

UDC 339.9-332.1

DOI: 10.46493/2663-2675.32(2).2022.16-24

Yaroslava Vermenych*

*Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
01001, 4 Mykhailo Hrushevskiy Str., Kyiv, Ukraine*

Cross-Border Regionalism in European Integration Strategies: A Conceptual Dimension

Abstract. At the turn of the millennium, the issues of borders and border territories that arose as a result of the reinterpretation of the place and role of national states and supranational entities became the focus of social analysis. Scientific attention to cross-border strategies of European integration processes is determined both by a new vision of the phenomenon of regionalism and the characteristic features of territorial identities. The relevance of the study of cross-border regionalism lies in the awareness of the increasing specific weight of territoriality in the modern world system and the need to find algorithms to answer the challenges of our time, which are marked by “binding to the territory”. The purpose of the article is the theoretical and methodological study of models and concepts of cross-border cooperation, which are formed under the influence of interconnected processes of globalization and regionalization within the European space. The current conditions of functioning of countries in the context of cross-border cooperation necessitate the substantiation of conceptual approaches to uncovering the essence of the cross-border region as a methodological construct. The application of geopolitical and geohistorical methodology determines the representation of the essential characteristics of cross-border regionalism as well as the determination of the role and place of border regions in European integration strategies. As a result of the study, it was proven that the effectiveness of cross-border cooperation depends on the extent, to which the historical traditions, mentality and social attitudes of the population of the border areas are taken into account in the process of creating Euroregions. It has been found that the minimization of risks caused by the long-term development of societies within various state organizations directly depend on the degree of scientific understanding of the specifics, potential and opportunities of cross-border regions, as well as the variability of value orientations and behavioral stereotypes. It was determined that the “transparency” of borders is a powerful resource for the balanced development of states, increasing the role of cross-border dynamics in the sphere of economy, culture, and ecology. The practical significance of the study is determined by the representation of spatial trends in the coordination of European integration strategies, the development of regional identity, and the decentralization of decision-making. Increasing scientific knowledge about cross-border regionalism will help to better understand the role and place of Ukraine in the modern world and bring it closer to entering the European political space

Key words: borders, regionalization, cross-border cooperation, Euroregion, regional integration, European space, identity

Introduction

The structure and dynamics of the modern global space largely depends on the competent use of the contact and barrier potential of borders. Their “transparency”, being one of the preconditions and consequences of globalization processes, should still have its limits, however, abuse of the border's barrier function can become an obstacle to the formation of a transport corridor necessary for international exchanges. Each state must strive to maintain an optimal balance that ensures its inclusion in the system of international relations and protects from unwanted interventions at the same time. Mobility and transparency of borders is a requirement dictated by the laws of modern political development and the realities of international cooperation. It is obvious that border regions are characterized by many specific features, which

is why they deserve special attention in the theory and practice of regionalism.

Regionalism has now become a brand that at the same time reflects the division of social space into various socio-cultural organizations and acts as a key tool for structuring social relations on the basis of networks. In this context, there are processes of formation of multi-level identities, including those related to the subnational and supranational levels and not necessarily included in the clear spatial framework of administrative-territorial organizations and states. The growing political activity of regional actors sharply increases the “innovative capacity” of the relevant bodies, primarily those embodying the “upward” regionalization, but also traditionally associated with the “downward” type to a large extent. However, only the near future will show to what extent the network type

Received: 31.07.2022, Revised: 01.09.2022, Accepted: 03.10.2022

Suggested Citation:

Vermenych, Ya. (2022). Cross-border regionalism in European integration strategies: A conceptual dimension. *Foreign Affairs*, 32(2), 16-24.

*Corresponding author

of regional interaction is more effective compared to the hierarchical one.

It is very problematic to unequivocally assess modern global transformational trends. On the one hand, there is a powerful integration strategy, the most striking manifestation of which was the creation of the European Union, the development of transnational cooperation networks, and the growth of information and cultural exchanges. From the other hand, the deepening of global differentiation in consumption levels and signs of a lack of resources provoked a distinct “logic of negativity” – increased aggressiveness, destructive bursts of religious fundamentalism, xenophobia, etc. It is only possible to approach the understanding of the prospects of these transformational processes on the basis of updated cognitive approaches, which are focused on the inclusion of the complex dynamics of centripetal and centrifugal processes, tracing the formation of hybrid identities, management and communication networks. Interstate borders, ethnic and other boundaries will structure the space for a long time, but their role will transform (hopefully synchronously) with global changes in the economic, social, and communicative areas of human interaction.

Meanwhile, we have to state that a modern person has found themselves in a situation where all space-time boundaries become conditional and blurred. Technological overcoming of space-time distances sharply differentiates the conditions of existence of local societies; for some of them, the inability to adapt to the realities of the globalized world becomes “a sign of poverty and degradation” [1, p. 18]. At the same time, the very concept of the border has undergone significant transformations. D. Zamyatin draws attention to the openness of the very image of Europe, which is inevitably “creeping” towards the East and “shifting” to Eurasia. Therefore, the European continent becomes not so much a geographical unit as an intellectual construct, a political and ideological project, which, according to O. Hnatiuk, “can mean absolutely everything and nothing.” Linguistic, historical and cultural criteria, by which the Europe is usually defined are becoming equally problematic. The linguistic criterion is related to the linguistic heterogeneity of European countries, the cultural one is related to the lack of homogeneous cultural identity even within the borders of one nation-state, and the historical one is related to differences in historical memory [2, pp. 139-147]. Such conditions no longer enable to “catch” and record the essence of these changes, relying only on traditional social analysis methods. More and more often, experts alarmingly note the uncertain state of the “diffuse” world system, the elusive elements of “fluid cross-border geography”, the disintegration of the former West-East and North-South formats of relations [3, pp. 70-84].

According to W. Beck, Modern European reality is characterized by hybrid forms of “new territory defined by political, ethnic and traditional cultural boundaries, but not tied to the land” [4, p. 289]. The process of its formation is closely related to the establishment of regionalism, the implementation of processes of regionalization of space and the strengthening of European integration. Regionalization occurs as ideologically legitimized integration, which is understood as a “return” to the historical concept

of Europe, according to which regions were political subjects, unlike modern states [5, pp. 7-28]. Regionalization strategies are being approved as a result of strengthening regional and local claims to subjectivity, as well as weakening the role of state institutions in the organization of administration, social and cultural development, and identity formation. Cross-border regionalism is seen as an effective tool for increasing regional subjectivity, stability and strengthening the identity, establishing integration relations with related spaces separated by political borders.

The purpose of the research is the theoretical and methodological study of models and concepts of cross-border cooperation, which are formed under the influence of interconnected processes of globalization and regionalization within the European space. The current conditions of functioning of countries in the context of cross-border cooperation necessitate the substantiation of conceptual approaches to uncovering the essence of the cross-border region as a methodological construct. The application of geopolitical and geohistorical methodology determines the representation of the essential characteristics of cross-border regionalism as well as the determination of the role and place of border regions in European integration strategies.

Dynamics of Integration Processes

Integration sentiments in Europe had the idea of Europeanism as their initial foundation, which is based on the myths about the civilizational superiority of Western European peoples, inherited from antiquity and established in the practices of the Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment. But the realization that the experience of the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire was far from positive in any way forced to look for other integration pillars. One of them was the idea of “Paneurope”, actively developed in the 1920s and 1930s by R. von Coudenhove-Kalergi, A. Briand and others. In the post-war context, it was replaced by three different versions of the idea of federalism. “Federalism by installment” by J. Monnet was based on the ideas of gradually carried out economic integration. In the 1980s, it was supplanted by the radical federalism of A. Spinelli with an emphasis on political integration and the personalist federalism of R. Aron, U. Mounier, and D. Rops. Collectively, they pioneered a neo-federalist approach. At the same time, the search for integration projects was conducted along economic lines. In the late 1930s, German economists began to lay the theoretical foundation for the corresponding strategy; it was a long-term integration project under the banner of “economic community”. But opportunities for its implementation arose only after the defeat of the Third Reich within the context of the implementation of the “Marshall Plan”. US aid in restoring the economic potential of Europe was also intended for the Soviet Union, but the USSR refused it, as it had its own plans for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, the “Marshall Plan” became a factor in the European split.

Beginning in 1951, the outlines of the “European House” gradually began to emerge – four decades passed from the signing of the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community to the Maastricht Agreement in 1992. During this time, the concept and practice

of EU integration construction was based on three fundamental principles: “integration is a tool, not a goal”, “integration should be done gradually”, “integration requires an adequate mechanism” [6, p. 437]. The fundamentally new system of European law created in accordance with these conceptual guidelines is subject to the task of a gradual transition from supranational entities to the Europe of regions. A special intergovernmental organization, the Council of Europe, founded in 1949, performs the role of a kind of “school of democracy”. Its main tasks are the struggle for human rights, strengthening pluralistic democracy, environmental protection, etc. One of the priority tasks can be described by the formula “Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe”. Not everyone agrees that the term “Europeanization” is the best in this case, as there can be seen the signs of Eurocentrism or “colonial power”. Although many people think that the term “EU-ization” would be more adequate to denote the influence of the EU on the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, it has not taken root yet [7, pp. 5-7].

The theoretical foundation of European integration is provided by the concept of “Europe of Regions”. The term was coined by the Swiss writer and public figure D. de Rougemont, who advocated the decentralization of management functions on a European scale. In order to strengthen the role of regions in integration processes, the European Regional Development Fund was created in 1975, which aimed at minimizing differences in the levels of development of countries and the development of regional infrastructure. The Assembly of European Regions, which has been operating since 1985, united 300 territorial communities with a population of about 400 million people at the end of the century. The “Declaration on Regionalism” adopted by it is based on the principles of capital concentration, joint financing of targeted programs, priority of individual rights over the rights of the community. One of the main principles was the principle of subsidiarity that lies in the transfer of specific management decisions to the level closest to the person. It actually reoriented the solution of social problems to the regional level. The regions were recognized as active subjects of EU policy and had the right to independently enter the international arena. The budget policy was formed “upwards”, from the region to the state. At the same time, the regions had different statuses, which were determined independently. The Committee of the Regions, established in 1994 under the Maastricht Agreement, was a consultative body comprising representatives of European regional and local authorities. The main attention was paid to problematic regions, which are taken care of by the European Regional Development Fund.

Since the second half of 2011, the European Union is going through hard times – the financial crisis is deepening and expanding, but not all states are ready to implement austerity measures to overcome it. There are insurmountable institutional and political differences between the federal core and the countries that refuse to join the euro zone. As F. Heissburg noted in the pages of the “Le Monde” newspaper, “those who closely followed the decline in the 1980s, and then the collapse of the Soviet empire, cannot help but draw some striking analogies to the current

situation in the European Union. In both cases, we observe a loss of economic viability and an erosion of economic growth, despite all the differences between these two systems” [8]. T. Snyder quite precisely defined the role of the EU and its prospects in 2003. “The European Union, he noted, is attractive not because of its common achievements (acquis communautaire), but because of the way of life it offers (savoir-faire). That is why it was convinced that the significance of this attractive ideal for Ukrainians will only grow” [9, p. 366].

Features and Forms of Cross-Border Regionalism

Regardless of the fate of the European Community in the future, we can confidently say that its contribution to the modern world structure and to the search for new forms of integration is incomparable. After all, new forms of integration and new models of movement of goods, services, capital and people have emerged and established themselves on the EU soil. This is where cross-border regions appeared, which are border territories with economic, cultural, transport, ecological cooperation, which embodied the thousand-year experience of “free cities” on a large territory from Italy to the Netherlands. And although the legal forms of cross-border cooperation are not clearly established and properly regulated, varying from a “joint partnership agreement” to a “partnership with the legal entity rights”, one cannot help but see as an effective form of cooperation “across borders” was born before our eyes. Cross-border regions are represented as a “further improvement” of new economic development indicators. Their boundaries are determined by modern practices of regionalism, and their emergence is connected with the desire of regional elites to focus on their economic and political interests. A noticeable reorientation towards transnational projects is gradually taking place in some state strategies.

Experts derive the idea of cross-border regionalism from the end of the 19th century. In 1875, France and Spain first created a bilateral commission for cooperation in the Pyrenees region [10, p. 158]. During the time that has passed since then, the forms of cooperation have changed and diversified many times. Three stages usually stand out in the history of European cross-border cooperation. The first began with the establishment of the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR) in 1969, within the framework of which the process of coordinating the activities of the authorities of these regions and their official recognition by the bodies of the European Union began. The starting point of the second stage was the signing by the member states of the Council of Europe of the 1980 Madrid Framework Convention on Cross-Border Cooperation between Territories. In 1984, in accordance with this convention, the status of AEBR was revised. The third stage is associated with the adoption of the European Charter of Local Self-Government and the Community Charter on Regionalization in 1985-1986. These documents initiated the reform of the European structural funds, which included special measures for the development of cross-border regions. The reform entered the stage of practical implementation in January 1989. The INTERREG regional programs were adopted in the following year [11, pp. 150-151].

International scientists distinguish three “floors” of cross-border regionalism. The first includes cross-border regional associations, natural economic territories, “triangles (zones) of growth”. Starting from the middle of the 20th century, cooperation at this level has evolved from the joint use of resources or the construction of infrastructure facilities to the integration of production capacities, albeit within spatially limited frameworks. The second “floor” of cross-border regionalism is the most common and most massive category of regional integration associations – subregional unions. Such associations provide a higher level of institutionalization, a wider scope of goals, tasks and spheres of cooperation. The highest “floor” of regionalism is represented by transnational associations, the organizational framework of which covers parts of neighboring macro-regions. Since the process of large-scale transregional cooperation takes place on all continents, the conclusion about the transformation of modern regionalism into a coherent system that provides stability to the development of the entire world society is no longer disputed [12, pp. 168-177].

R. Kalitchak defines cross-border regionalism as an integrated form of coordination of cooperation between neighboring states implemented in compliance with national legislation and relevant international agreements. The motivational drivers of such cooperation are: economic – the search for additional investment resources, latest technologies, sales markets, capable of improving the economic situation of the region; historical and cultural – joint actions regarding the preservation and spread of minority languages, cultural assets, historical heritage; political – enabling autonomous actions of the regions in the international arena; public – aimed at establishing closer ties between residents of border regions and active implementation of various exchange programs [13, p. 76]. Cross-border regionalism can manifest itself in various forms – localism and provincialism, subculturalism and traditionalism, ethno-national communication and cultural interaction, transnational integration and economic cooperation.

Cross-border regionalism is able to influence the activities of states and become an effective factor in the formation of internal regional policy at the expense of external cooperation. It is also a kind of “subnational diplomacy” as a reaction to drastic changes in the modern world, as it is obvious that national states do not have mechanisms for solving global problems. The cross-border space is characterized by a state of “fluidity”, which is manifested in the flexibility of rules and narratives, as well as the mobility of center-periphery forms of interaction. The regions are regarded in the discourse of cross-border regionalization as “spaces of contact”, spatial structures with higher priority than states, “exemplary forms of state cross-border intervention”, “institutionalized entrepreneurs”, “self-governing political subjects that retain the potential for independence, democracy and rescaling” [14, pp. 77-91].

In the vision of D. de Rougemont, the author of the “Europe of Regions” concept, cross-border regionalism acts as an integrative form of spatial cooperation, which aims at creating a sense of connectedness, interdependence and common interests of societies on different sides of the borders. Such a conceptual definition formulated back in the

70s of the last century has already become largely outdated. Emphasis was placed on the unity of the potential region “from the point of view of geography, history, ecology, ethnic groups and economic opportunities”, which is hindered by state sovereignties [15, p. 35]. In practice, however, it turned out that the cross-border cooperation level is affected not so much by the inhibiting influence of the sovereignties of the states along both sides of the borders, as by the historically formed inequality of economic opportunities. “The more modern is the representation of the cross-border region as a contact space divided by the sovereignties of neighboring countries, which has a historical and cultural affinity, a complex of national, regional, social elements that contribute to its interaction with the border regions to preserve and develop its living space” [16, pp. 130-137].

The concept of “cross-border region” unites three components: the space bounded by the peripheries of the regions, the subjects of integration strategies, and the contacts that are established as a result of their local practices. Cross-border regions can be functional and territorial. The first exists on the basis of labor, cooperative and other relations between economic subjects; this type also includes “working communities” and regional councils (regionalrat), which are popular in the West. Euroregions are an example of territorial cooperation. Thanks to the experience of cross-border cooperation and regulatory coherence at the level of international conventions, Euroregions are characterized by the presence of institutionalized cooperation between adjacent national authorities, represent national associations or coalitions of municipalities and regions. Organizationally, Euroregions usually have a council, a presidency, specialized working groups and a secretariat. Institutionally, they represent “active enterprises”, which naturally combine macro-objective and micro-subjective functions and processes [17, pp. 389-397].

The Euroregion is considered a form of international integration and cross-border relations, which ensures the joint development of economic, cultural and humanitarian cooperation, the implementation of cross-border economic projects, addressing employment, infrastructure and environmental issues. V. Dergachev defines Euroregions as border communities of international cross-border cooperation of European countries in the sphere of economy, culture, education, transport, ecology, which are established on the basis of the subsidiarity principles. Euroregions operate as a result of the redistribution of power between the central government and border communities, which are empowered to independently regulate their activities and conclude interregional cross-border agreements in accordance with national legislation [18].

It is obvious that Euroregions, despite all the issues associated with their formation along the post-Soviet borders, represent an innovative form of regional development management, attractive for attracting investments and therefore more effective compared to traditional ones. Its demonstrative and educational effects are not in dispute, as well as its ability to propose fundamentally new models within the framework of regionalism theories. It is no coincidence that the concept of “invention” of new forms of regionalism appeared in the West in connection with cross-border constants, in which the attention is focused

on the search for non-traditional forms of cooperation with neighbors. The instrumental function of Euroregions is especially important for the establishment of effective cooperation: after all, fundamentally new bodies have appeared for the settlement of possible territorial disputes, ethnic conflicts, etc. In the end, the Euroregions are able to answer the important question: are the legal systems and legislation of countries on different sides of the border compatible enough for cooperation to be productive.

Cross-border regions are now a sufficiently established form of integrative interstate interaction and, at the same time, a model of a new territorial, to some extent "suprastate", level of governance. The appearance of "large regions" marks a significant change in the traditional roles of states. Of course, they remain key players on the political scene, but lose their monopoly as almost the only bearers of legitimacy. "Centers of power" are shifting both downward, to the level of regions, communes and municipal entities, and upward and outward, to the level of cross-border relations. This entails the emergence of new forms of multi-layered diplomacy, multi-level governance and corresponding identity. The politics undergoes international legalization at all levels with the emergence of modern forms of interaction, coordination and representation. At the same time, politics itself is undergoing active regionalization. New social movements with regionalist and locally oriented guidelines are emerging. Party structures are formed according to the regional principle. At first glance, these processes are clearly positive, because they are accompanied by the formation of territorial forms of network democracy. But issues emerge at the organizational level – the public capriciously intertwines with the private, the number of new political actors grows uncontrollably. After all, the very existence of the EU – a multi-layered network structure – creates the problem of coordinating actions, with no shortage of pessimistic expectations about its future.

Although the practice of cross-border cooperation has a rather long history, not all of its theoretical parameters are adequately defined. The content of this term varies from a set of projects designed to implement the joint development of territories adjacent to each other, to the sum of already adjusted coordination mechanisms of multi-level cooperation in the economic, political, and cultural areas. As for the concept of "cross-border region", it can mean either: 1) the territory of border or cross-border cooperation between parts of several states; 2) a specific form of such a community with its own infrastructural, ecological and humanitarian interaction mechanisms; 3) a tool for the integration of a particular country into supranational structures; 4) a training ground for testing the possibilities of cross-border cooperation; 5) a kind of "umbrella project" for the implementation of bilateral or multilateral sectoral agreements, etc. V. Kolosov defines the main features of the cross-border region as follows: a) administrative and socio-economic integrity of territorial units along each side of the border; b) commonality and complementarity of the main and jointly solved socio-economic problems [19, p. 74].

Three different, although not clearly defined, terms for cross-border cooperation have taken root in the Western

European tradition. The most frequently used term "cross-border cooperation" refers to direct cross-border cooperation of regional and local authorities along both sides of borders. The concept of "interregional/transborder cooperation" has broader meaning, which is cross-border (interregional) cooperation, the purpose of which is to spread integration processes to large groups of regions, not necessarily territorially connected. The term "transnational cooperation" is also used as a neutral and polysemantic term, most often in relation to countries or large interconnected territories.

The Place of Ukraine in the Pan-European Space

In July 1993, Ukraine joined the "European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation between Territorial Communities or Authorities", which now part of the country's legislation. The concepts of "Euroregion" and "cross-border region" have been defined in the thesaurus of socio-humanitarian studies in their own way. The Law of Ukraine on Cross-Border Cooperation (June 2004) enshrines the definition of the Euroregion as "an organizational form of cooperation between administrative and territorial units of European states, carried out in accordance with bilateral or multilateral agreements on cross-border cooperation" [20]. The concepts of "Euroregion" and "cross-border region" are often equated. This is not entirely correct, although the Euroregion is the most common form of cross-border cooperation. According to I. Stundennikov, the concept of "Euroregion" is dominated by the political and legal component, while the main categorization factor for the cross-border region is the presence of homogeneous natural and geographical conditions, as well as common historical and ethnocultural development of the local community within spatial and temporal boundaries. In other words, the cross-border region is a historical-geographical and geopolitical phenomenon, while the Euroregion is an institutional form of cross-border cooperation [21, p. 116]. And although this distinction criterion is quite blurred (because the Euroregion is also a historical-geographical phenomenon in the spatial sense), one can agree with the emphasis on the political and legal constant in the definition of the Euroregion. It is obvious that the concept of "cross-border region" is broader in meaning, because cross-border cooperation can be carried out outside the Euroregions.

According to experts, "Euroregions have become a specific territorial tool for implementing the principles of European integration and at the same time evidence of a return to the ideal of "local societies" claiming full independence" [22, p. 123]. The relations of states in the field of cross-border cooperation are most often conveyed by the terms "interpenetration", "intertwining of interests", "complex interdependence", etc. With the emergence of Euroregions, the perspective of the study of migration processes changed: transborder nature became a special research object with an emphasis on the study of the interaction of flows of people, goods, ideas, cross-border networks, mutual influence of borders and elements of the social landscape. A kind of "consolidation" of cross-border regions, which complements the process of expanding their

competences, creates new channels of influence on authorities “from below”, at the level of territorial communities. At the same time, new forms of “horizontal” interaction are emerging, resulting in additional opportunities for resource accumulation. A specific form of vertical “political interlocking” based on network interaction is being developed, which involves the creation of a multi-level management system and new “coordinating systems”. As for network structures, they act in this system both as a management tool and as a public control lever, contributing to democratization processes at all officially recognized levels, be it European, national, regional or municipal.

The purpose of cross-border cooperation is to reduce the “barrier functions” of borders in favor of contact functions. The “opening” of borders is a powerful lever for mutual coordination of state policies, a tool of increasing the role of consultations and joint actions in the fields of economy, culture and ecology, as well as expanding the possibilities of service infrastructure. Ultimately, this gives the effect of spatial coordination of strategies, development of the regions’ identity and use of the advantages of diversity, decentralization of decision-making, as well as strengthening of local democracy. This minimizes the consequences of the “closedness” of interstate borders implemented by totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, as well as the artificial “marginalization” of certain territories. The priorities of cross-border cooperation within the Euroregions include the creation of an effective economic and socio-cultural space, ensuring national security in the face of globalization, maintaining the transparency of borders in the context of investment development, as well as establishing migration control.

Euroregions play a significant role in bringing Ukraine closer to the integrated European space. Fulfilling the requirements of the *acquis communautaire* (EU legal system) is a direct path to the establishment of a stable democracy, the creation of a competitive market economy, and the formation of effectively functioning civil society structures. The movement of Ukraine towards the EU cannot but be a long process, and the experience gained in the cross-border cooperation regions is truly invaluable. With the emergence of Euroregions, the concept of political and cultural neighborhood acquires a new meaning. Public institutions that justify the concepts of a special kind of local neighborhood (Parisian “Culture”, Polish “*Borussia*”) introduced the concept of “open regionalism”, within the framework of which the local and universal are juxtaposed, and the rules of intercultural dialogue are developed. Nostalgic historical and cultural versions of “neighborhood” are based on, in particular, in Poland, as an expression of para-imperial aspirations “to return to one’s borders” and “supremacy” over the former “*kresy*” [23, pp. 75-82].

Ukraine widely uses the cross-border international cooperation mechanism to deepen the integration process, particularly, participation in the development of European regions [24, p. 634]. As of 2018, the European “Association of European Border Regions” network (AEBR) has more than 200 border structures. The “Buh”, “Upper Prut”, “Dnipro”, “Donbas”, “Carpathian”, “Slobozhanshchyna”, “Black Sea”, “Yaroslavl” Euroregions have been established along the Ukrainian border. The association is focused on establishing “partner networks”, unification of border regions with

similar problems and interests. This positive trend should be further developed and deepened in every way. Euroregions as international integration structures can be established both within the EU, at the EU borders and beyond them.

Russian aggression significantly influenced the trend of events in Europe and the world, forcing EU politicians to think seriously about the prospects of the European Union and the possibilities of its expansion. In a political and ideological sense, the West entirely supports Ukraine in the ongoing conflict. “The UN General Assembly clearly expressed its position on March 27, 2014, declaring support for the sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders.” This resolution was supported by 100 states, 58 abstained and only 11 voted against. The joint statements of the members of the G7 repeatedly condemned the annexation of Crimea and stated that the actions of the Russian Federation aimed at destabilizing the situation in Eastern Ukraine are “unacceptable and must be stopped.” Similar resolutions were adopted by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the governing structures of the European Union – the European Council, the European Parliament, and the European Commission. At the G20 summit (November 2014), the leaders of the USA, Japan and Australia decided to join their efforts in solving the Russian-Ukrainian conflict [25, pp. 15-16].

Ukraine, however, is vitally interested in materializing declarations of support to a greater extent in concrete actions, and most importantly, accompanying them by guarantees of Ukraine’s acceptance into the EU, at least in the distant future. The German political scientist S. Meister quite frankly sheds light on the reasons for the absence of the latter. He believes that the European Union is currently experiencing the biggest crisis since its creation – nationalist views are growing in the member states, populist groups are gaining support with anti-European slogans. There is a clear consensus among the German elites and in German society that EU enlargement is impossible today. The Union is overburdened by recent enlargement, has internal integration issues, which makes many influential people say: “We don’t want another problem inside the European Union.” Many representatives of German enterprises cooperate with Russia, and the latter skillfully manipulates discourses to create a “fifth column” in Germany. After all, the image of Ukraine in Europe is very bad. The Ukrainian elite has not yet demonstrated the ability and desire to reform the country. As a result, there is growing skepticism whether the country really has the potential for change. On the other hand, S. Meister argues that Ukrainian society has already done a lot to show its commitment to European norms and principles, and expects solidarity from the European Union in a critical situation. “If we do not support Ukraine enough, if it does not succeed, it will be the end of the EU as a reliable foreign policy player attractive to other states. Ukraine is really a litmus test for the European Union in terms of adherence to its principles, values and norms, as well as the possibility of exporting them to stabilize its own region” [26].

The main problem of Ukraine today is the lack of a unifying doctrine, a set of ideas acceptable not only as a platform for a lasting consensus for at least 5-10 years, but

also for a temporary compromise. It is unrealistic to hope that Ukraine will be united by right-wing radical slogans with a clear anti-Russian undertone. It is also unrealistic to hope that a certain “renovation of the facade” will make it possible to preserve the customary system of priorities and the hierarchy of power in the country that has been formed for 30 years. Ukraine is no longer the same, and it was not so much the Maidans and anti-Maidans that changed it, as the armed confrontation in the East. Stresses of this scale do not go away leaving no trace. But an unquestionably positive factor is the clear awareness by Ukrainian society that “the policy of European integration and the development of bilateral relations with the European Union remains a key foreign policy priority for Ukraine.” As noted in the National Report of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine “Euro-Atlantic vector of Ukraine”, the course towards European integration “represents the realization of the civilizational choice of our state – breaking with the Soviet past and entering the European democratic community. The EU remains our important ally and partner in the fight against Russian aggression and a partner in the development of the regional security system” [27, p. 8].

As a system of socio-political relations and the outcome of globalization of modern nations, the cross-border cooperation stands out not only as an area of interaction between different cultures, searches for ethnic and cultural self-identification. It is also a sphere of conflict of interests of state structures, church institutions, national movements, political parties and public associations. The struggle of ideas at this level is inevitable, and it determines the competitive atmosphere between national projects, political and scientific discourses, and cultural memory models. A complex palette of mutual influences and “mutual repulsion” can provoke conflicts of values, distorted heterostereotypes, as well as generate antinomanism as a form of social consciousness. In the work “Nationalism Reframed” (1996), the outstanding theoretician of nationalism R. Brubaker proved that the “nationalizing state” creates a potentially conflictual “triadic configuration” – a field of constant sharp struggle, which involves external interested political actors. And then it is not so important whether the dividing lines are drawn by a sincere selective perception of otherness or by cynical distortions [28, pp. 149-173]. As Ya. Hrytsak showed, the Brubaker model explains what is happening in Ukraine much more accurately than any other. “We have a Russian and Russian-speaking population in the South and East of Ukraine, which resists Kyiv’s nationalistic policy and strives to be as close as possible to Moscow. As a result, we have a rather paradoxical phenomenon: despite significant linguistic, regional and other differences, Ukraine is divided, but does not split” [29].

According to O. Pakhliovska, “this Manichean approach to reality, this rigorous dualism of the division into “West” and “East” was among the reasons for the failure of the Russian strategy in Ukraine. Kremlin political technologists worked to divide Ukraine into the allegedly Orthodox Russian-speaking “East” and the allegedly Catholic Ukrainian-speaking “West” without understanding elementary things: Ukraine is indeed divided, but in a different way. There are two Ukraines – European and Soviet. The first

is a European multi-confessional, albeit Orthodox, multi-cultural universe, while the second is a mono-confessional and mono-cultural Soviet model. Moreover, in both realities, we find citizens of Ukraine of different nationalities, primarily Ukrainians, Russians and Jews, but they form two directly opposite worlds.” After all, just as it was a century ago, Ukraine finds itself at the center of this planetary conflict between the West and the East, the terrain of endless dialogue between them. The confrontation with Russia is where a rupture of civilizations occurs, a permanent process of their convergence and their divergence [30, pp. 358, 364].

Therefore, the cross-border space requires increased attention in the context of the formation of marginal, hybrid identity and culture, the presence of asymmetry in the demographic, economic, and political spheres. This is a dualistic phenomenon, which is characterized both as a contact zone between several border regions and as a mental construction resulted from the transformation of global integration processes and the destruction of the modern idea of the “state-nation-territory” triad. “The cross-border area appears as a contact, network space, where social and cultural-political mobility sets the rhythm for political processes” [31, p. 44]. In a modern hybrid situation, in which the processes of globalization and integration are not only accompanied by the same powerful manifestations of regionalization and localization, but also intertwine with them in a way, establishing new networks and problematic areas, the attention to the cross-border should double up. Essentially, all the states of the modern world were caught between these two poles of civilizational progress, and none of them today can form national interests without taking into account the complex interaction of global centripetal and regional centrifugal processes.

Conclusions

The issue of the stability of the pan-European regional space, which Ukraine aspires to enter, sets particularly high demands on the development of a universal theory of regionalism and its modified versions taking into account local features. This applies to cross-border cooperation to a great extent, because the movement towards multi-regionalization of the world has started in its direction, real opportunities are being created to equalize the living standards of the population to the average European indicators, mobilize local resources and jointly solve problems by states, on which national security directly depends. In the end, kind of “training grounds” of adaptation of European legislation and state support mechanisms to the realities of those countries outside the European Union are formed in the common cross-border space. However, the pace and efficiency of movement in the European direction will depend to a decisive extent on how ready each of the participating states is to go “their part of the way”.

Ukraine has taken many steps towards integration into the European and world space. However, the process of its entry into Europe was not as simple as it seemed. Its success and effectiveness are largely determined by how quickly our people will be able to get rid of the syndrome of lack of confidence in their own abilities and learn new priorities of political, scientific, cultural and educational life in the European space. The course of integration into

European structures imposes serious obligations on us, requires the development and consistent implementation of policies that would meet European standards. Identification processes are too complex and ambiguous in the modern world. Separatist sentiments are spreading,

increasingly reaching the level of outright terrorism. Under these conditions, the entire thinking population of the planet should be guided by the logic of the “do no harm” principle. Every nation has the right to self-determination, but every nation is fully responsible for its conscious choices.

References

- [1] Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [2] Shulha, M. (2010). Criteria for European identity. *Political Management*, 2, 139-147.
- [3] Neklessa, A.I. (2012). The future and the forthcoming: The crisis of the modern world. *Policy*, 2, 70-84.
- [4] Beck, W. (2001). *What is globalization? Mistakes of globalism — responses to globalization*. Moscow: Progress-Tradition.
- [5] Paasi, A. (2001). Europe as social process and discussion. Considerations of place, boundaries and identity. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8(1), 7-28.
- [6] Borko, Yu., & Butorina, O. (2001). *From the European Union to the United States of Europe. The European Union on the threshold of the 21st century: Choosing a development strategy*. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- [7] Schimmelfennig, F., Sedelmayer, U. (2010). *Europeanization of central and Northern Europe*. Kyiv: Universe.
- [8] Heissburg, F. (2011). *Will the EU repeat the fate of USSE*. USA: The Day.
- [9] Snyder, T. (2012). *The transformation of nations. Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera.
- [10] Zonova, T. (1999). From Europe of states to Europe of regions? *Policy*, 5, 155-164.
- [11] Zheltov, V.V. (2010). Borders in the context of globalization (geopolitical aspect). *Political Science*, 3, 143-152.
- [12] Pestsov, S.K. (2006). Architectonics of the modern world: Regional system of international relations. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 9(2), 168-177.
- [13] Kalitchak, R. (2007). *Regionalism in European integration processes*. Kyiv: Knowledge.
- [14] Lagendijk, A. (2005). Regionalization in Europe. Stories, institutions and boundaries. In *Bordering space* (pp. 77-91). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- [15] de Rougemont, D. (1968). *Vers une federation des regions. Naissance de l'Europe des Regions*. Geneve: Institute d'etudes europeenes.
- [16] Trubitsyn, D.V. (2011). Cross-border as an object of cultural research: A methodological review. *Humanitarian Vector*, 2, 130-137.
- [17] Hughes, E.C. (1997). Careers. *Qualitative Sociology*, 20(3), 389-397.
- [18] Dergachev, V. (2003). *Civilizational geopolitics (Large multidimensional spaces)*. Odesa: PREEI NANU.
- [19] Kolosov, V.A. (1988). *Political geography. Problems and methods*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [20] Law of Ukraine No. 1861-IV “On Crossborder Cooperation”. (2004, June). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1861-15#Text>.
- [21] Studennikov, I. (2003). “Lower Danube” Euroregion as an object of historical and regional research. *Studios for Archival Work and Documentation*, 9, 115-118.
- [22] Rendyuk, T.H. (2011). Crossborder and regional support between Ukraine and Romania on the issues of national minorities. *Ukrainian Historical Journal*, 1, 123-136.
- [23] Kurchevska, J. (2002). The collapse of the post-communist Europe – new and old neighborhoods of national cultures. *Political Thought*, 1, 75-82.
- [24] Vidnyansky, S.V. (Ed.). (2020). *Ukraine in the history of Europe in the 19th – beginning of the 21st century: Historical essays*. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine.
- [25] Smith, S., & Unescu, K. (2014). Russian-Ukrainian conflict: Country, heritage, prospects for the future development. *National Security and Defense*, 5-6, 15-16.
- [26] Desyaterny, D. (2016). *Stefan Meister: “I’m talking about the great failure of the Russian policy in Germany.”* USA: The Day.
- [27] Pirozhkov, S.I. (Ed.). (2019). *Euro-atlantic vector of Ukraine: National report*. Kyiv: National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- [28] Brubaker, R. (2010). National minorities, nationalizing states and external nation sister states in the New Europe. In E. Yana (Ed.), *Nationalism in late and post-communist Europe* (pp. 149-173). Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- [29] Hrytsak, Y. (2011). Who are the Ukrainians and what do they want. *Critique*, 7-8, 10-14.
- [30] Pahlyovska, O. (2016). *Finis Europae: The conflicting legacy of the humanistic “West” and the Byzantine “East” in modern Ukraine. Return to Tsargorod*. Kyiv: Ukrainian Press Group.
- [31] Koch, S.V. (2019). *Cross-border regions: Space of social order and political activity*. Odesa: Phoenix.

Ярослава Верменич

*Інститут історії України НАН України
01001, вул. Михайла Грушевського, 4, м. Київ, Україна*

Транскордонний регіоналізм в євроінтеграційних стратегіях: концептуальний вимір

Анотація. На рубежі тисячоліть проблеми кордонів та прикордонних територій у зв'язку з переосмисленням місця і ролі національних держав та наддержавних утворень опинилися у фокусі соціального аналізу. Наукова увага до транскордонних стратегій євроінтеграційних процесів обумовлюється як новим баченням феномена регіоналізму, так і особливостями територіальних ідентичностей. Актуальність дослідження транскордонного регіоналізму полягає в усвідомленні підвищення питомої ваги територіальності у сучасному світоустрої та необхідності знаходження алгоритмів відповідей на виклики нашого часу, які позначені «прив'язкою до території». Метою статті є теоретико-методологічне дослідження моделей та концепцій транскордонного співробітництва, які формуються під впливом взаємопов'язаних процесів глобалізації й регіоналізації в європейському просторі. Сучасні умови функціонування країн в контексті прикордонної співпраці зумовлюють потребу обґрунтування концептуальних підходів до розкриття сутності транскордонного регіону як методологічного конструкту. Застосування геополітичної та геоісторичної методології обумовлює репрезентацію сутнісних характеристик транскордонного регіоналізму, визначення ролі і місця прикордонних регіонів в євроінтеграційних стратегіях. В результаті дослідження доведено, що ефективність транскордонного співробітництва залежить від того, якою мірою в процесі створення єврорегіонів враховуються історичні традиції, ментальність та суспільні настрої населення прикордонних ареалів. З'ясовано, що мінімізація ризиків, зумовлених тривалим розвитком соціумів у складі різних державних організацій, перебуває у прямій залежності від ступеня наукового осмислення специфіки, потенціалу та можливостей транскордонних регіонів, варіативності ціннісних орієнтацій та поведінкових стереотипів. Визначено, що «прозорість» кордонів – потужний ресурс для збалансованого розвитку держав, збільшення ролі транскордонної динаміки у сфері економіки, культури, екології. Практична значимість дослідження обумовлюється репрезентацією просторових тенденцій узгодження євроінтеграційних стратегій, розвитку самобутності регіонів, децентралізації прийняття рішень. Примноження наукових знань про транскордонний регіоналізм допоможе краще усвідомити роль і місце України в сучасному світі і наблизити її до входження у європейський політичний простір

Ключові слова: кордони, регіоналізація, транскордонне співробітництво, єврорегіон, регіональна інтеграція, європейський простір, ідентичність