identify two different management of certain cases. On the one hand the

Russian speaking minority of Old orthodox Russians on the coast of Lake Peipsi in eight villages. There are several hundred people at most. The toponymic of this minority will be preserved, but not in Cyrillic but in Latin letters. On the other hand there is the "minority", sometimes the vast majority of local level, of Russian speaking people moved to Estonia during the Soviet period especially in the northeast of Estonian territory close to the Russian border. The Guidelines ascertains that the toponymic is not much influenced by this Russian speaking population. This claim is not proved yet and we have to put question marks over this statement. This interesting field of scientific investigation carried out more intensively i.e. at the University of Tartu (Zabrodskaja 2010).

7. Identity of people in contested border regions

To be busy with border relations means to deal with space- and place-concepts in geography. The area of a state or a supranational formation is first and foremost a limited space. The EU is speaking of the "area of freedom, security and justice" (Treaty of Amsterdam, Part One, Article 1). An area is a kind of a bounded space. But in connection with the terms of "freedom, security and justice" it seems that the EU is producing in a sense of bordering a place by making a difference in other areas, where terms of freedom, security and justice are not embedded into other places. This requirement of the EU, fixed in the Treaty of Amsterdam 1997, comes into force especially where this bounded area comes to its edges, on the external borders of the EU.

Cross border cooperation as the corrective initiative in the process of bordering is hindered by the disturbance between the involved states in case of contested borders. Simultaneously on CBC, supported and initiated by the EU, lies the shadow of supporting national interests.

Bordering processes and the complementary action of implementing CBC have influences to identity building processes of the people living in border regions. Because of their different daily life relations with the border a more intensive individuality of the people of the border regions may be the result. Each inhabitant of a border region can create his own place related identity by making his own geography in border relation.

77

To sum up CBC in border regions inducing a self-identity more than a collective identity. Identity can be defined here as the sense that people make of themselves through their subjective feelings based on their everyday experiences and wider social relations (Knox & Marston 2004: 508).

"Even in a highly developed late modern society no one is totally disembedded to in the sense that there do not exist any relations between our daily routines and practice and the material basis of our life-world. The fundamental difference from traditional societies lies in the fact that in late modern societies the human actor has the choice to make independent decisions and to change the formerly fixed relations between the social and the spatial" (Weichhart 2002)

In border regions affected by unsolved border disputes the spatial and the social are more connected to the people who stay in closer contact with the disputed border line. As long as there is no solution to border disputes there will be a spatial fix on a national level falling back to the inhabitants of the border regions, as the example of giving new names to the disputed areas in the Slovenian-Croatian case study showed.

8. Conclusion

The inhabitants of the border regions are not satisfied with the situation. They feel that as long as the discussions on a national scale is going on something is "wrong" with the border. Border disputes hindered cross border cooperation in economic and social relations on a regional level. As Heeg & Ossenbrügge pointed out in 2002 the EU as an actor can manage this challenge. To clear border disputes by using the concept of jumping scale in the process of EU enlargement develops the possibility of growing cross border cooperation.

The paradox of disputed borders on the EU external border is that bordering processes of the EU with a highly interested to solve such border disputes, and unsolved border disputes have the same effect of people living in the border regions. In border regions with disputed borders a spatial fix to national scale can be ascertained. To overcome mutual distrust between neighbouring countries border lines must be clearly fixed by a common agreement. Only then a cross border cooperation process with success for the regional development to the people living in border regions can be introduced.

In the sense of the concept of jumping scale Slovenia and Croatia want to overcome the border problem when the accession process to EU forced a solution of the border dispute. Solved border problems and growing CBC activities work together in the same direction of building up a common EU-area. In relations between Estonia and Russia this strategy yet comes to nothing. The old system of geostrategic order with Soviet Union/Russia as a superpower state still alive as an asymmetric relation of power between Estonia and Russia.

References

Carrera, Sergio; Hernanz, Nicholas and Parkin, Joanna (2013): Local and Regional Authorities and the EU's External Borders. A Multi-Level Governance Assessment of Schengen Governance and 'Smart Borders'. European Union.

Cox, K. R. (1996): Editorial. The difference that scale makes. In: Political Geography, Vol. 15(8), 667-669.

Deleuze, Gilles (1994): Difference and Repetition, New York.

Estonia-Latvia-Russia cross border cooperation Programme 2013: **http://www.estlatrus.eu/** eng/projects/

Estonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (o.J.): http://web-static.vm.ee/static/failid/394/Est-Rus_ border_treaty.pdf

European Union External Action (2013): http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/index_en.htm, 27.7.2013.

European Union External Action: Russia (2013): http://eeas.europa.eu/russia/financial_ cooperation_en.htm, 27.7.2013

Heeg, S.; Oßenbrügge, J. (2002): State Formation and Territoriality in the EU. IN: Geopolitics, Vol. 7(3), 75-88.

Houtum, Henk van; Naerssen, Ton van (2002): Bordering, ordering and othering. Tijdschrift voor Economische and Sociale Geografie, Vol. 93, No. 2, p. 125-136.

IBRU (International Boundary Research Unit) (2011): Croatia ans Slovenai submit arbitration agreement to UN: http://www.dur.ac.uk/ibru/news/boundary_news/?itemno=12176

Kladnik, D; Pipan, P (2008): "Bay of Piran or Bay of Savudrija? An example of problematic treatment of geographical names". *Acta geographica Slovenica* 48 (1): 57–91.

Knox, P. & Marston S. (2004), *Human Geography*, Upper Saddle River NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Lake Peipsi Center for Transboundary Research (2013): http://www.ctc.ee/implemented-projects

O'Connell, K. 2008. EU-Visa Policy: Squaring the Circle of Neighbourhood and JHA Objectives,

in Europe's Near Abroad. Promises and Prospects for the EU's Neighbourhood Policy, edited by D. Mahncke and S. Gstöhl. Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 115-134.

Paasi, Ansi (1995): Constructing Territories, Boundaries and regional identities. In: Forsberg, Toomas (Ed.): Contested Territory, Aldershot, p. 42-61.

Place Names Board of Estonia (2013): http://www.eki.ee/knn/index2.htm

Postimees, 24.5.2013: calls claims related to maritime areas incomprehensible; http://news.postimees.ee/1247104/estonian-formin-calls-claims-related-to-maritime-areas-incomprehensible

Treaty of Amsterdam (1997): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html.

United Nations Division for Oceans and Low of the Sea (1982): http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/part2.htm

Weichhart (2002): Embeddedness, Disembeddedness and Re-Embeddedness. Comments on Benno Werlen's Lecture. Nijmegen Centre for Border Research; Seminar "*Borders, Border Regions and Interaction*" Nov. 26 - 27, 1998, Unpublished manuscript; http://homepage.univie.ac.at/peter.weichhart/Homepage/RegId/regId08.htm (28.7.2013)

Wikinews: http://en.wikinews.org/wiki/Russia_voids_border_treaty_with_Estonia (27.6.2005)

Zabrodskaja, Anastassia (2010). Estonian-Russian Transfer by Russian-Estonian Bilingual Students. Slavica Helsingiensia, 40, 366 - 377.