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CS 1: LostFairy

CS 2: Response

CS 1: Citizen Science Experiment: ‘Talking Borders: from local expertise to global exchange’, 10thJuly 2018, 3 p.m. Vienna. We are using Dictaphones, one is number 25 and the other one is 55. Our user names are: mine LostFairy and yours is Response. Okay, so now we will start to talk about what a border means to me. So before I start to talk about borders, we need to understand that we, as human beings and generally the planet Earth, isn't the same in every aspect. Every region, every country, every human being is diverse or different to one another. And this also affects the perception that one has about borders, about our borders because there are so many things that affect someone's perception about the borders. I would like to summarise those things that affect someone's perception about borders as context. Because if we want to understand, why someone thinks something in or in some way about borders, we need to understand where does he come, what time we are talking about? What the historic background of the region he comes from. Is it filled with wars or it was always peaceful world? Were they always a part of some bigger power or did they have their own developed civilization? And before I start to talk about borders, I would like to first clarify the noun or the word - border. What does it mean? Where does it come from? And so on, so on. So border comes from the French language, from old French language, and it was devised in [00:02:00] the 14th century.  It has two meanings actually: border and edge of the shield. And French word I hope I'll pronounce it rightly 'bordeure'. So this word was devised in 14th century in Old French, and then it was taken into English. And today in modern English we have so many different meanings or different situations that we can use the word border in everyday conversation. So I think that's very narrow because it will, in my opinion, be, how to say it, the rational or one wouldn't be normal that the original word from the 14th century has more meanings and more usage than the modern day word. Because as we humans constantly develop, upgrade, become more sophisticated, intelligent and so on and so on. So in Modern English word border can be used in so many different ways. Basically the most common definition or meaning of world border that everybody knows, it's just a line that separates two regions, two administrative districts. It can also mean part of something. But also it can be used in non-political context like agriculture because you say border agriculture. It represents a small bit of land that is planted with plants, flowers, trees, whatever. So there are so many different meanings and different situations that you can use word border, and every time have a different meaning. It can also be used, for example, in arts because borders are used to decorate the main work. And this diversity of meaning and these definitions and the usage of world border [00:04:00] comes from our diversity as human beings because we on planet Earth there are over 7 billion people. We have our similarities and differences. From a biological standpoint we are pretty much the same. We all have, I don't know, two arms, two legs, same inner organs, but we also have some distinct features that separate us from every other human being. |t makes us unique, for example, fingerprints or the way we think. So this enables to have so many different perceptions about borders. And this is why I think it is very important, makes us very rich because there is no one mainstream or, how to say, most common opinion. Of course, there is most common or mainstream opinions about borders, but they're just there and we agree or disagree with them. But every one of us has its own opinion about borders, what they mean to him. But they represent to him: does he love him, does he hate him? Does he think they should be erased or kept and so on and so on? One of the biggest, as I said earlier, the factors that determine how we look at borders is the context. Which geographical space are we talking about? What is the history of that region, dating from earliest as we know about that region. And what is the history, as I said. So borders are viewed differently because of that context. Some of them, some people think they're a necessity, guarantee safety or stability, while some try to overcome them, neglect them. They think they're a relic of past and we should overcome them. We live in a globalized world where everything is connected and they should be erased. This [00:06:00] is also a paradox to me or, how to say, a cycle that is going non-stop, that never ends. Because since I can remember and if we look back from history, these borders have always been there, starting from the beginning of humanity. I don't know two millenniums ago till now. People always drew borders, either in real life or in their heads. And the next generation always tries to overcome or neglect the borders that were set by their ancestors. So this is a paradox because one generation makes borders, other tries to neglect them, change them, erase them, and so on and so on. And it never ends. So you need to ask yourself a question. Can we live without borders? Because if you don't need them why don't you just erase them. Why do we always keep making new and changing these existing borders. And one good example of that is the European Union. European Union is the best example to me or maybe America but it's basically the same that represents that borderless concept, borderless world, world without borders. And in European Union or in other states the borders between those states that make USA or that make European Union are almost non-existent. People know they're there, but they don't represent anything. There's no checkpoints, customs passport controls. It’s just a line there to be crossed. But on the other hand, those countries, for example, the USA or the European Union try to maintain tight control over borders to others outside that are not members of the EU. [00:08:00] And that is by me and my opinion completely natural because we as humans have three basic instincts. At least I think we have. First one is to eat so we can stay alive, second one is to reproduce, to continue our humanity. And the third one is how to say to shield yourself, to protect yourself from something that you don't know, that you're not familiar with, that is strange to you, whether it was other people animals, weather elements, thunder, you know, and so on and so on. So it's completely natural that people or, I started talking, European Union or the United States tried to maintain hard grip or tight control over their borders to Asia, Russia, Northern Africa because that's the way for them to protect what they have built through times. Because, if I remember correctly European Union was founded during that Cold War era. So they made a pretty good concept where borders are non-existent and that allows free flow of goods, merchandise, products, information, knowledge, people but also they try by controlling those borders towards outside the European Union, they try to preserve that concept that they made. Because they don't trust those outside, at least initially. We saw some cases where in new countries are like Croatia, Greece and so on. But mainly they try to keep those borders tight, and we can see that especially in this immigration crisis, with the refugees from the Syrian Middle East. But it's for me funny because they try to control that border towards Middle East, Africa so they can prevent immigration, but most [00:10:00] of that border is on is on sea. So it's very hard to control but at least they're trying, trying to preserve what they built. And it shows that borders are necessary in some degree. But also they can be neglected. So it's like we can do without them but we don't want. They're just there to make us feel safe, to be stable, to think we're safe and so on. So even though a border comes from a natural, I would say, from a natural need to protect yourself, they're mostly artificial products. They are made by men, not by some nature rules or something like that. Men drew borders, and some of those borders follow the nature. I don't know, we have so many cases where a river is a border, for example in South America between Brazil, Argentina, and I don't know what the third one. The Amazon is splitting those three countries. Then we have mountains, for example, the Alps. Here they separate Austria, Italy and so on. But also we have examples of borders that are very, very artificial because there is no, how to say, there's no reason for them to look like that. For example in Africa, the world of the colonizers, the borders are just mainly straight lines that don't follow anything, don't follow, I don't know the ethic how to say, they don't follow, there do not separate people. Sometimes the border, because it's a straight line, separates the same people in two.  It doesn't follow that situation on the ground and [00:12:00] the ethic disorder of something. I made a mistake but never mind. So, they're just lines but borders, because we are both historians, we look at borders every day. We start the world's culture and we think in my case at least, I took them before for granted. Because there is a border, if you are talking about some war. Across the border the war breaks out. So it happened like that, it finished like that, border was set. But every voter, in my opinion, in the world, and especially in Europe, because it's very turbulent region from a historical standpoint. Every border has its own, how to say this, its own history about what led to its creation. The history of conflicts around them, and so on. So I think most of us neglect that aspect of a border that historical aspect, because as I said before we just see a border. Okay, a border is just a line but there's always a different context, situations that determine it. And this is what I want to talk about because, as I said before, borders are man-made, and they're mostly made by big powers throughout history. Whether it was, I don't know, in ancient times, Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, in the Middle Ages the Byzantines, the Holy Roman Empire, the Russian Empire, Ottomans. And now in this new age Habsburg Monarchy, Prussia, Russia and Great Britain and so on. So they are the main factor, in my opinion, they are the engine that keeps the world going because they are big powers and when they make some decisions whether we like it or [00:14:00] not, it affects everyone. Even though we are not correct them. For example, Hungary and Great Britain have nothing common, there's no connection between them. But when Britain makes some big decision, it more or less affects Hungary. It's the same for my country Bosnia. So there's the engine that keep the world going. There the main factor in changing borders because (unclear)[00:14:31] time in history, especially in the Middle Ages over 18th and 19th century, there were so many wars, that let the creation of national states. And so many new borders were made or the old ones were established, recognized and so on. But that procedure of changing borders to me it's still active. In recent history we didn't have some big wars. They have the war in Iraq. Now this civil war in Syria, but it's civil war. We don't have those same wars from the 19th century where some big power invades another but there is, in my opinion, different way they do that. They're strong economically, and they destroy or weaken some countries that they like or they want to control economically. That country falls into a bad state, and then they use that and the money they have by giving loans credits MFF and stuff like that. And then they seize their most important infrastructure, airports, city harbours, passport border crossings. So basically that country is still independent, but on the other hand, it is controlled by someone other. And now I would like to express my own opinion about borders. Because my view of a border is strongly influenced by contexts. I come from a small country. Bosnia is in the Balkans and there was always some [00:16:00] people living there. Slavs, (unclear) and stuff like that. Yeah, but Bosnia is Bosnia. Today was conceived in my century. I mean, that's the earliest mention of it in those old documents. And from that point on she kept growing. Have all the makings, becoming stronger, bigger and stuff like. She reached its peak in 14th and 15th century when we became kingdom. And from a territorial standpoint we were the biggest at the time. We controlled from the Adriatic Sea almost to the Black Sea. But then in the 15th century Ottomans came, not just to Bosnia but to whole Europe. We all know that. And they conquered Bosnia. And Bosnia was under the rule for approximately 400 years until the Congress in Berlin in 1878. And for the most of those 400 years Bosnia was the frontier, how to say, an out most place, the border to Christian Europe. Every Christian army that attacked not to mention the crusades or rather the Hungarians. Bosnia was first to be attacked because it was the last frontier to the Christian world. So people spent a lot of money, resources to fortify those borders. And I think in that period people thought that border is a guarantee of safety. Because they know we have a border, we fortify then we should be safe. And from that point on throughout the history of Bosnia we were always part of a bigger power. First Ottomans then the Habsburg Monarchy. After the First World War we were part of the kingdom of SCS, Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and it was the kingdom of Yugoslavia, and finally the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. And [00:18:00] in that period, I mean when it was Yugoslavia, we were something like European Union today, six republics living in one country. They were borders but also not important. But then Yugoslav wars happened in the 1990s, everything broke up, and all these six republics became independent. So those, as in my case, especially those Yugoslav wars, but also, as I said right now, that history of my country says that we're always in some kind of conflict, war with someone. Whether it was on our side or if we were part of an Ottoman world we fought wars with (unclear)[00:18:43], we were involved. So in my opinion, that's the main reason why me and I think most of the people in Bosnia think that the borders represent safety, stability because they separate us from the ones, which are different from us - Serbs, Croats. Basically, I mean, we belong to the same ethnic group. So we are both south Slavs, but during those middle ages we embraced different religions. Bosnians in Bosnia are mostly Muslim, Serbs are almost all Orthodox and Croats are Catholics. So even from that standpoint, we are different. And even though, if we didn't have borders like an European Union, we would still make them in our heads, because we are culturally different. We live different lifestyle, eat different food. Some things or actions that are acceptable in my religion are not accepted in other religions, so I think even without borders we would still separate ourselves in our heads, and try to live with the ones we are close and we know. Also my [00:20:00], how to say, my view of borders is they are necessary to bring stability to some regions. Because in my context borders bring stability, and all of the borders or recognized by world. They are authorized and there's no question about it. So I think that prevents, in great measure, disputes over land between us, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia and so on. And it also helps us to control who comes in and who comes out, and also we have economic benefits because of the customs and stuff like that. So now I leave it to you.

CS 2: Yes. Thank you very much. Yes, it's my turn. Yes. I think too borders are really complicated. If it is a question or a problem, I don't know. But I'm sure we can distinguish several type of borders, for example, there are borders of countries, there are borders among social groups, and there are also administrative borders. I think administrative borders are necessary because we should organize their community, but I think we should decrease the gap between social groups and between countries. As you said and I share this - context is really important. I'm a Hungarian. I am studying in university. And yes, and I have mixed origins. So from my aspect borders is mainly negative thing and because of the political situation, I see that politicians use this in a very negative [00:22:00] way. Yeah, I totally agree with you. As far as I am concerned borders are artificial creatures. These are created by human because I think basically we are the same. You are, okay, you are from Bosnia and I am from Hungary, but we are humans. We look for maybe the same, things we would like to have a happy life. So our aims are basically the same. And the normal person would like to live his or her life in a peaceful way. Yes, and these are borders are evolving continuously. We see I think at first in the human history. At first borders were important between tribes. After that, maybe villages and cities and countries and now I think borders are most important among integrative units, for example, the Soviet Union now Russia and Russia between China or the European Union and the non European Union countries. Yes, and it's important to know these borders that we know now, was created by the nationalism in in that era. And plus in Africa and in Asia many places in the world that colonisation. And it has a lot of effects in our life. I think we can distinguish strong and weak borders. For example a strong border between Hungary [00:24:00] and Ukraine, because we should have passport if we would like to go to Ukraine, but we have just a weak border, I don't know better words to emphasize this, between Hungary and Austria because we are in the Schengen. We are the part of the European Union, and I really like this. For me, for from my context it's really important. I can't imagine my life without it. I really enjoy the freedom of movement, freedom of goods and everything, the common market. I think it's really beneficial not for just us, two individuals. It's beneficial for my country as well. So the borders, the characteristic, the style of the borders depend on the context. As you said it can be a defence. Yes, in your contacts I think it's right but, for example, in my context, I feel that it is a mostly cage or something like this. I think that because I'm a Hungarian so I'm living in the Carpathian Basin, and I think most of the Hungarians also associate borders with the negative meaning. I think that's why because, you know, the Ottoman Empire they conquest the third of Hungary and in that period Hungary was a frontier. And mainly half of the country was destroyed because of the wars. And after that Hungary was part of the Habsburg monarchy. And you know, in the Habsburg monarchy there were inner borders too. Hungary was like in a colony in a Habsburg Monarchy. In many [00:26:00] aspects and in many aspects not, but I think all in all it has negative effect on our country. And after that the monarchy lost the First World War, and we lose not just the territory. Most of the Hungarians, okay, they hardly accept that but we lost the third of the Hungarian population. So Hungarians associate it with a really bad (unclear) And after that the there was the Communist area, and of course Hungary was conquered by the Soviet Empire. So in that time the border was a really hard thing really, really hard thing. You know the name of it was the Iron Curtain and it's separated the world. So it is divided the world to two parts. And you know, okay plus the third world. And I think because of this, borders for me it's not a really good thing. Plus I really like Hungarian literature. It's a poor country, has a really rich literature and Any Endre who was one of the most famous poet in my country, he lived in the early 20th century and the late 19th century. He has verse and the name of it is 'The song of the Hungarian Jacobean'. He said the Danube and Olt, this is the river of Romania, has the same voice. [00:28:00] I think he was absolutely right. And he is absolutely right now, because our fate in the Carpathian Basin are the same or future will be the same in the Carpathian Basin and not just in the Carpathian Basin but inside the EU too. I think that's why we should create a united Europe. Because I think just politicians would like to make us enemy. Normally we don't have any problem with each other, We could live hundred and hundred years together in a peaceful way. Just after the nationalism, you know, what's happened? Yes, and secondly, of course, these were mainly a Hungarian historical perspective, but from my personal perspective I have many friends who are from abroad, from Pakistan, from Bangladesh, from Palestine, from Kurdistan, and from a lot of countries. And I see borders mean a real obstacle for them to cross borders. And they, for example, they can't go to the USA. They can't go to European countries easily. And okay, I'm a Hungarian and I'm lucky, in this point of view, I can go. So I see that borders are can be really, really hard obstacles, and okay, they are really talented guys. Maybe they should study in the USA on or the most developed European countries, but they can't, because they can't cross borders. And like it's a one of my personal view. Yes, [00:30:03] and the other thing is I'm a pro-European Hungarian citizen. So if I think myself at first, okay, my identity is at first I'm a European citizen. And secondly, I'm a Hungarian citizen and I would like to, I hope I live that time when we will have unified Europe. And another thing is the globalization. I think it's a really important process and I have to speak about this, because it's really important, because I think it really renewed everything. I think from the 1990s the whole world is continuously changing in a very fast way, the goods, the information can move easily because of the technology and because of the agreements among countries. And I don't understand why people can't move as easily as good or information. So OK we are here in Vienna. We can see this is not just an Austrian city. It is not just the capital of Austria. It is a diverse city. I from Hungary I went there. Okay. I am now I'm living in Budapest. It's a European city, but Vienna it is a diverse city. We can see many different religions, many different people. I really like it. That's why because Vienna is one of the centre of the globalised hubs. So we analysed the winner of the globalisation. But for example, there are the countries such as Hungary who are the losers of the globalisation. [00:32:03] Because they don't have the necessary resources, the necessary education and the necessary circumstances. And okay in this situation we can see a border again, a new border, which I think is really strong, really strong, the border between the globalised hubs and the countryside which are the losers in this point of view. Yes. Of course, we can distinguish borders among civilisations, among religions too. Yes, but now I think because of the globalisation populations are more (unclear)[00:32:47] mainly Europe. So I think we cannot distinguish clearly the border of the European civilization. Okay with Ukraine, is it a part of Europe or it's part of Russia. So I hope you understand this. And we can speak about of course social borders within a state or we can speak of global social borders. For example, the developed West and the development countries. Because there's a strong border among them because okay, I'm from Hungary. It is the part of the western civilization. It is the poorest country, but in a global context, it is a rich country. So it depends on again the context. Yes, and it's important. Why? Because the West could best maintain these living standards because they steal a lot of resources from the third world during [00:34:03] the 19th and 20th century and before that. You know, the colonisation everywhere. And borders exist within a state. This is the Communist way, you know, the class struggle and everything. But okay, not just the Communist theory, we can see there are different groups in a society. One of them can reach better living conditions. One of them can maintain just a lower living condition. They have different interest. We can see it as a social scientist. But I think a good state try to decrease the gap between these social state. For example, the Scandinavian states, they are really developed, and they manage this situation. They can manage these situations in a really good way. I think. For me these are the examples how to maintain the well developed but humanise country because they relocate the salary, the money very well. Yes, so only from my context because I'm young. I'm European. I'm a Hungarian. Borders are not really good. I have bad feelings about this because of the current political situation in Hungary. And because of the propaganda a lot of hungry people, mainly in the countryside, would like to have again the strong borders. But I think they don't realise that what is the Schengen, and what the EU means to us. EU [00:36:03] gave us a lot of opportunity, especially to the younger generations. For example, me as a student I can go everywhere in Europe for Erasmus. It's a huge chance. Yes, and so I have a mixed origin. So in my family there were Jews, Slavs, Hungarians, everything, just like almost every people in the Carpathian Basin I think they should know this. Yes. So for me strong borders are cages. I know and I agree with that we need borders, but I like these integrative units, the EU, and of course we need administrative borders because we should organise our community in an efficient way. Yes, and I think we should (unclear) strong border which can distinguish the EU country and the non-EU country because we are in the European Union. We share the same values. It means we should defend these values. But I think I really like French patriotism, which means everybody who lives in the territory of France, and share common values, he or she is a French, I totally agree with that. If somebody from Asia or Africa also, yeah, live in the EU and share the common values, he or she is a EU citizen. [00:38:03] But he or she has to share these common, humanistic values like us. To be honest in Hungary now borders is a really key thing, is really popular thing, but I think in a negative way because it promotes - we should have strong borders again. But now this generation should know from history, we should know about the Iron Curtain. I think most of the Hungarian youngsters would like to be part of the European Union and would like to be integrated part of the West. Because we share, I think most of the Hungarian share these values. And another thing is we are a small country. I think we should cooperate with others more. We should cooperate with other small countries in the Carpathian Basin and in the EU. Because in a global scale, on the global level Europe has a lot of too little countries. We should be unified because in a global context   we have several debates with the USA, China, with India and these are huge countries. Okay. Germany is a great country. France is a great country, but alone they cannot race with these huge countries, especially Asian countries. Yes, I think that's all. Thank you very much.

CS 1: So now we should start (unclear) between us about border. So I talked about borderless world and that concept. It is present in the EU and the United States and some other countries and you mentioned globalisation. I want to ask you do you think that globalization is just a mask for big powers, for example, USA, China, America, Russia to in some way seize control over those third world countries that have something that those big powers, for example oil, natural gas, and stuff like that?

CS 2: I don't think so because of the globalisation, the huge winners were the Asian countries because their middle class are developing, developing and the losers were the European and the so-called developed countries, middle classes in a way. But I see your point. I think there is something because we should know that globalisation has many negative effects too. We have to admit it. And yes, there are interests everywhere. There are interests of big companies and that's the interest, for example, unfortunately young children make clothes in Asia or in Africa. Yes. It can be a mask. I agree with you, but I think it is just a part of the truth. Yes, and it's interesting. It's interesting for me because you are from Bosnia and your context is similar but different. Because your country and my country is among big powers. My country between the German and the Russian Empire, your country between Turkey, Germany, Russia.

CS 1: Yeah rest [00:42:03] of the Europe which was Christian at the time.

CS 2: Yeah, so I can understand your point of view about the borders. But what do you think? Bosnia should maintain in the future, maintain its power or its borders or so your country will join to the EU and the Schengen?

CS 1:  I think right now, considering this situation we are in, I don't think my country will be a part of the European Union for a long time because we are economically weak. There's so much corruption, so much those rigging elections and stuff like that. And because Bosnia has so many different ethnic groups within its borders, the Bosnians, Serbs, Croats, Jews, the Gypsies and so on. We don't work together, and I don't know if you know, when the Yugoslav wars ended, we signed the treaty at Daytona. We signed the treaty, we have three presidents at the same time - one is Bosnian, one is Serb, and third is Croat, and they are elected every two years or four, I don't know for sure, and they switch. They are always three but one is the hot seat chairman too. And they rotate within their mandate. And, for example, if one or two decide to initiate some initiative, to do some projects, I don't know, anything. If the third one doesn't agree, everything stops, it cannot be done. Unless all the three of [00:44:03] them agree on certain things.

CS 2: So there are huge gaps. So that are strong borders among ethnic groups of your country? Ah yes.

CS 1: Yes, and if they don't agree, nothing can happen. We can't build something new unless all three parties agree. And because the situation is very bad in Bosnia politically, every side tries to get maximum for its own benefit. And then if they don't think they got what they want, they block

CS 2:  They block the whole movement.

CS 1:  The project, ideas and stuff like that. And also in Bosnia, we have really strong borders in our heads, as I said, when I was speaking for 20 minutes. We are all different. There are three main religions: Islam, Catholic Christianity and Orthodox Christians. So we are not the same and we should not, I mean, we tried to live together in Yugoslavia. But to me all that concept, whole Yugoslavia was for me some kind of utopia. I think the people that lived in Yugoslavia they lived in a lie, because Yugoslavia for its own people was very great. Everybody had jobs. They were free, how to say, holidays for the workers organised by the companies and stuff like that. And we had some pretty strong companies that were international companies. That didn't work only in Yugoslavia. They worked in the Middle East, America, Europe and stuff like that. But the problem is that, that was all going [00:46:04] on by taking loans from Europe. Because it was common practice in Yugoslavia that you just go to a company and get the job. When the companies announced they're taking you, I don't know, 50 new workers and then you apply for the competition or whatever. And you get accepted or not. That wasn't the case in Yugoslavia mainly because you just go to the company and get a job.

CS 2: It wasn't efficient.

CS 1: It wasn't efficient because you couldn't maintain how much workers you have, who's working, who's not. And most of the people in those companies really didn't. They worked, they produced but not as efficient that they can sustain themselves with that money. So Yugoslavia took a lot of credits. There was a research in my country that said for other or maybe 50 more years we won't pay the debt Yugoslavia took from Europe.

CS 2: Oh, yes. Yes. I know it's similar in Hungary. Sorry, but you know, the most interesting thing that for you I think borders it's a necessary thing which guarantees you stability and safety. But for me borders, it's a cage. It's an unnecessary thing, which, for example, the Soviet Union imprisoned countries with the strong border, with Iron Curtain.

CS 1: It's very different in my context because in Yugoslavia, as I said before, I think people live in utopia or in a lie. They thought it was all okay, everything is good. But in reality it wasn't. And every day everything broke down just 45 years after it was created. And [00:48:04] that example with Yugoslavia in my case shows me that we can't live together.

CS 2: Oh, it's so, it is a bad experience.

CS 1: Because we are from the same ethnic group, we are both South Slavs, but throughout history five, six, ten centuries, you were very different. And we have our differences: in religion, in everyday life, in some actions, we eat different food and stuff like that. And that concept was great on paper because everything, everybody lived together. There was no nationalism. I think also that people from the Balkan region: Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia and so on, we can't function on our own, we can't be independent. I mean we can be independent but we always need that, until now it has been like that. I wish to change that, but the situation is that we always need some stronger authoritative figure to lead us. To say, you need to do that to me because when we are on our own, we can do nothing. At least now, I hope that will change and I think it will change. But through history and now we were always led by someone bigger, stronger and we are used to that system to be governed by someone. That's why the people from Bosnia usually go to work in Germany, because in Germany there is order, discipline, strong figure that manage that and we fit well in that system. We know how to function in that system. And we don't know how to function on our own because for the most of time, we were governed by somebody else. So being independent and making our own decisions is very new to us.

CS 2: I totally agree with your point [00:50:04] because I think it is the case in Hungary too. Because from the 16th century we were the part of an empire which was not Hungary. Okay. We were part of the Habsburg Empire, then, okay, we became the part of Austrian-Hungarian monarchy. But okay, that is another form of Habsburg Empire. Then the Soviet and so we couldn't live, we couldn't create basic things which we need now to live, to live in a democracy and to prosper, to make prosperity for or country. Yeah. I totally feel that your feel. Yes, and sorry and now, you know, Hungary built a fence with the southern border. We heard in the lectures. It can't have because okay the people can't find another rules and nothing is the worst thing. Okay, Hungary built little passes who cares? Okay, but the government uses for political things and people would like to build more fancies, nothing in reality but in their minds. So they distinguish themselves from another human creature and I think it's not good because they become less tolerate than before. And for example, okay you are white, your skin is white. You probably won't have any problem in Hungary, but you are a Muslim. So a lot of Hungarian people, especially in the countryside, they feel that it's a strong border but not in reality, is not the strong border. We can speak to each other, we can be friends. It's nothing, it shouldn't be a strong border. So that's why I don't like many Hungarians who would like to build borders, because they [00:52:04] built ideological and religious and every kind of border. They always say they are Hungarians with a lot of pride and okay it's fantastic they're Hungarians, but please don't be at war because, I think it's because they will build a cage, a mental cage not just the physical cage.

CS 1:  Yeah, but it's the same situation in my context because we have borders and in our context they are very necessary. I mean we are different and stuff like that, but that shouldn't pose an obstacle to knowing each other. But as I said before, we were for a very little time independent, we governed ourselves, that is from the Yugoslav wars till now. Not just me but also Croatia, Serbia, stuff like that. And that we got used to being governed by someone else. I think that is why we also tend to create strong borders between ourselves, whether countries or within the people in the country because they, as I said, offer stability. And they distinctly show us what's ours, what's theirs. Because I don't think right now people in Bosnia would fit very well with this European concept of open borders, because I think they would be like small children in a candy store. They wouldn't know where to go, what they can they do, what cannot, and that's why I think my people make strong borders with other countries and within the very own country. And also I think borders are something like guidelines because, as I said, we have political borders, you talked about social [00:54:04] borders, cultural borders and stuff like that. But border is some kind of guideline because it tells us what can be done, what cannot be done, not just in political world, but in everyday. There are borders between prison and freedom. If you do that, it's okay.  It's regulated by those borders, and you won't have any consequences. But if you decide to cross the border and do something that is out of those borders, you're going to prison. I would like to ask you, do you think can we live without borders?

CS 2: No, of course these kind of borders that you mentioned, it's necessary because there are laws, everything. So we need these kind of borders. Okay, there will be social borders. It's okay. Just you know, the gaps between social groups, is not too good. I think too much gaps because then the society became frustrated, you know, and it's divided, and it's not healthy for state. And you know, it's interesting, I remember I don't know where I heard this, there is a border so border is not a single creature. It should be filled by an authority, by power. For example, there are the borders of borderlines of Hungary. Okay, really good, but it doesn't mean anything if there's no Hungarian authority. So the main authority in Hungary is the Hungarian state, you know.

CS 1: It is very funny. But I think we can both agree that borders [00:56:05] are needed. They are a necessity, but they shouldn't be an obstacle or something that prevents us to interact, to try to understand or learn new countries, new people, new ethnicities. And that they shouldn't be, how to say

CS 2:  Be too sharp.

CS 1: Yeah and to restrict someone's freedom of movement because one of the key civil rights that every human has is freedom of movement. Okay, we need borders to keep track who comes in, who comes out? Yeah, maybe prevent someone who we don't want to, some criminals, I don't know, some radicals. But we should not also make them so tight that it poses an obstacle for some person from outside those borders to try to cross it and to learn, for example Mexico. I think that border should be there and should be tight because all of the drugs and drug cartels in Mexico, but I also think, because it's so tight, it prevents people from Mexico or the United States, never mind, to cross the border, and to learn, and to try to understand, and see that there is some other cultures and some other people down the border that they didn't know. So in some other cases, maybe when they meet in Europe an American or Mexican, they know at least some basic information about other cultures. What is appropriate, what is not and stuff like that.

CS 2:  So you say, and I think I agree with it. Border has many functions, and we can distinguish [00:58:05] these functions too. But I remember what you said about Yugoslavia, but I think that was a failure. That was a failure too, because it was forced by the Serbian military dominance. Yes?

CS 1: Yes. When you talk about Yugoslavia, former Yugoslavia starting from the First World War till now, the kingdom of SCS, the kingdom of Yugoslavia. It was always dominated by the Serbs.  And all those creations were strongly centralised in Serbia. There wasn't decentralisation like in Europe today. Every centre that matters, for example, finances army, especially in Belgrade. And fun fact that in Kingdom Yugoslavia, we had the king that was from the Serb dynasty. And he reformed the country and actually erased the borders that my country has today. It divided country into several administrative regions. Administrative districts are regions that didn't follow the situation on the ground and all of the borders were erased.
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