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CS 1: Creator2

CS 2: Tec

CS 2: Citizen Science Experiment: ‘Talking Borders: from local expertise to global exchange’, 10thJuly 2018, 3 p.m. Vienna. We are using Dictaphone number 82 and 4. As a history student, I am more than interested in the phenomenon of borders. Not only from the political aspect, but from the cultural as well, taking into consideration that I am originally from Bosnia and Herzegovina and that I was born in Croatia, but I'm raised and educated in Serbia. When someone mentioned border, first I think about geopolitical lines, you know that separate different countries. So if we go back in history for far enough, we can see that people always have had some kind of need to mark their territories and I think that the reason for that is they wanted to ensure safety for their families from another group of people, you know, and nowadays governments have the responsibility to provide security, economics and social stability for their citizens. So I think that without borders there would be no control. And [00:02:00] there would be the reign of chaos. So maybe making borders is in the nature of the people. By the time you just improve the ways to control and regulate the limit of the movement of the people, you know, but there is then another question and that is what gives one nation the right to control who can cross their borders and who cannot do that. At the end we are all citizens of the planet Earth, we have all equal rights to its resources, you know. We, in the end, we cannot choose where we going to be born. You know that it's something that is given to all of us. And I think that every man should be able to seek for his own habitation, you know for place where he want to live, for place where he wants to be in every moment of his life. If that is the case then why there are borders and why there are wire fences that prevent people from being in the place they want to be. Never mind if the reasons are political, economical or if someone just wants to admire the nature in that place on earth. I think there are no big problems when there [00:04:00] is one man or one family that wants to move from one country to another but the issue begins when the majority of citizens from one country are forced to leave their homes, and they are forced to do that because maybe there are wars or maybe economical instability. In the past couple of years, through my country passed about 1.6 million of people and that is a really huge number and that has affected my country in a certain way but that situation hasn't made any ethnical changes, its hasn't affected security of the state. There were no bigger incidents, just some small violations. The point is that to come and stay in Serbia never was intentions for migrants. You know, they just want to pass our border and get to European Union states. Nowadays the main problem for Serbian authorities is how to provide the food and the shelter for migrants while they are still in Serbia. So our government created some exceptional centres for migrants, but it is interesting that very small per cent of migrants actually use them. I think nowadays at this point there are just about 900 of them in those centres. [00:06:00] One of the newest decisions of the Serbian government is to include children of the migrants in the educational system because many of them never really had the chance to educate themselves. I think that about 400 children are in primary schools and about 100 are in high schools. And I think that is a really great opportunity for them to educate themselves. I think that Serbian people have some kind of moral obligation to hold their borders open and because throughout Serbian history, in times of great danger, Serbian people had to move and often go to the territories of another country. Firstly in the period of Ottoman empires in 1690 after the Serbian people stood by Habsburg monarchy side against the sultan in the war. In fear of the revenge they had to leave their homes and escaped on the territory of Habsburg monarchy where they had some kind of privilege because of their position. They believed in some kind of living fence, metaphorically said. They were the border guardians [00:08:00] I think that it’s very important to emphasize that in those times the Serbian Orthodox Church represented the authority and the superiors of the church, negotiated with the court and met the people. Serbs also had another big migration into Russia in the 1750s. And what is interesting that there were about 50,000 of Serb who migrated but after just two or three generations, they stopped declaring themselves as Serbs. They considered themselves Russians. They were assimilated. I think that religion mainly was that factor which influenced that. And now there is a question: does the religion break the borders between nations or does it keep more noticeable? It is odd how the borders of different countries are not as strong as the borders of religion, and generally there are more connections with the people who are the same religion than with the ones who live in a neighbouring state and they are of different religion. It is interesting how religion is often used as a reason to start some war and then after the war borders are changed. Also, [00:10:02] in civil war that happened in Yugoslavia in the 90s, there was a huge migration, mostly from Croatia, where there was ethnical clearance of Serbs in Operation Storm. And when the Serbian people were expelled from their homes a lot of them moved in Serbia, but also in America and Australia. So my country nowadays has a moral obligation not to close the borders for the people who are forced to leave their homes because Serbs once were in the same position, and I want to emphasize this: the biggest problem in Serbia nowadays represents the situation on Kosovo and Metohija. Even though Kosovo and Metohija is de facto autonomy province of Serbia, [00:10:50] Kosovo and Metohija is the oldest territory of our country. And after the things that occurred in 1999 there was (pause) established some administrative line between Serbia and Kosovo, even though it's the same country. But in real life that is really a real border, because the authorities of Kosovo and Metohija want to create a new independent state and that is the violation of resolution 1244 of United Nations. They are doing that regardless of Serbs who are still living there. It is more difficult nowadays to pass from Serbia to Kosovo and Metohija than from Serbia to Hungary, for example, it is very, very strange. One more phenomenon about border is how they're almost never ethnical, and how historical circumstances determine how borders are going to look like regardless of people who are living there, inside different countries. For example, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the third constitutional nation are Serbs but they live in two countries, they live in Serbia and they live in Bosnia, even though it is the same nation, the same religion, everything, the same language. Everything is the same. It is interesting how the borders that exist nowadays existed in the past. For example, history students from Vojvodina are much more focused on studying about history of Habsburg monarchy, than our colleagues from the universities in Belgrade or Niš. They [00:14:02] learn much more about Serbian medieval history and Ottoman Empire in history, because in those days they were citizens of the Ottoman Empire. What is interesting for me, even though there is a border and Republica Srpska is a different country than Serbia, the students who came from Republica Srpska to study in Serbia, if they declare themselves as Serbs, they can have the same position as students from Serbia. I think that this is the really nice thing. I think that borders are actually boundaries for me personally because they stop [00:16:02] me from doing things that I like. It is more difficult for me to travel because of the administrative stuff, because Serbia isn't in the European Union and I think that borders limit how we are going to live and where we want to be. Nowadays with modern technologies I think that there is less and less language boundaries between people. We can find a way to communicate with different people even though we don't understand their language. We can find a way to speak with them and we don't have any boundaries in making friendships with different people from different states. With the internet and the social media, we are very well connected and, in that case, the state we are coming from doesn't matter. So in some way I think that borders are really an obstacle for the existence. Borders are really an obstacle for people to be in places where they want to be, and live in the country where they want to be. But I think that there is some necessity of borders because with borders the state can control and provide security for the citizens.

CS 1: [00:18:05] I begin with my theme, it's about people with disability. I try to find what I want to say. Okay, let's begin. Integrity, unity of subjects are the basis of systemic nature of its mental qualities and the unity of inner or outer spaces and the basis of its life activity. It is found that the (diversity?) depravation of development with disability causes a violation or the psychological boundaries of the personality as a result of which is adaption and (unclear?) psychological boundaries of the personality as a result of which is adaption and (unclear) effectiveness are reduced and sacrificial position is (unclear?) and victimisation is increased. The latest psychological literature is treated as a set of human properties determined by a complex of social psychological and biophysical conditions that contribute to the disadaptive style of the subject’s response leading to damage to his physical or emotional health. Psychological person's serenity is an evolutionary and socially developed systemic personality quality, what is a necessary condition for normal functioning and development, and reflects the ability of a person to control, protect and develop his psychological space on the basis of generalized experience of successful autonomous behaviour and preservation of the boundaries of psychological space. According to the concept of psychological serenity (name – unclear?), the psychological space of personality includes the complex of physical, social and purely psychological phenomena with which a person identifies himself territory personal object social attachments, attitudes and which they define his actual activity and strategy of life. Borders are physical and psychological markers that separate the areas of personal control and the privacy of subjects and determine the rules for interaction between them. It is the formation of the boundaries of psychological space that determines the weakening of the psychological sovereignty of the individual. Psychological serenity implies the inner emotional agreement of the person with the circumstances of life, which is manifested in the experience of authenticity of one's own being, their (properties?) in this particular temporal and value circumstances of his life, the certainty that his actions are coordinated with his desires or convictions. If a person is exposed to the influence of circumstances, and the will of other people, which he doesn't now internalize, one can speak of depravation of the person - from the Latin deprive. [00:21:34] The dominant experience in this case is a sense of subordination, alienation, fragmentation of one's own life characterised by difficulties in finding the objects or the environment with which personal responsibility, inability to make decisions and increased victimization of this person. Psychological sovereignty is also synergetic due to life situations presented in [00:22:05] the environmental language, therefore (name mentioned above?) offers to study it in the field of specific dimensions of psychological space, sovereignty of the physical body territory, personal belongings, habits, social connections based on values. The category of boundaries is used here is (patheo?) metaphor. If the boundaries of the body of subject’s territory, possession of personal things have an exact objective localization then the wonders of taste, habits and social preferences are experienced indirectly through subjective attribution to one's own or another manifested in behaviour, social communicative attributes of the person. The study of psychological sovereignty of students with disability (unclear) on the basis of the question is (unclear?). Sovereignty of psychological space was held in 2010 on the basis of the (unclear) State Pedagogical University by categories of function limitation subjects distributed as follows: violation some sensory functions, vision, hearing - eight people; violations of (stato-dynamic?) functions - 15 people; violation of the functions of blood circulation, respiration, digestion, secretion, metabolism (unclear?), internal secretion - 79 people. Of this disabled group, one was four people, two groups  - 45 people, and three groups - 53 people. There is also study showed [00:24:05] that 67% of subjects have depraved sovereignty border values with indicate deficit, and the realization of need for privacy for full-on effective personal function - 5.9 persons. This data require detailed analysis of the (deprivated?) of individual measurements of psychological space of students with disabilities and interpretation. The index of deprivation for students with disability or the sovereignty of social ties was 69.6 per cent, which is characterized by control over the social life of a person’s disfunctionality, distortion and the formation of systems of social and professional interaction, difficulties in achieving interrupting and selecting contacts determining the intensity of interaction and achieving psychological intimacy. The low structure of borders due to the inability to include another in the social sector of their psychological space and inability to protect their social boundaries leads to the fiction of the deprivational experience, increased vulnerability to adverse effects victimisation. As a result a sense of alienation and loneliness, social deprivation within sub-systems of the addiction, educational space formal semi-formal currently increasing distance in relations to fellow students. Such a disadaptive style of the subject’s response includes not only behavioural [00:26:05] aspects but also a complex psychological experience as reflection of one’s inferiority, irrelevance in the conditions of a university. 54.9 per cent of students with disability, territorial sovereignty is deprived. There are no weak territorial boundaries, which can be explained by the lack of psychological security and educational environment or the university victimisation of the individual. The sense of insecurity in the environment strengthen fixations on the defect, complicating self-realization and adaptation and deformation communicative space of the university exacerbating victim's (unclear) [00:27:03] of the disabled person and making it difficult to form an individual and group identity, who I am and who we are, leading to low status of an individual and group identity, who am I and who we are, leading to lower status due to rejections, limiting the ability to control the intensity of social contacts and information, regulation, protection from intrusions and ultra strong stimulation by the educational environment. So then we'll see of habits depravity in 47…where was I? I begin from sense. The sense of insecurity of environment strengthens fixation of defect complicating self-realization on adaptation in the information communicative space or the university exacerbating the initial (unclear) [00:28:32] of the disabled person and making it difficult to form an individual and group identity: who I am, who we are, listening to allow status due rejection limiting the ability to control the intensity of social contacts and information or regulation and protection from intrusions. An ultra-strong stimulation by the educational environment. So (vanity?) of habits deprived in 47.1 of persons. In other words under the conditions of the university they feel a forced change in the comfortable channel of them. It's considered that one of the reasons for the deprivations of his dimensions and disabled students in the state of the weakness subjectivity due to the typical nature of the state or psycho-physiological functions and social consequences of this. The organisation of educational process at the university does not take into account the individual functional limitation of the disabled in terms of the duration of lectures, the ability to record lectures, the volume of vision and other loads etc. As well as need to periodically drop out of the educational process due to prolonged [00:30:06] and periodic treatment. The negative consequences are excessive stress, the development of other exertion [00:30:13] and chronic fatigue reduce motivation, the emergence of apathy and depressive states. Together all these forms, their opposition at the victim and contributes to the victim’s maladaptation. Deprivation of the physical body is represented in 35.3 per cent of students with disabilities and experience of discomfort caused by touching, smelling in the course of administration of physiological needs. This group consisted mainly of students with visual hearing and several motor pathologies, which leads to the conclusion: significant physical limitations of vital activity are a significant factor in the deformation of the boundaries of the physical body. And the conditions of the professional and educational and there are many students are faced with problems related the opportunity for establishing contact self-orientation. The university environment, not adapted to the needs and opportunities of students with disabilities, determines their increased dependence on others, increase the likelihood of intrusion into personal space and fixes victim status. The deprivation of physical body [00:31:51] interpersonal space and fixes the victim status. The deprivation of sovereignty is revealed in both things in 38.2 per cent of subjects and means the non-recognition of human right to have personal belongings and hence the problems [00:32:06] and self-presentation maintain personal and social identity marking personal territory. Sovereignty of this is and value X illogical is the most conserved dimension of psychological space of students with disabilities. It was revealed in 78.4 per cent or subjects. At the same time every fifth 21.6 per cent of disabled students said values deprived such students are experiencing forcible acceptance of (non-close?) values and accepting these occupy a passive life position.

Unfortunately, the conditions of most modern universities do not contribute to the formation of activity or (initiative?) [00:32:52] of disabled people. We do not stimulate the development of their abilities for effective social functioning. (unclear) [00:33:01] weakness, the personal boundaries of a disabled students and consequence of the scarcity of the social physical and spiritual aspects of his life activity determines the specificity. The system of social connections, personal territory and temporary organization of law possesses the greatest sensitivity to deprive and influences of the vocational educational environment, hence, the more significant in the victims plan. With relative preservation and resistance to impact on the body personal items and the value systems. Taking into account with psychological characteristics and the process of special psychological support of the educational process promote full adoption integration, effective social function and self-realization of students [00:34:06] with disability. Thank you for your attention. I told before what I will be speaking about borders because from beginning I was born in Moscow we have in Russia very many conflicts too. It is everywhere from Ukraine to Japan, in Caucasus too. [00:34:44] I have a lot of friends in Ukraine so for example, and it's very painful theme up for me for Serbia now because it's no difference between Croatians. I have a lot of friends from former Yugoslavia. What I cannot tell that we are very different, you know. I'm not a big specialist in this situation and I have a lot of examples so I cannot speak about this and it's very painful and I don't understand how I can explain this and because of this I choose these students with disability because I'm working in this area with people with disability, I study in this area and because of this, I thought maybe I can answer for questions.

CS 2: You don't study psychology?

CS 1: [00:36:06] No. Pedagogic for people with disabilities. I'm working with people who cannot… they have a lot of borders, I mean.

CS 2: What do you think? What is the biggest obstacle for people with disabilities, is that harder for them to make friendships or and I want to know. It is harder for them?

CS 1: But of course it's harder because they're just live in isolation. From 1960 it's already 60 years how we try to get anywhere.

CS 2: Does the conscience of people that don't have disabilities approved, you know, do they have more...do the people who know disabilities have more understanding nowadays for the people with disabilities, you know?

CS 1: Yeah. Yeah, it's better it's better, but this situation with people with disability it's not just about people who are around. It's about these people, you know, they [00:38:06] they don't have even their own borders because they have to beg for everything. I cannot go, I cannot eat. I cannot telephone or something like this and they always seem begging and not everybody tell you ‘Of course I help you. They say leave me in peace here.

CS 2: I think people with disabilities are much more stronger, you know, they break their own...

CS 1: Not everybody, not everybody, because somebody's like a victim. They say of course you can go, and I cannot, I don't have legs. Somebody can fight, somebody can just (unclear) This is not when we're afraid. It's border to go somewhere. [00:39:27] And after this look with big eyes. I want a husband. So I want to go to somewhere but I cannot because I cannot go. Or because I cannot see. Something like this, you know, it's from my experience. I don't know, not everybody feel like me. Maybe I need more people to ask and make something like this, but who I met, it's three groups.

CS 2: What is the biggest disability when [00:40:06] someone cannot hear or see or walk? What is the biggest?

CS 1: I don't know. It's dependent on a person, somebody without hands, without legs and they can do everything. Somebody have just small illness, but they already cannot do anything. It depends on a person.

CS 2:  I think it depends whether persons with disabilities are surrounded by their families and friends, how much understanding they have.

CS 1: Yeah, but I saw another side from these people. They said they take too much care. They don't allow these people to do something. "You are sick. You have to stay at home." And it's already be cripples. For example, they are 30 years or 40 years and still with mother, but they have no another life. It is like a child.

CS 2: They are afraid for him. But I think that they can also encourage people with disabilities to move on and go to...

CS 1: I like this theory, but we don't have a lot of time. Because of this I want to ask you something about your theme, maybe you can explain to me. You said something like Serbian [00:42:06] and Bosnian, it's just the same.

CS 2: Yes. That's the same nation, same people in Bosnia. You have three constitutional nations, the Croatians, the Muslim, and the Serbs. For example, my family, all of my cousins are from Bosnia, and I'm Serb. In the war, which happened in 90s, my family was exiled from there, every one of them was in the war. They were expelled from their properties, you know, all the Serbs from that city were expelled. It's interesting that no one ever returned there, you know, they are all mainly in Serbia, but a lot of them went abroad. That is a big problem, there is a border, not just the border of the states, but border in mind, you always have some fear to go there, because there is no one who is like you anymore. They are no more Serbs or any others. You can be supported on and you're always afraid that something bad is going to happen just because you are who you are.

CS 1: And this situation with Muslims in Bosnia? It's not your country, but maybe you know, because I have neighbours. Yeah, and they are from Bosnia now, but they are strong Muslims with (clothes?) and hairs on their face.

CS 2: I don’t understand.

CS 1:  Is it (big time?), is it big part of (volk?) Muslims? Or just 10-20 per cent?

CS 2: So there is a really big per cent of Muslims in Bosnia there. I know…

CS 1: Can we say what is Muslims’ land?

CS 2: Well, there's mainly the Muslims and Orthodox and Catholic, they live together in the same place, but in Republic of Srpska, that is something like autonomy province of Bosnia, there are mostly Serbs. So in the war, I think that the borders were determined by powerful people. For example, my parents lived and went to school with Muslims and they were friends. But after the war in that city, there are no more Serbs there. They're just Muslims but in most of the cities there are Muslims or Serbs, somewhere in bigger per cent some in smaller, but there are some cities that are mainly Muslim cities. And where there are more Serbs in Bosnia, but I never lived there so I cannot tell you much about that.

CS 1: I don't know why [00:46:07] you think that the people from Serbia are not in European Union?

CS 2:  I really don't know that is the question for me. I really don't understand. So geographically Serbia is in Europe. Serbia in the past was once an empire. Even, you know, we had Serbian. We conquered almost all the Balkans. And I really don't know why. In the First World War, Serbia was on the winner side, in the Second World War as well. So I really don't know. I think that is some Balkan thing, you know. (laughs)

CS 1: Which city are you from?

CS 2: I am from Novi Sad. It is in autonomy province of Vojvodina. It is north from Danube. That territory once belonged to Habsburg monarchy. The south of Danube belonged to Ottoman Empire when they conquered the Balkans. After the First World War, Vojvodina belonged to kingdom SHS, to Yugoslavia, Kingdom of Yugoslavia. That is why people from Vojvodina have more connections with people from former Habsburg area.

CS 1: What do you plan to do? In your future, mostly. If it is personal, maybe if you don't want to tell, well…

CS 2: No, it is OK. I'm studying history and I would like to teach history in schools. It's my biggest desire.

CS 1: Like a teacher or like professor.

CS 2: A professor in primary school.

CS 1: Don't you think that history can be different?

CS 2: I think that there are the facts and there are variations. I think there are the facts and there are different interpretations of history. Everyone can use facts to interpret something that they want, but the facts are the facts, and they are not just the numbers or names. I think that the real picture can be seen, you know, after some times, and I think that the real professionals they have no obstacle to say, even though they don't like what they [00:50:07] discovered by researching something. I can ask you this: in your opinion are the borders more harmful or beneficial?

CS 1: What do you mean?

CS 2: Harmful.

CS 1: Have you another question for me because it's (unclear) [00:50:34]

CS 2: Do the borders stop you from doing something that you like?

CS 1: Not really no. No. But I live in Vienna. Because of this, I go to other countries, I don't need documents or to change money or have a visa. It's been a long time so I forgot about these problems. But if I came from another country, it will be a big problem. Last week I read about Bologna process. I think it's a very good idea. For example, when you study Serbian, after this you can work everywhere in the world.

CS 2: Yeah, your degree will be accepted.

CS 1: And I said OK, wow. It is a win! I mean, it is a very good idea, but this [00:52:08] academic mobility is a wonderful idea but I think that it will be not working because everybody will (secure work?). Do you know what I mean?

CS 2: No. Not really.

CS 1: For example we don't have enough work ourselves. We don't wait for maybe for economy to become good and somebody come to your country and work and make this better. But from another side, you don't want to go to somewhere. You want to stay with your family. And you said no, I don't need any specialist. I can do it myself. I don't know. Maybe we will not be spending too much money for education because we will be waiting and somebody will come already with big experience. What do you think?

CS 2: I think it is good to have different people. It is good to exchange experiences between experts. It's a good thing to share your knowledge with different people and there are some things that I wouldn't know if I did not hear you and your research.

CS 1: What about a job in Serbia?

CS 2: I cannot say that it is a great [00:54:08] situation, the economical situation. A lot of people are forced, they don't want to, but they're forced to go to European Union states and work there because there is no way for them to earn money in their country and I think that is terrible.

CS 1: But I've heard you have a very good institution at the university.

CS 2: Yes. Our experts are really good.

CS 1: And you prepare people for the European Union?

CS 2: I don't understand your last questions.

CS 1: I mean they prepare people. They don't want to stay in Serbia. They want to go.

CS 2: That is very strange, we have really great experts. And it costs to educate somebody. They just leave from your country. A lot of our medical students go to Germany. And now I think that Serbia will be in deficit with the doctors because they are in Germany. But in Serbia they have no possibilities to earn enough for them and the payments are really low. For an educated person who has a degree, I think, in Europe you can earn enough money. But you know it costs you your friends and family. Yeah, it's very difficult. If I had to go somewhere, I don't know if I would do that.