



EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

***Border Discourse: Changing Identities,
Changing Nations, Changing Stories in
European Border Communities***

Interested in European research?

RTD info is our quarterly magazine keeping you in touch with main developments (results, programmes, events, etc.). It is available in English, French and German. A free sample copy or free subscription can be obtained from:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Research
Information and Communication Unit
B-1049 Brussels
Fax (32-2) 29-58220
E-mail: research@cec.eu.int
Internet: http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/rtdinfo/index_en.html

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Research
Directorate K — Knowledge-based economy and society

E-mail: rtd-citizen@cec.eu.int

European Commission

EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES
Border Discourse: Changing Identities, Changing Nations,
Changing Stories in European Border Communities

Final report

Project HPSE - CT-1999-00003

Funded under the Key Action
'Improving the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base' of FP5

DG Research
EUROPEAN COMMISSION

ISSUED IN
March 2003

Coordinator of project :
Ulrike Hanna Meinhof
University of Southampton
School of Modern Languages
Southampton SO17 1BJ UK

Partners :
University of Wolverhampton, UK, Dariusz Galasinski,
Technische Universität Chemnitz, DE, Werner Holly,
Universität Klagenfurt, Austria, Brigitte Hipfl,
Università degli Studi di Trieste, IT, Emidio Sussi,
Universität Bern, Switzerland, Doris Wastl-Walter.

Directorate-General for Research
Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH**

Commissioner: Janez Potočnik
Directorate-General for Research
Director General: Achilleas Mitsos

The Directorate-General for Research is responsible for implementing EU level policies and activities in view of the development of the European Research Area. It initiates and implements the necessary Community actions, in particular the RTD Framework Programmes in terms of research and technological development. It also contributes to the implementation of the 'Lisbon Strategy' regarding employment, competitiveness at international level, economic reform and social cohesion within the European Union.

The Directorate 'Social Sciences and Humanities; Foresight' Directorate K, addresses key societal, economic and S&T challenges for Europe. It identifies and analyses major trends in relation to these challenges and examines them in the light of the principal EU strategic objectives and sectoral policies. The overall context for its work is the transition towards the knowledge based economy and society in Europe.

Within this overall framework, the Directorate provides a policy relevant research based capability executed through the promotion and management of research activities in the areas of social sciences, humanities and foresight, the exploitation of their results and its own analyses. In this way, the Directorate offers knowledge for policies (including RTD policies) while supporting the formulation of policies for knowledge.

Director: Theodius LENNON

Scientific Officer: Aris Apollonatos

Aris.APOLLONATOS@cec.eu.int

<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/citizens.htm>, for information on Priority 7 – 'Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge Based Society' under the 6th Framework Programme.

<http://improving-ser.jrc.it/default/>, the database of socio-economic projects funded under the 4th and 5th Framework Programme.

http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/social-sciences/index_en.html, Social sciences and humanities in Europa.

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

Freephone number: (*)
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

LEGAL NOTICE

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.
It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu.int>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005

ISBN 92-79-00161-2

© European Communities, 2005

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Luxembourg

PRINTED ON WHITE CHLORINE-FREE PAPER

PREFACE

Within the Fifth Framework Programme of the European Union for Research and Technological Development (1998-2002), the Key Action "Improving the socio-economic knowledge base" carried broad and ambitious objectives, namely: to improve our understanding of the structural changes taking place in European society, to identify ways of managing these changes and to promote the active involvement of European citizens in shaping their own futures. A further important aim was to mobilise the research communities in the social sciences and humanities at the European level and to provide scientific support to policies at various levels, with particular attention to EU policy fields.

The Key Action Call "Improving the socio-economic knowledge base" had a total budget of 155 Million of Euros and was implemented through the launch of three Calls for proposals. As a result, 185 selected projects for funding have started their research work respectively in 1999, 2001 and 2002, involving more than 1600 research teams from 38 countries.

At least half of these projects are now finalised and results are (being) systematically published in the form of a Final Report.

The Calls have addressed different but interrelated research themes which have contributed to the objectives outlined above. These themes can be regrouped under a certain number of areas of major policy relevance, each of which are addressed by a significant number of projects from a variety of perspectives.

These areas are the following:

- Societal trends and structural changes;
16 projects, total investment of 14.6 Million Euro, 164 teams
- Quality of life of European Citizens,
5 projects, total investment of 6.4 Million Euro; 36 teams
- European socio-economic models and challenges
9 projects; total investment of 9.3 Million Euro; 91 teams.
- Social cohesion, migration and welfare
30 projects, 28 Million Euro; 249 teams.
- Employment, and changes in work
18 projects; total investment of 17.5 Million Euro; 149 teams
- Gender, participation and quality of life
13 projects; total investment of 12.3 Million Euro; 97 teams
- Dynamics of knowledge, generation and use
8 projects; total investment of 6.1 Million Euro; 77 teams
- Education, training and new forms of learning
14 projects; total investment of 12.9 Million Euro; 105 teams
- Economic development and dynamics
22 projects; total investment of 15.3 Million Euro; 134 teams
- Governance, democracy and citizenship
28 projects; total investment of 25.5 Million Euro; 233 teams
- Challenges from European enlargement
16 projects; total investment of 12.8 Million Euro; 116 teams
- Infrastructures to build the European Research Area
9 projects; total investment of 15.4 Million Euro; 74 teams.

The work undertaken by the project, "Border Discourse: Changing Identities, Changing Nations, Changing Stories in European Border Communities" has contributed primarily to the area "Governance, democracy and citizenship" .

The report contains information about the main scientific findings of the project and their policy implications. The research was carried out by 6 teams over a period of 3 years (2000-2003).

The project explores the differences and similarities in the border communities of the European Union's Eastern and Southern borders, in which three generation families construct potentially conflictual identities, as a result of social political and economic upheavals which happened during their life time. The project identifies and suggests effective policies for integration and social cohesion at regional, national, transnational and European level.

As the results of the projects financed under the Key Action 'Improving the Socio-economic knowledge base' become available to the scientific and policy communities, Priority 7 "Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge Based Society" of the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Union for Research and Technological Development (RTD) is building on the progress already made and aims at making a further contribution to the development of a European Research Area in the social sciences and the humanities.

I hope readers find the information in this publication both interesting and useful as well as clear evidence of the importance attached by the European Union in fostering research in the field of social sciences and the humanities.

T. LENNON,
Director

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	7
1.1 Summary of objectives and overall results in achieving these	7
1.2 Summary of methodology, implementation of research design, key findings	9
1.3 Conclusion and policy recommendations	14
2. Background & objectives of the project	19
2.1 Objectives	19
2.2 Description of work	20
3. Scientific description of the project results and methodology	21
3.1 Methodology and innovative aspects of results	21
3.2.1 Stage One: Key Narratives	23
3.2.1.1 Former German-German border	23
3.2.1.2 Austrian Hungarian border	26
3.2.1.3 Austrian-Slovenian border	29
3.2.1.4 Italian-Slovenian border	32
3.2.1.5 German-Czech border	36
3.2.1.6 German-Polish border	40
3.2.2 Stage Two: Comparison Across The Corpus	43
4. Conclusions and policy implications	49
4.1 The Historical Axis of Hurt/Trauma	49
4.2 The Axis of Inequality	51
4.3 Conflicting Identities	51
4.4 Alternative axes	52
4.5 Negative emotions and cross-border policies	54
4.6 Discourse and Identity	54
4.7 Conclusions: current problems	56
4.8 Policy implications: how to overcome the above problems	56
4.9 Need for further research in the particular area of our research	57
4.10 Action Research	58
4.11 Implication for framework programmes in general	58
5. Dissemination and/or exploitation of results	61
6. Acknowledgements and References	63
6.1 Acknowledgements	63
6.2 References	64
Annexes	67

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Many nation states in Europe have undergone dramatic social and political upheavals in the 20th century with the construction of new or the redefinition of existing national borders before and after World War II, and more recently as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. New borders divide territory which was previously unified. Old borders collapsed, reuniting territory previously divided. The political definition and ideological make-up of many nation states changed accordingly, with new developments in process today which offer major new alignments in Eastern and south-eastern Europe under the umbrella of an expanding European Union. Families with three generations in the communities on the borders between what is at present the European Union's eastern and south-eastern frontier, and those on the previous border between East and West Germany have experienced between them several dramatic socio-political changes during the life-time of all but their youngest citizens. Further major change is pending with the first wave of accession countries' joining the European Union within the first half of the first decade of the 21st century, thus completing a process whereby a formerly heavily guarded and divisive border turned into an open border between neighbouring friendly states, to finally become an internal border within EU territory. Hence these families had and will continue to embrace major shifts in their public allegiances which will again directly affect the daily life in their communities.

Our research focused on such three-generation families in corresponding sets of geographically contiguous border communities, and aimed to compare how their members perceive and discursively construct their identities in relation and possibly in contrast and opposition to these upheavals in the official spheres of politics. Since at the public level – cross-community, cross-region, trans-national and European projects support better social co-operation and socio-economic and political infrastructures, our research also investigated the uptake and frequent rejection of such well-intended policies amongst ordinary people. We hoped that if we could better understand the nature of these negative attitudes and the reasoning behind them, we would be able to complement, or where necessary help to correct public policies and their local impact. Ultimately we hope that our research findings will add to the long-term prospect of a growing together of the people of Europe in a socially inclusive, diverse, tolerant, cohesive and economically prosperous community.

This executive summary is divided into three sections (for a full account of our work see the extended final report published on our website, and in particular the publications listed under section five):

- Section 1: Summary of objectives and overall results in achieving these.
- Section 2: Summary of methodology, implementation of research design, key findings.
- Section 3: Conclusion and policy recommendations.

1.1 Summary of objectives and overall results in achieving these.

Our research aimed to identify the nature of potentially conflictual identities which people in different border communities along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union construct, and to identify and advise on effective policies for integration and social cohesion at regional, national, transnational and European level.

It also pursued a range of more detailed objectives:

- § to identify differences and similarities in the historical conditions in politically-sensitive border communities along the eastern and south-eastern borders of the EU;

- § to identify the ways in which members of three-generation families in the different geographical locations along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union perceived and narratively constructed their identities in relation, and possibly in contrast and opposition, to each other and to the upheavals in the official spheres of politics;
- § to examine how the discursive markers of identity appear in the lexico-grammatical structures of the data. To examine how these markers interplay with the visual stimuli provided by selected photographic representations of the changing geographical and socio-political environment of the respective border territories, and of other symbolically charged images;
- § to identify the similarities and differences in the identity formations of individuals and groups of different ages and gender and how they interact with differences in nationhood, experience, and memory;
- § to identify how evaluations about people living on the other side of the borders (e.g. friend/enemy positions) relate to the formations of a group identity in people's own community (e.g. negative identity);
- § to examine whether, to what extent and how they perceive themselves today as Europeans in opposition to or as an extension of other forms of personal, local, regional, national or transnational identities;
- § to find out whether and to what extent European identity is embraced as a solution to perceived national or regional conflicts or whether it is itself perceived as a conflict. To identify the key elements within the linguistic and cultural environment of border communities which encourage the perceptions of social cohesion or disunity at local, regional, national and European levels.
- § to examine how people relate to the different public policies in these communities, regions or nations, where social cohesion and economic prosperity is the aim of cross-border projects, e.g. projects at the public administrative level, and to compare these to other shared but more grass-root driven activities such as cross-border sports, shopping, eating out or disco evenings;
- § to examine whether and to what extent there are similarities and differences between the different geographical areas under considerations, and if so, whether and how these interrelate with structural similarities caused by the border existence itself and/or by economic and social changes caused by the political reorientation of the respective nation states.
- § to create comparative data sets for the above across different but comparable border communities along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union and including communities along the former and now dissolved border between East and West Germany, with the aim to support best practice for the creation of a tolerant, socially inclusive and economically vibrant Europe.
- § To indicate means by which policies can best combat social tensions and promote a European identity.

All of the above objectives have been achieved within the life cycle of the project: results have been reported on and made publicly available in various earlier reports, as specified in the different sections of this final report (for a full account of our dissemination activities, see section 5 of this report). So far our work has been/ is about to be published in two edited volumes with co-authored, integrated articles by all the members of the consortium (Meinhof ed. 2002, Meinhof ed. in press 2003). A substantive number of individual or co-authored articles have appeared or are in the pipe-line. National and international conference papers, symposia, local and international workshops, invited speeches to universities and schools, undergraduate and post-graduate courses at several universities, a dedicated web-site

(<http://www.borderidentities.com/>) have allowed wide and continuing dissemination of our work across an interdisciplinary and multi-level range of academic, political, and educational settings. Members of the group have also participated in, and acted as advisors to policy and research meetings at national, European and international level

Several of these activities will continue and expand beyond the life-cycle of the project with a whole range of projects already in process. These include, for example, other R&D developments arising from an early clustering of our border identity project with two framework projects at the European University Institute in Fiesole (co-ordinated by Prof. Risse and Prof. Strath); a cross-linking of our project with the international GIPCS project (*Globalisation, Identity Politics and Social Conflict Project*) supported by the British Academy and the British Council, with a first shared symposium on 'Conflictual border identities in Europe and Africa' taking place in Lagos, Nigeria in April 2003; cross-fertilisation with a further Fifth Framework project (*Changing City Spaces: new Challenges to Cultural Policy in Europe* again co-ordinated by Prof. Meinhof, including Prof. Strath and one of the former Klagenfurt partners, Dr Busch); a new book project in German in preparation for De Gruyter Press (Holly and Meinhof eds. *Grenzidentitäten im Diskurs*), and a new web teaching resource for German and European Studies (Meinhof, Armbruster, Rollo forthcoming).

1.2 Summary of methodology, implementation of research design and key findings

Our research provides the first comparative study of a set of communities on the border between today's EU and its eastern and south-eastern ascendant nations. A multilingual team of researchers from seven different countries over a period of three years conducted parallel collaborative research in 6 sets of paired communities on either side of the border, thus covering a total of 12 regions, including those on either side of the Thuringian-Bavarian border, which only became, and then ceased to be, state border territory with the division and reunification of Germany.

This research allowed us to understand what makes the experience of living on these borders different from or comparable to one another, in spite or because of differences or similarities of culture and language. In particular, we wanted to derive, consolidate and build upon a better understanding of the following questions which we took as fundamental to the overall aim of our project:

- § In which ways did historical and present day experiences of socio-political change shape the attitudes of European citizens about the demarcated or overlapping cultural and administrative spaces of the European Union right along the line of its current most debated area of expansion?
- § In which ways did public worlds of political change affect the ways in which people think of themselves and their neighbours?
- § In which ways are these processes interlinked with people's identities, and how do they manifest, construct and confirm themselves in everyday narratives and talk?

In-depth insights about these questions were gauged by a shared but highly indirect method of field-work design and interviewing. Pioneered by Meinhof & Galasinski during earlier research on the German-Polish and former German-German borders (see Meinhof & Galasinski 2000), all member of the research consortium used photographs of buildings, bridges, border crossings, landscapes, events, symbols. All the carefully chosen images represented geo-physical, political, spatio-temporal snapshots of the border communities during the lifetime of the three generations and were instantly recognisable and historically placeable by each generation living there. Looking together at photographs created an atmosphere of shared experience between

researchers and informants and allowed open yet nevertheless semi-structured questioning and conversations (see also the different chapters in Meinhof ed. 2002 for an account of the type of pictures used for the different communities). This technique also avoided one of the most difficult problems for all researchers with a discourse-analytical focus, namely that the words and labels for the different socio-political entities and events together with their pronunciation could first be introduced by the informants and not by the interviewer. The significance of thus avoiding a circularity in research design cannot be over-stated in the linguistic mine-fields of 20th century Europe. The tremendous political changes which affected the communities through naming and renaming of towns, regions, nations; the accompanying positive or negative repertoire for the people living there and differently loaded terms for events (such as the difference between labelling flight as expulsion or resettlement, see Holly 2002) made any particular choice, pronunciation or avoidance of terms by our informants highly relevant for an understanding of their complex identities. The benefit of the method is even more remarkable in that across a span of 60-80 minute recordings with each individual informant we found that their selections covered a whole range of possibilities, most of which proved significant when read in connection with the content and the evaluative frame of the narratives. Hesitation phenomena, hedging, broken-off sentences, self-corrections in connection with these choices also provided an interesting basis for subsequent analysis. Amongst our data, there were instances of consistent usage at all times, sometimes overriding the socio-political context; others that varied according to that context; others again systematically varied in their linguistic choices in relation to the more evaluative content of the narratives. Furthermore although the images did trigger an initial spatio-temporal frame for the narratives, this did not constrain the selection of the themes themselves. Informants quickly took a hold of their own memories and set their own priorities. Even the 'key narratives' (see below) were sometimes triggered by photos, but very often they were not, or not in any predictable form. By contrast, images which we had specifically selected for stimulating particular themes proved to be nothing of the sort. This non-trigger effect was most notable in the case of the European themes.

Key findings emerging from the implementation of the methodology

- Discourse analysis on the data revealed that although many "liberal" views were expressed they often concealed prejudices of a deep-rooted nature. The habitual use of racist expression seems to be so strong that the user can be unaware of it, but acts as confirmation of these views amongst friends, family and peer groups.
- Interviewees often expressed prejudiced opinions directed against those on the other side, emphasising a wide range of every-day and often superficial characteristics projected on the people or their community: these included cultural, linguistic, behavioural, physical , taste or style differences.
- Negative attitudes towards the others and the prejudiced perception stop interaction and replace lack of experiences of the Other with indifference, fear and dislike.
- EU enlargement does not readily feature in people's experiences or emotions except when prompted or, more negatively, when activated against a weaker group – e.g. the Austrians and Slovenians will mark Europe off against the Balkans. Cross-border relations are not usually seen as European but mainly as translocal phenomena.
- The youngest generation are very often amongst the most prejudiced in spite (or because) of a general lack of engagement or experiences with one another This was particularly marked at the German-Czech, the German-Polish and the former German-German and the Austrian-Hungarian border, and less so on the borders of Austria and Italy with Slovenia.
- Indifference is a common feeling and this can mask other attitudes such as fear or anxiety. Indifference is not necessarily any easier to tackle than explicit negativity.
- Contradictions and confusion in a community – often arising from historical legacies and a lack of knowledge - can cause as many problems as complete inactivity and unawareness in communities with no CBC relations.

- Language itself can take on a symbolic role in dividing people since negative attitudes and evaluations about people get transferred to their language. This is true at the level of different standard languages (e.g. German vs. Polish/ Czech/ Hungarian/ Slovenian; Italian vs. Slovenian) but also works at the level of dialectal difference (e.g. between Franconian and Thuringian or Saxon dialect speakers).

Key findings emerging from the collaborative analysis and comparison of results

After the analysis and comparison of a very rich data set of transcribed, annotated and translated interviews from all the researched communities, the consortium was able to present its key results through two major patterns:

Key narratives: these emerged overwhelmingly from within specific communities and generations, and foregrounded the local dimension of historical and contemporary experiences.
 Narrative clusters: these linked certain communities along different axes and foregrounded the translocal, transnational dimension.

Key narratives of specific communities and generations, foregrounding the local dimension

The key stories in our case studies revolve around a variety of topics of which the following are the most significant:

In the former German-German borderland many self-descriptive narratives are focused on work. These are set within the ongoing experience of unification, both on a national and on a personal level. Work, being a crucial field of personal and inter-personal experience as well as a signifier of moral values, corresponds almost metonymically to the distressing transformations our interviewees have had to come to terms with. Their narratives of work articulate clear positions of identity and difference, alongside what many called the “border in the heads” between East and West Germans. At the same time, the rhetoric about work gives rise to a range of emotive responses and conflictual accommodations to a ‘unified’ national entity.

The self-narratives collected on the Italian-Slovenian border are far less articulate about clear self-other distinctions. People’s stories are centred on personal relationships to history and to their own community as a historic entity. The interviewees on either side describe themselves in a language of memory, which includes strategies of remembering as well as of forgetting. The historical trauma of Italian fascism and its aftermath, which established the clearest division between the two communities, provides an illuminating memory-scape in people’s narratives. Generally, Italian narrators ‘forget’ fascism and have, in tandem with it, no language to talk about the ‘Slovenians’. Slovenian interviewees address their victimhood and resistance to fascism, but a substantial number of people adopt a strategy of silencing their historical grievances in order to foster ‘normal’ relationships with Italians.

Comparably, key narratives on the Czech-German border revolve around historical self-understanding. German fascism and the German invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 represent the traumatic event of the past that is still clearly present in people’s stories. As with the Italian narrators on the Italian-Slovenian border, German interviewees in Bärenstein and Vejprty adopt strategies of ‘forgetting’ to deal with the question of complicity with German fascism. Czech interviewees address issues of resistance but, like the Slovenian interviewees, adopt a narrative strategy of avoidance. In both cases it seems that individuals of all generations employ narrative strategies of evasion in order to neutralise an unresolved and potentially conflictual cross-border relationship.

The narratives on the Hungarian-Austrian border are equally fraught with ‘silences’, albeit not caused by a traumatic historical rift between the two communities. Here the most striking processes of ‘forgetting’ include the common pre-border past until 1921 and the common

present after 1989, which extends to an almost complete lack of acknowledgement of and interest in the population on the other side of the border. People on either side incorporate the border as a physical barrier in a discourse of past and present limitations to their lives. It provides a foil for expressing daily hardships and limited economic means on the Hungarian side, and for articulating anxiety about violence, immigration and the stigma of cultural ‘backwardness’ in Austria.

The physical dimension of the border is lifted onto yet another level in the Austrian-Slovenian case. In striking contrast to the Austrian-Hungarian example, the very physicality of the border as an experiential space is incorporated into people’s narratives. It provides a kind of liminal space in which interviewees not only experience the natural beauty of the mountains but also seek unique and thrilling border-crossing encounters. Whereas the ‘view across the border’ causes no apparent interest on the Austrian-Hungarian border, it is vividly and variedly employed in the Austro-Slovenian narratives. As such the border is clearly embedded in discourses of difference, which reflect the wider historical and geo-political power relations that affect the lives of Austrians and Slovenians.

The spatial experience of the border also figures in the narratives on the Polish-German border. Here the urban space both of the home town and of the neighbour directly across the river is a key factor in the identity constructions of the people who live there. The Polish town’s status in the narratives of its inhabitants gives rise to attempts to discursively incorporate Görlitz into their own living space. The Görlitz narratives, on the other hand, see the present status quo of the town more statically as its desirable shape, which does not need to be ‘resolved’ by incorporating Zgorzelec.

Narrative clusters: combining communities along different axes and foregrounding the translocal, transnational dimension

Focusing on clusters implied a different but complementary approach to the phenomenon of living on borders. Rather than investigating the sets of communities independently from one another, this meant combining all the data from all the communities. By comparing the narratives of all the sets of communities with one another we wanted to find out whether there are larger transnational dimensions to the phenomenon of living alongside the entire length of this borderline. Again, the overall framework is one of interaction between the macro-worlds of socio-political change and the every-day life within the communities as narrativised by the people themselves. The three-generation families in the communities we investigated had, on the one hand, the shared experience of a historically highly conflictual and now gradually opening border, but on the other they belong to seven different nation states with six different national languages. By comparing the data across the entire spectrum of these languages and cultures, we were looking for – and indeed found – many instances of shared perceptions. These cut across local and national lines and form clusters of eastern and western borderlands, with Italy, Austria and Germany on the western, and Slovenia, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Poland on the (south-) eastern side; or put differently, with EU states on the one and ascendant nations on the other. Our clusters show that the geo-political dimension of the borderline needs to be understood as an axis along which disturbing memories of past conflict and violence – the axis of historical trauma and hurt – are mapped onto present-day socio-economic asymmetry and inequality.

On the eastern side of our borders we find some of the poorest regions in Europe. Here the gross national product, expressed as the purchasing power of its inhabitants, lies at under 50% or between 50-75% of the average of the enlarged European Union. Almost all of Poland and Slovakia, and large parts of Hungary, belong to the first and most of the Czech Republic to the second category. The only one of the ascendant nations which averages at 75-100% is Slovenia, but here, too, the difference to its richer EU neighbours is marked. These economic inequalities and their social consequences feature time and time again in the narratives we collected.

However, the situation is further complicated by the fact that the border regions of the EU states to their eastern neighbours, though markedly richer, are relatively poorer in relation to the rest of their nation. (Italy, with its rich northern regions, is the one exception to this). This discrepancy in wealth between certain regions and the rest of the country can be seen very clearly in eastern Germany. All the former GDR regions where our communities bordering Poland and Czech Republic and the Eastern (Thuringian) part of the former East/West German border are located, are relatively poor in relation to West Germany.

What we find here is a situation where the division of communities as a result of historical political upheaval – the effects of war, redefinition of nationhood, population migration through flight, expulsion or resettlement – continues today in the form of socio-economic inequality. People in these communities by looking across their borders – be they rivers or brooks, meadows or mountains – literally look across a socio-economic fault-line which divides the richer from the poorer in today's Europe. Thus it comes as no surprise that the construction of identity for many of the people living on these borders works itself through a system of in-grouping and out-grouping which echoes and confirms these divisions in all forms of every-day social practices. Axes drawn by historical tension continuing as axes of social and economic inequality thus confirm cycles of continuing negative stereotyping or indifference. Hence there is a clustering of experiences along either side of this historical and often also social and economic divide.

There is a need for those from border regions to legitimise their decision on either staying (usually out of loyalty/moral grounds) or leaving (economic reasons/better prospects.) It can therefore be seen that originating from a border region does impact on inhabitants' reasoning and affects their future plans (see Wastl-Walter et al 2003, Hipfl et al 2003). The fact that borders are becoming more transparent means that the potential for conflict has increased, as old and new inequalities become more apparent. Most people speak from a marked perspective – as either advantaged or disadvantaged. It is important that this social phenomenon is recognised – both by the people themselves and by regional policy makers. This implies a close understanding of the linguistic strategies which people use to try and cope with difficulties or sensitive events: from negative stereotypical views about the ethnic other to the ignoring of contradictory evidence (see for example Galasinska and Galasinski 2003). All teams found evidence for the ways in which language was used to mark an in-group or an out-group: the "them versus us" mentality. We found many examples for processes whereby people projected onto members of the out-group norms and practices, which were based on prejudice rather than genuine encounters. However, these clusters of belonging and not-belonging to particular groups, of in-grouping and out-grouping others were not fixed for all times but often changed even within the time-frame of one 60-90 minute interview when the context and perspective of the narrative altered. Hence we understood the complex ways in which linguistics, social attitudes and prejudices of other social groups interact in the border communities and how the transmission of cultural norms, values and ideology is affected..

One of our unexpected findings related to the 'absence of Europe' in our data. We had anticipated that the communities in the eastern and south-eastern periphery – which will soon be an open border within EU territory – would be involved in a good deal of discussions, ideas and emotions about the role of Europe for its citizens. All our trigger photography included EU-related pictures, either as signs attached to buildings and other investments in the border regions itself, or as abstract symbols. Through these we hoped to elicit attitudes and experiences with the European Union past, present and future, gauge local involvement with the many EU-inspired projects, and appreciate the role which European identity would play viz. other more local or national forms of identification.

However these pictures did not normally trigger any reaction about Europe (see also Armbruster, Meinhof and Rollo 2003; Meinhof & Galasinski 2002). Most citizens living in the border communities lack a sense of belonging to Europe – contrary to the researchers' initial

expectations. This may be a reflection that European unity is still in process and that there has been no consolidation of a European identity. People do not volunteer positive experiential values and identifications with Europe or the European Union, even where some of their practices would suggest these (e.g. travelling to other parts of Europe, not having to exchange foreign currency; enjoying some of the positive outcomes of EU investments in their communities etc). Hence information about attitudes towards the EU and Europe required more direct questions which elicited a highly differentiated and ambivalent set of answers. Interviewees also often contradict themselves, giving a positive view of Europe in one part of the interview, but in another context offering negative views which express fears and anxieties on a more local level. Our data also suggests that the EU tends to be regarded as an economic entity rather than a cultural/social one. On the whole it became clear to the researchers that narratives concerning Europe most clearly expressed the endurance of older East-West identities and their re-interpretation in the face of enlargement, rather than a growing Europeanisation. In summary, we thus identified the following thematic clusters across the different sets of communities (for a full account see Meinhof ed. 2003):

- § Marginality, linked to the question of out-migration.
- § Geographical marginalisation linked to social, political, and economical separation from and disadvantages in relation to more central regions of the country. Border regions as social “dumping” grounds.
- § Role of youth in marginal communities.
- § Language choice as marker of difference: asserting ethnic identity and power through language
- § Language use as constructing difference: discursive strategies of coping with sensitive topics about out-groups
- § Absence of Europe as imagined community.

1.3 Conclusions and Policy Implications

The research completed through this project offers the first comparative study of its kind. Carried out over three years the research allowed us to understand what makes the experience of living on these borders different or comparable with one another. How did the public worlds of political change affect the ways in which people think about their neighbours? How are these processes mapping onto people’s identities? And how do these manifest themselves in everyday narratives? To what extent can we think of these identity-forming experiences as community specific, trans-border, national or transnational? The conclusions of this research can be clustered into six axes:

Historical axis of hurt/trauma

This is an important factor underpinning current attitudes and self-understandings. It highlights the interaction between macro political change and micro identity formation between local communities. It is particularly noticeable on the German-Czech, German-Polish and Italian-Slovenian borders. Here the historical experience of trauma still informed the narratives. Sometimes it would be linguistically explicit and sometimes covert, yet in both cases it can be clearly shown that these issues have never been resolved. In all cases, experiences of historical conflict or hardship shape the views of the self or other. In addition to historical events dating back from the war, relationships are also shaped by the degree to which the Iron Curtain had taken root and made cross-border traffic possible. Examples here range from the extremely strict German-German border to the more liberal regime in the Italian-Yugoslavian case. As a result the entrenched political ideologies between East and West are less apparent in the border communities between Austria/Italy and Slovenia.

Socio-economic inequality

Research highlighted that the historical perspective needs to be looked at in conjunction with socio-economic factors. The study found that fears and future expectations often revolved around economic factors – particularly with regard to EU enlargement. The oldest divide between east and west is still apparent. The economic inequalities between east and west featured constantly in the narratives. The division of communities as a result of historical/political upheaval, war and population migration all continues today in the form of socio-economic inequality. Geo-political borders today also mark divisions between richer and poorer communities, affecting identity formations, in-grouping and out-grouping, and all the associated social practices. Hence, cross-border relations are more relaxed where economic differences are relatively small (e.g. between Austria and Slovenia) and where there is a longer culture of CBC exchange, e.g. between Slovenia and Austria/Italy).

Conflicting Identities

Our research found ample evidence for the context-bound nature of identities, for their multi-layeredness and their contradictions and contestations. In-group and out-group constructions thus varied across the groups as well as individuals according to context. At the same time we also found systematically recurring alignments in similar contexts. For example, when discussing the East/West differences in Germany, many marked their differences in socio-economic terms, drawing on work ethic, attitude, and status as a marker of difference between both sides. Yet when the subject moved to European enlargement to the east, or to other ethnic or more disadvantaged groups within or outside Europe, they defined themselves more readily as Germans (or in some instances as Europeans when the ‘other’ groups came from outside Europe). Therefore a sense of cultural identification and unity is often constructed against the foil of dissociation from other groups perceived as more different from one’s own.

All interviewees crafted narratives of identity along those axes of inequality that were experientially most real to them, and arising from a historical or a socio-economic framework. The borders themselves are seen as symbols of unity, marginality, and exclusion in present and in past. Discourse analysis was revealing in this respect as it clearly showed where and in relation to which themes individual narratives pointed at conflictual and contradictory identity formations.

Alternative axes

Apart from the historical and socio-economic axes of the east/west borderline, other clusters formed along different axes:

§ Post-communism axis

Several communities share a common experience of rapid economic and political change – mainly the transition of CEEC countries into liberal democratic states with market economies – and this has had a big impact. This experience has been shared by the German communities of Görlitz, Bärenstein and the Thuringian communities (as well as Guben from the preceding research). Research suggests here that interviewees hold a post-communist identity when the context is wider if compared to western Germany, but rarely align themselves with Polish or Czech neighbours who have had similar experiences.

§ Rural/town divide

Two of our six sets of communities can be described as relatively large towns (Görlitz-Zgorzelec on the German-Polish border and Gorizia-Nova Gorica on the Italian-Slovenian border). It is in these towns, in contrast to the other, largely rural communities we investigated,

that we can see a higher degree of co-operation and interaction at the official level. There are many cross-border initiatives, initiated and supported by the local authorities, and everyday cross-border interaction, often in the form of shopping tourism, is relatively high. At the other end of the spectrum, in the peaceful villages of Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent on the Austrian-Hungarian border, cross-border interaction is almost non-existent. As our research has shown, interest in these communities in the other across the border is very low indeed. The pulling effect of urban centres on people from their environs also operates across international borders; many of our young generation informants mapped out their futures in terms of cities they would like to/have to move to in order to have a career (but see Guben/ Gubin from our earlier research as a counter-example, Galasinski & Meinhof 2002). Adjacent villages, on the other hand, have little in terms of employment and, in modern capitalism, little in the way of consumer goods to offer each other. On the Austrian-Hungarian border, as on the other more rural borders, it was clearly the urban centres, in this case Vienna and Budapest, which especially the young and middle generations look to. This leads to large levels of out-migration towards the centres away from these peripheral communities, with serious consequences for their vitality and economic viability.

§ Linguistic axis

Another area in which the main East-West divide is qualified and undercut is in language. In some of these communities the political border reflects an almost clear-cut language divide: this is true of the German-Polish, German-Czech, and Austro-Hungarian communities. But in each of these communities, this present-day situation disguises a history where the situation was much more complex; in the first two, German used to be spoken across what is now the national border, in the latter there was within the living memory of the older generation a history of bilingualism on both sides of the border - now completely disappeared. In the Austrian-Slovenian and Italian-Slovenian communities, the political border does not coincide with the linguistic one, since substantial Slovenophone minorities live in Eisenkappel/Zelezna Kapla and in Gorizia/Gorica. The former German-German border, currently reverted to its historical regional status, language is at first glance not an issue. But dialectal differences get used even here by our informants to reinforce separation and otherness.

Negative emotions and cross-border policies

CBC programmes are largely ignored by the young – this was contrary to expectations as researchers thought the young would be able to begin to bridge the gap. Divisions are therefore often reproduced by the younger generation. The lack of knowledge regarding EU investment is staggering. Ironically, EU projects often cause hostility to arise rather than eradicating it. The result of the research shows that to be successful with local people, EU policies need to be much more sensitive to local needs. There is a great deal of resentment and negativity regarding projects if the consequences for local people are not thought through.

Discourse and Identity

All researchers took a qualitative approach – using ethnographic tools and discourse analytical methods. A strong relationship between the talk of individuals and the wider social, cultural and historical conditions has been identified. The study showed that discourse is a major way of creating identities and that many individuals share certain axes of identification because they share values and emotions for in-grouping and out-grouping. It is therefore possible to identify discursive overlaps revealing groupings marked out by village, town, region or language. This method enabled researchers to understand village and family identities as well as the wider sets of relationships in which people embedded themselves, such as region, nation or occasionally Europe. The linguistic analysis showed the degree to which ideological representations are

naturalised and become accepted, often as a negative norm. The Italian-Slovenian border provides some hopeful exception here, in that young people seem to have adopted a more positive attitude to change and do not seem threatened by their neighbours. This is something to focus and build upon.

Action Research is a second stage of participatory research aiming at concrete practical outcomes. This was piloted (as researchers had built up a relationship with the communities) with the younger generation as researchers had been surprised at their negativity. A Metaplan was drawn up, encouraging people to discuss and air their views in local workshops. This method does not blame people for their views but allows them to air their positive and negative feelings and attitudes. It also permitted the participants to see that their attitudes were endemic in other nations and regions. This provided a good basis for the discussion of possible solutions for the respective communities within a local and European context. In some cases, students asked for a continuation of the discussions, which was a strong positive outcome. However, these discussions may be difficult to continue, as it is not clear if these could be developed without the help of mediators. The local people trusted the researchers as a result of the project activities. It is important that a solution to this should be developed, as this discussion process would ensure that insider and outsider viewpoints could merge and benefit from each other's perspective. We therefore recommend that second stage proposals of at least 2-3 years of work be permissible in future in such cases where one could build on achieved (but initially unpredictable) results within a research area. EU framework programmes could play a further role in action research, which will be necessary as enlargement takes place. The Higher Education institutions of the eastern accession countries should be able to play a role in achieving the shared strategic goals.

In general the study has therefore shown that division and hostility still exist whether people openly express this or not. The removal of the German-German border highlights that democratic change does not eradicate problems. The key finding of this study has been the attitude of people. If anything EU enlargement will probably see a more open expression of tension. However, so long as this is anticipated and EU investment is targeted in the form of local projects with local involvement, inhabitants will be able to see the benefits of unity rather than the negativity of being separated. It is the attitudes of local people, which need to be closely monitored. In terms of implications for policy-making, the policy makers at EU level have the power to change policies and make them more effective, though it is important not to preach from above. Local opinion must be considered at all times, and local co-operation must be sought for all stages of the developmental process. Social cohesion and cultural diversity is the driving force behind Europeanisation. Grassroots policies need to reflect this, and not just the main EU policy. The EU needs to become more democratic itself and place more emphasis on developing the regions as EU policy should strengthen regions of common space and common economic need - not nations. A better understanding and better practices for local decision making are therefore essential. The information gap needs to be bridged – again by involving local people in decisions. The results of projects need to be disseminated and filtered out to the whole community, highlighting the benefits to the people but without propagandist rhetoric. Instead there needs to be a range of platforms for local people to discuss the problems and successes of previous projects, and to brainstorm ideas for future activities. They will need to be taken seriously and their views and decisions must lead to definite outcomes.

New discursive possibilities need to be explored in order to develop and maintain communication channels. Economic co-operations and shared marketing strategies must receive support. Local media channels such as TV, newspapers and radio need to become more involved in the project developments and implementations to ease the dissemination process. Better interaction between and greater sensitivity towards local and trans-local agents – NGOs,

educational institutions, media, policy makers, cultural organisations etc – is a vital ingredient here. This study has consequently highlighted the need for further research. In particular more research is needed in terms of developing and strengthening the local decision making processes and in understanding how developments can sometimes unintentionally bypass people's perceived needs. The process of decision-making needs to allow for the conflicting opinions of people. We need a clearer understanding of why people do not respond well to policies and projects designed to improve their lives. In general, a more holistic approach to cross-community development is needed which is sensitive to the multiple and complex identities and identifications of the people living there.

2. BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

Our project targeted three-generation families living in corresponding sets of geographically contiguous border communities on the border between the EU and some of its Eastern and Southern neighbours. The communities we focussed on have undergone major socio-political, highly conflictual changes during the lifetimes of all but their youngest citizens. Today they are associated at the public level with the aims of creating a socially inclusive, tolerant, cohesive and economically prosperous united Europe.

Our research proposed to gain comparative and in-depth insights into the nature of potentially conflicting identities which people from different nations, ethnicities, generations and genders construct and negotiate in relation and possibly in contrast and opposition to the official spheres of politics, and to recommend policies that would further social cohesion between such communities at local, national and in particular at the European level.

2.1 Objectives

Our research aimed to identify the nature of potentially conflictual identities which people in different border communities along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union construct, and to identify and advise on effective policies for integration and social cohesion at regional, national, transnational and European level.

It also pursued a range of more detailed objectives:

- § to identify differences and similarities in the historical conditions in politically sensitive border communities along the eastern and south-eastern borders of the EU;
- § to identify the ways in which members from three-generation families in the different geographical locations along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union perceived and narratively constructed their identities in relation, and possibly in contrast and opposition, to each other and to the upheavals in the official spheres of politics;
- § to examine how the discursive markers of identity appear in the lexico-grammatical structures of the data. To examine how these markers interplay with the visual stimuli provided by selected photographic representations of the changing geographical and socio-political environment of the respective border territories, and of other symbolically charged images;
- § to identify the similarities and differences in the identity formations of individuals and groups of different ages and gender and how they interact with differences in nationhood, experience, and memory;
- § to identify how evaluations about people living on the other side of the borders (e.g. friend/enemy positions) relate to the formations of a group identity in people's own community (e.g. negative identity);
- § to examine whether, to what extent and how they perceive themselves today as Europeans in opposition to or as an extension of other forms of personal, local, regional, national or transnational identities;
- § to find out whether and to what extent European identity is embraced as a solution to perceived national or regional conflicts or whether it is itself perceived as a conflict;
- § to identify the key elements within the linguistic and cultural environment of border communities which encourage the perceptions of social cohesion or disunity at local, regional, national and European levels;
- § to examine how people relate to the different public policies in these communities, regions or nations, where social cohesion and economic prosperity is the aim of cross-border projects, e.g. projects at the public administrative level, and to compare these to

other shared but more grass-root driven activities such as cross-border sports, shopping, eating out or disco evenings;

- § to examine whether and to what extent there are similarities and differences between the different geographical areas under considerations, and if so, whether and how these interrelate with structural similarities caused by the border existence itself and/or by economic and social changes caused by the political reorientation of the respective nation states;
- § to create comparative data sets for the above across different but comparable border communities along the eastern and southern borders of the European Union and including communities along the former and now dissolved border between East and West Germany, with the aim to support best practice for the creation of a tolerant, socially inclusive and economically vibrant Europe;
- § to indicate means by which policies can best combat social tensions and promote a European identity.

2.2 Description of work

Our project has extended to a wider European framework from the results of a study funded by the British ESRC into German-German and German-Polish communities conducted during 1999/2000. We focus on three-generation families in communities which are straddling the eastern and south-eastern boundaries between the EU and some of its ascendant nations, with very different political systems and official allegiances; communities between Germany/Poland; Germany/Czech Republic; Austria/Hungary; Austria/Slovenia; Italy/Slovenia, and the previous border between East and West-Germany.

Our research aims to compare how these people perceive and discursively construct their identities in relation and possibly in contrast and opposition to the upheavals in the official spheres of politics and the past; how the changes which radically redefined the nation in which our families were living are constructed in the context of the challenges and opportunities provided by the expanding European Union.

The main data for our study has come from oral narratives triggered in semi-structured interviews by photographs symbolically charged for the communities. These photographs represent socially recognisable events/locations in the changing socio-political realities of the communities, spanning the different historical periods of our families' life. Our informants related to salient images, which not only signified different historical phases in their communities, but also symbols of the process of division, unification and co-operation at regional, national and European level. Through discourse analysis of the data, we have gained insights into the construction of identities of people living in border communities and highlight those elements of their identities that would further co-operation and social cohesion between such communities at local, national and in particular at the European level. A key focus has been identity formations' responsiveness to policy developments aimed at cross-border and European integration. The project will thus have direct application to the formulation of the policy seeking to further European integration which is sensitive to people's world views, a policy that aims to prevent eruptions of nationalism and regional resentments.

3. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT RESULTS AND METHODOLOGY

to translate the visual sign into their linguistic and conceptual understanding indicated that the concept ‘Europe’ was not at the forefront of people’s social lives and did obviously not figure as a meaningful signifier. We will first report on our methodology and describe the major innovative results yielded by our specific methodological approach. Secondly we present our analytical results and contextualise these within the particular research settings of our border communities. Our analysis combined two major axes, which will be presented respectively: The first approach spans a local cross-border axis and concentrates on identity narratives that emerged in each set of our contiguous border communities. This was an attempt at understanding border communities within their specific local settings. The second approach spans a translocal trans-European axis and compares and contrasts all communities under investigation. This analysis combines specific local knowledge with trans-local commonalities and aims at understanding those spheres of identity and self-understanding which have a wider significance among those contemporary European citizens who formed the social unit of our research.

3.1 Methodology and Innovative Aspects of Results

In accordance with the method specified in the ‘state-of-the-art report’ all teams used a set of photographs to generate interviewees’ responses and narratives. The photographs depicted popular local landmarks in their historical transformations, including images of the respective border landscapes. The overall interview method worked well, enabling respondents’ own linguistic choices and an intended passivity on the interviewers’ side. In general, the old and middle generation responded as desired, using the photographs as aides-memoires for their personal and collective histories, identifications and commitments. The young generation was, at times, more hesitant when confronted with photographs and needed more direct questioning by the interviewer. This is not surprising, given that their historical experience spans a relatively short period. However, in all cases we were able to confirm our assumption that individual narratives ‘from below’ would reflect identity constructions ‘from above’. This made comparisons along generational lines particularly feasible and provided one of the main theoretical foci in our first publication. In all cases, the use of photographs generated certain ‘key narratives’ by which people made strong identity claims and positioned themselves within their local and translocal histories. This enabled insights into the locally specific fields of identity, which pointed at the same time, at locally (and cross-border) specific axes of cohesion and division. These were, for instance, the realm of work (German-German border), the traumatic past (Italian-Slovenian and the German-Czech borders), the use of a common space (German-Polish and Austrian-Slovenian borders) or the sense of isolation and exclusion (Hungarian-Austrian border) (see Meinhof ed. 2002). The shared method of critical discourse analysis enabled all team members to work with each other’s data and compare questions of cultural identity across the entire spectrum of communities. This led to a comparative exploration of similarities and differences of people’s border experiences, which afforded crucial insights into the spheres of unity and division that mark some increasingly ‘European’ experiences today (see Meinhof ed. 2003).

Our close methodological focus on language and narrative as the means by which people express and craft their identities proved very successful. Discourse analysis with its attention not only to what people say but how they say it, provided useful insights into consciously held and subconsciously negotiated views of the self and other. Thus, for instance, ethnic or racialised prejudice was often not expressed directly, but its presence was visible in people’s ways of

using language and adopting specific strategies of talk. These strategies often remained non-discriminable for the interviewer in the interview situation as such, and only became apparent through our detailed transcription, annotating and subsequent close reading of the data. In most border data the close reading of the transcribed interviews revealed that consciously expressed liberal views can conceal prejudiced talk which remains in the background at first but whose force becomes apparent once the data is analysed. We realised that the degree of habituated and routine forms of ethnic prejudice can be so strong, that they remain unconscious to the speakers or listeners. Prejudice was often directed against the population on the other side of the former or present divide, and against people marked as 'foreigners' by skin colour, religion or 'culture'. These discursive practices also revealed to us that photographs which represented the local border history generated narratives about belonging, insiders and outsiders or the self and other in general. Thus, local people incorporated the geography of power, which the state border represented, into their own narratives by marking symbolic boundaries themselves.

In this regard, the German-German data serves as a good example and highlights the interesting 'pilot' function this data can have in relation to the other communities we researched. With regard to the German-German data one of the main insights we gained by using careful discourse analytical methods was, that even after a decade of unification the former border remains an essential reference point, not just for narratives about the past but also about people's present daily lives. Thus, despite the joy, relief, and reunion that was brought about by the fall of the border, its symbolic force remained strong and continues to shape people's identities. People still define each other as 'Easterners' and 'Westerners'. Another insight gained in this respect was that the continuing force of East-West ideologies was particularly visible among the young generation. Despite not having experienced the Cold War and rigid border regime that separated the two parts, nor having witnessed the sequence of historical change, the young generation seemed to struggle more with unification and the 'new' national identity than middle aged or old people. This might be due to the fact that they are the first generation to 'live out' a range of radical changes without being able to draw on their parents' or grandparents' experiences. Since the German-German border is the only border in our sample that is dissolved, this research experience provided particular insights within our overall comparative approach that spans 12 communities. The fact that there are still a range of divisions and frictions despite the relatively successful German-German union, indicates some of the problems EU enlargement may face in the near future.

Using photographic images as triggers showed that there were specific linguistic and narrative frames people adopted (consciously or not), and which represented the 'reality' of the border for them. The comparability of these stories within one community also showed that people adopted frames of meaning which were shared by their culture at large. However, the use of these triggers also showed that if the viewer cannot correlate the visual image with a specific set of culturally encoded meanings, the visual sign remains unnoticed or its meaning uncertain. This became obvious and particularly insightful with regard to our images that represented signs of 'Europe' or the EU. Interviewees across the entire set of border communities did not 'recognise' these signs and subsequently did not incorporate them into their narratives. This failure within their everyday understandings of who they were and where they had come from. This insight was only to be gained by a qualitative methodological approach such as ours and would have been overlooked by direct questioning or surveying with questionnaires (see also Armbruster, Rollo, and Meinhof, in press, 2003).

Below we set out the two stages in which our research developed over the lifetime of the project. First of all we looked at the sets of communities in terms of their translocal interconnectedness and locally specific fields of identity. Here we were interested in the 'key narratives' which our informants from either side of the same border returned to again and again

throughout their interviews. These results sprang from a comparison across the local border, community by community. The second stage takes a different but complementary approach to the phenomenon of living on borders; it involved an investigation of the data all along the EU's eastern border from Poland to Italy. This thematic rather than geographic division of the corpus allowed major insights into what factors are important in the identity constructions of people living in communities all along this border.

3.2.1 Stage One: Key Narratives

The results below will be presented in a geographical fashion.

3.2.1.1 Former German-German border

Research Setting

Research was conducted in the borderzone of the federal states of Bavaria, Thuringia and Saxony. Bavaria, or, to be more precise Upper Franconia, is former FRG territory and Thuringia and Saxony belonged to the former GDR and were re-established as administrative units with unification in 1990. This area is within close proximity to the German-Czech border and has therefore also a (soon to be redefined) EU border on its doorstep.

Originally, research was to be carried out in the village of Moedlareuth which had been separated by a wall throughout the 40 years of national division, separating an Upper Franconian part from a Thuringian part. Due to difficulties in finding sufficient numbers of three-generation-families and willing interviewees who would participate in the project, the geographical scope of research was widened. Finally interviews were carried out in 5 villages on the Eastern side (Sparnberg, Gebersreuth, Ullersreuth, Dobareuth, Hirschberg) and in 4 villages on the Western side (Moedlareuth-West, Toepen, Untertiefengruen, Berg).

All villages share a close location to the former border which was almost hermetically sealed throughout its existence; The Thuringian villages used to be in the restricted border zone of the GDR, which imposed military control and restrictions of movement on its inhabitants.

Before the two areas became firmly embedded in the politically conflictual geography of 'East' and 'West', this particular region was economically, socially and culturally integrated. Economic and cultural flows were maintained by a socio-geographical North-South axis: Most materials used in the local Franconian porcelain, glass, leather or paper industries came from Saxony, Bohemia, Thuringia or what used to be German areas in the East. Equally, many goods produced in Bavaria travelled north rather than south. This situation was clearly echoed by our elderly informants from Bavaria who all reported to have had a clear economic, cultural and social orientation towards Thuringia and Saxony before 1945: people often worked there, shopped there, and had close social ties. The erection and increasing militarisation of the German-German border brought these practices to a complete halt. From now on, both parts were incorporated into two differing if not opposing systems: Principles of parliamentary democracy, federalism and a capitalist market economy in the West and Democratic Centralism, Marxism-Leninism and a centrally planned economy in the East.

The Thuringian and Bavarian (Upper Franconian) region in which we conducted our interviews is a rural area dotted with villages and small towns no larger than 2000 people. This settlement pattern has largely remained the same throughout the years of division. However, the agricultural economies which used to dominate the area underwent different developments. In Thuringia farms were collectivised and a large agricultural co-operative (LPG) established. In addition a leather factory, located right by the border river Saale, provided several hundred jobs during GDR times. All of our middle aged and oldest generation Thuringian interviewees had either worked in the leather factory or the LPG. After 1990 the LPG was transformed into a commercial company and the leather factory was closed down and eventually dismantled.

On the Upper Franconian side the smaller and medium sized farms remained intact, but like all farming communities in the EU they increasingly faced economic problems. During our time of study in 2000 only two or three large farms spanning several villages were still full-time agricultural units, all specialising and rationalising their production. During the 60s and 70s the border region on both sides faced a decrease in its population, as many mainly younger people moved away to larger towns in search for better job opportunities. In addition some people living on the Thuringian border were expelled by the GDR regime or moved out of the highly controlled restrictive border zone. In West German Upper Franconia this population decline continued into the late 80s and was only arrested when significant numbers of East Germans settled in the area. Since 1993 many people on either side have begun to commute 'across' for work and share the consumer facilities of larger towns. Despite having ceased to be a geographically marginal area of Germany, the regional population as a whole faces economic problems. Our research made clear that the regional population is also still in the process of 'growing together' in mental and cultural terms.

Research Analysis

As indicated above our first analytical focus was placed on how people narratively construct their identities and on how these narratives would negotiate identity positions from 'above' with those from 'below'. For this purpose we analysed 'key narratives' within our entire data set. By this we mean forms of 'emplotment' that recur across a range of individual narrators within one community. We observed a certain narrative tenacity of particular episodes, modes of reasoning or rationales ascribed to events. We believe that these point to the role which larger public narratives play in the narrativization of the personal self. Key narratives are often the means by which narrators make strong identity claims, which may then devalue other identities. It is in this sense that key narratives also reveal tensions and conflicts that exist across the border. We found that in the German-German borderland many self-descriptive narratives are focused on work. Here we imply a wide-ranging set of themes: work ethic, skills, quality of produce, (un)employment, salaries, as well as notions of effort, hardship, initiative, orderliness and material wealth as the deserved fruit of one's labour. This rhetorical repertoire served to construct a firm us-them divide between easterners and westerners and was shared by people right across the spectrum of gender, age and location. Identity and difference were not specified in national terms but in how far one shared the same ethic of work, or had the same specialised skills. Work, being a signifier of moral values as well as a field of personal and interpersonal experience, corresponded almost metonymically to the distressing transformations our interviewees had to come to terms with. It gave rise to a range of emotive responses and conflictual accommodations to a 'unified' national entity. As such personal narratives were linked with large-scale public narratives in Germany, in which the meanings of work are defined. The ethic of hard labour for instance, has not only been idealised historically in either part of Germany but also been a favoured image of Germans abroad. It was remarkable to see that it emerged at a time when nationhood was again under discussion, in order to mark out frames of belonging. At the same time, questions of employment and job security had gained a new force, given the economic problems caused by unification and general recession. However, in different moments within the same interview this shared rhetoric of distinction could be turned into a rhetoric of unity. The question of EU enlargement for instance, prompted many to mark off and devalue a 'Czech' or 'Polish' work ethic against a 'German' one, and thereby they united what they had divided in other layers of narrative. Key narratives that revolved around work thus provided a common language by which people crafted their own identities in relation to collectives of 'others' (see Armbruster and Meinhof 2002).

All our analytical work has used the tool of critical discourse analysis, with shifting emphases on different aspects in our data. Whereas the analysis of key narratives led to a resultant picture

that included a majority of people, irrespective of age, gender or location, the analysis of people's overall linguistic strategies led to a different level of complexity, revealing the richness of our data.

By focussing on lexical choices, grammatical forms and syntactic and textual patterns we could see the difference of generation or location emerging from our data. Thus, for instance, there was a clear variation between the narratives of the old and middle generations in the former GDR. Older people often set their experiences in a clearly narrative structure, peopled by specific characters, with descriptive and colourful mis-en-scene elements, and rounded up by a clear completion and evaluation of the recounted event. Their children's generation, on the other hand, often incorporated experiential accounts into an argumentative structure, where arguments are put forward that respond to an absent and silent opponent. Narratives do not always contain specific characters, are replete with linguistic features that avoid agency or causality and are often unfinished. In both cases people negotiate their own historical experiences with the wider politics of post-unification in Germany. The older generation framed history in relation to the war and post-war periods and highlighted experiences of victimisation and fear. Post-unification time was underrepresented and often evaluated positively.

The middle generation's periodisation of history was mainly framed by GDR and post-GDR times which are juxtaposed in a contrastive fashion. Being highly conscious of the anti-GDR rhetoric in the western part of Germany, this generation felt the need to define their former lives as distinctly positive (see Armbruster and Meinhof, forthcoming, 2003).

With regard to the young generation on either side, the attention to linguistic features and strategies revealed a particular form of out-grouping which was directed against foreigners in Germany. In this context it became clear that the younger generation's narratives about the border are particularly marked as narratives of boundary drawing against others. Despite a strong media presence of violent racism on foreigners at the time of the fieldwork, many of our young interviewees represented foreigners as 'problematic' and threatening. A generally negative portrait of the foreigner absolved many of these narrators from making explicit racist statements and it secured their superiority and tolerant self-image at the same time. Thus, rhetorical strategies gave shape to a racially privileged subject position of the speakers as 'white' Germans, without their marking whiteness as an explicit facet of identity. This seemed to be *the* field of self-identification that most strongly revealed a conflictual relationship of young people with unification, open borders and globalisation.

In general the linguistic and discursive analysis of our narratives showed that the border has remained a cognitive and symbolic map for people on either side which marks people's memories, everyday knowledge and perception of others. Despite sharing linguistic and cultural knowledge and a sense of nationhood across the former divide, our research showed that the process of unification is not accomplished.

This points at the possible difficulties other border communities in our sample might face, given that they are separated by larger and even more sensitive historical, linguistic and cultural differences (see also Armbruster and Meinhof, forthcoming, 2003).

As to the larger picture of Europe, cross-border flows and globalised realities, we were able to gain insights about people's geopolitical self-awareness. Here the close proximity to the Czech border provided a key reference point. People referred to their crossing of the border to acquire cheap goods on the other side and to a Czech-German border traffic, which was often understood as 'illegal' and potentially threatening. There was very little evidence for identification with a cross-border region (such as suggested by the *Euroregio Egrensis*, including Bohemia, parts of Franconia, Thuringia and Saxony) or a wider European space. Interestingly however, our interviewees were positive about their regions or federal states. Given that Thuringia was not acknowledged as a specific cultural or administrative unit during the GDR period, the identification with this region was quite strong. This might be due to Thuringia having been a 'dormant' identity space throughout the GDR as well as to the need to

create sub-national identities in the new federally organised Germany. The adoption of an Upper-Franconian identity on the Western side has always been strong. With regard to Europe however, our interviewees often related this question to their sense of being German nationals and to the perceived relationship of their nation with other nation states. Here they often identified with Germany as an economically and politically strong state which is in the danger of being weakened by its poorer neighbours. Europe was generally seen through an economic prism, and regional or local economic grievances were held against EU enlargement and the prospect of cross-border co-operation. However, as indicated above, Europe narratives were not necessarily stable but contained shifting and contradictory messages. Even though people often phrased their views in terms of pro or contra opinions, there was no clear-cut match between a pro-European stance and a liberal discourse, nor did a contra-European stance neatly match an anti-liberal discourse. While positive views of Europe could be couched in highly elitist, exclusivist discourses, negative views were sometimes articulated within visions of a free and borderless trans-national society. People discursively construct implicit in-groups of 'us' at those points when explicit out-grouping devices against 'them' are most prevalent. Europeans in this region seem to feel a sense of belonging to some vague notion of Europe most actively when they draw a line against less privileged outsiders who have not quite earned the right of an entry ticket (see Armbruster, Rollo, Meinhof, forthcoming).

3.2.1.2 Austrian-Hungarian border

Research Setting

In contrast to other border areas included in this study the border between Pinkamindszent and Moschendorf is still closed. After the elimination of the Iron Curtain, mayors on both sides of the border planned to establish a permanent border crossing in the near future. The villagers in Pinkamindszent welcomed this idea; however, people in Moschendorf were anxious about the peace of their village, and with the help of a local plebiscite, they managed to block the plan. Today nobody can be seen near the single slim barrier and the board signalling the state borders. There is a striking silence about the area, only interrupted by the occasional sounds of a tractor in the fields, or of Austrian police helicopters searching for illegal immigrants.

The two villages, though located within a two-kilometre distance of each other, have gradually drifted apart and become estranged from one another. As part of the former Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy Moschendorf belonged to the administrative district of the Hungarian village of Pinkamindszent; the villagers were taught Hungarian as the state language at school. In 1921 the Great Powers drew the state frontier in line with the earlier linguistic border: On both sides this led to a gradual decline and eventual loss of competence in the neighbouring villagers' mother tongue. In the period between the World Wars there were still people who knew and actively spoke the mother tongue of their neighbours: A competence which continued to be reinforced by a whole range of cross-border activities, made possible by the transparent and open nature of the state border until the establishment of the Iron Curtain in 1948. Typical cross-border activities were the use of land on the other side, religious pilgrimages, visits to pubs and dances, or, in post war times, typically, smuggling.

The Iron Curtain suddenly terminated these everyday relations and the villagers of the two settlements could not meet for more than forty years – with the exception of autumn 1956, when the border was not under control for some weeks and thousands of Hungarians fled to Austria.

In contrast to other border areas under survey, in these two villages we had the opportunity to carry out research at the time of the fall of the Iron Curtain. In 1990 the border was opened for a day, and the villagers of Pinkamindszent visited the Moschendorf in a procession. Until 1995 mutual, one-day annual visits became a custom, and during this period, the village councils kept

in touch with each other on a regular basis. However, the initial enthusiasm and interest, which we could witness twelve years earlier petered out on both sides.

Regarding the lack of interest, communication, and cross-border relations we might point out several inter-related reasons. Both villages belong to a peripheral region whose potential for economic development is weak. These regions have to cope with a range of economic and infrastructural problems, with serious demographic and social consequences (out-migration, ageing, lack of sufficiently qualified population). Until recently, the villagers of the two settlements have not recognised their common interests or possible benefits of cross-border co-operation.

Furthermore, we can hardly find anyone in these two villages who speaks the language of the neighbouring village. The intention to overcome these linguistic barriers was only revisited by the town councils and headmasters on both sides of the border. The lack of a local border crossing makes it considerably difficult to establish vivid cross-border relations and a deeper understanding of the Other. It is not only in the local but also in the regional interest to build a by-road and a border crossing, however, so far this local-regional interest has not been represented successfully and efficiently at nation-wide level.

Research Analysis

In the course of our research we came to the conclusion that these two villages situated by the Austrian-Hungarian state border can be best characterized with the notion of *silence* – and this has several meanings. Firstly, it refers to a sense of physical stillness: there is no movement of traffic or people at this state border, and both villages are restful and quiet. For the villagers this stillness represents one of the settlement's greatest attractions. Secondly, silence is related to a striking absence in the narratives we collected on either side: people do not speak about their neighbours on the other side of the border. Their shared history that came to a halt in 1921 is displayed at most in fragments of uncertain knowledge. Only a few of the old people retain memories of former cross-border activities. The broken off communication thus leads eventually to oblivion and a complete dissolution of communicative memory between the communities.

In contrast to most of our other border regions, the communities Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent have not been separated by traumatic historical events, by a shared burden of guilt, or damage inflicted upon one another, and yet, remarkably there is a complete lack of interaction. The apparent disconnection and striking lack of explicit reference to their neighbours as people nevertheless resonates in our interviewees' stories. This becomes particularly visible in the ways in which the narrators reflect on the meaning of the border. People on both sides adopt narrative strategies of evasion, distancing, and naturalisation when prompted to reflect on the physical barrier on their doorstep. However, there is also a great deal of ambivalence in these narratives: stories of detachment coincide with stories of intimacy, or to put it differently, the apparent lack of identification with the border on the one side emerges as an argument for the need of borders on the other.

In the collected narratives, the border emerges primarily as the object of remembering the past, especially those forty years of life in the shadow of the Iron Curtain. This is more pronounced in the case of the Hungarian village, which was a peripheral settlement, doubly isolated by the Iron Curtain from both the West, which was perceived as an enemy, and from the inner regions of the homeland Hungary.

The narratives of three generations reveal contrasting and ambivalent attitudes to the border. Some interviewees in the Hungarian village remembered their fear while driving their cattle to the fields, being escorted by armed guards along the land-mined state borders. Others spoke of the games they played as children with the frontier police and represented the 'normality' and "mundane" character of their lives. For people in the village of Moschendorf, as well as for other villagers of Austrian frontier settlements, the presence of the border watched by a foreign

country's soldiers was always a given condition seen with a mixture of abhorrence and indifference. Similarly, the Moschendorfers today couch the new borders of Schengen in a language of distance and protection.

Remarkably, the border and the question of co-existence with the border do not play an overtly central role in the narratives we recorded. References to the border may range from indifference (recurrent syntagms: "this doesn't bother me", "we've got used to it") to the joy felt when it was reinforced as a Schengen border. The border does not seem to influence people's private and public lives, or to play a determining role in their positions of identity. Yet, when taking a closer look we can see that the apparent 'absence' and triviality of the border is actively produced in our interviewees' narratives. Our informants engage in narrative strategies of ambivalence. There the border is construed as an inconspicuous part of the natural environment, as a blind spot in personal life stories, as a space that guarantees security and peacefulness; but also as an object of fear, danger, and resentment.

Both past experiences and future aspirations shape individual and collective memories. The socio-political transformations since 1989, the dilemmas that surrounded the proposed opening of the border, the establishment and reinforcement of the Schengen border, the question of entering the European Union, and the political transformations in Hungary write and rewrite people's views and memories about life on the border. Viewed in this light, Hungarian scepticism and resignation as well as Austrian indifference and a sense of 'fear' become understandable.

The border in Pinkamindszent, which isolates the village from both Austria and the inner regions of Hungary, forced the local inhabitants to work out strategies of adaptation to their experiences of isolation and exclusion. This resulted in naturalisation of the border, coupled with strategies of irony, detachment, and normalisation. Even though the narratives in Moschendorf might suggest on a surface level that people are indifferent to the border, their protest against a proposed border opening indicates the opposite. As we have seen it is the rhetoric of fear and danger that reveals this spirit and that 'forgets' the non-frightening non-threatening events of the recent and more remote past.

Ironically, in a situation where the border regime has been relaxed and Cold War enmities ceased, the inhabitants of these two villagers have not grasped the opportunity of getting together. Instead, villagers on both sides have reinforced the separateness and silence between them. In Moschendorf people legitimise the Schengen border in their midst and reaffirm their identity as Austrians. The geo-political redefinition of the state border from a Cold War to a Schengen frontier has strengthened their identification against the people across the border. For people in Pinkamindszent the situation is different. Here the dissolution of the inner border is more obvious as an important factor in their construction of who they are. While the border separating them from Austria is marked as 'natural', this border symbolises social and economic differences and hierarchies that the people of Pinkamindszent struggle with (see Wastl-Walter, Varadi, Veider 2002).

A survey issue focused upon the possible meanings attached to EU-membership and the enlargement of EU by the people of the Austrian and the Hungarian village. Since Austria became a member of the European Union in 1995, Austrians participated in the regional development programmes of the EU. In the first step Burgenland as a whole was an "objective 1" region during the period from 1995–1999. For the period 2000–2006, Burgenland has again been designated an objective 1 region, as there is still some marginality to overcome. Within the scope of the community initiative LEADER II, i.e. another EU program, the community of Moschendorf could encounter some small projects in the fields of tourism, culture, education, industry and agriculture, together with neighbouring Austrian communities. In addition to the common projects, every community had its own project. The region is also included as a LEADER+-region in the period 2000–2006. Nevertheless, agriculture is declining here in the border region since Austria joined the EU. Many part-time farmers have already leased their

fields, the livestock has been sold, and the machinery, which was left over, is waiting in the back yard for a buyer from the neighbouring Hungary.

The entry of Hungary into the EU is being anticipated very differently among the people of Moschendorf. The municipal politicians see a great opportunity to get out of their peripheral position, if they succeed in linking themselves more to the large Hungarian centres of Szombathely and Körmend, as used to be the case during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The whole district is calling to the regional government of Burgenland for major infrastructure improvements, for example an extension of the roads to the east, or at least better connections in that direction.

The farmers in Burgenland consider it as the end of their agricultural business if Hungary joins the EU. What remains at a family level will be self-supply exclusively, as long as the older generation is capable of carrying on the farming activities. They anticipate that, in the end, there will only be a few large enterprises left, which will buy or at least lease all the fields. The fear of the cheap labour from former Eastern areas is mentioned regularly as well. The only chances identified are related to achieving higher qualifications through education, in order to be competitive with workers in the neighbouring countries.

It is certain and evident, that people in Pinkamindszent are not thrilled about entering the European Union. Their attitude can be better described as uncertainty, scepticism, and fear. This attitude is often expressed in the interviews by a repeated "I don't know;" "even the wisest don't know;" "I don't know what I should expect." This is related to the existential uncertainty and their pessimistic assessment of their own future perspectives. They are afraid that joining the EU will result in worsened living conditions. The younger think that, for their children, joining the EU can bring more possibilities for jobs. Those men who work in the co-operative are afraid that Hungarian agriculture could not be competitive within the Common Market. But we can also see, that with regard to the issue of joining the EU people in Pinkamindszent are poorly informed and that the news in the mass media does not contribute to a better understanding of the situation or the perspectives. It is, however, important that people in Pinkamindszent are conscious about the process of EU expansion eastward, even if they cannot influence Hungarian accession.

3.2.1.3 Austrian-Slovenian border

Research Setting

At the Austrian-Slovenian border the two communities Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla on the Austrian side and Jezersko on the Slovenian side were investigated. The two villages are located in a picturesque rural area on either side of the Karawanken/Karavanke, the mountain range that forms today's border between Austria and Slovenia. The fact that the border is a mountain differentiates the Austrian-Slovenian border from the other borders that were analysed in the project. In this case the border is not a bridge or a field, which means that the two communities are not within the range of vision of each other. Hence the border crossing is outside the everyday life experiences of the majority of the inhabitants. The border crossing is high up in the mountains at 1218m above sea level. It is 15km away from the centre of Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and 7 km away from the centre of Jezersko. In order to get to the border crossing one has to drive up a winding road on both sides of the border and overcome an altitude difference of about 300m on the Slovenian side and 650m on the Austrian side. This means that the two communities are 22km away from each other, which, however, does not result in a "silent border", i.e. with hardly any exchange as in the case of Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent at the Austrian-Hungarian border. On the contrary, the border-crossing and its surroundings at the Austrian-Slovenian border represent a popular place to go for the inhabitants

of Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko. Hiking, skiing and biking are common leisure activities of the population of the region and many mountain hikes end in one of the two pubs at the border crossing. Most of the people that were interviewed in the course of the project spoke about their memories of Sunday-trips and family outings to the border crossing. The border crossing as such is experienced as a welcome attraction of regional life.

Both communities share the characteristics of a remote, rurally structured area. Apart from forestry, agriculture and stock breeding there is no alternative economic sector. There are few job opportunities in both communities, which enforces people to commute on a daily or weekly basis and leads to the steady out-migration of primarily the young generation.

Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla is the southernmost community of Austria and is located in the south-eastern part of the province of Carinthia. Apart from the two main towns Klagenfurt and Villach, the province is a rural area which is characterised by typical problems of such areas, such as an insufficiently developed infrastructure and negative migration rates. Between 1951 and today the population figure of Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla dropped constantly from 3894 to 2811. In 1989 alone, 450 people left the community due to the closure of the local cellulose factory. Since the amalgamation with the community Vellach/Bela in 1964 Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla has been 200km² in size. The community includes the centre Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla itself and 11 small settlements. These are located in small valleys that branch off from the centre of the village. Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla comprises a substantial Slovenian speaking minority. Whereas the centre of the community has always been dominated by the German language, for a long time Slovenian was the only language used in the valleys.

Jezersko is significantly smaller than its Austrian neighbour in terms of population and territory. With its 677 inhabitants and its size of 68,8 km² Jezersko has a low population density. Due to few job opportunities most of the inhabitants commute to Kranj or Ljubljana. The village is located in the north-western part of Slovenia in the region Gorenjska on the south-eastern edge of the Alps. In the course of the Slovenian communal structural reforms Jezersko became an independent community in 1998. During the last two decades most efforts have been put into the improvement of the infrastructure, such as the building of water pipes, the improvement of roads and the renovation of buildings (the school building for example). Between the two World Wars Jezersko was one of the leading Slovenian tourist centres. Because of its mountainous climate and a mineral spring, the community has the character of a spa. For almost three decades (1953-1981) a hospital for eye tuberculosis brought many visitors to the region. Today tourism is again one of the promising fields of development. In fact, both communities see their future in soft tourism with the focus on health, recreation and sports.

With regard to history, both communities were once part of the province of Carinthia in the Austro-Hungarian empire, but as in the case of Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent, the division of the old Empire into new states after World War I placed these communities on either side of a national border. The establishment of this border was accompanied by violent border conflicts between the newly founded states (Republic of Austria and the Kingdom of the Serbs, the Croats and the Slovenians – SHS/ later Yugoslavia) which were finally settled by a plebiscite in 1920. Despite the border, the connections between the two communities remained intense until World War II. During World War II the border was violently removed in the course of the German invasion of Yugoslavia in 1941. After the end of the Second World War the border between the two communities was closed for a few years. The independent development of Tito's Yugoslavia meant that the border was never a full part of the Iron Curtain. Crossing the border became increasingly easier. From the 1950s onwards the border was opened progressively. With the abolishment of visa requirements in the mid-60s, cross border relations gradually improved and intensified. Slovenia's independence, achieved in 1991, has led to the further intensification of cross-border relations.

Research Analysis

The analysis of key narratives in Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko showed that they are all related, in one way or another, to the border and to the including/excluding effects of borders in particular. It is striking to realise here that the borders that are drawn by our informants only partly correspond to the nation-state boundary. In some of the constructions which we found in the data the interviewees creatively shift the state border and hence create spaces which do not correspond to the political units of the nation-states. These different and shifting borders are grounded in ethnic and language-based discourses, which have been utilised politically in this region. Our informants' border-constructions create different spaces of belonging. Generally speaking, the border fulfils two specific functions in the constructions of our informants. These are the dividing/ separating function of the border on the one hand, and the unifying function on the other.

With regard to the separating function of the border it has to be said that we find a strong tendency among our interviewees to foreground the dividing aspect of the border. This is particularly true for the Austrian side where the informants draw a clear dividing line between Austria and Slovenia. They try to support their construction by claiming that the nation-state border is a "natural" border and hence try to play down the fact that borders are always the result of political decisions. In the case of this border in particular this argument of the border as being natural is significantly striking because the border as it exists today was only drawn in 1920 after border conflicts and a plebiscite. Until the end of World War I the border did not exist and both Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko were part of the same province within the Habsburg Empire. The informants legitimise the naturalisation of the border with the physical features of the borderline and they construct it as something which is as old as the mountain range.

This strong tendency of regarding oneself as being divided off from the neighbouring state is also related to the Slovenian minority that lives in Southern Carinthia. The informants' insistence on this specific border is strongly related to how they perceive the Slovenian minority in their own community. Due to their constructed connectedness with Yugoslavia/Slovenia, Slovenians are perceived as a threat. This construction corresponds to the discourse of nationalist groups in Carinthia whose goal is the suppression of the Slovenian minority. The informants' fear of the neighbour to the south as well as the nationalist discourses are rooted in the historical developments around the plebiscite which represents the core element of the foundation myth of Carinthia. This has had a sustainable effect on the identity positions available to the people living in the region. The territorial claims of the SHS after World War I (and later of Yugoslavia after World War II) form the basis of the discourse of the 'threatened border' and nationalist groups still use those claims as an argument for their perception of a permanent 'threat from the South', endangering the 'unity of Carinthia'.

The separating function of borders is not only applied to the national border between Austria and Slovenia but also to the community level. This is the case in the Austrian community Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla where a border within the community itself is being constructed by some of the informants. This border within is directly related to the relationship between the Slovenian-speaking minority and the German-speaking majority in the community. This boundary, however, is not simply a language border separating the two language groups from each other. As the informants' constructions show, there are more complex dimensions of identity and belonging involved. In the everyday life shared by a mixed population of German speakers and Slovenian speakers language acts as the master signifier and the language use of the people is read as a political statement about their identification with either one of these ethnic groups. To speak German is being read as positioning oneself within the nationalistic discourse described above. To speak Slovenian is being considered as resistance to that dominant discourse. The inhabitants of the community are highly aware of the politically charged nature of their language use and engage in constant practices of policing themselves and

others. As the interviews show, the informants try to escape the social ascription and attribution of a certain group-identity. However, this is very hard, if not impossible. In the construction of “the border within”, language is utilised as a border with a separating function.

On the Slovenian side of the border the informants’ constructions reveal a strong tendency to foreground the unifying aspect of the border. In contrast to the Austrian side’s construction of the border as “natural”, the interviewees from Jezersko claim the opposite. They deny the border in its contemporary ‘physical’ form. The border is seen as something which is not supposed to be where it is right now. It is the mutual past before 1918 that is referred to when this claim is being made, i.e. the time when the community belonged to Carinthia during the Habsburg period. The idea that this should be a “natural” border is rejected and the mountain range is reduced to a “hump” in the constructions on the Slovenian side. The implication is that the decision to draw the border along the mountain range was wrong. This is not only a nostalgic reference to a past long gone, however, it has also become a central component of Jezersko’s contemporary local identity. What we find here in the interviews is the practice to deny the nation state border as it exists between Austria and Slovenia and to create a common space in different ways. Apart from foregrounding the common history, the informants construe this close relationship to their neighbours in Austria also by referring to human relations across the border. They frequently mention relatives and friends on the Austrian side. Even the overall decline in actual meetings does not seem to change their feeling of connectedness with the people across the border. Language is another tool to express closeness and hence is ascribed a unifying function in the interviews. Many informants emphasise the fact that they speak German (despite the fact that there is no German-speaking minority in Jezersko) and they stress their good knowledge of the German language. This construction obviously contains a strong desire to be part of the Western lifestyle. Learning the German language is considered as a way of opening up this possibility and acquiring cultural capital. At the same time the informants draw links to the common linguistic space they share with the Slovenian-speaking minority in Austria. The aspect of sharing the language with the people across the border is foregrounded here. Our informants’ constructions of closeness to Carinthia/Austria are supported by a discourse that constructs Slovenia as part of the West and of Europe in cultural terms, which is affirmed by recent economic and political developments in Slovenia. In addition, the forthcoming entry of Slovenia into the European Union is constructed in this context as a “return home” to Europe, rather than as an entry into a “whole new world”.

Similar to the constructions of a common space with the northern neighbour in the interviews on the Slovenian side, some informants from Eisenkappel/ Železna Kapla construct a common space with the southern neighbour. They shift the border along the Slovenian language line to include Ljubljana further south, and hence include Slovenia into this common area.

In addition, the data of both the Slovenian and Austrian informants contains evidence of another border which is shared by our interviewees. It is a construction by which both communities mark themselves off from a common other that is located further south. They use different terms for this common other - on the Austrian side it is called the ‘South’ or the ‘Southerners’. On the Slovenian side the term ‘Balkans’ is used. This construction is based on a geopolitical concept that separates Europe from the Balkans. It puts both communities Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko on the same side, namely on the side of Europe (see Hipfl, Bister, Strohmaier, Busch 2002).

3.2.1.4 Italian-Slovenian border

Research Setting

Gorizia and Nova Gorica are two cities divided by the border between Italy and the Republic of Slovenia. The region where they lie has had a complex history: Slavonic, Latin and

German ethnic groups have been in contact here and often also in opposition. Nova Gorica was planned and built after 1948 and Gorizia became for the first time a 'border community' only after WW2 and the Treaty of Paris (September 15, 1947). Before that, except for brief periods spanning 1700 and 1800, Gorizia and the surrounding area was part of two wider political-administrative units: until WW1 it was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and, between the two wars, of the Italian State.

The population of Gorizia in 1901 was 25,432 and reached its peak in the 70's (42,778 in 1971), then slowly decreased to the lowest point of 38,505 in 1991. The average age is quite high and growing; this trend is common to the entire North East of Italy. The ethnic structure has also changed. According to Czoernig, the Gorizia area in 1857 was composed as follows: 66.6% of Slovenes, 24.4% of Friulians, 7.7% of Italians, 1.1% of Germans and 0.2% of Jews. In 1910 there were 7.7% of Germans, 35% of Slovenes and 57.3% of Italians and Friulians. According to the Group Alpina estimate, in 1975 there were 0.5% of Germans, 76.7% of Italians, 9.1% of Friulians and 13.7% of Slovenes. Today, the ethnic structure is likely to be even more favourable to Italians and less to Friulians and Slovenes.

Since the end of WW2, the Italian-speaking community in Gorizia has been characterised by the following speech repertoire: Venetian-Julian dialect (similar to that used in Trieste) as the low variety; standard Italian as the high variety; Friulian is today a very limited speech variety in this area, mainly used in private-familiar domains and spatially limited.

As for the Slovenian-speaking community in Gorizia and Nova Gorica the speech repertoire can be divided as follows: Collio/briško- or Carso/kraško-dialects as the low variety; standard Slovenian as the high variety.

Nearly all the members of the Slovenian-speaking community in Gorizia master the local varieties of Italian. Knowledge of any form of Slovenian among the Italian-speaking community is very rare.

Since the Fifties, a very important role has been played by a sizeable community of 'Istria exiles' (Italian-speaking people who left the coastal regions of Yugoslavia after WW2). For a series of complex reasons they became the champions of "Italianity", as opposed to the Friulian and, even more so, to the Slovene elements.

The population of Nova Gorica has registered a slow but constant growth from 1948 to 1991; in that year the population was 59,126. Due to changes to the municipality borders, the population is currently lower (35,151). Ethnically, the majority of citizens are Slovenes and only a minority are from the republics of former Yugoslavia, who migrated here in the past.

According to the Treaty of Paris, the largest part of the town of Gorizia remained under Italian administration; at the same time two bigger suburban villages remained in Yugoslavia. With the new border, dividing this area for the first time, 8% of the previous Province territory, 74% of the population, 38% of industrial and handicraft units, and 52% of commercial activities passed to Italy. Yugoslavia thus controlled the entire mountain area, the valleys of Isonzo-Soca and Vipacco-Vipava, north of Gorizia, nearly the entire hill area of Collio-Brda and part of the Carst-Kras. The municipality of Gorizia lost three fifths of its territory and one fifth of its population.

In the area of Gorizia, a large part of the Slovene population (about 20,000) remained in Italy, thus forming a minority community within the Italian state. This minority group had to adapt to the social organization of the majority. The most relevant consequences of the new border are to be found at the urban level, since nearly the entire city of Gorizia and the main roads and railways, connecting the city to Udine and Trieste, also remained in Italy.

The first years after the creation of the new border (called "the line of demarcation") - initially made of barbed wire fences in some places - was totally impermeable and strongly guarded, particularly on the Yugoslav side. During those years it was a real 'Iron Curtain'. Only in the second half of the Fifties, with the Udine Agreements, was a regulation made for cross-border activities and four border crossings were opened in the urban area. With the passing of time, the border became more and more open, permeable and loosely guarded.

After the new border the Yugoslav territories had no administration and infrastructural centre at all. Because of this situation, it was agreed to build a twin border-city on the Slovene side (Yugoslavia) and call it Nova Gorica. The Yugoslav administration planned to create a new urban centre connecting Solkan-Salcano and Šempeter-S.Pietro - previously suburbs of Gorizia - which was meant to become a beautiful city to show off for propaganda purposes. The project started in 1948, but after 10 years Nova Gorica was still a 'work-in-progress'. Due to a lack of financial and economic potential, both at local and national level, the project was never completely realized. Nevertheless, Nova Gorica has been carrying out relatively important administrative and economic tasks and has become a relevant centripetal force. Its most important role is related to cross-border relations and trade with the twin-city of Gorizia in particular and the rest of Italy in general.

As stated before, the border between the two states and neighbouring cities was virtually closed until 1955. After that time, from the second half of the 1960s on, cross-border relations progressively and remarkably improved and intensified. The bases for this improvement were the Udine Agreements, particularly those signed in 1955 and 1962, which regulate cross-border movements of people and goods in a 20-kilometre border area. Since then cross-border economic, social and cultural relations have improved at the private level (individuals, organisations, enterprises, etc.) as well as at the public level (policy-makers, bodies and institutions).

Since the independence of Slovenia in 1991, Nova Gorica has been part of the independent democratic Republic of Slovenia, currently one of the ascendent nations to the EU. Cross-border cooperation further improved, also due to EU policies, particularly with regard to Interreg, which is a very important means for the development of cooperation between the Autonomous Region Friuli-Venezia Giulia and the Republic of Slovenia.

Today the border is weakly or not at all guarded – with the exception of main communication routes. Numerous people cross the border here illegally. Immigrants from developing countries (Asia, Middle East, the Balkans *inter alia*) enter or try to enter the EU through this 'door' between Slovenia and Italy.

Research Analysis

Because of the historical specificity of Gorizia/Gorica and Nova Gorica, we collected our samples not just from two but from three different groups. In Italy the material comes from two distinct communities, the Italian-speaking majority and the Slovenian-speaking minority. In Slovenia our informants are all Slovenians from within the community of Nova Gorica. Studying the narratives, we were impressed by the ways in which our informants interpret history which they have directly or indirectly experienced and by the justifications they bring to their own stories. In using discourse analysis, our principal aim is to detect the relation between the "official" history and the "personal" stories.

We believe, that our informants tend to construct and legitimize their own identity – and the identity of others – on the basis of recurring narrated personal events related to recent history. These key stories are deeply rooted in critical events such as Fascism and the subsequent Partisan Movement, and "Titoism".

With regard to Italian Fascism, there is not one instance in our interviews, where a member of the Italian-speaking community explicitly identifies with this historical past or declares any sympathy with it. Informants either dissociate themselves from what they see as a destructive event, or they express their resignation at not having been able to do anything against it, suggesting, that opposition was "objectively" impossible. Narratives about the period obviously recur more frequently in the old and middle generation rather than in the young. There emerges sometimes a contradiction between the official, institutionalized and openly manifested disapproval of the fascist era, and the private sympathy for an authoritarian and efficient

government. According to some narratives, it was the Partisan movement, the “Titoism” which followed and the defining of the border that produced the really great, profound caesura – at least from the Italian-speaking point of view – one’s own identity and the identity of the other.

Prevalent amongst the young generation is the impression that the Partisan movement and the immediate post-war period are taboo, and that the accounts of the preceding generation consist of individual, disjointed, personal episodes – from which there issues, however, a picture of historical nemesis: the repressiveness of Italian Fascism is matched by the barbarous practice of ‘infoibazione’ (i.e. ‘throwing down into caves’) perpetrated by the ‘Slavs’ upon the Italian population, so that it is impossible to say which of the two sides suffered the more. In the collective memory of the inhabitants of Gorizia there is a focal point, one around which the Italian part seeks its catharsis, its ‘redemption from sin’. In other words, guilt committed by Italian fascists and abuses perpetrated on Slovenians were to be cancelled out by the practice of ‘Infoibazione’ committed by the ‘Slavs’ against defenceless Italians.

Among the historical events that left their distinct mark on the collective memory formation of the Slovenian-speaking community in Gorica and Nova Gorica there are some which have clear parallels with the experience of the Italian-speaking group. However, the mark these events left on the narratives of the informants, and their attitudes towards the “lived” history and its interpretations, differ in substance and significance.

First the fascism with the policy established in the border zones between the two world wars and then the Partisan movement and “Titoism”, are the historical events with the most significant consequences for the daily life of the various communities resident in this area. As with the Italian-speaking informants, for the Slovenian interviewees (and particularly for those living in Gorizia) the subject arises more often out of the experiences of the oldest generation, since it was this generation which had actually to live through and undergo – perhaps more on a community than an individual level – the impositions and restrictions of the nationalist, totalitarian regime.

A first and very important aspect of the repressive policies of the fascist regime on non-Italian linguistic groups, particularly those on the border areas, was actually linguistic repression. The use of any language but Italian was considered to be an act of political disloyalty. Slovenian names and family names as well as geographic names were Italianized; the use of Slovenian in schools, church and elsewhere in public life was prohibited; Slovenian was removed from public inscriptions. The policy of language suppression had a strong impact not only on the linguistic behaviour of the Slovenians, but also on their attitudes to those who did not allow them to speak their own language.

The perception of the period related to the Partisan movement and “Titoism” by the Slovenians is in certain ways alike on both sides of the border, yet different from what emerges from the analysis of the material gathered within the Italian-speaking community. The period of the Partisan movement is significant for all the Slovenian informants and in general it assumes a positive value: for the oldest it emerges from the memories and stories of their experiences, for the youngest, in what they learned from the various socialization agents (relatives, school, the media etc.). Although within the young generation feelings are less intense and involved, the attitudes in general are nevertheless fairly uniform across all the informants. It thereby acquires the characteristic of an intergenerational collective memory. The pillars upon which such a positive value rests are “liberation”, “defeat of Fascism”, and “amends” for what had been done by the regime between the two wars.

Speaking about their contemporary everyday life the Slovenes of Gorizia construct ‘the other’ as follows: For the old and middle generation, the Italians belong to two groups: on the one hand, there are those who do not hold any prejudices against the Slovenians. These are said to be mainly from the places outside Gorizia, although some of them do live in Gorizia as well. On the other hand, there are “the culturally closed Italians”, i.e. those who “keep the border in their hearts”, “have a narrow view”, “are rooted in the past”, “hate all Slovenians”, “negate

Slovenians”, “want to eradicate the Slovenian population from Gorizia”. Italians with such ethnical prejudices are “the Italians of Gorizia who fear for their Italian identity”.

The positive connotation ascribed to the Partisan movement reaches the point where the subject of the Partisans’ atrocities (foibe and others) – a subject raised with some frequency by the Italian-speaking informants – is hardly ever mentioned. Only in one interview from Nova Gorica do we find a direct, explicit reference to the foibe. And even in this case the context of such an explicit recall of Partisan atrocities is the fascist policy of assimilating and Italianizing Slovenian surnames.

Our interpretation of this omission of Partisan guilt by Slovenian informants is not so much that the foibe and the atrocities of the Partisans are taboo, or constitute a “crime” which must be repressed. In the narratives it seems rather that people either feel that this historical problem (the foibe) concerns the “others”, and not the local Slovenian community, or that ‘the foibe’ itself has been exploited, exaggerated, and thus used as a means to blackmail, or at least to pressurize Slovenians.

What emerges clearly and in a most striking fashion is that Italian speakers simply do not perceive the Other. In their memory narratives, in their interpretation of the pictures, and in the recalling of the situations or events they highlighted, the presence of the Other in the same place and at the same time is simply overlooked. This could lead us to believe in a “natural, spontaneous, positive coexistence” between Italian and Slovenian-speaking groups, which is therefore non-problematic or at least defused and resolved. On the other hand, it is impossible that traumas as profound as those created by Fascism and its repercussions have been peacefully overcome simply by the removal of the Other.

From the Slovenian-speaking community in Italy one of the typical minority-group behaviour emerges: although the Slovenian-speaking-informants living in Italy affirm a strong feeling of identity within their own group, in the contact with the Other (the Italian group) they prefer not to display their difference in an ostentatious fashion. By contrast, the Slovenian informants of Nova Gorica display a more active and critical confrontation with the Italian-speaking community across the border.

For the Slovenian-speaking informants living in Italy, the main contrasts between themselves and Italians are “contrasts about principles and rights”. They want to be accepted as a minority, with their own linguistic rights. Although as individuals they do not like conflictual relations with the members of the majority, as a group they desire recognition and acceptance.

From the material we analysed we can draw another general conclusion. For the Italian-speaking community Fascism is taboo, minimized and basically repressed. For the Slovenian-speaking communities, two different attitudes are detectable. On the one hand, there are those who clearly hold the opinion that they were the victims of an authoritarian Fascist regime that must be criticized and condemned. On the other, and these are mainly to be found amongst the Slovenian population of Gorizia, there are those who display a general trend – which may or may not be conscious – to “normalize” the Fascist period and its aftermath. Even though the tendencies to minimize or repress those events could be interpreted as a strategy of silencing, different motivations are also possible. Two different attitudes are also visible towards the Partisan movement: for the Italian-speaking informants the “Tito-Partisans” are still essentially to be considered “infoibatori” (they have thrown Italians into caves); for the Slovenian informants Partisans are “Liberators” who have victoriously liberated people from Fascism.

3.2.1.5 German-Czech border

Research Setting

At the German-Czech border, research was conducted in the two communities of Bärenstein and Vejprty. These two towns were chosen mainly for reasons of geography: Saxon

Bärenstein and Czech Vejprty, lying on either side of a small creek, the Pöhlbach or Polava, form a closed settlement; they are the only directly adjoining towns or communities on the Saxon-Czech border.

The community of Bärenstein lies in the Saxon district ("Landkreis") of Annaberg-Buchholz, the town of Vejprty in the North-Bohemian district ("okres") of Chomutov, both situated in the higher ranges of the Erzgebirge ("Ore Mountains") at an altitude of about 700 meters. After the Second World War, both communities underwent fundamental changes. Until 1945, the existing historic border between Saxony and Bohemia (or between Germany and Czechoslovakia) could hardly be felt by the population. Up to that time Vejprty (formerly Weipert) had a majority German population and could be regarded as a prospering industrial town with about 14 000 inhabitants. Neighbouring Bärenstein, which had always been smaller (about 4 000 inhabitants in 1939), benefited also from the number of factories in Weipert. Our interviewees reported that the two communities could have been regarded as one entity at that time; people regularly crossed the border, going to work or for leisure activities to the other side. Marriages across the border were normal, also among the families we interviewed. The end of the war set an abrupt end to these relations. A barbed wire fence separated the two towns from then on. Transport routes between Saxony and Czechoslovakia were cut, as well as existing service pipes. The expulsion of the Sudeten-Germans nearly caused the depopulation of the border region; although the Czech government had sent people (Slovaks, Moravians, Roma *inter alia*) from the interior of the country to settle in the border regions, the population figure sank considerably. In 1950 Vejprty had 5800 inhabitants. A great number of houses and factory buildings formerly belonging to Germans were torn down. Still nowadays one gets the feeling in Vejprty that the town seems to be too large for its remaining inhabitants.

The population figure in Bärenstein, however, increased after the war, on the one hand because of a number of fugitives and expelled people coming from the east, on the other hand because of the uranium exploitation of the Ore Mountain region by the Soviet occupying power, for which manpower was needed. In the fifties, Bärenstein reached the highest number of inhabitants in its history with more than 6 500. But this number decreased with the end of uranium mining in the sixties in the Bärenstein region. The miners and their families moved to other places in Saxony or Thuringia. Up to the *Wende* in 1989, however, Bärenstein had a respectable number of smaller factories which provided work. Also tourism was a source of earnings in the region; many factories in the highly industrialized Karl-Marx-Stadt (Chemnitz) area had their holiday homes in Bärenstein.

During the first years of Socialism, there were hardly any relations between Bärenstein and Vejprty. Although the neighbour on the other side of the iron fence could be seen every day, visits could only take place under severe restrictions. The nearest border crossings were more than a hundred kilometres away, and in the first years after the war even family members from the one side couldn't get a permission to go to the other side easily.

One special date in the common history of the two towns was August 1968, when tanks of the Warsaw Pact States crossed the border bridge by force on their way into Czechoslovakia. Although still a kind of taboo, this topic was mentioned by interviewees from the oldest and middle generations on both sides after initial hesitation.

The situation changed a little for the better in 1972, when a border crossing for cars was opened in Oberwiesenthal (15 km away). Many of our interviewees from Bärenstein told us that from this date on trips to Vejprty or others places in Czechoslovakia were common, not least because of shopping tourism. Although the export of currency from the former GDR to other countries was strongly restricted, people went to Czechoslovakia where goods like fish or fruit or even satchels and ski boots were available. Strict customs checks, however, interfered with the newly starting relations.

After the fall of the Iron Curtain, a pedestrian crossing was opened on the border bridge. The railway track between Bärenstein and Vejprty had been reopened, but it had to be closed again

in 2000 because of low usage and track defects on the Saxon side. During the nineties, the increasing shopping tourism was a problem for the citizens of Bärenstein. Especially at the weekends, thousands of visitors came to Bärenstein, where they parked their cars everywhere, and went to Vejprty to buy cheap goods like cigarettes, liquor or falsified brand clothes at the Vietnamese market. Although the number of shopping tourists has slowly been decreasing in the last few years, the fact is still a bone of contention on both sides of the border. Local tradesmen on both sides of the border complain about a narrow market. In Bärenstein, tradesmen and craftsmen additionally are confronted with the lower prices people pay in the Czech border region for goods or services.

Both towns share the situation that they still lie in a geographically marginal area, far away from centres like Prague or Dresden. Until 2002, a centre for the re-integration of Aussiedler, descendants of Germans who had settled in Russia centuries ago, was located in a former barrack complex in Bärenstein. In Vejprty six nursing homes for mentally handicapped people were built in the last decades.

In addition, there is a high rate of unemployment on both sides since the *Wende*. Official rates of more than 20% are a sad reality in Bärenstein and Vejprty. The economic decline, caused by the closure of factories, means for Bärenstein as well as for the total Saxon Ore Mountains region a movement of labour towards the old *Bundesländer* (former West German federal states). The population in Bärenstein sank from 3 400 in 1981 to 2 800 in 2002. Mostly young people leave the area. In Vejprty, a similar trend can be seen. In 1970, 3500 people were living there; in 2001 only 3300. The interviewees of the Czech youngest generation said that they see no future for themselves in the town and want to leave.

Research Analysis

The relationship between Germans and Czechs has always been a sensitive, if not explosive one, since the 19th century at the latest. More obviously than elsewhere along our border, the present situation in Vejprty and Bärenstein is embedded in a history which continues to have an impact, helping to shape the pictures each side has both of itself and of the other side, whether perceived and dealt with explicitly or not. This history therefore influences the current potential for conflicts and for reconciliation. In our data, we find three key historical periods and events reflected in the interviewees' narratives.

The year 1938

The most striking outcome of our closer look at the material is that the topic of 1938 is for the Germans on both sides as well as for the Czechs a topic which is dealt with very cautiously. The Germans of the older generation have to deal with the mostly unspoken problems of involvement and guilt, even if they come from families which, for one reason or another, suffered themselves from the Nazi system. They thus display different forms of alibi arguments and of unprovoked self-defence, referring – more or less explicitly – to work duties, difficult situations, persecution or discrimination and to the moral balance which is re-established by their own expulsion after the war.

The middle and younger generations on the German side try to keep the distance which time has put between them and past events and show several typical ways of dealing “with the bad”: minimising contact, moving the topic into a “myth zone”, emotional control or rational explanation. Nobody really integrates the time, personally or as a group member, into their own identity. The youngest generation in particular has a strategy of complete avoidance; the historical vacancy which is left there does not seem to guarantee a strong protection against extremist positions which are attracting more and more followers, though apparently not in the individual cases of our interviewees.

On the Czech side the hidden question – especially for men – concerns the topic of weakness and defeat which seems to be connected with their concept of these events; they are thus treated

as occasions for the compensatory display of courage in their own family, or moved into the zone of quasi-private criminal acts, if they are not actually downgraded in their relevance. As on the German side the political topic is avoided more than taken up voluntarily. It seems to be a real “non-topic”. But again, this does not mean that it is a matter which is finished. The attitudes shown are still connected with fear and a lack of comprehension.

What is missing on both sides, is a clear, courageous and sober view of historical events such as those of 1938, also on a local level, without the need for accusations or defences, as a basis for integrating difficult and conflict-laden periods of history, too, into individual and group identities

The period following the end of WW2

The most important theme regarding this period is the ‘expulsion’ or ‘transfer’ of Germans after WW2 from the Czech borderland as it is manifested in biographic interviews carried out in the area in which these Germans had lived (on the Czech side) or to which they had come (on the German side). It is obvious that individual memory work is influenced by the official memory policy but on the other hand it differs in some aspects, for example regarding differential use of words denoting sensitive historical events. In the framework of what can be called semantic fights, in order to categorize the post-war events, both politicians and common people choose particularly the following words: ‘expulsion’ (Germ. Ausweisung, Vertreibung, Austreibung), ‘resettlement’ (Germ. Umsiedlung), ‘flight and expulsion’ (Germ. Flucht und Vertreibung). On the Czech side the term ‘displacement/transfer’ (Czech odsun) is in common use. Individual memories are partly fixed as far as their language manifestation is concerned, but they also display a rich meaning structure which contains the whole field with its double character: acts of expulsion violating human rights, connected with terrifying events and elements of trauma on the one hand and historical context of guilt and involvement on the other. However, this context is suppressed in many narratives. How can expulsion be ‘worked through’? The suffering of ordinary people must be acknowledged, those who played a role must not be faded out, and the historical reasons may not be omitted because the following generations can only understand what is explained to them.

The year 1968

The oppressive end of the ‘Prague Spring’ in August 1968 could also be experienced in our two communities Bärenstein and Vejprty, because troops of the Warsaw Pact States crossed the border bridge between the two towns. Nevertheless, this subject was a taboo in the GDR and in the CSSR and – as our interviews show – seems still to be an avoided topic. One point which came out clearly in the statements of the generations who experienced this event was fear on both sides of the border and a reference to 1938 by members of the old generation. The tanks of the invading troops seemed to be an impressive symbol in this context. Some interviewees of the old generation even tried to give a political evaluation of the situation at that time and the consequences for the time that followed. On both sides, images of the own and the others were given. For the middle generation, the aspect of experiencing a kind of adventure came to the fore. A various number of experiences and feelings as well as the image of the agent and the deed on both sides were analysed. The influence of official language use throughout Socialist times could be clearly seen.

For all three periods of history under research, a lack of information about historic facts among the young generation either in their family’s history or in common history was highly visible.

3.2.1.6 German-Polish border

Research Setting

The communities we researched on the German-Polish border were Görlitz and Zgorzelec. Before World War Two they formed the German town of Görlitz, a large, prosperous town at the western edge of the province of Silesia. The treaty of Potsdam in 1945 confirmed the Oder-Neisse Line as the new border between Poland and Germany, thus dividing all the towns which lay on either side of the rivers. Apart from many smaller communities and villages, this affected also the larger cities of Frankfurt (Oder), Guben and Görlitz. In the GDR, Görlitz was in the Bezirk (region) of Dresden. In today's unified Federal Republic it finds itself in the Bundesland of Saxony. Zgorzelec lies in the Wojwodship (region) of Lower Silesia, and in the Powiat (county) of Zgorzelec. In Görlitz the population before the war (1934) was 94 645 for both sides of the river. After the war (1949) the figure for Görlitz (ie the western side alone) was 101 742. This was due to the influx of refugees from the territories lost to Poland. By 1985 the population had fallen to 79 277, and after unification even further (1990: 72 237; 1998: 65 958). The unemployment rate in April 2000 was 21.7%. Zgorzelec's current population is ca. 36,000 and has an unemployment rate of ca 14%. There are three border crossings in the vicinity between the two countries in the towns or its immediate vicinity. One is in the town itself, one is on a motorway in use since 1996 (Jedrzychowice-Ludwigsdorf); and one is a rail crossing, utilising the old German rail line from 1846. The two town authorities plan to build a fourth: a pedestrian bridge in the old town area.

The eastern bank of pre-war Görlitz was occupied by Soviet forces in May 1945 and handed over to Polish control soon after. As in the rest of the newly Polish borderlands, the German population was moved out almost entirely. The new town was eventually named Zgorzelec and was inhabited by people from other parts of Poland, some themselves having lost their homes when Polish territories in the east were ceded to the Soviet Union. At the turn of 1949/50, a group of almost 15,000 Greeks and Macedonian political refugees settled in the town. Most of them later relocated to other parts of Poland or, in the 1980s, returned to Greece. Today only ca. 200 people of Greek origin still live in Zgorzelec. The main thrust of the town's development is associated with the construction of mining sites and a power plant in the vicinity of the town in 1959-65. The mines and the power plant have since been the main employers for the population of the town and thus are responsible for the relatively (for Polish Western borderlands) low unemployment rate.

The re-drawing of the border after the war left the historical town centre, main railway station and the majority of the town's buildings (relatively unscathed by the war) in German territory. The river, once a focus for recreation in the town, lost its role. The border was tightly controlled and not open to the general public until 1971. Cross-border interaction was minimal, mainly in the form of Polish workers employed in the factories in Görlitz, eg the Condensor factory on the riverbank, clearly visible to both sides. Today this factory stands derelict as a symbol of industrial decline for both sides. The town's historical role as the gateway to Silesia and Eastern Europe, eg as a staging post on the historical trade route Via Regia linking Western Europe with the East (Frankfurt am Main - Dresden - Krakow - Kyiv), was lost. The border opening in 1971 provided the first opportunity to visit not only Zgorzelec but also the mountainous regions of Lower Silesia, once popular German tourist resorts, and the homelands of many Görlitz citizens. But the East German state, afraid that the instability in Poland caused by the rise of the Solidarnosc movement might prove contagious, closed the border again in 1981.

Both towns have undergone major socio-economic change in the past decade. In Görlitz the main industries which provided most of the town's employment have been decimated, and there has been a dramatic drop in population as people leave in search of employment. On the official level there has been a wide recognition of the need for close cross-border cooperation. Since May 1991, Görlitz and Zgorzelec have belonged to the Euroregion Neisse, comprising eastern

Saxony, Lower Silesia and the northern part of the Czech Republic. The towns signed a co-operation agreement in 1991. On 5 May 1998 (Europe Day) the councils proclaimed the Euro-city Zgorzelec-Görlitz. Under this umbrella, the two towns co-operate in the following four areas: a) city planning; b) environmental protection; c) culture, sports, education; d) law and order. This co-operation has resulted in several initiatives to improve cross-border interaction, including a regular bus line across the border, linking the centre of Görlitz with a large supermarket located in Zgorzelec and the free movement of local taxis across the border. The two authorities are involved in long-term strategic planning which has been conducted *inter alia* via a joint project on the future development of the Europe-town: 'Town 2030. Joint visions of the Europe-Town Görlitz-Zgorzelec'.

Research Analysis

Experience of space.

One of the most striking elements in our data is the construction of the space (both urban and not) inhabited by our informants. As stated above, the redrawing of the border after WW2 left most of the town and its main facilities within German territory. Post-war Görlitz was, although truncated, still a relatively coherent town with a good infrastructure and a beautiful medieval town centre relatively unscathed by the war. The Polish town, in contrast, cannot be seen as a stereotypical town – with a clear central focal point, such as a market square. This architectural 'inadequacy' is, interestingly, also a lived one – the inhabitants of Zgorzelec continually construct it as in one way or another problematic or incomplete.

The spectrum of labels used to describe Zgorzelec as incomplete range from emotionally quite neutral terms such as 'suburb' or 'part', through more pejorative ones such as 'pseudotown' or 'branch', to quite graphic images of amputation: 'severed limb' and 'axed-off arm'. As such, Zgorzelec is a clearly negative source of identity. There is no pride, no positive emotional investment in such a 'pseudo-town'. This lack of pride in Zgorzelec is only fostered by the comparisons of its ugliness with the clean streets and squares of Görlitz. In fact, it is in Görlitz where the inhabitants of Zgorzelec occasionally place the centre of their own town. Paradoxically then, the centre of Zgorzelec is constructed to be located in another country!

Görlitz, on the other hand, was a strong (positive) identity marker for almost all of the interviewees who lived there. There were no such grotesque images of amputation in their descriptions of their home town, which was seen as an organic whole which did not need to find a complement on the other side of the river. Where the narratives from Zgorzelec were dynamic, forever seeking a resolution to an unsatisfactory present, whether in its perceived lack of beauty, cleanliness or completion, the narratives from Görlitz were static and positive. The strength of the town as a marker was in contrast to the unresolved problem of regional affiliation; whereas in other German communities investigated in this project there was a strong regional identity which many interviewees claimed in their talk, Görlitz lost its region (Silesia) in the redrawing of the post-war boundaries. Historically, an important element in this sense of Silesianness was a rejection of neighbouring Saxony, to which the town now administratively belongs. This awkwardness revealed itself in several interviews where a strong attachment to Görlitz as an urban space offered a positive and uncomplicated alternative to this regional identity.

The separation from Görlitz felt by the Zgorzelec interviewees is counterbalanced in a way by its being constructed as completely accessible – a place only a walk away. People of Zgorzelec emphasise not only their ability to walk to Zgorzelec, but also the fact that they can do it always, any time, easily. Access to Görlitz is just about unlimited, unhindered. We see this stress upon access to Görlitz as another way of incorporating into the Polish living space. Zgorzelec is part of Görlitz and can bask in its reflected beauty.

These quite contradictory constructions – on the one hand Zgorzelec is separate from the ‘proper’ town of Görlitz, and the other, it is part of the space, show both the historical dynamism and the contradictory nature of the constructions of modern identity. Poles of Zgorzelec not only have to cope with the 50 years of communist propaganda of the best-guarded border in Europe, but also with the ‘new times’, the 10 years of Poland’s aspiration to join the European Union and it is the accessibility of Görlitz which seems to construct Poles as paying European consumers.

This accessibility of the other side is not reciprocated in the German data. While many interviewees betray an ignorance of even basic facts about the layout of the Polish town, those interviewees who do recount trips into Zgorzelec do so in terms of unfulfilled negative expectations. So a trip to a restaurant there was enjoyable in that it was not unclean, or that there were no unpleasant incidents on the way.

Finally, what is also interesting in the constructions of Zgorzelec is that the narratives concerning the town are almost invariably ahistorical. We observed a temporal shift from the concrete reality, indexically represented in the photographs, to the sociospatial un-reality of ‘blurred boundaries’. Even though presented with the relatively specific historical time of the photograph, the informants’ narratives invariably tended to hover around the very concrete temporal dimension of the present day. We think these temporal shifts to be indicative of two interrelated aspects. On the one hand, it is the continuing uprootedness and displacement of our interviewees, who, despite almost six decades of Polish residency in Zgorzelec, still do not feel at home there, and at the same time, on the other hand, the more local context of present-day political disappointment (see our comments of post-communism below).

But the accessibility of Görlitz and the relative invisibility of the border is not only related to the current period of free movement across the border. We were quite surprised to note that the newly established border became almost invisible also in the stories referring to the times of the immediate war aftermath.

Also here, there is a division between the public and private spheres in which the constructions are situated. The border in the public sphere is constructed as a means of identifying ‘us Poles’ against all those living on the other side. The public sphere is represented to demand a border which is largely positioned as an impenetrable barrier between the communities on its either side, protecting Poland and Zgorzelec’s (Polish) community. Moreover, its positioning is largely rendered in nationalised terms of state, nation and its history. Interestingly, this discourse of the border has not changed over the time. The huge political and social changes in Poland and Eastern Europe started in 1989 do not appear to feature in our informants’ discourse on, for lack of better expression, the public border.

Despite the explicit declarations as to the need to change the status of the border, in fact, this status has not changed at all. Our informants seem not to be able to move beyond the past and see the border outside it. Their narratives of the border are very clearly anchored in history. We see the statements of the future change as not much more than the interviewees’ attempts to draw upon the existing public discourses, they are attempts to be perceived as going with the spirit of the time, rather than stories which are as unproblematic and ideologically ‘ironed out’ as those of the border as protection or division.

Interestingly, however, these stories sit happily alongside those which position the Polish-German border in very different terms, or even make it disappear altogether. But these stories pertain to the realm of the private sphere, the sphere of the individual every-day lives. Here the border loses the meaning of the dividing line and becomes first a physical obstacle in trade or smuggling, and over the time, a non-entity.

Thus, even in narratives referring to the time when crossing the border was either extremely difficult or for all intents and purposes impossible, the border river was not much more than a physical obstacle to be negotiated (usually at night). Contrary to our expectations we have encountered stories of contacts between the two communities on either side of the river right

from the beginning of Poles inhabiting Zgorzelec. These are stories of helping each other with the bare necessities of life, in which the macro-historical considerations of Polish-German conflict do not feature.

But even this border, the physical obstacle, vanishes altogether, in the stories of today's daily pilgrimages onto the other side for mainly shopping. In the discourse of our informants, Germany, a different country after all, becomes not much more than a newsagents' shop one 'pops to' in order to get some goods. In such discourse Görlitz is much closer to Zgorzelec than any other town in Poland. In these stories, the border doesn't exist at all.

What our findings show is that despite the publicly proclaimed change from the totalitarian to a civil society, our informants' discourses have not yet espoused these ideals. Their discursive constructions of a national border do not involve them as real people, real members of the civil society. The very notion of a national border does not belong to them, but, rather to the states, to authorities. The very word 'border', it seems, cannot be dissociated from its divisiveness. While its governments are endlessly negotiating the terms and conditions of Poland's membership of the EU, the border, it seems, is a demarcation line between the civilisation centre and the margins. This, in turn, pushes our informants to the xenophobic attitudes of 'protecting their land' against the greedy neighbours. This is underscored by the origins of the border in the greatest and bloodiest wars of the past century. The border, imposed as a direct result of the war, and continually described in the communist Poland as the outpost of Polishness, cannot be dissociated from its function as a protective line against the Polish arch-enemy. Such constructions, finally, show a significant gap between the public and their representatives be it on the local or the national level. Our informants' discourses are not inclusive of the integrationist discourses of the Polish political elite.

This is also why the private lives of the people of Zgorzelec are regulated by different rules from those of nations or history, this is also why the national border cannot be part of the community's private sphere. It must become a mere river, another obstacle posed by life, or it must disappear altogether. And indeed, as we showed above, this is what happens in our data. Most interestingly, this disappearance of the border, even though it legally and practically still exists, shows the shift of our informants to the EU style of life, without formal borders or passports. Our informants shed the identities of those living upon the margins of civilisation and become paying customers, fully aware of the strength of their money. They do not merely go shopping for the cheaper or better goods in Görlitz, much more significantly they cross the invisible border to shop for their new European identity.

And here we come to laying out the Polish border paradox. Our informants speak about the border as they always have. Despite all the political and social changes of the last 13 years in Poland, it seems that the only 'border discourse' that has changed is that of Polish political elites. Both nationally and locally, the border now open, an imagined line across which Poland and its citizens do more and more business with their German partners. But this new discourse, the post-1989 discourse of the border has not penetrated the discourses of the 'real' people, at least those represented by our informants.

3.2.2 Stage Two: Comparison Across The Corpus

Below we present our second stage of analysis: the comparison of our entire data-set. Here we look at the ways in which local understandings compare with trans-local ones and where we can identify clusters of themes that have a trans-European saliency.

The comparative themes that have emerged from our analysis are as follows:

Coping with marginality and the question of emigration

Coping with economic and social asymmetries
Coping with sensitive cross-border relations
Language and identity
Youth spaces
The Question of Europe

Two of the themes focus on one of the central themes which connect many people in border communities: that of their marginality in relation to the rest of their respective nation state. By definition border areas are geographically placed at these margins. But in addition, people living in these areas are often also marginalized in the political, social and economical circumstances of their lives. Some of these European border regions have been used as ‘social dumping grounds’ where stigmatised and persecuted groups, such as Sinti, Roma, expatriates from other nations, the politically suspect and the disabled, are settled far from the centre. In other border areas where fear of escape to the more prosperous neighbours created specially secluded zones along the former Iron Curtain, it was the ‘model citizens’ who were positioned there, and who had become isolated along the borderline in both directions. The research of the Bern team focuses on the strategies people in these border areas adopt in trying to cope with their marginality¹. In particular they foreground the decisions which centrally affect border communities today: namely whether people are ‘staying’ or whether they are ‘leaving.’ Narratives of those who leave and of those who stay behind often explicitly or implicitly reflect a perceived need to legitimise their decision. Stayers are often ambivalently positioned between love of one’s home region or country, a feeling of moral obligation not to leave, and resignation because of missed opportunities elsewhere. Leavers, by contrast, legitimise their decisions more outright as escape from the poverty of the periphery (economic marginalisation), political marginalisation or repression, or educational or professional reasons. The data also lends itself to comparison between the views of the different generations, the gender specific view and the specific visions and contexts of the different communities east and west of the Iron Curtain.

Whereas in the first topic the focus is on the consequences of marginalisation from their respective centres for communities on both eastern and western sides of our borders, the second is a look at the same communities through the prism of social and economic inequality². The communities along the eastern side of the border here form one cluster; those on the western side form another. In many ways this topic is a continuation of the arguments developed in the previous one by raising the question of relative symmetry or asymmetry of neighbouring communities alongside our borderline. In the case of central and eastern European countries, borders between actual and future EU-members can be divided in many ways along the axes of several asymmetries, all with the potential for conflict between them. During the times of the Iron Curtain which prohibited cross-border relations, these asymmetries could stay latent; now, with the border becoming more and more transparent, old and new inequalities are becoming noticeable. Such asymmetries may concern mere *data bruta* such as the relative size of territories, or the amount of gross national product. But these go hand in hand with stereotyped perceptions with emotional and evaluative components. Such negative emotions have fossilised even where there may be counter examples in every-day encounters. In the data the Chemnitz team found evidence for both explicit comparisons as well as a whole range of more submerged and implicit evaluations. They foreground various dimensions of asymmetries: differences in relative wealth, attractiveness, state of development, character, work, crime. Most people speak clearly from a marked perspective, as members of the advantaged or disadvantaged group, expressing feelings of superiority or inferiority. In most cases, there is an obvious dominance of one side, but this may be contrasted or even balanced by an opposite perception, when other reference groups are brought in or other perspectives become relevant. A community on the

¹ See Wastl-Walter et al (2003)

² See Holly et al (2003)

eastern side of the border, for example, may be poorer in an absolute sense than its direct neighbour across the border, but it may be more prosperous in relation to its own nation state than its western neighbour is. The Chemnitz team isolate several verbal strategies which people use in order to cope with asymmetry: these include simple expressions of self-consciousness/arrogance or inferiority; ignorance of the 'other' so as to avoid potential problems; but also complex attitudes towards the other, sometimes with compensating mechanisms. In some cases asymmetries which contain potential conflict are re-interpreted by turning them into a potential partnership ('we have empty flats, you have a need for them, we could help each other out').

Their focus on the ways in which the post-1990 visibility of asymmetrical relations gives rise to a whole plethora of negative emotions such as prejudices, fear, dislike, hatred. This is further developed by the team from the University of Wolverhampton in an investigation of the linguistic strategies which informants used in their attempts to cope with topics which they themselves perceive as difficult or sensitive³. This topic concerns the ways in which in their discourse about people living in European border communities informants negotiate accounts of implicit or explicit ethnic conflict, prejudice or negative stereotyping of 'the Other'. The Wolverhampton team indicate two types of such strategies which they refer to as 1) mitigation and 2) 'oracular reasoning' (Mehan, 1990). Mitigation is used to soften or licence negative stereotypical views about the ethnic 'other'. 'Oracular reasoning' on the other hand occurs in those instances where a basic premise is confronted with contradictory evidence, but the speakers wish to ignore or reject it. This investigation uses examples where informants talk about the Other from either across the border, or, in the case of multi-ethnic communities, from within the community itself. They found that informants on either side tend to construct the Other generically, as a uniform and unvaried group of people. Since living on the borders in the daily presence of the others provides contradictory evidence to this homogeneous negative view, informants have to deal with conflictual voices (either explicit or implicit in the informants' discourse) which question their accounts or contradict the claims they make (see also Meinhof & Galasinski 2000). The strategies of coping with conflictual accounts of the Other thus become indicative of the tension between two opposing tendencies: on the one hand a threat from the Other which depends on the social/ethnic separation of the border communities, and on the other hand the new and changing public and political discourses of the Other which go counter to those more private discourses.

This emphasis on the discursive processes of identity formation leads to the next topic. Adding a sociolinguistic dimension to the analysis of the narratives collected within the communities, the team from the University of Trieste found that language itself becomes a signifier for the asymmetrical and unequal relations between the people living there and argue that it is not only the way we use the repertoire of our languages which marks social identity, but the language or the languages we speak are themselves part of our 'cultural capital'⁴. Hence their emphasis on the ways in which people evaluate their own language(s) and the language(s) of the other, and how they use and reflect on language as an identity-constituting marker. The Trieste team investigate the interrelation between language choice, language use, attitudes to languages and cultural identity in our communities. Border communities constitute *per se* a reservoir of "natural" multilingual and multicultural experiences. Yet as a result of a whole range of socio-linguistic factors, these are very often restricted to an "artificial" monolingualism. Nevertheless they offer a privileged observatory for the study of the relationship between language and identity. They investigate the effects of socio-political factors - such as the re-drawing of the borders - on the linguistic situation, affecting language loyalty, language shift, loss or retention of bilingualism and also assess the role which language policy and educational provisions for language learning played in this respect. The team's analysis investigates how members of our

³ See Galasinska & Galasinski (2003)

⁴ See Carli et al (2003)

communities use, and reflect on language as a marker of an in-group or an out-group: an "us-feeling" and/or an "us-against-them-feeling". Group feelings are emphasised by using one's group's own language, and members of the outgroup are excluded from its internal transactions. The social evaluation which speakers ascribe to the language itself thus often masks value judgements of a different order. This analysis gives an in-depth account of the complex ways in which linguistic and social attitudes, and prejudices about other language groups interact in some of our communities, and how the transmission of cultural norms, values and ideology is affected. This involves an appreciation of the extent to which people in their narratives about the other speech communities construct 'myths' about the language use of the past and present. To what extent do people project onto members of the outgroup linguistic norms and practices which are / are not reflected in actual practice, and how, inversely, do they define, present and interpret their own social selves. By evaluating data from different border communities with parallel or complementary relations between and amongst the various speech communities this examination also reflects on whether there is always a categorical and necessary relation between language and ethnic identity, and whether this results predominantly in negative constructions of the other group.

When we embarked on our work in the communities along the (South)- Eastern border of the European Union which will soon become an open border within EU territory, we expected to find a great deal of awareness, discussions, ideas, attitudes and emotions about the role which Europe plays or might play for its citizens. However this did not turn out to be the case.

The Southampton team explored and compared the entire data sets with regard to the meaning of Europe and the question of European identity. Contrary to expectations, they found that interviewees in all border communities lack any real sense of belonging to Europe and rarely define themselves politically or culturally as Europeans. This may be a reflection of the political process of European unity which is still under way and has not yet led to a consolidation of shared cultural definitions of 'Europeanness'. In addition, the Union was originally created for economic purposes and is still often understood as having an economic rather than a cultural or social *raison d'être*. However, the widespread lack of interest and knowledge remains striking in our border regions since here European and EU enlargement initiatives which support cross-border economic and infrastructural developments are particularly visible. The team investigated how interviewees expressed their views about Europe, which in almost all the cases only occurred when they were prompted by the interviewer (See section 3 for our method that foregrounded interviewer passivity). The exploration of the narrative themes/concepts through which people establish their relationship to Europe and the facets of identity which people represent when they qualify 'Europeanness' shows that these are narrative practices imbued with ambivalences and uncertainties. In contrast to the optimistic outlook and rhetoric of local, national and European policy makers, Europe in our informants' accounts figures largely as a category of out-grouping, by which people activate categories of ethnic or national difference and construe negative others. This is often expressed in ambivalent statements whereby a positive evaluation of Europe is followed by a negation or contradiction of that statement, in which people give voice to a range of fears and anxieties. As an in-grouping device it remains curiously empty. Here the local and historical context of the cross-border relations over-rides the larger transnational issues of European integration, governance and citizenship. In all cases when prompted, the European Union provided some prism for people's identification, positive or negative, with a stronger implicit overlap between EU and Europe on the western and a more ambivalent and explicit double-vision on the eastern side. Underlying all these narratives about the future which citizens that live on the current eastern margins of the European Union tell, are feelings of anxiety, insecurity, and fear, though mixed at least in some instances with a sense of promise of a better economic existence. On the whole it became clear that the Europe narratives most clearly expressed the endurance of older East-West identities and their re-interpretation in the face of enlargement.

The Klagenfurt team examined youth spaces and identity constructions of young people across our border communities. Given that this generation will be shaping the ‘new Europe’ this is a particularly important topic. The team had a close look at the situation of the young generation in all our communities, the discourses they adopt and are embedded in.

4. CONCLUSIONS & POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In addition to the detailed scientific findings for each set of border communities our work offers the first comparative study of a set of communities on the border between today's EU and its eastern and south-eastern ascendant nations. The collaborative research was conducted by a multilingual team of researchers from seven different countries over a period of three years. This research allowed us to understand what makes the experience of living on these borders different from or comparable to one another, in spite of differences or similarities of culture and language. We set out to throw light on a series of interlinking and highly significant questions for Europe's citizens. How did the experiences of living on this conflictual border shape their attitudes about the demarcated or overlapping cultural and administrative spaces of the European Union right along the line of its current most debated area of expansion? How did the public worlds of political change affect the ways in which people think of themselves and their neighbours? How are these processes interlinking with people's identities, and how do these manifest and construct themselves in everyday narratives and talk? To what extent can we think of these identity forming experiences as community specific, translocal across the border, translocal alongside the eastern or western side of these borders, national or transnational? What are the contextual circumstances which underlie the formatting of national, translocal or transnational clusters?

This is the overall framework of our research, and sections 3 and 4 set out in detail the most significant findings.

Below we will first summarise the results which strike us as the most significant in relation to their wider European relevance. evidently our communities share a number of experiences, but also differ in various ways. our mapping of results will also make apparent the degrees to which commonalities and differences feed into more general evaluations of existing and possible future policies.

4.1 *The Historical Axis of Hurt/Trauma*

The ongoing resonance of historical experiences of trauma and hurt emerged from our comparative analysis as an important factor underpinning current attitudes and self-understandings. It informs the complex interaction between the macro world of politics and political change, identity formation in general, and the sometimes sensitive or conflictual relationships between contiguous border communities in particular. This was especially visible in the data concerning the German-Polish, German-Czech and Italian-Slovenian borders. In all these cases the historical experience of trauma, be it in the form of expulsion and forced resettlement, in the form of violent conflict or political oppression, still informed people's narratives and their understandings of cross-border relationships. The continuous presence of these issues, sometimes linguistically explicit, sometimes more covert, showed that they had never been fully resolved. The historical situation is as follows:

In the North, Poland's western border was formed along the rivers Oder and Neisse in 1945 as a result of the Potsdam agreement between the victorious Allied Forces which moved the western border of Poland further westwards onto formerly German territory. Along with several other towns and communities, the eastern parts of Guben and Görlitz on the River Neisse became part of Poland and were renamed Gubin and Zgorzelec. Virtually the entire German population of these towns either fled or were evicted by the incoming Poles, many of whom had in turn lost their homes to the Soviet Union which had annexed some of Poland's eastern territory (see also Galasinski & Meinhof 2002, Barker & Galasinski 2001). For both Poles and Germans the experience of resettling in these towns after 1945 not only meant a shift of territory but the respective nation states themselves changed fundamentally. Both became Soviet-dominated

socialist states: the German Democratic Republic and the new People's Republic of Poland; both ceased to exist in that form after the weakening and eventual collapse of the Soviet Union made possible German unification and the democratisation of Poland.

Further south, the borderline divides contemporary Germany and the Czech Republic, and with it the communities of Bärenstein (G) and Vejprty (CZ). Here, too, the year 1945 and Germany's defeat entailed substantial population movements. For our three-generation families the most significant changes were those from about 1914 onwards. At the outbreak of World War I, the borderline between Bohemia and Saxony was of no consequence since at that time the majority of Vejprty's population was German. With the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918, Czech officials moved in from the interior, and a general mix of population between the German majority and Czech minority ensued, including many marriages between inhabitants of Bärenstein and Vejprty. In 1938 the area was annexed by Hitler's troops and in 1939, sanctioned by the Munich Accord, became part of Germany. It remained so until after World War II, when the German population of Vejprty (Sudeten-Germans and German-Silesians) was forced to leave: depending on the point of view, they were 'transferred' (Czech version), 'expelled' (West German version) or 'resettled' (East German version) (see Holly 2002). Thousands of these people went no further than the immediately adjacent town of Bärenstein because they hoped to return home soon. In Vejprty itself people moved in from other parts of Czechoslovakia, including regions which are today in Slovakia. Those Germans who were allowed to stay in Vejprty (such as the elderly, spouses of Czechs, or experts in various fields) were joined by others of German heritage from other areas of the Sudetenland.

For most of the post-war period, the situation here echoed that on the Polish-German border, in that two neighbouring socialist states, dominated by the Soviet Union nominally became friendly neighbours; yet in spite of some progress in official relations towards the end of the 1950s, there was little contact between the people. This situation declined further when East Germany supported the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, which brought an end to the "Prague Spring" in 1968 with Soviet tanks rolling across the Pöhlbach river between the two communities of Bärenstein and Vejprty. After 1990 the situation again replicated that on the German-Polish border, as far as East-West relations were concerned. But for the population of Vejprty a further realignment occurred in 1992 with the dissolution of Czechoslovakia into the two separate states of the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

In the Italian-Slovenian case, the border cut through bilingual regions of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire, but it did not lead to an ethno-linguistic division as between Austria and Hungary (or indeed Germany and Czechoslovakia, and Germany and Poland).

However here, too, the historical legacies of a collapsing empire after the First World War, new national borders in the 1920s, and, in particular, Italian fascism in the 1930s and 1940s, left unresolved conflicts which structure people's experiences right up to the present day.

Inevitably, interviewees in all our communities see themselves as historical beings and shape their narratives in historical terms. In all cases, experiences of historical conflict or hardship shape views of the self and other (see section 3). However, with the overall question of policy implications in mind, we wish to emphasize those conflicts that have shaped sensitive and conflictual cross-border relationships up to the present. In addition to the sketched developments above, relationships are also informed by the degree to which the Iron Curtain had taken root and made cross-border traffic possible. Here our examples range from the more or less permanent and strict closure on the former German-German border to the much more liberal regime in the Italian-Yugoslavian case. Consequently, the entrenched political ideologies between East and West are still much more apparent in our German-German or Austrian-Hungarian narratives than in those collected on the Italian-Slovenian or Austrian-Slovenian borders.

Despite the overall importance of history, our collaborative approach has shown that historical and political realities alone do not make up the full picture. This leads on to our next section that deals with an interpretation of our borderline in socio-economic terms.

4.2 The Axis of Inequality

The close analytical reading of our interview narratives made us aware of the fact that the historical matrix above can only lead to an in-depth understanding of our material if we combine it with a socio-economic perspective. Especially if we ask questions about policy, our data makes clear that the historical legacy of war and other forms of international (cross-border and transnational /ideological) tension are mapped onto social and economic inequalities when individuals construct and confirm ongoing negative emotions and attitudes about the ‘others’. These can range from indifference and negative stereotyping to fear, mistrust, or hatred. Quite frequently fears and future expectations that related to one’s neighbour in particular and an enlarged European space in general were defined in economic terms. These are rooted in a range of economic facts that mark their largest difference between the old divide of East and West.

In almost all of Poland and Slovakia, and large parts of Hungary the gross national product lies at under 50% of the average of the enlarged European Union. The rate in the remaining regions of Poland and Hungary (with the exception of the area around the capital city) and the Czech Republic lies between 50 and 75%. The only exception among the ascendant nations is Slovenia which averages at 75-100%, but here too is a marked difference to its immediate EU neighbours. These economic inequalities and their social consequences feature time and time again in the narratives we collected. Significantly, the border regions of the EU states to their eastern neighbours, though markedly richer, are relatively poorer in relation to the rest of their nation, Italy with its rich northern regions being the one exception. This discrepancy in wealth between certain regions and the rest of the country can also be seen very clearly in eastern Germany. All the former GDR regions where our communities bordering Poland, the Czech Republic and the Eastern (Thuringian) part of the former East/West German border are located, are poorer regions compared to West Germany.

What we find here is a situation where the division of communities as a result of historical/political upheaval – the effects of war, redefinition of nationhood, population migration through flight, expulsion or resettlement – continues today in the form of socio-economic inequality. People in these communities by looking across their borders – be it the rivers or brooks, meadows or mountains – literally look across a socio-economic fault-line which divides the richer from the poorer in today’s Europe. Thus it comes as no surprise that the construction of identity for many of the people living on these borders works itself through a system of in-grouping and out-grouping which echoes and confirms these divisions in all forms of every-day social practices. Axes drawn by historical tension continuing as axes of social and economic inequality thus confirm cycles of continuing negative stereotyping or indifference. Again, our collaborative trans-European approach has shown that cross-border relations are more relaxed where economic differences are relatively small and coincide with comparably less inherited historical tension (visible through its absence or presence in the young generation’s stories) and a longer culture of cross-border exchange. Our communities on the Italian-Slovenian and Austrian-Slovenian border serve as examples. Interestingly, the communities on the Austrian-Hungarian border which proved the most ‘silent’ and disconnected of all (see Wastl-Walter et al. 2002) are separated by a large economic gap, but have no experience of historical trauma, nor any culture of exchange.

4.3 Conflicting Identities

As mentioned above, both the axis of trauma and conflict (historical identity) and the axis of inequality (socio-economic identity) figure in all narratives we collected and comprise two large

thematic clusters that make an overall comparability of our data feasible. However, these clusters do not feature in uniform or neatly organised and overlapping ways.

As fields of dis/identification they provided frameworks for how our interviewees created a sense of who they were and where they had come from. Inevitably, the experience of overall change our three-generation families had gone through went hand in hand with the emergence of new identities on national, and international levels which impinged on local and personal identities in various ways. The fact of shifting and contested identities became quite visible to us in the variation that occurred between the generations – such as when the older and middle generations' narratives differed in their representations of the same historical experience (e.g. middle and old generation in the former GDR; see Armbruster & Meinhof 2003 forthcoming). In the same vein, the imminent larger political shift towards EU enlargement showed in all communities under study, that this has not yet led to a displacement of national identities or the identification with a supra-national Europe on the level of individuals.

Our discourse analytical approach and close reading of the linguistic data also revealed a sense of shifting, multiple and sometimes even contradictory identities on the individual level. As people moved through differently contextualised settings in one and the same narrative they also moved through different levels of understanding the self and other. Thus, for instance, when east and west Germans talked about the experience of unification they carved out a difference between each other that was primarily motivated by socio-economic definitions of personhood (e.g. work ethic, employment, industriousness etc.). In relation to Europe and EU enlargement however, they collapsed these differences into unity and identified themselves unanimously as 'Germans'. Whereas in the first instance, both groups identified themselves in a field of felt or feared economic inequalities, in the second that focus receded and was replaced by a shared sense of unity vis-à-vis a foreign and economically weaker out-group, e.g. Czechs or Poles.

In general, all our interviewees crafted narratives of identity that dealt with those axes of power and inequality that were most tangible to them, and that dealt in one way or another with a historical or socio-economic framework. As sketched above, this provides a clear trans-European overlap in our sample, and it seems that the overall theme of the border, that was suggested by us as researchers, was everywhere understood to be about these spheres of identity. Borders were understood as symbols of unity and division, as symbols of history, of marginality, belonging and exclusion. Inevitably, these issues provide complex positionings. The subjective investment people have in their narratives, their emotional, conscious and unconscious thoughts which they attach to certain identity positions revealed themselves in their ways of talking. Our methodological approach that made full use of discourse analysis was particularly revealing in this aspect – it clearly showed where and in relation to which themes individual narratives pointed at conflictual and contradictory identity formations.

4.4 Alternative axes

Our research was based on the assumption that the EU's current eastern borderline, which coincides with several historical and current socio-political and economic faultlines as outlined above, represents a conflictual border for the inhabitants of the border regions we investigated. This presumption did not, however, predetermine the clusters and groupings which we expected to find in the data obtained in the interviews. On the contrary, the fact that our method was used by all the researchers in the same way, using charged images of the local area to trigger self narratives, allowed us to compare the communities and allow clusters to emerge which may or may not coincide with the east-west divide along which the communities are located.

As we have shown in section 3, the borders on which our interviewees live conjure up and in many cases reflect historical divisions and conflicts for our informants, but they also represent a

socio-economic faultline in the present. Our research revealed other axes and clusters which did not coincide with the borderline separating east from west. The common experience in the last decade of major and rapid economic, political and social restructuring - namely the transformation of formerly socialist states of central and eastern Europe into liberal democratic states with western-style market economies - has had an enormous impact on the lives of all three generations of our sample and of course is reflected in their identity constructions as revealed in the interviews. This experience has been shared by our interviewees from communities in the former GDR, two of which (Görlitz and Bärenstein) fall on the western side of the main EU border. Our research has revealed that interviewees in these communities do reflect what we might summarise as a 'post-communist' identity when the context is wider, unified Germany, in so doing marking themselves off against their compatriots in the western part of Germany; they rarely align themselves, however, with their Polish or Czech neighbours who have experienced similar changes in the past decade. Indeed, in contexts when these others arise, our eastern German interviewees very often collapse the differences so deliberately maintained against western Germans (see Section 3). The eastern German corpus is thus interestingly ambivalent on this east-west divide, sometimes, aligning itself with the western, sometimes with the eastern, always marking itself off against an other: western Germans or Poles/Czechs, according to context.

Our communities can be grouped together in other ways. Two of our six sets of communities can be described as large towns (Görlitz-Zgorzelec on the German-Polish border and Gorizia-Nova Gorica on the Italian-Slovenian border). It is in these towns, in contrast to the other, largely rural communities we investigated, that we can see a higher degree of cooperation and interaction at the official level. There are many cross-border initiatives, initiated and supported by the local authorities, and everyday cross-border interaction, often in the form of shopping tourism, is relatively high. At the other end of the spectrum, in the peaceful villages of Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent on the Austrian-Hungarian border, cross-border interaction is almost non-existent. As our research has shown, interest in these communities in the other across the border is very low indeed. The pulling effect of urban centres on people from their environs also operates across international borders; many of our young generation informants mapped out their futures in terms of cities they would like to/have to move to in order to have a career. Adjacent villages, on the other hand, have little in terms of employment and, in modern capitalism, little in the way of consumer goods to offer each other. On the Austrian-Hungarian border, as on the other more rural borders, it was clearly the urban centres, in this case Vienna and Budapest, which especially the young and middle generations look to. This leads to large levels of out-migration towards the centres away from these peripheral communities, with serious consequences for their vitality and economic viability.

Another area in which the main East-West divide is qualified and undercut is in language. In some of these communities the political border reflects an almost clear-cut language divide; this is true of the German-Polish, German-Czech, and Austro-Hungarian communities. But in each of these communities, this present-day situation disguises a history where the situation was much more complex; in the first two, German used to be spoken across what is now the national border, in the latter there was within the living memory of the older generation a history of bilingualism on both sides of the border - now completely disappeared. In the Austrian-Slovenian and Italian-Slovenian communities, the political border does not coincide with the linguistic one; with substantial Slovenophone minorities in Eisenkappel-Zelezna Kapla and Gorizia-Gorica the linguistic divide runs right through the communities on the western side. On the former German-German border, currently reverted to its historical regional status, language is at first glance not an issue. But language gets used even here by our informants to reinforce separation and otherness, when in reality no substantial difference exists.

4.5 Negative emotions and cross-border policies

In the previous sections we have shown how the political border reflects both a history of conflict and represents present socio-economic inequality. With the imminent enlargement of the EU to include all of the ‘eastern’ states represented in our study, the border that separates our communities will be downgraded. The EU has many programmes and policies encouraging cross-border cooperation and interdependence in these communities and others all along the border (INTERREG, PHARE, etc). In each of the regions where our informants live there is ample evidence of EU investment in cross-border infrastructures, e.g. common sewage treatment plants, cross-border transport infrastructure. When setting out on this research we tentatively assumed that with time, especially the younger generation could be relied on to support and take forward the integration of these border communities, according to the proverb ‘time heals wounds’. But all along this border we find that these projects are either ignored or rejected, often by the middle and younger generations in particular. Indeed, the example of the former German-German border, which provides us with a case-study of communities where a conflictual border has already been physically removed, demonstrates that this supposition is entirely false. We find that the divisions are reproduced and perpetuated by the next generation. Even where EU investment in these regions is focussed on cross-border activity and economic regeneration, when confronted with examples of these policies, such as shared sewage treatment plants in Gubin and Vejprty, our informants on both sides react very negatively. People’s lack of knowledge about these investments provides space for suspicion and hostility to arise, reinforcing the very division between the communities which the projects were designed to ameliorate. This one of the key findings of our research all along the border; again and again, EU-funded projects, entirely laudable in their intent and providing real practical benefits, do not meet with acceptance among the local population. The example of two sewage treatment plants, in Gubin and Vejprty show how such investments can be counter-productive when conceived in the wrong way. Our informants on the German side of these borders expressed resentment at public money being invested in the other community, providing employment on the other side. From our Czech and Polish interviewees, in turn, we heard complaints of increased bills and rates caused by the new facility. In some instances, policy measures identified with EU developments (e.g. the Eurocity development Guben-Gubin) were explicitly rejected by some informants even where they had previously recounted positive experiences with some of the effects of these developments (see Meinhof & Galasinski 2002). Our research thus shows that EU investments needs to be much more sensitive to local people’s concerns, attitudes, and grievances if they are to be successful in bringing communities together.

4.6 Discourse and Identity

As outlined in section 3 our methodological approach provided an in-depth understanding of the significance which language and discourse play in reflecting and confirming identity constructions. Our decidedly qualitative approach, using ethnographic tools and discourse analytical methods, provided some key understandings of the constructions of the Other and of the more general question of identity construction. A set of photographic materials which we presented to our interviewees, generated a range of rich narratives, which came very close to everyday language and which revealed conscious and less consciously held layers of people’s identities.

In line with a wide range of academic literature on the subject we have identified a strong relationship between the talk of individuals and wider social, cultural and historical conditions and contexts in which these individuals live. This twofold relationship between individual and community is captured in the meaning of ‘discourse’ – which entails practices of understanding, interpretation and interaction individuals share or draw on in particular contexts. Discursive

realities are thus realities of meaning which are not merely reflective but also constitutive of a certain social reality. This references issues of identity, but also of power and ideology, and, what is particularly tangible in our cross-border contexts, it references the marked asymmetries we sketched above. Not everyone is an equal participant in the shaping, and reshaping of discourse – which accounts for the fact that subordinated or marginalised groups in society can be discursively absent in many ways. In a cross-border field where people on either side do not really participate in each other's discursive worlds (especially where they do not share the same language), prejudice and stereotypes can have an enduring presence, despite significant political change. We will come back to this point below.

We illustrated in our project work and analysis, that engaging in discourse is a major way of crafting identities, and that many individuals share certain axes of identification because they share in agreement and in disagreement a similar range of discourses. Here we could identify discursive overlaps that revealed groupings among and boundaries between people, marked by, for instance, age, village, town, region, nation, language and more. This was very tangible within one and the same community but also in relation to the community under study and other locations or people within their own nation state. Thus our method enabled us to understand village and family identities but also wider sets of relationships in which people embedded themselves, such as the region, nation or relatively rarely, Europe as a supra-national body. At the same time, identification with a larger social or cultural unit always implies dis-identification and dissociation from others.

This remains most visible if we look at our cross-border results, as it is here that we can clearly see those discursive realities that have strong ideological underpinnings. This is the field where discourses take on a taken-for-granted character, and where definitional practices have become so entrenched that other, alternative meanings remain entirely submerged or cannot compete with the 'common sense' reality. Despite the fact that many practices of 'othering' those on the other side of the border often appear as utterly fictional and imaginary, they are still very effective in their social and political consequences. As a result, people might make no efforts to get to know each other, might opt for a form of politics that excludes the other, might disagree with 'Europeanisation' and so on. We have encountered examples of this in all our communities. East Germans in Barenstein, for instance, or the Austrian groups on the Hungarian and Slovene borders identified on the one hand against richer centres in their own countries and defined themselves as disadvantaged communities. But being disadvantaged also provided also one of the strongest arguments against more open borders, as that would aggravate the situation. It was rare to find alternative explanations or understandings of disadvantage, which would not turn into blaming those who live in the neighbour state or which would not ultimately explain why these neighbours have to be feared. This became quite evident too in our local policy workshops, where policy makers of different political convictions mobilised the same ideological discursive 'truths' that we had become familiar with in our interviews with local people. Thus, for instance, there was endless understanding of why Czechs or Poles had to become figures of anxiety and fear for Germans and why, relatedly, policy efforts had to demonstrate to local people that Poles and Czechs were quite 'like us' and 'normal' and not the threatening hoards people imagined them to be. Thus, we could identify not only the very effective ideological power of certain discourses and their relative poverty in explaining issues of inequality, disadvantage, economic and social asymmetry, but also the virtual absence of discourses that appreciate differences and present them as non-threatening. The same problem became strikingly evident even in our German-German example, where the degree to which language, culture, history and economy are shared is very high. Yet, people reproduced discursive practices of out-grouping each other, even by drawing on the same value system of work and work ethics. The ideological discourse of east and west (which is evidently also an inherited discourse from the past that is re-circulated and reworked) was so dominant that people argued with it in mind and, in many cases, could not even think of alternative discourses

with which to interpret and understand their immediate neighbours. Our linguistic analysis showed particularly well the degree to which such ideological representations are naturalised and become accepted as 'common sense'. Thus despite making positive claims about others, verbal strategies often reveal 'hidden' prejudice or negative stereotypes within the same argument. Thus, for instance, even 'well-meaning' west Germans who were conscious of the inequalities involved in unification had negative stereotypes filtering through their talk. The Italian-Slovenian border remains the notable exception in our sample, as it is here that new discursive images seem to have emerged – notably to do with the promise of open borders and a new co-operative European space. Here, and in sharp contrast to the other borders, it is mostly young people who adopted these positive discourses of change and who did not assert a threatening image of their neighbours on the other side of the border. Our research made strikingly obvious to us that there is still a great deal of work to be done, if the European project is to work as a 'discursive reality' that affirms social cohesion and appreciates cultural diversity.

4.7 Conclusions: current problems

Our research into identity construction along this EU border has confirmed the symbolic resonance the border has for all the communities that lie on it. It represents and evokes historical conflict and division, including *inter alia* the Second World War, post-war division and ideological conflict. These divisions are reinforced by the large socio-economic inequalities which coincide with the borderline today (see Meinhof ed. 2003). Our research shows that these are very potent forces in shaping people's conception of who they and their neighbours are and help maintain division and if not outright hostility, then at least apathy towards the other. The inclusion of the former German-German border amongst our sample provides ample evidence of the persistence of these divisions long after the physical border has been removed. Our methodology has allowed us profound insights into the complexities and contradictions of people's constructions of their identity, but it also allows us to observe patterns across the corpus all along this border, as outlined in point 3 above. Alternative axes emerged among the data; an urban/rural division emerged, as did a refined version of the general east-west division (post-communist/west) where the eastern German data have an ambivalent position. The role of language as a demarcation line was clear-cut in some border settings, in others the line ran right through the middle of the communities, obscuring the political border. A key finding of our research is the attitudes amongst the local populations all along this border towards EU-funded cross-border programmes and investments. Far from helping to remove divisions and hostility, as they are currently implemented, they are often rejected by the local people and serve to reinforce the very problem they seek to resolve. The imminent enlargement of the EU in 2004 will bring many challenges for the communities and policy makers. Our findings have several profound implications for future policy in these areas.

4.8 Policy implications: how to overcome the above problems

- The results of projects such as ours point to the deep-rooted feelings and attitudes which cause continuing division and rejections of policies of co-operation. This must be brought to the notice of the elites and local policy makers via EU bodies, and should be taken very seriously. The elite has a more controlling access to public discourse (media etc). As long as they take note of the complexities of local feeling and do not simply preach from above, the elite has considerable power to shape opinions (especially with regard to the prejudice, racism, entrenched ideological discourses we identified, also in the elite themselves). The policy makers we encountered often voiced pro-Europe opinions and made strong verbal

claims about the importance of cross-border contact and co-operation. But unless they carry local opinion with them, and engage with local practices, even the best-meant plans are doomed to failure or at the best gain only very slow acceptance. Verbal claims thus need to be put into various and always cooperative fields of action involving the local population, especially in those areas where the power of prejudice and negative outgrouping is still strong.

- Social cohesion coupled with a respect for cultural diversity is one of the driving forces behind Europeanisation. This is often stated in policy documents, but needs to be taken more seriously involving grassroots policy. The EU has to become a more democratic institution itself and think seriously about the democratisation of local decision making processes. As it is now people feel excluded, uninvolved, unconcerned, even condescended to. For example, people should be able to vote for local Europe committees on community levels which could be organised in a cross-border fashion; village levels could then cooperate with regional levels (specifically including cross-border areas into one region). It is part of EU policy to strengthen regions (not nations) but in many of our communities this has not yet filtered through into local awareness.
- There is an information gap between the local population and the EU. Even some of the well-liked achievements brought about by EU investment are often not recognised as such, and thus do not unsettle indifference or negative feelings about what is perceived as distant EU policy. Such information gap is best overcome by involving the local people in decision making, implementation and dissemination of results rather than purely relying on top-down measures.
- There need to be a range of fora in which local people can discuss projects and needs right across the different levels of governance. These need to be taken seriously and lead to concrete outcomes which involve the local people themselves in all stages of their realisation (see above). Co-operation also has to be accompanied by efforts to find a new language for cross-border relations, and establish new discursive possibilities, beyond threat, dis-identification and racism; the identity of 'Europe' has to be understood in a wide sense, affirming cultural differences and multicultural realities. Kindergartens and schools should be important partners here; pupils need to be actively involved in cross-border politics and activities; as should workers associations. Economic co-operations and shared marketing strategies across borders should be supported especially those that emerge from within the communities themselves. Examples of these might be weekly or monthly markets in our rural areas where both communities can offer their produce or handcrafts – marketed as regional culture and diversity; alternately held on each side. Specific support structures should particularly be targeted towards economic cooperation: in our rural areas this could also include tourism, shared recreation facilities. A good example is the wine production in the Burgenland and their cooperation with Hungary and other regions in Europe. In order to generally support cross-border relations on all levels, local media, radio and TV stations should be supported and/or created (here again young people could play important roles) and local people should have active participatory roles in developing programs, bilingual broadcasting etc.
- All this will help to tackle unresolved histories and historical enmities; people have to recognise what unites them not only what separates them;

4.9 Need for further research in the particular area of our research

More research is needed in local and translocal decision making processes, and how they often bypass peoples' perceived needs. This needs to be conducted at grass-root level using finely-tuned and sensitive research instruments which also allows some understanding of conflictual

and paradoxical feelings amongst the people. Talking to the elite alone (local policy makers), or asking simple attitude questions alone will not provide the necessary insights, as our research has shown, and could further alienate the local population, often feeding rather than alleviating prejudice.

Much clearer understanding is needed of why local people do not respond to policies that aim at improvement of their lives and good cross border relations – this can be shaped as action research with a clear focus on seeing people as political actors who can learn to become actively involved in their own destinies. Economic investment in these areas has to be accompanied by cultural strategies and real local involvement on several levels. In general a much more holistic view of cross-community development is needed, which takes note of all the different historical, social, political, and especially cultural factors, which involves local people at all stages of planning, implementation, evaluation, adjustment and dissemination of best practice.

4.10 Action research

One area which would lend itself particularly well as a follow-up to the kind of research we conducted would be action research. By this we mean a second stage of participatory research aiming at concrete practical outcomes. This could only be conducted as a second cycle of research (rather than being already preconceived in a first proposal) and would build on the results of a first more independent research cycle such as the present framework projects allow. To give just one concrete example: we did not expect to find that in our border communities it was the young people who were more indifferent or hostile to one another than the oldest generation who had lived through all the hardships of the war; nor were we prepared for the fact that these negative attitudes were almost invariably based on a complete lack of experiences with one another. In one local workshops on the former German-German border with pupils from Thuringia and Bavaria we were able to engage them in owning up to and discussing their own negative attitudes since it was our researchers who had worked in the communities and gathered the data. For these discussions we used a well established participatory method called Metaplan which does not blame or embarrass people for their ‘bad views’ but allows them to be aired, commonly assessed and then investigated for possible solutions. Furthermore, by drawing on our range of research results right along the borderline we were able to demonstrate that these attitudes were not just endemic to their own communities but had comparable roots in other regions and nations. The result of this workshop was that the students themselves asked for a continuation of such discussions. However, whether or not such a continuation will take place without the mediation of our researchers is not certain. This is just one small example, but it shows that researchers who have gained substantive insights, experience, made extensive contacts and gained the trust of the local community in a first independent research project would be in a prime position to act as mediators between the different groups. Thus the rather poor links which currently exist between NGOs, educational institutions in the communities, local people in general, and independent academics could substantially work for the benefit of the communities. It would ensure the cross-fertilisation of insider and outsider perspectives, and make available much-needed academic expertise to the formulation of further action research programmes at grass-root level

4.11 Implication for framework programmes in general

It follows from the above, that we would recommend an additional layer to existing framework programmes which would allow second stage proposals of at least 2-3 years work to build on achieved results but which would be specifically aimed at realising the policy recommendations

of a current framework project in practical terms making use of teams which have already been sensitised to the local situations. At present the ‘accompanying measures’ scheme does not lend itself to this kind of expansion, but it could easily be adapted to serve such a purpose. We have already given one practical example from our own local workshops where research findings are brought back to communities which could then form the basis for a future cycle of action research to implement best practices. A follow-up stage building on finalised successful first cycles of research could also allow cross-fertilisation between different EU programmes, focusing on education, media, and EU development programmes. In the complex and difficult stages of European enlargement the EU Framework programmes could play a further role in furthering the collaboration between independent academic and action research towards shared and well-conceived strategic goals in cycles of interconnecting activities.

5. DISSEMINATION AND/OR EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

Below is a brief overview of some of the ways in which the project consortium has engaged and will continue to engage in dissemination activity. For a full list of our activities, see the annex at the end of this report.

Consortium members have engaged in disseminating the project results as widely as possible. This has taken many forms, including:

- § Presentations to national and international conferences across the several disciplines covered by the project; In particular several consortium members will attend a Special international symposium/ workshop, co-ordinated by Ulrike Meinhof: “Ethnicity, text and discourse analysis” part of Globalisation, Identity Politics and Social Conflict (GIPSC) Project, Lagos, Nigeria. This will include a panel discussion ‘Resolving differences in Africa and Europe: borders and their legacies’.
- § Published academic articles and books, including the two core publications: *Living (with) Borders. Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe* (ed.) Meinhof (2002) and *Bordering European Identity* (ed.) Meinhof (forthcoming).
- § Interaction with local and national media, resulting in a series of newspaper articles and radio interviews with consortium members.
- § The incorporation of project results into teaching programmes and online learning and teaching resources. These include seminars and lectures at universities across Europe.
- § The project website (www.borderidentities.com) which will continue to be maintained and updated at Southampton by the current project secretary, Nicky Robbins.
- § Engagement with other collaborative projects, such as the following 5th Framework Programmes: ‘Does implementation matter? Informal administration practise shifting immigrant strategies in Four Member States’ (coordinator: Bo Strath);
‘Europeanization, Collective Identities, and Public Discourses (IDNET)’ (coordinator: Thomas Risse);
‘Orientations of Young Men and Women to Citizenship and European Identity’ (Lynn Jamieson, Edinburgh).
- § Local workshops with policymakers and young people in the communities we researched. Each team returned to the communities and organised workshops with various formats and target groups.
- § Cooperation with local projects, including the ‘Town 2030. Joint Visions of the Europe Town Goerlitz-Zgorzelec’, a local cross-border project aimed at developing future strategies for the integration of the two sides of this German-Polish town.
- § Our final conference in Zgorzelec where we discussed our findings with local representatives and two other cross-border projects: the Town 2030 project, mentioned above and a Czech-German-Polish sociological research project called ‘Biographical identities in the Borderland’.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

6.1 Acknowledgements

Many people in different capacities have helped to realise this research project. Our profoundest gratitude goes to the people who allowed us to interview them and to use their narratives as research data. We would like to thank all the families and individuals we interviewed in our border communities and whose names have to remain anonymous for reasons of confidentiality. All research teams experienced a great deal of invaluable local support from administrations and institutions, political representatives, NGOs, and from enthusiastic individuals who gave generously of their time and expertise. We are particularly indebted to:

IN THURINGIA AND BAVARIA: Elisabeth Mord; Ursula Meinhof; Arndt Schaffner, Robert Lebegern and Ingolf Hermann of the German-German Museum in Mödlareuth; Ulrike Leue and Rev. Gerhard Schneider.

IN GORIZIA: Mayor Gaetano Valenti; President of the Province of Gorizia Giorgio Brandolin; Chairman of *Caritas* Ruggero Dipiazza; and former Member of the Italian parliament Mario Prestamburgo.

IN NOVA GORICA: Mayor Crtomir Špacapan and the Rector of the University of Trieste Lucio Delcaro.

IN MOSCHENDORF: former Mayor Stefan Behm; current Mayor Peter Schlaffer; Mayor of Strem Werner Trinkl; and the Secretary of the local authority Jasmin Freibel.

IN PINKAMINDSZENT: Mayor János Martin and District Notary Jeno Tóth.

IN BÄRENSTEIN: Mayor Wolfgang Franke; Father Steffen Boerner and Chronicler Hugo Glaser;

IN VEJPRTY: Mayor Václav Netolický, Journalist Josef Kadlec and Vladislav Kounovský of the Music School. Zdena Binterová of the Regional Museum in Chomutov, Pavla Nová of the Police Museum in Prague, the regional archive in Chomutov, Journalist Mario Kaden, and Edmund Lauterbach and Gerhard Scharf of the Heimatausschuss Weipert.

EISENKAPPEL/ZELEZNA KAPLA AND JEZERSKO: Our thanks to everyone who helped our research, both NGO's all the families that we spoke to.

IN GÖRLITZ: Mayor Rolf Karbaum and staff, Dr Birgit Dippe and the Euroschule Görlitz, Marion Seifert, Pascal Rouxel and Katrin Köhler.

IN ZGORZELEC: Mayor Miroslaw Fiedorowicz and staff, Radoslaw Baranowski and the Dom Kultury, Zbyszek Dobrzynski, Jan Kabanienko, Hanna Barbara Majewska and the Zubrzycki family.

We would like to express our gratitude to the European Commission which funded our project under the Fifth Framework Programme, and especially our scientific officer at the Commission, Aris Apollonatos, who has provided us with continuous assistance and encouragement. We would also like to thank our consultants Carl James, Teresa Tavares and Louise O'Neill at Iago European Consultants Ltd, Leeds.

Last but not least, we wish to thank our project secretaries Karen Hand and Nicky Robbins for their priceless support.

6.2 References

Below is a full list of publications which have arisen from the research carried out for the project. For an extensive bibliography please consult the project website at: www.borderidentities.com

Armbruster, Heidi & Ulrike H. Meinhof (2002) 'Working Identities: Key Narratives in a Former Border Region in Germany.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 15-32.

Armbruster, Heidi & Ulrike H. Meinhof (forthcoming) 'Memories of Home? Narratives of Readjustment on the German/Polish and former German/German Borders' in *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative* edited by J.Thornborrow & J.Coates.

Armbruster, Heidi & Ulrike H. Meinhof (forthcoming) Embodied Borderlands. Narratives of Place and Cognition on the former German-German Border. *Revue Geographique de l'Est*.

Armbruster, Heidi, Craig Rollo & Ulrike H. Meinhof (forthcoming) 'Imagining Europe. Everyday Narratives in European Border Communities.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Carli, Augusto, Cristina Guardiano, Majda Kaucic-Basa, Emidio Sussi, Mariselda Tessarolo & Marina Ussai (forthcoming) 'Asserting ethnic identity and power through language.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Carli, Augusto, Emidio Sussi & Majda Kaucic-Basa (2002) 'History and Stories: Identity Construction on the Italian-Slovenian Border.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 33-51.

Galasinska, Aleksandra (forthcoming, a) ““One needs to grow up for Europe!” Discourses of Europe in a Polish border community”. Forthcoming in proceedings of the International Conference on Globalisation: English and Language Change in Europe, edited by Anna Duszak, John Benjamins.

Galasinska, Aleksandra (forthcoming, b) ‘Temporal shifts in photo-elicited narratives in a Polish border town’, *Narrative Inquiry*.

Galasinska, Aleksandra & Dariusz Galasinski (forthcoming, a) 'One needs to grow up for Europe!' Discourses of Europe in Polish border communities. Chapter in the book "European world view: narratives of the people of Europe. ed. John Wilson and Sharon Millar.

Galasinska, Aleksandra & Dariusz Galasinski (forthcoming, b) 'Silence and identity. Untold stories in narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border', *Multilingua*.

Galasinska, Aleksandra & Dariusz Galasinski (forthcoming, c) 'Discursive strategies of coping with sensitive topics of the Other.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Galasinska, Aleksandra, Craig Rollo & Ulrike H. Meinhof (2002) 'Urban Space and the Construction of Identity on the German-Polish Border.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 119-139.

Galasinski, Dariusz & Aleksandra Galasinska (forthcoming) 'Untold stories of advantage in narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border'. *Multilingua*. Special issue on Silence, guest ed. A. Jaworski.

Hipfl, Brigitte (2001) ““Shifting Borders” – a Case Study of Identity Discourses in a European Border Region”, at <http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/cpin/cpinfolder/papers/brigitte.htm>

Hipfl, Brigitte, Anita Bister, Petra Strohmeier & Brigitta Busch (2002) 'Shifting Borders: Spatial Constructions of Identity in an Austrian-Slovenian Border Region.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 53-74.

Holly, Werner (2002a) 'Traces of Czech-German History in Biographical Interviews at the Border: Constructions of Identities and the Year 1938 in Bärenstein-Vejprty.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 95-118.

Holly, Werner (2002b) "Mit nischt". Der Frame 'Vertreibung' in biographischen Interviews an der deutsch-tschechischen Grenze'. In *Vorträge der finnischen Germanistentagung in Turku 2001*, ed. Dagmar Neuendorff, Helsinki.

Holly, Werner, Jiri Nekvapil, Ilona Scherm & Pavla Tiserova (forthcoming) 'Unequal Neighbours: Coping with Asymmetries.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Meinhof, Ulrike H. (2001a) 'Can a Discourse Analyst also be an Ethnographer?' The Clarion. 'The View from Elsewhere'. Vol 7:1 p.23

Meinhof, Ulrike H. (2001b) 'Discourse and Identity' in *Atti del 2o congresso di studi dell'Associazione Italiana di Linguistica Applicata* edited by Camilla Bettoni et al. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni.

Meinhof, Ulrike H. (ed.) (2002) *Living (with) Borders: Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe*. Border Regions Studies 1. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Meinhof, Ulrike H. (ed.) (forthcoming) Bordering European Identities. Special Issue on Borders. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

Meinhof, Ulrike H. (forthcoming) 'Migrating borders: an introduction to European identity construction in process.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Meinhof, Ulrike H., Heidi Armbruster & Craig Rollo (2002) Identity Discourses on Est-West Borders in Europe: An Introduction'. In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 1-13.

Meinhof, Ulrike H. & Dariusz Galasinski (2000) *Border Discourse. Changing Identities, Changing Nations, Changing Stories in European Border Communities. A State-of-the-Art Report*. European Commission.

Meinhof, Ulrike H. & Dariusz Galasinski (2002) 'Reconfiguring East-West identities: cross-generational discourses in German and Polish border communities' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Vol 28:163-82.

Pavlakovich, Vera K., Barbara Morehouse & Doris Wastl-Walter (eds.) (in press) *Challenged Borderlands: Transcending Political and Cultural Boundaries*. Border Regions Studies 2. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Rollo, Craig (2002) 'European Border Identities' *Languages at Southampton*, Vol. 1/1

Scherm, Ilona (2001) 'Geschichte(n) an der deutsch/sächsisch-tschechischen Grenze. Das EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ an der TU Chemnitz.' In: Mehnert, Elke (ed.): *Gute Nachbarn – schlechte Nachbarn. Tagungsband des 4. Deutsch-tschechischen Kooperationsseminars der Technischen Universität Chemnitz und der Westböhmischen Universität Plzen*, Chemnitz 2001, p.146-150.

Scherm, Ilona (2002) 'Das Ende des „Prager Frühlings“ an der sächsisch-böhmisichen Grenze bei Bärenstein und Vejprty/Weipert – dargestellt in biographischen Interviews der ältesten Generation'. In: Mehnert, Elke (ed.): *Gute Nachbarn – schlechte Nachbarn. Tagungsband des 5. Deutsch-tschechischen Kooperationsseminars der Technischen Universität Chemnitz und der Westböhmischen Universität Plzen*, Chemnitz 2002, p.213-226.

Váradi Monika Mária, Doris Wastl-Walter & Friedrich Veider (2002) 'A végek csöndje. Határnarratívak az osztrák-magyar határvidékről'. In: *Regio. Kisebbség, Politika, Társadalom* 13, 2002, p.85-107

Wastl-Walter, Doris & Monika M. Varadi (in press) 'Ruptures in the Austro-Hungarian Border Area.' In: Pavlakovich et al (eds).

Wastl-Walter, Doris, Monika M. Varadi & Friedrich Veider (2002) 'Bordering silence. Border narratives from the Austro-Hungarian border'. In: Meinhof (ed.), pp.75-93.

Wastl-Walter, Doris, Monika Varadi & Friedrich Veider (forthcoming) 'To Stay or to Leave. Coping with Marginality.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

7. ANNEXES

§ List of Publications, Conference Presentations & any other papers

CONSORTIUM MEMBERS:

Conferences/Papers

Whole consortium

28.11-1.12.02 Final conference in Zgorzelec

27.11.2002 Presentation and discussion of project results with delegates from the scenario conference of the project 'Town 2030. Joint Visions of the Europe Town Goerlitz-Zgorzelec.'

04.2003 Centre for African Cultures and Civilisations. GIPSC project in Lagos, Nigeria. *African/European symposium on Border Identities*. Supported by the British Council and the British Academy.

SOUTHAMPTON

Conferences/Papers

Heidi Armbruster

5-7.07.2001 'Memories of Home? Narratives of Readjustment on the German-Polish and former German-German border', Fifth Cardiff Round Table in Sociolinguistics, Gregynog.

Heidi Armbruster, Ulrike H. Meinhof, Craig Rollo

04.03.2002 School of Modern Languages Research Seminar, University of Southampton. 'EU Border Identities: German Perspectives'.

04-06.04.2002 Sociolinguistic Symposium 14, Ghent. "Da kammer halt nix machen": Discourse strategies of responsibility and its avoidance in contemporary Germany.

Heidi Armbruster, Craig Rollo

13-15.09.2002 'Revisiting the Majority: Narratives of Identity on the German/Polish and former German/German Border', University of Southampton in association with the German History Society - GERMAN HISTORY FROM THE MARGINS

Ulrike H. Meinhof

8.03.2001 'Discourses of Identity on the German-Polish Border', University of Wales, Aberystwyth.

23-25.03.2001 Special workshop, 'Discourse analysis. A research method in cultural studies', University of Klagenfurt.

2-3.04.2001 'Stories of Displacement: Three-generation families and the narrative construction of a lost Heimat', Invited special workshop: Bo Stråth.

23-24.04.2001 EU Fifth Framework Seminar, Brussels.

15-17.06.2001 Second Tinos Conference: '20 Years of Greece in the European Union, The Moving Frontiers of Identities in Europe', Cicladic Academy for Europe, invited participant.

18-19.06.2001 ID-net Meeting. European Research Institute, Fiesole, Italy (in collaboration with Ohio State University).

9.07.2001 South African Association for Applied Linguistics, organiser of plenary symposium: 'Discourses of Identity'. Paper on Border Identities in Europe. Grahamstown.

10-12.10.2001 Dialogue Among Civilisations: Rethinking the Concept of the 'Enemy', Antananarivo Madagascar, in conjunction with Unesco. Plenary Talk followed by panel discussion. 'Border Identities in Europe and the Construction of 'the Other'.'

31.10.2001 Cross London Seminar in Language and Literacy, King's College London. Paper: 'Can a discourse analyst also be an ethnographer?'

1.11.2001 Open University, Milton Keynes, Sound recording of panel discussion on German Identity.

15.01.2002 Queen Mary's College, University of London 'European border identities'

15.05.2002 Goldsmiths College, London – Educations faculty 'EU Border Identities: combining ethnography with discourse analysis'.

21.06.2002 CILT, Scotland – Keynote at conference. 'Discourses of identity and identification: an applied linguists perspective.'

31.10.2002 Invited paper: Grenzidentitaeten im neuen Europa Institute for Social Science/ Lehrstuhl für Kommunikations und Politikwissenschaft. University of Erlangen-Nuernberg

09.12.2002 Annual lecture: 'European border experiences: narratives of identity and identification'. Centre for European Studies Research, University of Portsmouth.

10.12.2002 13th AILA World Congress, Singapore. Colloquium paper 'Searching for European Identity in EU Borderlands'.

02-05.02.2003 'Language and Identity: Talking about and across East – West European border communities.' International Seminar on Globalisation, organised by the British Council. Cumberland Lodge, Windsor, UK.

05.2003 Two day series of seminars and lectures. Nijmegen, Holland.
'Researching European borders'.

Craig Rollo, Ulrike Meinhof

19-21.09.2002 'I'm a European, but a West European. Narratives of Europe, the EU and Enlargement in a German Border Town' International Conference on Globalisation: English and Language Change in Europe, University of Warsaw

Publications

Heidi Armbruster, Ulrike Meinhof, Craig Rollo

(forthcoming) 'Imagining Europe. Everyday Narratives in European Border Communities.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

2002 'Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe: An Introduction'. In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 1-13.

Ulrike H. Meinhof

2001 'Can a Discourse Analyst also be an Ethnographer?' The Clarion.
'The View from Elsewhere'. Vol 7:1 p.23

2001 'Discourse and Identity' in *Atti del 2o congresso di studi dell'Associazione Italiana di Linguistica Applicata* edited by Camilla Bettoni et al. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni

2002 (ed.) *Living (with) Borders: Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe*. Border Regions Studies 1. Aldershot: Ashgate.

(forthcoming) (ed.) Bordering European Identities. Special Issue on Borders. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

(forthcoming) 'Migrating borders: an introduction to European identity construction in process.' In Meinhof (ed.) (forthcoming).

Ulrike H. Meinhof & Dariusz Galasinski

2002 *Border Discourse. Changing Identities, Changing Nations, Changing Stories in European Border Communities. A State-of-the-Art Report*. European Commission.

2002 'Reconfiguring East-West identities: cross-generational discourses in German and Polish border communities' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Vol 28:163-82

Dariusz Galasinski & U.H. Meinhof

2002 Looking Across the River, German-Polish Border Communities and the Construction of the Other *Journal of Language and Politics* 1(1)

Heidi Armbruster & Ulrike H. Meinhof

2003 (forthcoming) 'Memories of Home? Narratives of Readjustment on the German/Polish and former German/German Borders' in *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative* edited by J.Thornborrow & J.Coates.

2002 'Working Identities: Key Narratives in a Former Border Region in Germany.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 15-32.

(forthcoming) 'Memories of Home? Narratives of Readjustment on the German/Polish and former German/German Borders' in *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative* edited by J.Thornborrow & J.Coates.

Craig Rollo
June 2002 'Languages at Southampton': Vol. 1, Issue 1 – European Border Identities

Aleksandra Galasinska, Craig Rollo, Ulrike Meinhof
2002 'Urban Space and the Construction of Identity on the German-Polish Border.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 119-139.

Teaching
Heidi Armbruster, Ulrike Meinhof, Craig Rollo
Final year course based on research entitled 'Discourses of Identity'.

Craig Rollo
25-27.10.2001 Participation in "Symposium Europäische Integrationsbestrebungen auf politischer und regionaler Ebene - Tschechien und Polen"
Organised by TU Chemnitz, LSt für Politikwissenschaft und LSt für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeographie

Other activities
28.10.2002 A meeting with discussion with young people in Görlitz, , organised with Institut fur okologische Raumentwicklung (Dresden) and Project Stadt 2030, www.stadt2030-goerlitz-zgorzelec.de

30.10.2002 Workshop with young people from Hof and Schleiz. Workshop with local policymakers, Moedlareuth.

27.11 - Preparation of final conference in Zgorzelec
1.12.2002

March 2003 Preparation of some of the project materials as a learning and teaching resource for German Studies

WOLVERHAMPTON/SOUTHAMPTON

Conferences/Papers

Dariusz Galasinski

23.03.2001 'The (un)settled past. Narratives and the constructions of memories in German and Polish border communities' Narrative in Discourse Analysis and Socio-cultural Research, University of Leeds.

27-28.04.2001 "Mafia or returning Germans? Perceptions of security in two Polish towns on the border with Germany", Regional Security and Borders in Post-Communist Europe Workshop, CREES, University of Birmingham.

9.01.2002 D. Galasinski, University of Opole (Institute of Polish Philology): "Context and the discursive construction of identity".

22.06.2002 Narratives of the disenfranchised self in the Polish post-communist reality. A conference on Post-communism: Theory and Practice Warwick, UK.

4-7. 07.2002 Discursive constructions of disenfranchisement. The positioning of self in the Polish post-communist reality. International seminar on: 'Poststructuralist. Psychoanalysis. Politics. Wroclaw, Poland.

28.11-
1.12.2002 Summary of the project's results, Final Conference, Zgorzelec.

July, 2002 Discursive constructions of disenfranchisement. The positioning of self in the Polish post-communist reality. 'Poststructuralism. Psychoanalysis. Politics.' International seminar, University of Wroclaw, Poland.

June, 2002 Narratives of disenfranchised Self in the Polish post-communist reality. A Conference on 'Post-Communism: Theory and Practice. Warwick.

June 2001 Bradford University (Department of Modern Languages): "Border discourses and border identities. Construction of nationality in Polish border communities".

Aleksandra Galasinska & Dariusz Galasinski

11-16.07.2001 Shopping for new identity. Changing constructions of the Polish-German border in a Polish border community. (to be presented at) 35th World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology 'The Moral Fabric in Contemporary Societies'. Krakow.

10-15.07.2002 Untold stories of advantage in narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border. 8th International Conf. of Language and Social Psychology, Hong-Kong.

10-15.07.2002 Untold stories of advantage. Narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border, 8th ICLASP, Hong Kong.

26-27.11.2002 Scientific preliminaries for identifying attitudes and identities of the inhabitants of Zgorzelec, Scenario Conference, Zgorzelec.

Aleksandra Galasinska

4-6. 04.2002 "Those in power have large families." Media and authorities in narratives of responsibility in a Polish border town. Sociolinguistic Symposium 14, Ghent, Belgium.

19-21.09.2002 -"One needs to grow up for Europe!" Discourses of Europe in a Polish border community. (forthcoming), International Conference on Globalisation: English and Language Change in Europe, Warsaw.

22-24.11.2001 'Such a little wing, such leftovers' Discursive constructions of a Polish border town. International conference on 'Language, migration and the city'. University of Bayreuth, 22-24 November, 2001.

'One needs to grow up for Europe!' Discourses of Europe in a Polish border community. International Conference on Globalisation: English and Language Change in Europe, Warsaw-Falenty, 19-21 September 2002. (A. Galasinska)

Publications

Ulrike H. Meinhof & Dariusz Galasinski

2002 "Reconfiguring East-West identities: family discourses in German and Polish border communities". *JEMS* 2002

Dariusz Galasinski & Ulrike H. Meinhof

2002 Looking Across the River, German-Polish Border Communities and the Construction of the Other *Journal of Language and Politics* 1(1)

Aleksandra Galasinska & Dariusz Galasinski

(forthcoming). D. Galasinski, A. Galasinska, Untold stories of advantage in narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border. "Multilingua" - special issue on "Silence", guest ed. A. Jaworski,

(forthcoming) A. Galasinska, D. Galasinski, 'One needs to grow up for Europe!' Discourses of Europe in Polish border communities. Chapter in the book "European world view: narratives of the people of Europe. ed. John Wilson and Sharon Millar.

(forthcoming) A. Galasinska, "One needs to grow up for Europe!" Discourses of Europe in a Polish border community. Forthcoming in proceedings of the International Conference on Globalisation: English and Language Change in Europe, edited by Anna Duszak, John Benjamins.

(forthcoming) A. Galasinska, Temporal shifts in photo-elicited narratives in a Polish border town, *Narrative Inquiry*.

(forthcoming) A. Galasinska, D. Galasinski, Discursive strategies of coping with sensitive topics of the Other, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (ed. Meinhof)

(forthcoming) A. Galasinska, D. Galasinski, Silence and identity. Untold stories in narratives of ethnic conflict on the Polish-German border, *Multilingua*.

Teaching

A. Galasinska

12.03.02 Invited session about data collection in ethnographical > projects for MA students, Univ. of Bradford.
D. Galasinski

Other activities

28.10.2002 A meeting with discussion with young people in Görlitz, , organised with Institut fur okologische Raumentwicklung (Dresden) and Project Stadt 2030, www.stadt2030-goerlitz-zgorzelec.de

Reviews of German/Polish border project, by other authors

Jan 2003 The project was reported in detail by Marzenna Guz-Vetter in *Polsko-Niemieckie pogranicze* (Polish-German borderland) published by the Institute of Public Affairs (Warsaw, 2002) in Poland. An interview with Dr Galasinski conducted by Ms Guz-Vetter will be broadcast on Westdeutscher Rundfunk ('Neue Heimat').

CHEMNITZ

Conferences/Papers

Chemnitz team

25.10.2002 *Workshop in Bärenstein, „Sächsisches Haus“*
§ organizing the workshop, translating all invitations, statements, programmes, lists etc. in Czech, presenting a little exhibition of the photos used in the interviews and other documents related to history
§ statements about "Images of the EU-enlargement" (Ilona Scherm), "Images of Asymmetries and Conflicts at middle-east European borders: Unequal Neighbours" (Werner Holly), "Images of explosive Phases in history" (Werner Holly, Pavla Tišerová)
§ articles (based on interviews with Werner Holly) in several newspapers in connection with the workshop: "Freie Presse" Chemnitz, 25th Oct. 2002
"VDI Nachrichten" Köln, 31st Oct. 2002
Gerhard Scharf: Workshop in Bärenstein, in: "Mei' Erzgebirg" (periodical of the Sudeten-German inhabitants of Weipert), Dec. 2002, 48, Nr. 579, p. 17
Mario Totzauer: "Ungleiche Nachbarn entlang der Grenze", dtpa (German-Czech Press Agency, online), 28th Oct. 2002
§ radio interviews with Werner Holly (BBC Sachsen) and Ilona Scherm (Mdr3 Kultur)

Werner Holly

6.09.01 „Mit nischt“. Der Frame ,Vertreibung‘ in biographischen Interviews an der deutsch-tschechischen Grenze.
at the Finnish Germanisttagung in Abo/Turku, (appears in 2002 in the conference transcript)

23.04.2002 "Mit nischt!" Der Frame „Vertreibung“ in biographischen Interviews an der sächsisch-böhmischem Grenze. University of Regensburg

15.05.2002 Vorstellung der Arbeit des Projektes "Border Identities", biographische Interviews am Beispiel des geschichtlich bedeutsamen Jahres 1938
Gemeinsamer Projekt-Workshop mit dem Projekt „Biographical Identity in the Borderlands“ des Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Prof. Dr. František Zich & team)
Thema: Biographische Interviews
EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ der TU Chemnitz und Institute of Sociology Univerzita Ústí nad Labem/CZ

8.07.2002 "Mit nischt!" Der Frame „Vertreibung“ in biographischen Interviews an der sächsisch-böhmischem Grenze. University of Bayreuth

31.07.2002 Grenzidentitäten an mittel-ost-europäischen Grenzen
TU Chemnitz, 29. Internationaler Sommerkurs für deutsche Sprache

24.10.2002 The EU-Project "Border Identities" at the TU Chemnitz – Research questions and summing-up the project's key results (in German), lecture at the 6th Politik- und Regionalwissenschaftlichen Symposium „Die MOE-Staaten vor dem EU-Beitritt – Chancen und Probleme aus politik- und regionalwissenschaftlicher Sicht“ at the TU Chemnitz

Petr Bednarský:

30.03.2001 „Soziale Kategorien“, Linguistic Circle, TU Chemnitz

12.06.2001 „Biographisches Erzaehlen und Identitaetsbildung an der deutsch-tschechischen Grenze“, University of Regensburg. International Conference: Perspektiven der deutsch-tschechischen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen

Ilona Scherm:

24.03.2001 Geschichte(n) an der sächsisch-tschechischen Grenze: Das EU-Projekt "Border Identities" an der TU Chemnitz. 4. deutsch-tschechisches Begegnungsseminar „Gute Nachbarn – schlechte Nachbarn“, Markersbach

21.09.2001 „Das Jahr 1938 an der sächsisch-böhmischem Grenze.“ Biographische Interviews des Projekts „Border Identities“ der TU Chemnitz, at the Heimatpolitisches Herbstseminar des Heimatkreises Mies-Pilsen in Schloss Schney,

23.09.2002 The EU-Project “Border Identities” at the TU Chemnitz (in German),
statement at the 5th Sächsische Regionalplanertagung (Conference of Saxon Regional Planners) in Oberwiesenthal

30.09.2002 The role of historical events (1938, 1945-47, 1968) and their influence on development of personal and national identity (in English),
lecture in the Summer Course for American students “Civilisation and Culture of Central Europe” at the TU Chemnitz

08.11.2002 The EU-Project “Border Identities” at the TU Chemnitz (in German),
statement at the Arbeitstagung Egerländer Kulturschaffender in Marktredwitz

11.11.2002 11.11.2002 – History and national identity (in German),
lecture at the Hochschulgeographischen Fachtagung der TU Chemnitz (TUC) und der Westböhmischen Universität (WBU) on 11th and 12th November 2002 in Pernink/CZ and Annaberg-Buchholz/D

Pavla Tišerová:

6-7.11.2001 „Erlebte Grenze. Projekt Border Identities an der TU Chemnitz.“
at the conference: „Národní identita - determinanty a subjektivní vnímání v podmírkách současné multietnické společnosti“, in Opava, CZ
(appears in 2002 in the conference transcript)

28.02.2002 „Das Pilsner Studienbegleitprogramm als Modell interkultureller Sprachvermittlung“
Tagung „Fremdsprachen an Hochschulen. Intergration – Interdisziplinarität – Internationalität“ Fremdsprachenzentrum der TU Chemnitz
TU Chemnitz

21.03.2002 „Europäische Perspektiven und Probleme der Tschechischen Republik“
Seminar „Die Tschechische Republik auf dem Weg in die Europäische Union“ Bildungsstätte Heiligenhof der Sudeten deutschen Landsmannschaft
Bad Kissingen

07.05.2002 “Geschichte(n) an der sächsisch-tschechischen Grenze. Das EU-Projekt, Border Identities“ Infoseminar anlässlich der Europa-Woche 2002 (mit Ilona Scherm)
im Auftrag der Sächsischen Staatskanzlei Dresden
Rathaus Chemnitz

12.09.2002 Konstruktion der Identitäten an der sächsisch-böhmisichen Grenze“ within the scope of the seminar "Europäische Perspektiven der Tschechischen Republik und Polens" organised by: Bildungsstätte Heiligenhof, Bad Kissingen

20.11.2002 „Wissenschaftliche Studien zum Meinungsbild von Tschechen und Deutschen im Grenzgebiet“ within the scope of the seminar "Aktuelle heimatpolitische Entwicklungen" organised by: Bildungsstätte Heiligenhof, Bad Kissingen

23.11.2002 „Ungleiche Nachbarn: Asymmetrien an der sächsisch-böhmisichen Grenze“ within the scope of the intercultural seminar "Perspektiven der tschechisch-deutschen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. Unternehmensführung im vereinten Europa" organised by: Verband Deutscher Unternehmer in der Tschechischen Republik, Goethe-Institut Prag in the Handwerkskammer (Chamber of Handicraft) Chemnitz

Jirí Nekvapil:

15-17.11.2001 Distributed dialogical networks as a way of doing politics (Paper presented at the international conference 'Sprache und politischer Wandel', Universität Wien)

22-24.11.2001 On the Role of the Languages of Adjacent States and the Languages of Ethnic Minorities in Multilingual Europe: the Case of the Czech Republic (Report presented at the international conference 'The future of European multilingualism in the enlarged European Union', University of Vienna,)

27.05.2002 Sprachbiographien und Analyse der Sprachsituationen: Zur Situation der Deutschen in der Tschechischen Republik
University of Erlangen

20.08.2002 Language and Identity in the Czech-German Borderland
(in Czech), lecture in the framework of Summer School of Slavic Languages, Prague, Faculty of Arts, Charles University

10.09.2002 Linguistic Aspects of Memebership Categorizations (in English), paper presented at the Euroconference Interactional Linguistics, Helsinki

12.11.2002 12.11.2002 - Information on the Project (in Czech), lecture in the framework of the Seminar on the Anthropology of the Border, Prague, Faculty of Humanities, Charles University

05.12.2002 Language Biography Narrative as a Sociolinguistic Method (in English), paper presented at the International Symposion "Varietätenforschung", Heidelberg

Publications

Werner Holly

2002a 'Traces of Czech-German History in Biographical Interviews at the Border: Constructions of Identities and the Year 1938 in Bärenstein-Vejprty.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 95-118.

2002b 'Mit nischt'. Der Frame 'Vertreibung' in biographischen Interviews an der deutsch-tschechischen Grenze'. In *Vorträge der finnischen Germanistentagung in Turku 2001*, ed. Dagmar Neuendorff, Helsinki.

Ilona Scherm

2001 Geschichte(n) an der deutsch/sächsisch-tschechischen Grenze. Das EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ an der TU Chemnitz. In: Mehnert, Elke (ed.): Gute Nachbarn – schlechte Nachbarn. Tagungsband des 4. Deutsch-tschechischen Kooperationsseminars der Technischen Universität Chemnitz und der Westböhmischen Universität Plzen, Chemnitz 2001, p.146-150

2002 Das Ende des „Prager Frühlings“ an der sächsisch-böhmisichen Grenze bei Bärenstein und Vejprty/Weipert – dargestellt in biographischen Interviews der ältesten Generation. In: Mehnert, Elke (ed.): Gute Nachbarn – schlechte Nachbarn. Tagungsband des 5. Deutsch-tschechischen Kooperationsseminars der Technischen Universität Chemnitz und der Westböhmischen Universität Plzen, Chemnitz 2002, p.213-226

Werner Holly, Jiri Nekvapil, Ilona Scherm, Pavla Tiserova

(forthcoming) 'Unequal Neighbours: Coping with Asymmetries.' In Meinhof (ed.)

Other Activities:

Werner Holly

4.07.2001 Data session about the EU-project "Border Identities", Linguistic Circle, TU Chemnitz,

Ilona Scherm
since 2000 contacts with (and permanent exchange of views on the project)

- Mr Vogt, Archivar bei der Bundesbeauftragten für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Außenstelle Chemnitz
- Prof. Dr. Peter Jurczek, Lehrstuhl für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeographie der TU Chemnitz (u.a. Gutachter für INTERREG-Programme in der Euregio Egrensis)
- Doz. Dr Milan Jerábek, Ustí nad Labem
- Prof Dr. Jaroslav Dokoupil, Plzen

02.02.2001 participation at the annual press conference of the Euregio Egrensis in Mitterteich/Bavaria

23-25.03.2001 participation at „Gute Nachbarn-schlechte Nachbarn“, 4. deutsch-tschechisches Begegnungsseminar. Markersbach/Erzgebirge (see above)

2-3.04.2001 participation at the symposium „EU-Osterweiterung und Arbeitsmarkt“, arranged by the Euregio Egrensis. Karlovy Vary/CZ, discussion with mayors and other local policy makers about the EU-project „Border Identities“

24.04.2001 meeting in Baerenstein and Vejprty mit dem Heimatbetreuer von Weipert, Eduard Lauterbach (Oberursel), in the afternoon short presentation of the project at the Seniorenclub der Arbeiterwohlfahrt Baerenstein (with Pavla Tišerová)

8.05.2001 participation in „Von INTERREG II-A zu INTERREG III-A“, Vortrag zu EU-Gemeinschaftsinitiativen in Südwestsachsen. Regierungspräsidium Chemnitz (within the Europa-Woche 2001)

9.05.2001 participation in „Aktuelle Fragen der grenzübergreifenden Zusammenarbeit in Südwestsachsen – Nordwestböhmen“, lecture of Prof.Dr. Peter Jurczek, TU Chemnitz, within the Europa-Woche 2001

11.05.2001 Mothers' Day Celebration at the „Bund der Deutschen“ in Vejprty (with Pavla Tišerová)

12.05.2001 information desk of the Europa-Union Deutschland, Kreisverband Wunsiedel, informations about Czech-German relations- July 12th: Berufungsvorträge an der TU Chemnitz für den Studiengang „Europäische Verwaltung“

11.08.2001 Teilnahme am Heimattreffen in Vejprty – Bärenstein. Veranstalter: Heimatverband Weipert in Gunzenhausen. Ort: Vejprty, Bärenstein Gespräche mit Fr.Lorenz, Hr. Scharf, Ortschronist Glaser. Thema: EU-Projekt Border Identities

21-23.09.2001 Teilnahme am Heimatpolitischen Herbstseminar des Heimatkreises Mies-Pilsen in Schloss Schney. Vortrag (s.o.)

11.10.2001 Teilnahme an Studienfahrt des Lehrstuhls für Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeographie der TU Chemnitz und European Studies nach Ustí n.L. dort Gespräch mit Doz. Milan Jerabek, Soziologisches Institut über das EU-Projekt „Border Identities“

17.10.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen. Vortrag Kurt Biedenkopf: "Sachsen im neuen Europa" Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz

25-27.10.2001 Teilnahme am "Symposium Europäische Integrationsbestrebungen auf politischer und regionaler Ebene - Tschechien und Polen"
Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz, LSt für Politikwissenschaft und LSt für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeographie. Ort: TU Chemnitz

28.10.2001 Teilnahme an der Kulturtagung der Egerländer Gmoi Podiumsdiskussion zum Thema: „Heimatvertriebene und Heimatverbliebene“ Veranstalter: Egerländer Gmoi. Ort: Egerland-Kulturhaus, Marktredwitz

07.11.2001 Teilnahme an Diskussionsveranstaltung „10 Jahre Sächsisch-Böhmisches Euroregionen“ im Rahmen der Deutsch-Tschechischen Wochen Dresden. Ort: Brücke-Villa, Dresden

10.11.2001 Teilnahme an Verleihung des Euregio-Egrensis-Preises in Boží Dar

14.11.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen. Vortrag Hans Lemberg: "Mitbewohner - Konkurrenten - Nachbarn. Deutsche und Tschechen in ihrer gegenseitigen Wahrnehmung" Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz. Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114

16-18.11.2001 Teilnahme an der Tagung „Europa der Regionen – Bayerische und böhmische Identität“ Veranstalter: Ev.-luth. Heimvolkshochschule
Ort: Bad Alexandersbad

27.11.2001 Teilnahme am Gastvortrag von Doz. Dr. Heikki Eskeleinen, Universität Joensuu/Finnland über „Cross-border co-operation at the Finnish-Karelian border“ Veranstalter: LSt für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeographie der TU Chemnitz. Ort: TU Chemnitz

28.11.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen. Vortrag Pavel Kohout: "Die Tschechen und die Deutschen zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft" Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz. Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114. Gespräch mit Pavel Kohout, Schriftsteller, Bericht über das Projekt "Border Identities"

23.01.2002 Teilnahme am Seminar „EU-Erweiterung: Investition in die Zukunft“ Veranstalter: IHK Südwestsachsen, Handwerkskammer Chemnitz. Ort: IHK Chemnitz

15.02.2002 Jahrespressekonferenz der Euregio Egrensis, Rathaus Marienbad/Mariánské Lázně

25.04.2002 Ausstellungseröffnung im Egerland-Kulturhaus Marktredwitz

03.05.2002 Workshop des COPE-Projekts des Landkreises Annaberg und der Stadt Videbæk/Dänemark: Präsentation der Projektidee für Bärenstein und Vejprty, Sächsisches Haus Bärenstein

03.05.2002 Eröffnung der Europa-Woche in Bayern mit Staatsminister Reinhold Bocklet. Selb, Rosenthal-Theater

06.05.2002 „Die EU-Erweiterung – Verhandlungsstand. Focus: Tschechien“ Runder Tisch des Euro Info Centre IHK Chemnitz

08.05.2002 „Interreg III A – eine bedeutende Förderung der EU im sächs.-tschech. Grenzraum“ Informationsveranstaltung, Regierungspräsidium Chemnitz

15.05.2002 Gemeinsamer Projekt-Workshop mit dem Projekt „Biographical Identity in the Borderlands“ des Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Prof. Dr. František Zich & team) Thema: Biographische Interviews EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ der TU Chemnitz und Institute of Sociology Univerzita Jan Purkyne Ústí nad Labem

25.11.2002 Meeting with journalists from “audioscop medien Schwarzenberg” about the project and further possible activities in the border region

13.12.2002 Representing the project at the Christmassy celebration of the “Bund der Deutschen” in Vejprty, meeting the new mayor of Vejprty, Mrs Gavdunova and the vice-mayor; visiting the exhibition “Vejprty in old photos”, organised by the City of Vejprty and Kadyo enterprise in Vejprty

Pavla Tišerová
since 2000

- contacts with the Deutsch-Tschechisches Gesprächsforum, Prague Prof. Dr. Otto Pick Exchange about teaching foreign languages in Germany and the Czech Republic and about bilateral scientific projects
- contacts with the Organisation der Deutschen in Westböhmen, Pilsen. President: Mrs Gertrud Trepková. Regular exchange and common activities about German-Czech relations, report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“
- contacts with the Czech Centers in Berlin and Dresden report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

3.02.2001 meeting of the project team of the international project „Form und Gebrauch des Deutschen in Mittel- und Osteuropa“ Mannheim co-ordinator Dr. Claudia M. Riehl; report about aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

10.02.2001 working-party of the Sudeten-German pedagogues in Dingolfing, Pilsen; President Dr. Hans Mirtes, report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

14-15.02.2001 Annual meeting of the Germanists' Association of the Czech Republic, Ostrava. Report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

March 2001 Nancy Haupt, University of Dresden
Co-support of the term paper: „Entwicklung der Sprachinseln in Tschechien“

2-4.03.2001 assembly of the „Freundeskreis der sudetendeutschen Mundarten“, Bad Kissingen, report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

24.04.2001 visit of Vejprty with „Ortsbetreuer“ Mr Eduard Lauterbach together with Ilona Scherm
in the afternoon at the Pensioners' Association (Seniorenclub der Arbeiterwohlfahrt) Baerenstein: aims of the EU-project „Border Identities“

9.05.2001 participation at the panel discussion „EU-Osterweiterung: Wagnis oder Notwendigkeit?“, in the Haus der Jugend Spektrum in Chemnitz
statement: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

11.05.2001 Mothers' Day Celebration of the Bund der Deutschen im Erzgebirge, Vejprty
Conversation with the mayor of Vejprty, Mr Netolický, with Mr Petr Mlejnek, forthcoming candidate for the mayorship, with Mr Josef Kadlec, local journalist

24-27.05.2001 Study trip to the Egerland für Czech-learners at the TU Chemnitz, Franzensbad
Subject: History and Presence of the Czech-German neighbourhood
Organized by Pavla Tišerová

02-26.07.2001 Participation and organization of the training workshop of the international project: Atlas der deutschen Mundarten auf dem Gebiet der Tschechischen Republik, Pilsen
report: aims and methods of the EU-project „Border Identities“

7.08.2001 Vortrag an der Sommerschule TU Chemnitz
Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
Ort: TU Chemnitz, N112
Thema: „Böhmishe Dörfer. Zur Entwicklung des Deutschen in Böhmen.“

11.08.2001 Teilnahme am Heimattreffen in Vejprty – Bärenstein
Veranstalter: Heimatverband Weipert in Gunzenhausen
Ort: Vejprty, Bärenstein
Gespräche mit Bgm. Netolický, Fr. Lorenz, Hr. Scharf
Thema: EU-Projekt Border Identities

22.09.2001 Gespräche mit Vladimír Kaiser, Kreisarchiv Ústí n. Labem, Kristina Kaiserová, Kreismuseum Ústí n. Labem u. Institut für germano-slawische Studien an der JEP-Universität Ústí n. Labem
 Ort: Ústí n. Labem
 Thema: EU-Projekt Border Identities

27.09.2001 Vortrag auf der GAL-Tagung
 Veranstalter: Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistik
 Datum: 26.-29.09.01
 Ort: Universität Passau
 Thema: "Form und Gebrauch des Deutschen in Tschechien"

17.10.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen.
 Vortrag Kurt Biedenkopf: "Sachsen im neuen Europa"
 Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
 Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114
 Gespräche mit Partneruniversität Pilsen

25.10.2001 Teilnahme am "Symposium Europäische Integrationsbestrebungen auf politischer und regionaler Ebene - Tschechien und Polen"
 Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
 Ort: TU Chemnitz

27.10.2001 Vortrag am "Seminar für junge und mittlere Generation"
 Datum: 27.10.01
 Veranstalter: SL Hessen in Wiesbaden
 Ort: Wetzlar
 Vortrag: "Tschechen und Sudetendeutsche auf dem Weg zur Annäherung. Ein Wandel der Identitäten nach der Wende."

07.11.2001 Vortrag auf der Tagung "Nationale Identität - Determinanten und subjektive Wahrnehmung in den Bedingungen der heutigen multiethnischen Gesellschaft"
 Datum: 06.-07.11.01
 Veranstalter: Slezský ústav Slezského muzea v Opave, Dokumentační stredisko Rady Evropy pri Evropském informačním stredisku UK v Praze
 Ort: Opava, Slezský ústav SZM
 Vortrag: "Erlebte Grenze. Projekt Border Identities an der TU Chemnitz."

14.11.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen.
 Vortrag Hans Lemberg: "Mitbewohner - Konkurrenten - Nachbarn. Deutsche und Tschechen in ihrer gegenseitigen Wahrnehmung "
 Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
 Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114

22.11.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen.
 Vortrag František Cerný: "Die Osterweiterung der Europäischen Union. Der Meinungsstreit aus der Sicht des tschechischen Botschafters in der BRD a.D. "
 Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
 Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114
 Gespräch mit František Cerný, ehem. Botschafter der Tschechischen Republik in Deutschland, Bericht über das Projekt "Border Identities"

28.11.2001 Teilnahme an Vortragsreihe Zukunft Europa: Traditionen - Realitäten - Visionen.
 Vortrag Pavel Kohout: "Die Tschechen und die Deutschen zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft"
 Veranstalter: TU Chemnitz
 Ort: TU Chemnitz, N114
 Gespräch mit Pavel Kohout, Schriftsteller, Bericht über das Projekt "Border Identities"

17.01.2002 Vortrag: „Die Tschechische Republik auf dem Weg in die Europäische Union – Chancen und Risiken“ im Rahmen der Seminarwoche „Europäische Perspektiven der Republik Polen und der Tschechischen Republik“
 Veranstalter: Bildungsstätte Heiligenhof
 Ort: Heiligenhof, Bad Kissingen

seit November 2001 Vorbereitungen zur Gründung einer Deutsch-Tschechischen Gesellschaft in Chemnitz
 Ort: Chemnitz

20.01.2002 Teilnahme am Arbeitsreffen des Deutsch-Tschechischen Frauengesprächsforums zur Vorbereitung der internationalen Konferenz „Sprachbarrieren in Europa überbrücken“
 Veranstalter: Deutsch-Tschechisches Frauengesprächsforum Berlin
 Ort: Dresden, Studienhaus der Brücke/Most-Stiftung

26.01.2002 Vortrag „Das Projekt Border Identities an der TU Chemnitz“ an der Tagung „Biographien im Grenzraum“
 Veranstalter: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Dresden
 Ort: Seifhennersdorf

09.04.02 Tagung „Tschechisch und Deutsch im Kontakt“
 Universität Regensburg

13.04.02, Arbeitstagung zu „Sprachdynamik in Grenzregionen“
 Thema: Vorbereitung einer internationalen Konferenz und Entwicklung des Modells „Europäische Nachbarschaftsschule“
 Deutsch-Tschechisches Forum der Frauen
 Dresden, Brücke/Most-Studienhaus

17.04.2002, „Sachsen und Tschechien - Chancen der Zusammenarbeit“
 Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung
 Referenten: Heiko Kosel (MdL/Bautzen), Jaromír Kohliczek (Decín)
 Chemnitz, Soziokulturelles Zentrum Quer Beet

02.-
 03.05.2002 Workshop im Rahmen der Europawoche 2002
 Thema: "Europäische Flüchtlings- und Asylpolitik im Lichte der EU-Osterweiterung"
 Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, AG In- und Ausländer e.V.,
 Ausländerbeauftragte der Stadt Chemnitz
 Chemnitz, Hotel Chemnitzer Hof

06.05.2002 Workshop (Runder Tisch) im Rahmen der Europawoche 2002
 Thema: "Die EU-Osterweiterung – Verhandlungsstand. Focus: Tschechien" IHK Chemnitz

15.05.2002, Gemeinsamer Projekt-Workshop mit dem Projekt „Biographical Identity in the Borderlands“ des Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Prof. Dr. František Zich & team)
 Thema: Biographische Interviews
 EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ der TU Chemnitz und Institute of Sociology Univerzita Jan Purkyne Ústí nad Labem Ústí nad Labem/CZ

18.-
 19.05.2002, 53. Sudetendeutscher Tag
 Veranstalter: Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft Nürnberg
 Organisation der Ausstellung „10 Jahre Organisation der Deutschen in Westböhmen“

24-26.10.2002 6th Politik- und Regionalwissenschaftliches Symposium „Die MOE-Staaten vor dem EU-Beitritt – Chancen und Probleme aus politik- und regionalwissenschaftlicher Sicht“ at the TU Chemnitz (Chairs of Social Geography and of International Politics)

5-6.12.2002 Workshop „Die Erweiterung Europas und die nationale Identität in den Medien Deutschlands und der MOE-Staaten 1989-2002 (ENIM)“ of the Chair „German as a foreign Language“ at the TU Chemnitz

17-18.01.2003 Antike Kultur und europäische Identität. Symposium der Fachgruppe Geschichte der TU Chemnitz.

Jirí Nekvapil:

15.05.2002

Gemeinsamer Projekt-Workshop mit dem Projekt „Biographical Identity in the Borderlands“ des Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (Prof. Dr. František Zich & team)
Thema: Biographische Interviews
EU-Projekt „Border Identities“ der TU Chemnitz und Institute of Sociology Univerzita Jan Purkyne Ústí nad Labem Ústí nad Labem/CZ

Teaching

Werner Holly

Summer term
2002

Hauptseminar: Diskursanalyse (unter Verwendung von Interviews aus dem Projekt), TU Chemnitz

2002/2003

Sprache und Wissen (language and knowledge), Hauptseminar 2 std., WS 2002/2003, TU Chemnitz (using parts of the interviews about the “Europe” topic)

Reviews of German/Czech border project, by other authors

Alexander Friebel: Wird das Erzgebirge bald ein „Altenhaus“? EU-Projekt ermittelt Gemütszustand von Böhmen und Sachsen in der Grenzregion. In: *tu spektrum* 3/2002, 19.

Gerhard Scharf: Wird das Erzgebirge bald ein „Altenhaus“? and: Tschechen hoffen auf Europa. in: „Mei Erzgebirg“, Dec. 2002, 48, Nr. 579, p.16-17

Adolf Wolf: Europaskepsis auf beiden Seiten der deutsch-tschechischen Grenze. In: www.sudetendeutsche-in-hessen.de, also to be printed in: Ascherländchen /Ašsko, Deutsche Umschau; Informationsdienst (Fachzeitschrift über Kriegsfolgerecht, Vermögensrückgabe und Entschädigung nach dem Einigungsvertrag); Eschborner Zeitung; Schwalbacher Nachrichten; Bad Sodener Echo; Kelkheimer Bote in the next weeks

Adolf Wolf: „Die Jugend macht fort“, Studie zum EU-Beitritt. Europaskepsis an deutsch-tschechischer Grenze. In: Deutscher Ostdienst (DOD), Nr. 1/2003, 45.Jg. („Europa: Zerbrechlich wie Glas“)

BERN

Conferences/Papers

Bern team

29.06.2002

The whole team of the project meets the mayors of Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent. > Ost-Bildpost August 2002, Moschendorfer Gemeindenachrichten 12/2002

14.09.2002

Workshop with the policy makers in Moschendorf and Pinkamindszent / team of Berne > Vas Népe. Report from Mária Treiber, 16 September

Doris Wastl-Walter:

26.02.2000: "Changing geopolitics and discourses at the former Iron Curtain" Paper at the Meeting of the PGSG (Political Geography Speciality Group of the Association of American Geographers) in Westpoint, USA

14.03.2001: "The construction of Spaces and Identities", in the colloquium "Policy, Planning and Space" at the UC Davis, USA

20.03.2002: "Making a difference by building a fence" paper presented in the Session:
Discourse and accommodation in Border regions at the Annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers in Los Angeles

Monika Maria Varadi:

26.04.2001: Teleki Pál Institut, Budapest, Co-presenter at a meeting about the Austro-Hungarian border region.

Publications

2002 *Wastl-Walter, Doris, Monika M. Varadi and Friedrich Veider.* Bordering silence. Border narratives from the Austro-Hungarian border. In: Ulrike Meinhof (ed.). *Living (with) Borders: Identity Discourses on East-West Borders in Europe.* Border Regions Studies 1. Ashgate, Aldershot, p.75-93

2002 *Váradi Monika Mária, Doris Wastl-Walter, Friedrich Veider:* A végek csöndje. Határ-narratívák az osztrák-magyar határvilágról. In: Regio. Kisebbség, Politika, Társadalom 13, 2002, p.85-107

forthcoming *Wastl-Walter, Doris, Monika M. Varadi and Friedrich Veider* 'To Stay or to Leave. Coping with Marginality.' In Meinhof (ed.)

In press *Doris Wastl-Walter and Monika M. Varadi:* Ruptures in the Austro-Hungarian Border Area. In: Vera K. Pavlakovich, Barbara Morehouse and Doris Wastl-Walter (eds.): *Challenged Borderlands: Transcending Political and Cultural Boundaries.* Ashgate, Aldershot Border Regions Series 2.

In press *Vera K. Pavlakovich, Barbara Morehouse and Doris Wastl-Walter* (eds.): *Challenged Borderlands: Transcending Political and Cultural Boundaries.* Ashgate, Aldershot Border Regions Series 2.

Other Activities

Numerous oral and written communications with local and regional leaders (Mayors, members of regional parliaments, people responsible for EU-Programmes in the area). We could not present any final results, because the interpretations just started, but we introduced the project and kept them informed about the progress and first impressions.

KLAGENFURT

Conferences/Papers

Brigitta Busch

12.05.2001 "Shifting Borders. Language and Identity in the Border Region between Austria and Slovenia." Conference: Minorities, language and cross-border co-operation in Europe, Belfast.

9-11.07.2001 Paper in the plenary colloquium and in the workshop on identity constructions in the border region between Austria and Slovenia. SAALA Conference 2001 (Association for applied linguistics), Grahamstown.

Brigitte Hipfl

1-8.06.2001 Report about the project at the 13th symposium of the Academie du Midi about "Ethik - Ost und West". Alet-les-Bain (France).

Anita Bister and Petra Strohmaier

4-5.04.2002 "Wenn wir alle in ein vereintes Europa gehen, werden wir bald alle gleich sein, oder?" Identitätskonstruktionen im österreichisch-slowenischen Grenzraum. Paper at the conference: "1. Österreichisches Osteuropa-Forum. Herausforderung Osteuropa: Die Offenlegung stereotyper Bilder." Klosterneuburg (Austria).

Workshops

Brigitte Hipfl

23-25.03.2001 Organisation of the workshop "Diskursanalyse. Eine kulturwissenschaftliche Forschungsmethode". University of Klagenfurt.

Nov 2001 "Shifting Borders" – a Case Study of Identity Discourses in a European Border Region", presentation at the Curriculum and Pedagogy Institute, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Brigitta Busch

9.04.2001 "Combating Racism and Xenophobia". International workshop in Brussels (DG XII), participation in workshop discussions

Brigitte Hipfl & Petra Strohmaier

6-7.06.2001 Report about the project at the workshop "Media and Identity", University of Ilmenau.

Brigitte Hipfl, Anita Bister & Petra Strohmaier

06.11.2002 "Leben an der Grenze/Živeti ob meji" (Life at the border) with pupils from Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko/ Preddvor. Jezersko.

21.11.2002 “Zusammenarbeit über die Grenze(n) hinweg/Sodelovanje preko mej(e)” (Cooperation across borders) with policy makers from Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla and Jezersko. Seeberg Saddle.

24-27.01.2003 „Österreichs Grenzen in einer erweiterten EU. Schlussfolgerungen aus den Projektergebnissen und Zukunftsperspektiven.“ (Austrian Borders after the EU enlargement. Project Results and future perspectives), Loipersdorf.

Anita Bister

8-13.07.2001 "Mental borders in the Austrian-Slovenian border area. Presentation of the project 'EU Border Identities' ". Fortbildungsseminar des Pädagogischen Institutes des Bundes Kärnten zum Thema "Grenzen", Bad Eisenkappel/Železna Kapla.

Petra Strohmaier

Oct 2001 Report about the project at the workshop “Gender Studies und empirische Forschung – ein Spannungsverhältnis”. German Association for Journalism and Communication Studies, Dortmund.

Publications

Brigitte Hipfl

05.12.2001 “Shifting Borders” – a Case Study of Identity Discourses in a European Border Region”, at <http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/cpin/cpinfolder/papers/brigitte.htm>

Oct 2001 “EU Border Identities” article written by Karin Waldher in Unisono (official journal for the University of Klagenfurt), p.18

Brigitte Hipfl, Anita Bister, Petra Strohmeier & Brigitte Busch

2002 Shifting Borders: Spatial Constructions of Identity in an Austrian Slovenian Border Region.’ In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 53-74.

Brigitte Hipfl, Anita Bister, Petra Strohmeier

forthcoming Youth Identities along the Eastern Border of the European Union In Meinhof (ed.)

Other Activities

Brigitte Hipfl

April 2001 Report about the project in the “Privatissimum für DiplomandInnen und DissertantInnen” at the University of Klagenfurt.

May 2001 Report about the project in the seminar on “Theory and Practice of Cultural Studies”. PhD - Programme at the University of Klagenfurt.

29.09.2002 Report about the project at the Canadian Centre for Austrian and Central European Studies, Prof. Szabo, Edmonton University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

24-25.10.2002 Report about the project to Karmen Erjavec, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia at the annual conference of the Austrian Society for Communication (ÖGK), University of Klagenfurt.

fall semester 2002/2003 Interdisciplinary Lecture "Einführung in das Thema Grenzen" (Introduction into the issue of border), University of Klagenfurt.,

25.11.2002 Panel discussion in the context of the Interdisciplinary Lecture "Einführung in das Thema Grenzen" (Introduction into the issue of border), University of Klagenfurt.

Anita Bister & Petra Strohmaier

27.09.2001 Presentation of the project at the Department of Media and Communication Studies of the University of Klagenfurt.

22.10.2001 Presentation of the project at the University of Klagenfurt.

24.10.2002 Meeting with Mag. Dr. Karel Hren, Chair of the Austrian Section of the European Bureau for Lesser Used Language. Report about the project and discussion of future perspectives. Klagenfurt.

Brigitte Hipfl and Anita Bister

12.06.2002 Project Presentation "Leben in Grenzräumen". Science Week Austria, University Open Day, June 12, 2002, Klagenfurt/Celovec.

Brigitte Hipfl, Anita Bister and Petra Strohmaier

16.03.2002 Radio interview broadcasted at Radio Agora/ Campus programme: Title of the programme: "Brigitte Hipfl, Petra Strohmaier & Anita Bister sprechen über das Projekt: 'Border Discourses: Changing Identities, Changing Nations, Changing Stories in European Border Communities'" (- broadcast again on March 19, 2002).

15.01.2003 Meeting with Mag. Gernot Ogris, the representative of the Youth Department of the provincial government of Carinthia. Report about the project and discussion of future perspectives, Klagenfurt.

15.11.2002 Meeting with Marjon Bolwijn, Journalist of "de Volkskrant" (National Newspaper of the Netherlands). Report about the project and discussion of key results of the project, Klagenfurt.

Anita Bister

02.01.2003 Report about the project to Ruud Halink, director of the "Talenacademie Nederland" (Netherlands Language Academy), coordinator of the European project "CICERO", the centre for the learning and teaching of neighbouring languages in border regions. Discussion of future networking possibilities, in Maastricht.

Reviews of Austrian/Italian border project, by other authors

Marjon Bolwijn. Publication of newspaper article "In Karinthie zit de taalgrens tussen de oren" in de Volkskrant" (National Newspaper of the Netherlands), December 2, 2002, p.4.

TRIESTE

Conferences/Papers

Augusto Carli:

2001 Rassegna dell'Istituto Pedagogico di Bolzano. Numero monografico su "Identità e Multiculturalità", IX (2001). (Review of the Pedagogic Institute of Bolzano, Monography about Identity and Multiculturalism).

2001 Plurilinguismo. Contatti di Lingue e Culture. Centro Internazionale sul Plurilinguismo. Udine, 7 (2001). (Plurilingualism, Contacts of Language and Culture. International Centre for the Study of Plurilingualism, Udine).

2002 METIS. Rivista di Sociologia. Padova. (Accepted 2001, It will be published on the Unique Annual Number, 2002) pp 65-86

Oct 2001 A brief description of the project has been Illustrated in the Foundation Paper of the "Dipartimento di Scienze del Linguaggio e della Cultura" (Department of Language and Cultural Sciences), University of Modena, October 2001.

11.01.2002 Modena, Fondazione San Carlo for the Doctoral Program about Cultural Sciences: presentation of Border Project and discussion during the Doctoral presentation about "individual and collective identity" by Pier Paolo Portinaro (Università di Torino).

20-21.02.2002 III National Conference of the Associazione Italiana di Linguistica Applicata (AItLA).

20-21.03.2002 University of Sassari, Facoltà di Lingue Letterature Straniere.

08.05.2002 Conferenza dei Rettori delle Università Italiane (CRUI).

30.05.2002 Decimo Congresso Italo-Austriaco "Sguardi reciproci", Gorizia-Udine.

05.06.2002 Description of Border Project at the presentation of the Doctoral Program in Linguistic sciences at the University of Modena

16.07.2002 Newsletter AItLA (Associazione Italiana di Linguistica Applicata), July 2002, cfr. www.sslmit.unibo.it/AItLA.

23.09.2002 Short description of the Project for the AItLA-Report.

26-28.09.2002 International Congress of the Italian Society of Linguistics in Bergamo/Italy.

19.11.2002 Conference in Modena at the Accademia Nazionale delle Scienze about “Language and Identities”.

23.11.2002 Conference in Milan, Università Bocconi, “Languages for Scientific Research”.

21.12.2002 Conference in Florence of the AItLA-Executive Board.

14.01.2003 Presentation of the Project at the Meeting of the SLI-Executive Board in Naples.

Emidio Sussi:
 May 2001 A description of the project and the first results regarding communities of Gorizia-Nova Gorica has been illustrated to the members of Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Uomo (Department of Human Sciences), of the University of Trieste.

11.11.2001 Paper: “Evropska raziskava o identiteti” (European research on identity) appeared in “Primorski dnevnik” -a Slovene newspaper (belonging to the Slovene minority) published in Italy, p.17.

29.11.2001 Seminar about the project “EU Border Identities”, in the Class of ‘Sociology of Ethnic Relations’, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Trieste .

15-16.02.2002 Presentation of the project during the Seminar "Università, Scuola e Minoranze" ("University, school and Minorities"), Gizzeria Lido (Catanzaro - Calabria - Italy).

12.12.2002 Seminar about the project “EU Border Identities” (description of the project and the results), in the Class of ‘Sociology of Ethnic Relations’, Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Trieste.

16.01.2002 Gorizia. The description of the project and of the first results has been illustrated to the researchers of Slovenski raziskovalni institut (SLORI) - Slovene Research Institute (Italy). A decision was taken to prepare a page in February 2003 about the project in the daily newspaper Primorski dnevnik (published in Slovene language in Trieste (Italy))

Augusto Carli, Emidio Sussi & Cristina Guardiano
 24.10.2002 Gorizia. Local Workshop with Policy Makers: “Gorizia – Nova Gorica. Identity, Language and Cross-Border Relations in the European Integration Process” Province of Gorizia, Assembly Hall

Majda Kaucic Baša:
 30.03.2001: Information about the EU Border Identities Project, Commission for Language Planning and Language Policy (Delovna skupina strokovnjakov za jezikovno nacrtovanje in jezikovno politiko) at the Parliament of Slovenia. Ljubljana.

30.03.2001 As a member of the Commission for Language Planning at the Parliament of Slovenia M. Kaucic Basa informed the Commission about the EU Border Identities Project.

5.10.2001 »Vizija jezikovnega razvoja Nove Gorice v raziskavi EU Border Identities« (A view of linguistic development of Nova Gorica in the EU project Border Identities). Paper presented on the round table »Odprta vprašanja jezikovne politike v Sloveniji« (Linguistic policy in Slovenia: Current issues). Congress of the Slovenian Slavists, Nova Gorica and Gorizia/Gorica, October 5, 2001. To be published in: *Zbornik slavisticnega društva Slovenije* 12, Ljubljana, 2002.

»Comportamento linguistico e identità etnica: Il caso degli sloveni di Gorizia« (Verbal behaviour and ethnic identity: The case of Slovenes of Gorizia). In preparation for *METIS, Rivista di sociologia*, Padova. To be published in the Annual Number for 2003.

Mariselda Tessarolo:

10.12.2001 Paper presented at an interdepartmental meeting about identity, called "Identità di confine" (Border Identity).

Mariselda Tessarolo & Cristina Guardiano:

Paper: "Lingua e Identità in una città di confine" ("Language and Identity in a border city"), *METIS. Rivista di Sociologia*. Padova. (It will be published on the Unique Annual Number, 2002).

Cristina Guardiano:

Brief presentation of the Project, and discussions about topics and methods of the research, linguistic analysis, purposes of the project, partial and expected results, during two (informal) meetings with doctoral students in linguistics belonging to several Italian universities.

31-01-06.2002 Discussion about BP: methodologies, aims of the research, first results, during a meeting with Doctoral Students from the Universities of Padova, Palermo, Pisa and Trieste, at the University of Trieste

Carli, Augusto, Emidio Sussi & Majda Kaucic-Basa

2002 'History and Stories: Identity Construction on the Italian-Slovenian Border.' In Meinhof (ed.), pp. 33-51.

Carli, Augusto, Cristina Guardiano, Majda Kaucic-Basa, Emidio Sussi, Mariselda Tessarolo & Marina Ussai

forthcoming 'Asserting ethnic identity and power through language.' In Meinhof (ed.)

Teaching

Majda Kaucic Baša:

The EU Border Project was described in the author's Sociolinguistics lectures at the universities of Ljubljana (Pedagoška fakulteta), Trieste (Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia) and Maribor (Pedagoška fakulteta).

Reviews of Italian/Slovenian border project, by other authors

Come cambiano le identità lungo il confine – IL PICCOLO – 24. 10. 2002, p.19 (Italia) (How identities change along the border)

Javna razprava / O identiteti na meji - Mladi na Goriškem verjamejo v Evropo – Prve ugotovitve raziskave, ki jo je podprla EU – PRIMORSKI DNEVNIK – 25. 10. 2002, p. 1, 14 (Italia)

(Public discussion / About identity on the border – Youth in the Gorizia region believes in Europe. – First findings of a research, financed by the EU)

Raziskava EU o družbi pri nas – O odnosih med Gorico in Novo Gorico – NOVI GLAS – 31. 10. 2002, p. 14 (Italia)

(EU research about our society – About relations between Gorica and Nova Gorica)

Na Pokrajini – O mejni identiteti - PRIMORSKI DNEVNIK – 24. 10. 2002, p. 12 (Italia)

(On the Province seat – About border identity)

Javna razprava / Na sedežu Pokrajine – Cezmejni odnosi in identiteta na poti v evropsko integracijo – Gorica in Nova Gorica predmet raziskovalnega projekta - PRIMORSKI DNEVNIK –23. 10. 2002, p. 14 (Italia) (Public discussion / On the Province seat – Crossborder relations and identity on the road to European integration – Gorica and Nova Gorica object o a research project)

Posvet o odnosih na meji med Gorico in Novo Gorico – STA – SLOVENSKA TISKOVNA AGENCIJA – SLOVENE PRESS AGENCY – 29. 10. 2002 (Slovenija) (Simposium about border relations between Gorica and Nova Gorica)

RADIO AND TV (with Emidio Sussi)

24. 10. 2002 - Notiziario/porocila (con intervista/z intervjujem) per Radio e TV – RAI – Sede regionale (Italia) (Bilingual news: information and interview for regional radio and TV of national network RAI)

25. 10. 2002 - Intervista/intervju per Radio Koper-Capodistria (Slovenija) (Interview for Radio Koper-Capodistria)

29. 10. 2002 - Intervista/intervju per Radio privata friulana (Italia) (Interview for a private Friulian radio)

ADDRESS LISTS

Border Discourse: Changing Identities, Changing Nations, Changing Stories in European Border Communities

Contract No: HPSE-CT-1999-00003
EC contribution: 1132000 ECU
Starting date: 1 February 2000
Duration: 36 months

EC Scientific Officer: A. Apollonatos
E-mail: Aris.Apollonatos@cec.eu.int

Co-ordinator:
University of Southampton
School of Modern Languages
Southampton SO17 1BJ

U.H.MEINHOF
Tel: +44 (0)23 8059 2255
Fax: +44 (0)23 8059 3288

E-mail: uhm@soton.ac.uk

Partner Institutions:

University of Wolverhampton
The School of Humanities, Languages
and Social Sciences
United Kingdom
Dariusz GALASINSKI
D.Galasinski@wlv.ac.uk

Technische Universitaet Chemnitz
Philosophische Fakultat, Professur für
Germanistische Sprachwissenschaft
Germany
Werner HOLLY
Werner.holly@phil.tu-chemnitz.de

Universitaet Klagenfurt
Institut für Medien - und
Kommunikationswissenschaft
Austria
Brigitte HIPFL
Brigitte.hipfl@uni-klu.ac.at

Universita degli Studi de Trieste
Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Uomo
Italy
Emidio SUSSI
Sussie@sp.univ.trieste.it

University of Bern
Department of Geography, Social and Regional
Studies
Switzerland
Doris WASTL-WALTER
Dwastl@giub.unibe.ch

European Commission

**EUR 21528 — EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES — BORDER DISCOURSE: CHANGING IDENTITIES,
CHANGING NATIONS, CHANGING STORIES IN EUROPEAN BORDER COMMUNITIES**

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2005 — 95 pp. — 21.0 × 29.7 cm

ISBN 92-79-00161-2

SALES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

Publications for sale produced by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities are available from our sales agents throughout the world.

You can find the list of sales agents on the Publications Office website (<http://publications.eu.int>) or you can apply for it by fax (352) 29 29-42758.

Contact the sales agent of your choice and place your order.

The project explores the differences and similarities in the border communities of the European Union's Eastern and Southern borders, in which three generation families construct potentially conflictual identities, as a result of social political and economic upheavals which happened during their life time. The project identifies and suggests effective policies for integration and social cohesion at regional, national, transnational and European level

KI-NA-21528-EN-S



Publications Office
Publications.eu.int

2-19100-92-92 ISBN



9 789279 001611 >