CONCEPT

of Empirical Sociological Research of Slovak-Ukrainian Transborder Cooperation

CONCEPT

of Empirical Sociological Research of Slovak-Ukrainian Cross-Border Cooperation

Uzhgorod, 2017

The information-analytical report, summarizing the results of the project *"Information Support and Implementation of Innovative Approaches to CBC of Slovakia and Ukraine"*, funded by the grant of the Norwegian kingdom with the help of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and co-financed from the state budget of the Slovak Republic, analyses the methodological principles and results of monitoring empirical sociological survey of the Slovak-Ukrainian transborder cooperation.

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

Indeed, the world will never cease to amaze us with its paradoxes. This idea can be proven by the early third millennium situation of "spatial separation of states and nations", in other words, borders. On the one hand, pushed by relentless globalization and dynamism, these dividing lines often disappear or become provisional; on the other, stimulated by terrorist threats, criminality and illegal migration, these lines involve reincarnation in various forms (from introducing the advanced biometric control technologies to using archaic engineering structures similar to the notorious "Berlin wall").

Europe has not escaped this destiny either. In this citadel of modern civilization in the course of the European Union massive expansion the internal borders between the member states have virtually disappeared. Instead, the control on the new frontiers, primarily in the East, has been significantly strengthened.

As a result, between the East and the West of Europe there appeared many new problems of a humanitarian, economic and political nature. These problems are actively dealt with by the concerned officials who conduct various forums and adopt equally diverse solutions. Of course, it is necessary and it gives certain results.

However, it is surprising how little attention is paid to keeping the "feedback" contact with the main subjects of transboundary processes – the residents of border regions in central Europe, including Slovakia and Ukraine, those who were first and most affected by the geopolitical changes - to studying their thoughts, feelings, evaluations.

This informational and analytical report offered to our readers is trying to analyse this connection. Not overestimating its value (since the implementation of an international pilot project is not easy both in methodological and in organizational terms), it can be confidently maintained that it provides solid information to reflect on common problems of borders and cross-border cooperation between Ukraine and Slovakia at the European Union's new Eastern Border. And most importantly, it forms the basis for medium and long term monitoring of cross-border processes, without which the operation of open and secure borders is impossible.

In turn, the monitoring is only feasible when a sociological support system for Slovak-Ukrainian border cooperation has been built.

The sociological services system of transborder cooperation *is a combination of scientific, organizational and practical measures to ensure the performance of such func-*

tions as getting (extracting), administering or collecting, storing, retrieving, processing, transmitting and practically applying sociological information concerning the genealogy, current progress and projected development of the modern transborder cooperation.

Building a sociological support system for cross-border cooperation is carried out through joint efforts of CBC actors from Slovakia and Ukraine. It is also contributed to by the partners of the project *"Information Support and Implementation of Innovative Approaches to CBC of Slovakia and Ukraine"*, funded by the grant of the Norwegian kingdom with the help of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and co-financed from the state budget of the Slovak Republic – the Centre for Social and Psychological Sciences of Slovakia Academy of Sciences (Bratislava, Slovakia) and the Institute for Transfrontier Cooperation (Uzhgorod, Ukraine).

The purpose of this scientific and practical report is to identify and analyse the main components that make up the sociological services system for Slovak-Ukrainian cross-border cooperation, to reveal its importance for improving the management efficiency of transboundary modern processes, and to present the main results of CBC empirical sociological research to the wide public.

The authors of this analytical research are:

Marian Haydosh - professional guarantor of the project, Ph.D., Senior Fellow at the Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences, Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS), (Slovakia).

Serhiy Ustych - professional guarantor of the project, Director of the Institute for Cross-Border Cooperation, Doctor of Sociology, Professor of the UzhNU, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary (Ukraine).

Ryune Yertyn Rafaelsen - an expert of the project, Mayor of the Municipality, Sor-Varanger (Norway).

Oleksandr Bilak - an expert of the project, deputy Mayor of Uzhgorod (Ukraine).

Volodymyr Prykhodko - an expert of the project, Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Department of International Economic Relations, Uzhgorod National University (Ukraine).

Svitlana P'yasetska-Ustych - an expert of the project, PhD (Economics), associate professor at the department of economics (Ukraine).

Olesia Benchak - project manager, teacher at Uzhgorod National University (Ukraine).

Dmytro Miroshnikov - an expert of the project (Ukraine).

Eugene Yaschenko - an expert of the project (Ukraine).

1. MODERN GEOPOLITICAL CHANGES AND THEIR SOCIOLOGICAL REFLECTION

1.1. Social reincarnation of the borders' issues

Society development often witnesses processes associated with the seemingly sudden mainstreaming of phenomena. These phenomena in their historical destiny are getting a "second wind", experience a kind of social reincarnation. Something similar happens in the last decade with the social phenomenon of borders. Obviously, the issue of borders is at the foreground of societal relations again, as evidenced by the development in the country.

As known, human activity as a social being in temporal and spatial dimensions is regulated. This regulation is natural or social.

The phenomenon of the border is one of the most significant *social regulators of spatial human activity*. Introduction of the institute of the border that is *real or imaginary lines on the earth's surface, defining the boundaries of the land and water area of the state (state territory),* was a radical intrusion of man to the natural world organization, in particular *to its spatial characteristics*. The border, by setting artificial interstate distinctions, "broke" the space politically. *And this invasion is large-scale.* Border perimeters of the some modern state entities are huge in length, like: Russia - 61 000 km, China - 36 000 km, USA - 12 000 km.

In addition, the phenomenon of the border is one of the *most paradoxical, controversial phenomena of social life,* since it clearly denotes unity of *philosophical finitude and infinity (discreteness and continuity) of things existent.*

Borders, like any other social phenomenon, *have their own genealogy.* The way the borders are configured on the current political map, *has been forming over several historical stages.* The days of slavery (up to fifth century BC) saw the first powerful nations emerge: Greece, Rome, Carthage, Egypt, Babylon, Persia, China, India. In feudal times (fifth to fifteenth centuries) on the basis of small feudal states large, powerful countries were formed: Russia, Byzantium, England, Spain, France and others. In the new capitalist era (16th – early 20th centuries) the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, French, and Russian Empire dominated, which is confirmed by the map of political boundaries and linguistic habitats in Central and Eastern Europe as of July 1914.

In early 20th century there were 55 sovereign states in the world. Before the Second World War there were already 70 states. The length of all state borders on the political map of the world at this time was more than 165 thousand km.: In Eu-

rope - 27 933 km, in Asia - 42 025 km, in Africa - 46 140 km, in North America - 18 400 km, in South America - 30 515 km. In 1945, after the war ended, the political map of Europe had a different look. Today, the world has much more borders as the number of countries increased significantly

These countries have different international legal status. 193 states (in 2014) are members of the United Nations. There are unrecognized states. In addition, there are UN Member States, which only partially recognized by the totality of other UN member states. There are unrecognized states that actually control their own territory. There are also unrecognized states that control parts of their own territory. There are partially recognized countries, mainly those under military occupation. There are partially recognized states under international management. Finally, there are partially unrecognized states.

As one can see, the status palette of today's world politics actual participants is very diverse.

The states also significantly differ by their major *objective parameters*: area – from the giant Russia of 17,075,200 square km. to the miniature Bassas de India - 0.2 square kilometers, and population - from billion-populated China (6,446,131,400 people) to the island state Pitkorn with a few dozens of people(46).

Even more striking differences are evident *in the levels of economic and social development,* with the integrating indicator of the share of gross domestic product per capita of the country - from more than 10 thousands dollars and more in rich countries to a few dozen dollars in the poor countries.

Europe is the continent most separated by boundaries. Here for each unit area there are much more borders ad than anywhere in the world.

Europe's geopolitical dynamics is the largest, with often tectonic nature. However, the large-*scale geopolitical reformatting of the past two decades Europe,* the continent has not experienced for a long time.

First, the political map has seen the Soviet Union disappear – for a long time a very influential subject of the European and world geopolitics. Secondly, the international political arena received a new player – the European Union. Not only is the extent of the new formation striking (its jurisdiction covers a huge European area from the Atlantic and Adriatic to the Baltic and the Carpathians). The most surprising is the manner the European superstate was established. If usually the countries had been forced to enter into similar structures, this union of 28 European states other countries are begging to enter into. And this is despite the fact that everyone is perfectly aware that the decision making is influenced by the two largest countries - Germany and France.

Thus, there are reasons to state that *by geopolitical importance, the results of the mentioned geopolitical reformatting of Europe are quite comparable with the Second World War effects.*

Recent geopolitical changes and globalization of life have generated the new philosophy of the spatial differentiation of states, and with it the being of the human.

Extremely controversial process is going on: on the one hand, almost complete overcoming of borders (as in the case of European Union members states), or even their "dilution", on the other hand - strengthening of strict state and territorial divisions. In particular, the current borders between East and West of Europe *limit, by strict regulation, one of the basic natural human rights - the right to free movement*[1].

At the same time one cannot ignore the fact that, in historical terms, borders are part of state formation, and are its required attribute. That they had been clearly constituted at one time played a positive role in the nation-state identification process, gave impetus to the economic and cultural development of peoples. Even today, the barrier function of borders is very controversial: creating communication barriers to people in general, still it is an essential component of the of economic interests protection for states, fight against crime, including international terrorism.

Therefore, in evaluating the phenomenon of borders, a concrete historical nature of this phenomenon should certainly be considered along with its internal multi-dimensionality.

The border is a static phenomenon. Transborder[2] processes (flows[3]) are a dynamic form of border existence. *Cross-border processes (CP) are subjective and natural interactions that take place across the border*. Cross-border processes exist since boundaries exist. They can be limited by various parts of the spaces (in particular territories) of states, or can stretch over all their depth. Cross-border processes can equally include, say, military intervention of one state to another, or communication across borders using mail pigeons.

Given the radical technological, social and political changes that have taken place in the modern world, communication across borders transformed significantly. It became much bigger, more dynamic and pragmatic. As a result, the phenomena associated with the border, have a growing impact on the livelihoods of people.

---

[1] It is sad that today, at the beginning of III millennium, many people can remember with envy the first "unwritten" constitution of England - "Magna Carta» («Magna Charta libertatum"), enacted in 1215. Indeed, Articles 41 and 42 of this legendary document affirm the right of everyone to move freely both within the country and leave the kingdom. [1].

[2] «Transborder (transfrontier)» (Eng.) means "across the border, on the other side of the border"

[3] The term"transborder flows" is commonly used in international official documents, including the European Union, and the research literature as a synonym of "cross-border process

1.2. The historical evolution of the borders' phenomenon

It is likely that the time and location of the individual who had created borders for the first time will never be determined. There exists an ironic comparison of borders' appearance with how an individual tends to put up fences around a newly-bought property. Everything which ends up inside this fence, is considered to be their property. A house is built, a barn is constructed and a garden planted. Those who do not abide by the rules for entrance and exit are considered trespassers and uses disciplinary measures. Oftentimes, to impose order, he utilises a whip.

Naturally, in real life everything is far more complex. Borders, as mentioned, are a product of many factors interaction on economic, political, spiritual and material fronts, formed over significant period of time. In looking at the historical evolution of borders, the British scientist C.B. Fawcett in his work 'Borders. Teachings of Political Geography', identified three main tendencies of their development: 1) tendency to pinpoint border divisions; 2) tendency for territorial borders to match linguistic and national divisions and 3) tendency for the creation of borders alongside natural features that can be described as 'natural barriers'[4, p.42].

The oldest borders were not clearly defined lines but rather vast border swathes, with the lands of the respective owners on each side. In ancient times, countries were usually divided by artificial barriers: rivers, deserts, forests, swamps, mountains. It is accepted that in literature, the first written mention of territorial division was that of columns dividing Attica and Peloponnesus built in II century BC. Romans of the Imperial era have left a historical legacy in the form of so-called limes (from 'limes', border, in Latin). Limes—were militarised border regions which included fortified buildings populated by soldiers, chains of civilian outposts—municipals, populated by veterans, as well as a road with a hard surface, connecting forts with towns. From the military-tactical perspective, the location of the forts was such as to ensure control over water sources in the desert, river crossings or mountain passages [5].

A typical example of ancient border infrastructure is the Great Wall of China. Its construction began in the 3rd century BC and was intended to protect China from attacks by nomads. The length of the Great Wall is 8, 851 kilometres and 800 metres. 6260 kilometres are composed of bricks, 2232.5 from natural mountainous elements. About 360 kilometres are not a wall at all, but rather ditches filled in with water. From a distance, the wall resembles the twisted form of a dragon [6].

Feudal states' borders were more clearly designated. This applied to land owned by feudal barons, communes, churches, cities, provinces etc. Even at that time, borders were not set by agreements between nations. One of the first known agreements which set the frontier line was the Pyrenees Treaty between France and Spain in 1659. It recorded that the "Pyrenees mountains, which have long separated the Gaul from the Spanish, do already form and will continue to form the border of the two kingdoms. In order to keep up this separation, both sides

will appoint commissars who will appropriately determine the borders and will continue to distinguish the two kingdoms.

In Russian history, the term 'border' first appears in the first half of the 14th century. In an agreed order between Novgorod and the Livonian order concluded in 1323, it is stated that "everyone retains their borders, as they were always". However, the term 'national border' was put into writing much later, at the end of the 18th and beginning of 19th century. It was during this period that the terminology of organisational structures which are responsible for protection of borders was first recorded—'border post', 'border outpost', 'guard', 'patrol' and others. In 1847, in the Dictionary of Church-Slav and Russian Language, the word 'border' was defined as a 'border, line which separates one land from another. State borders. Also, a border post.

It should be noted that the creation and solidifying of borders was influenced by economic factors, particularly the transformation of certain territories into taxable areas for the benefit of the local ruler, and subsequently involving fees for transit through his territory. Gradually, alongside the development of cartography, the precision of borders had also improved.

It is said that the new is the thoroughly forgotten old. This ancient proverb is accurate when applied to the United States' recent project to construct a giant border fence at the Mexican border. Discussions about the necessity for the fence, somewhat akin to the Great Wall of China, first occurred after the September 11th attacks, when representatives of the American intelligence community had said that the Western borders of the US allow terrorists to infiltrate the US. The decision to build the fence was made by Congress in 2005. So far, out of the 1074 planned kilometres of fencing, almost a thousand has been built. In accordance with the programme, the fence will be supported by a technologically sophisticated detection system and additional patrols. For instance, the border is already guarded by 18,000 agents of the Border Service. Congress had already allocated 2.7 billion dollars out of its security budget.

The first international legal agreement of significant importance, which recorded the multilateral agreement between Western European states, was the famous Westphalia treaty of 1648. The Treaty resulted from the Thirty-Year War that had determined the geopolitical map of Europe for 150 years into the future.

Another instance of borders arising from multiple years of struggle is the weakening and humiliation of Germany. Through the agreement, its fractured nature and local rulers' despotism was reinforced, and indentured servitude was reintroduced. German counts have received the right to collect taxes and mint money. In international affairs, they have gained near-sovereignty—they maintained armies and entered into agreements with foreign states. All this had serious implications for the geography of European borders throughout the next century, including the creation of the basis for the century-long conflict between France and Germany. During a speech in front of the Reichstag in 1906, the German Impe-

rial Chancellor von Bulow said that "the Peace of Westphalia created France and destroyed Germany".

Another important effect of the Peace was the spread of countries with two separate religious ideologies—catholic (corpus catholicorum) and evangelical (corpus evangelicorum)--this became an established fact of European systems for international relations [7, p.267-268].

In the middle ages, there were no powerful social factors for the identification of national borders. As in the Roman Imperial era, feudal Europe did not recognise state nationalism. The motivation of religious unification was prevalent. Also, before identifying oneself with an ethnic group (for instance, French or English), people considered themselves Christians.

As noted by E.B. Cherniak, 'in medieval Europe, a certain degree of joint historical background, joint social institutions and culture was expressed through a single religion—a universal, at that time, form of ideology, alongside national languages—Latin as the language of diplomacy, theology and science, as well as political-governmental creations such as the Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic Church [7, p.25].

Even at the beginning of the 19th century, in 1815, at the Congress of Vienna, the next (after the Westphalia summit) international forum of size, while determining the political borders in Europe, the national-ethnic division was entirely ignored. This tendency prevailed for considerably longer. The need to create centralised national states (primarily, for the development of trade relations), has become more and more clear as clear national borders became necessary. The need to govern all persons residing within a border, as well as the necessity of establishing a legal jurisdiction and a single trade market, led to a correspondence between "political and tariff borders--giving the state border its contemporary and conclusive nature, serving as the boundary for a sovereign state" [8, p.737-738].

National self-identification in Europe had gradually acquired ideological dimensions. From one perspective, national emotions were inflated especially patriotism, while on the other—ideological concepts of national exclusivity and divine support were created and nurtured. Oliver Cromwell in 1655 without any doubts had come to the conclusion that "the English people are chosen by God" [9, p.404]. French politicians were not far behind. In his speech at the 1774 Congress, the revolutionary government member Betrand Barrer stated that "I would like to draw everyone's attention today to the most beautiful language of Europe, which for the first time bravely described human rights and civil liberties, which had relayed to the world the most enlightened ideas about freedom and great poetical theories. We will leave Italian to the enjoyment of spiritual music and overly gentle, decadent poetry. Let us leave German language, generally unsuitable for free peoples, until feudal and military governments are destroyed—which primarily use the language as their instrument. Let us leave Spanish to the Inquisition and

its universities, until it is used to tell the tale of the Bourbons being expelled, those who have stripped the people of their rights in Spain. As to the English language, it was great and free until it was enriched by the words 'reign by the people'; this language is just a dialect of the tyrannical and despotic government, of banks and stocks" [10, p.314].

Based on ideological statements of nationalism, external political strategy of governments was formed—primarily the policy relating to borders. In particular, this gave rise to the ubiquitously prominent concept of 'natural borders'. Each country, naturally, interpreted their configuration differently. For instance, the French edition of this concept the natural borders of France were the Rheine River, the Alps and the Pyrenees.

Returning to the Vienna Congress and its decisions (the so-called Vienna Proclamations) it should be noted that it had started a new principle for the re-drawing of the maps of Europe—so-called legitism. Legitism is the policy of the holy union created at the Vienna Congress, for the return to the throne of the lawful monarchs and preservation of their hereditary lands. One of the main principles of the dynastic status quo, inspired by the Austrian Chancellor Metternich, was the right of intervention. This concept had essentially risen to the status of an international customary law. A document was prepared—'Act on Guarantees', which justified the need for military intervention. Based on the idea of a dynastic status quo, the holy union also conducted practical political actions, in particular for the suppression of the revolutions in Naples, Piedmont and Spain in 1820-1823, and Italy as well as Hungary in 1848.

However, it was impossible to stop the natural course of events. The integration of 1848-1849 was reversed following two decades, due to the assistance of three wars: France and Piedmont versus Austria, Prussia versus Austria and Prussia vs. France, as well as the closer ties between Italy and Germany. During this period, the diplomatic policies of the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck reigned supreme--they foresaw a rejection of 'ideological influences' on foreign policy in the spirit of the Holy Union and reliance on national motives [11].

The so-called geopolitical cauldron within which economical and political interests of states were cooking prevailed--desire for national self-identification and religious-cultural conflict between peoples--this cocktail heated up especially quickly in the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century. It reached its boiling point in 1914, when World War One occurred. The nature and scale of this war will be discussed below, but at this point it is worth noting that it resulted in previously unseen redrawing of borders.

This revision was conducted due to the Versailles system, namely the collection of agreements which have formally reinforced the results of the First World War. The majority of their content naturally deals with Germany.

As regards Western Europe, Articles 32 and 34 of the Versailles Treaty a new and fully sovereignty of Belgium over the disputed regions of Morene, Eipen and

Malmedi was granted, with no control by Germany. In Article 40, Germany recognised that the Grand Dukedom of Luxembourg beginning with 1st January 1919 will cease to be part of the German taxation union, and Germany cedes all rights for the use of railways, joins the cancellation of the neutrality stance of the Grand Dukedom and recognises from that point on onward any peace treaties formed between the Allies and the unified countries with regard to the Grand Dukedom.

France benefitted from full territorial satisfaction also. The victors saw it as their moral obligation to correct the injustices caused by Germany in 1871 as regards French rights as well as those of the Alsace-Loraine population.

In relation to this, under Article 51 of the Treaty, territories which Germany had received following the Preliminary Peace signed in Versailles on 26th December 1871 and the Frankfurt Agreement of 10th June 1871, would revert to French sovereignty starting with 11th October 1918.

Austria was not spared the Treaty's attentions either. Article 80 set out that Germany recognises and will strictly enforce the independence of Austria along the borders outlined by the Treaty, signed by Austria and the Main Allies as well as Unified nations.

However, the most significant changes took place in the Eastern European direction. Article 81 stated that Germany recognises the complete independence of the Czechoslovak state which includes the autonomous Russin territory to the south of the Carpathians. Germany would also proclaim its agreement to the borders of this country in the outline designated by the allies.

Article 82 stated that the border between Germany and the Czechoslovak state will be determined by the current border between Austro-Hungarian and German empires, as of 3rd August 1914. Lastly, as regarding the Czechoslovak state, according to Article 83, Germany will cede to this country all its rights to a part of the Silezian territory.

Germany was also forced to recognise the full independence of Poland. In addition, the allies have taken away the very important city of Danzig, which was announced as a free city, although was attached to the Polish fiscal zone. Independence from Germany was also achieved by all territories which entered the former Russian Empire until 1st August 1914. Lastly, the defeated country had agreed to cede in favour of the victors all its rights and legacies for overseas territories [12, p.179-185].

As is shown by the above, the Versailles system did not only punish the aggressor. It also used the most brutal possible form of robbery and humiliation. This could not have had serious consequences in inspiring revenge. In the course of the two post-War decades, the weakened Germany using its former enemies did not only get up from its knees but also seriously expanded its military power. This resulted in the Second World War, even worse than the worst.

The curtain on this second tragic drama in human history was raised in the German city of Potsdam 17th July-2nd August 1945, at a conference of the US, British

and Soviet leaders. At this forum, the leaders made a series of decisions regarding the post-War structure of the world, later joined by France. In particular, the Potsdam conference established the main principles for the peaceful and democratic development of Germany, namely:

- Democratic rebuilding of the entire political environment of Germany, with the German people being given all opportunities to "reconstruct their own lives on democratic and peaceful bases";
- liquidation, in permanent form, of all German militarism and fascism, in particular so that "Germany would never again threaten its neighbours or the preservation of peace globally";
- destruction of German monopolistic entities as it is they which bear most responsibility for World War 2.
- preparation and formation of a peace treaty with Germany, which corresponds to the principles of the Potsdam Agreement

Within Germany territory, the Allies agreed to establish a zone-based occupational regime (on basis of which Germany was later divided into East and West).

Territorial rights of Poland and Czechoslovakia were restored. The Soviet Union received the city of Konigsberg and the bordering regions [12, p.251-254].

Accord between the victors did not last; soon after, after the conclusion of the 'hot' World War, the Cold War had begun and lasted for several decades, even more dangerous in terms of its possible consequences. This time, between former allies.

However, regardless of the tensions in their relations, the parties did not permit major revisions to European borders. The legal status of these borders was regulated through a series of international treaties and acquired modern interpretation, now widely recognised.

Nowadays, 'national border', it understood to refer to actual or conceptual lines on the surface of the Earth, which denote the land or sea territories of a country (national territory).

National territory alongside with national public authority and population, is a necessary attribute of a state. It consists of a part of the earth's surface which belongs to that state and is exclusively governed by that state. Nations tend to have attributes such as sovereignty, namely the superior authority over its territory and independence in international relations. National territory consists of land, national waters, underground resources, territorial waters (territorial sea) and air space, which lies above land as well as national and territorial waters.

Land areas consist of discrete land masses, parts of the land continent, or parts of dry land that are separated by part or parts of other countries. Water areas belonging to a country include internal (national) waters and waters of the naval belt, which are connected to the naval cost of the state—territorial waters or a ter-

ritorial sea. International (national) seas, lakes, canals and rivers which are located within the limits of the land mass of that country, as well as seas delineated on all sides by the lands of that country, but connected by a channel to other seas or the ocean. National territory of a country which has a naval coast, encompasses also the naval belt beyond the limits of the land mass and internal waters up to a certain distance-territorial waters (territorial sea).

National territory also encompasses the innards of the earth, located between the surface of the land areas and the bottom of the aquatic territory and stretch to the extent of the technologically accessible depths.

Within its internal legislation, the state ensures its exclusive sovereignty over these underground areas, in particular regulating the conditions for their exploration and exploitation as regards natural resources, the conditions for building/stretching various cable networks through the subterranean areas, use of piping etc.

National borders also encircle air space, located above the land areas or above internal and territorial waters of the state. The country, based on its complete and exclusive sovereignty, establishes the appropriate legal regime for air travel.

Therefore, state borders delineate the borders of the national territory within space located in three environments: land, water and air.

International law also establishes the formation of international borders. Borders are established in two ways--delineation and demarcation. Delineation refers to the detailed description of where the border lies (which rivers it crosses, at which distance from a population centre, in which direction etc.) and their drawing on a map.

Following the discussions about delineation, a Treaty (Agreement) is signed regarding the course of the border with the addition of maps showing the border. This concludes the legal formation of the national border and parties begin demarcation.

Demarcation—is the designation of the border on the actual landscape by installing border warning signs on land, buoys on water. The demarcation process is conducted by a mixed commission involving representatives of both countries. The commission signs a protocol with a detailed description of the border's location, as well as additional protocols and maps for each border sign/post. All these documents become part of the border treaty.

There is also the concept of re-demarcation. This refers to the process of joint verification and, when necessary, the replacement of destroyed border markers or installation of new ones [13, p.9].

In international practice, the ideas of orographic, geometrical and geographical borders are used. Orographic borders are traced by accounting for natural barriers (rivers, mountain ranges etc.). Geometric—refer to straight lines, which connect points on the earth's surface.

Geometric borders traced through certain geographic coordinates (for instance, along a meridian or parallel of the navigational coordinates), are referred

to as geographic (or astronomical) borders. In practice, mixed borders prevail—orographic on certain areas, geometric and geographic on others [14, p.41].

It is important to distinguish *demarcation lines* from state borders. These lines occur as the result of armed conflict and a subsequent ceasefire. These lines have been drawn, in particular, in Korea in 1949 and Vietnam in 1954. In reality, national border lines can take many forms.

For instance, the two small nations of San-Marino and the Holy See, are surrounded by Italian borders on all sides. The border of the Vatican is a tall medieval wall 3.2 kilometres in length, with several gates which are always locked at night. The border of San-Marino is a road entrance with an arc inscribed with "Welcome to the ancient territories of freedom". The Kingdom of Monaco does not even have its own borders.

In some cases, due to various reasons, borders divide not only populations but also population centres, as was the case in Berlin prior to the unification. This is also the case currently with the separated city of Valga/Valka, located on the border of Estonia and Latvia. Valga and Valka were the same city from their establishment in 1286, populated by Estonians and Latvians.

However, in 1920, when Estonia and Latvia became independent, the city of Valga/Valka was divided. This division was confirmed in 1991 after the fall of the USSR. Similarly divided is the city of Narva, on the border of Estonia and Russia. The Russian part of the city is called Ivangorod. Similarly, Ukraine and Slovakia divide the village of Selmenci.

The areas located near the border are included within the nation's border. This usually includes:

- the border zone;
- part of the water masses of the border zones, such as rivers, lakes and other bodies of water, as well as internal seas and territorial waters of the state where the border control is conducted;
- checkpoints at the border;
- territories of administrative units which lie next to the national border.

The majority of modern countries own territories on the basis of their purchase/acquisition or settlement in the past. In the process, the concept of 'borders which arose historically' prevails.

Frequently, territories enter the territory of one state or another due to geographic discoveries, namely the right of ownership following discovery. It is also quite common for territories to have been acquired through occupation or conquest. This occupation can be lawful, where the territory was up until that point without ownership (*terra nullius).*

The sovereignty of national territory means also the sovereignty of national borders. As noted by Y. Klimenko and N. Ushakov, "the principle of sovereignty

of national borders can be seen as the necessary corollary to the sovereignty and integrity of national territories"[14, p.92].

The principle that national borders are untouchable, including the prohibition of armed action and threats of force, does not prohibit the lawful changes of territorial lines when these changes are not under duress. Even in the official commentary of the League of Nations Statute, issued in 1919, it was highlighted that this document "does not intend to place upon the current territorial formation the seal of higher power and permanency" [15, p.364].

The UN statute also does not create impediments for peaceful territorial changes. Territorial status must be changed in accordance with the law which dictates' nations ability to determine their own fates, for instance through appropriate treaties between interested parties or on basis of decisions of authoritative international organisations, if they correspond to the generally recognised principles of international law (for instance, the territorial decree of the Potsdam conference between the three great states, the Paris Peace Conference etc.)

Modern international law involves not only fundamental territorial changes but also partial changes of state territory in favour of other countries. These changes are lawful only when made on basis of freely agreed of all involved parties. Partial changes in national territory in the form of free concessions, exchanges, sale etc., mean a change in national sovereignty over the area being transferred from one state to the other.

These territorial changes according to treaties are conducted on basis of mutual consideration of economical, political, defensive and other interests of the parties. Naturally, countries' approaches to solving these problems do not always coincide. Countries often encounter international disputes.

This concept is widely understood, and means any occurrence between two or more countries of differences significant enough, over a certain issue, that their primary interests are interfered with, and no agreement has been reached. One of the most common forms of international dispute is over territory. "Territorial disputes—is a dispute between countries regarding the legal dependence of a territory" [16].

Territorial disputes have an extensive history. At one time or another, states have vied for the same territory, believing they were the first to discover it. Disputes between countries often occur over a territory which has an economic strategic importance (for instance being rich in natural resources or access to waterways, sources of water etc.) The presence of a national territorial dispute involves its recognition as such by both parties. If there is no such recognition, then there is just a unilateral proclamation amounting to a *territorial inconsistency*.

Territorial inconsistencies can be on a *national or regional* scale. The national level involves the conduct of negotiations, while the regional level requires the existence of dissatisfaction among citizens which most frequently represent the interests of citizens within the border regions.

As territorial inconsistencies and disputes involve the crucial element of governmental activity—its territories, they frequently result in dangerous border conflicts--a sub-type of international conflicts. The literature in this area suggests a number of classifications of border conflicts. According to one such system, border conflicts occur for the following reasons:

- ethnic reasons;

In 1977, Somalia had conducted an armed action against its neighbour Ethiopia, under the aegis of its entitlement for part of that country--the Ogaden desert where ethnic Somalis reside.

- following political division of a territory along battle lines;

In the 1960-70's, a conflict arose between South and North Korea characterised by numerous disagreements in the form of border-centred armed confrontations (infringements of air and water space), in the course of which ships and planes were destroyed.

- as heritage of the colonial era;

The Falkland Islands (Malvin Islands) is the source of territorial disputes between Great Britain and Argentina, reaching back to the colonial era. It caused the armed conflict between these states in 1982.

- as a forerunner of war, showing the escalation in relations between countries;

The modern conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia in which the disputed territories were only the rationale for open war.

- for economic reasons;

In 1980-1988 between Iran and Iraq a bloody war was conducted with reliance on a dispute over the border waterway of Shatt-al Arab.

- for religious reasons;

In 1941, a border conflict arose between Saudi Arabia and Iraq, caused by the fact that the majority of the Saudi Arabian population were Sunnis while the majority of Iraq's were Shiite.

- resulting from unfinished or insufficient demarcation/delineation of borders and appearance of disputed territories;

China has numerous joint areas of the border with neighbouring countries--a large part of the borders with India and Tajikistan; 33 kilometres of border with North Korea in the Pektusan mountains, the Spratli Islands (Malaysia, Philippines, Taiwan, Vietnam and possibly Brunei); the naval border with Vietnam in the Tonkin strait; Parasel islands disputed between Taiwan and Vietnam; the Japanese Senkaku islands; Taiwan in its entirety is seen as a rebellious province of China.

- As the result of inconsistent interpretations and unequal treatment of existing treaties and the actual borders;

For instance, Europe which had come through numerous wars, the conduct of armed actions requires justification. In Asian and African countries, it is frequently enough to have a unilateral desire and will of a country to make a claim on the land of another.

A separate category is *border incidents* which result in borders being infringed. These are frequently connected to territorial disputes, although they themselves do not serve as their subject.

International law designates *means of resolving international conflicts* including international disputes. These include negotiations, mutual favours, mediation, investigative and cooperative commissions, international arbitration and references to international organisations.

In the course of these actions, some of the arguments used include *the length of affiliation, effectiveness of possession* (uninterrupted and non violent territorial supremacy, even if *de facto* in nature) as well as the *behaviour of the parties*--the subjects of the dispute (prolonged silence can be interpreted as consent) and the doctrine of *inter-temporal rights* (disputes must be resolved according to legal norms which existed at the time of the legal relations arising) [17].

The non interference with the border line on the landscape is ensured (through the mutual agreement of the parties) by certain *regimes of border control*. These regimes regulate the upkeep of the border, the mode by which people and transport units cross them, the crossing of goods and livestock, the business activities occurring at the border, resolution of incidents etc. The border control regiment is determined by national legislation.

As mentioned, the mode of national control is particularly aimed at ensuring that the border line, as designated on the local landscape using border signs, is not shifted arbitrarily and is maintained to the appropriate extent. If the border post is wholly or partly destroyed or damaged, then its reconstruction or repair is conducted immediately by the government which has possession over that territory.

The regime also mandates the mode by which citizens and cargo are allowed through the border. When crossing the border in designated places (check points), the appropriate governing authority conducts visa, passport and customs control.

Passport (from the French passé porte), is a document which confirms the identity of the holder. The passport had initially given the right (temporarily or permanently) to settle at a location, but had subsequently become used for regulating the exit and entry of citizens abroad. The first passports were used in the Renaissance.

In the 14th-15th centuries, many governments began to issue written confirmations of identity to certain persons, within which the civil servants noted down their names and occupations. In 1460 passports received legal grounding. During years of war or epidemics, in addition to passports (for travellers and so forth), special certificates confirming identity were issued, in particular the holder's health or behaviour.

Visa (from the French visa and Latin visus—seen, reviewed) widely means the permission of some person or functionary on a document or decree which confirms its authenticity and gives it authority. In common usage, it means a note/mark in a passport which gives permission to enter the territory of the relevant

country and exit, or for transit. The development of bureaucracy in many countries turned stamps or notes in the passport into a document in its own right, which often contains a photograph, holographic markings and several levels of protection.

Following September 11th, the US began a radically new means of control over entrance/exit--biometric. The new passport is different from previous versions in that it contains a plastic page with a built in microchip, which contains personal data and a digital photo of the holder. Biometric passports have become widespread in international practice.

For instance, there exists an EU programme to be implemented in 2012 for citizens of the Shengen zone, for passports to become biometric. Russia since 1st January 2008 had introduced biometric passports as an option for all citizens.

The Ukrainian Parliament had passed a law according to which everyone who enters the country from 2010 will be identified using biometric data. 247 border control posts would have to be equipped with the appropriate technology [18].

Biometric data in passports has been implemented for 34 countries already. The size of the biometric identification market had reached 3.8 billion dollars in 2008 [18]. There exist various visa regimes and classifications of visas. They can be ordinary visas, work-related visas and diplomatic visas. In terms of length/ frequency of use, they can be distinguished into single entry, double entry, triple entry and multiple-entry. Visas are issued by the appropriate authorities of the state, for a particular period. Most countries imposes a permission-based entrance system for foreigners, namely that the foreigner can only enter the country when he has the required visa in his passport.

Requests for visas are considered by consulates. A consulate is part of the foreign relations ministry apparatus of the country, located on the territory of another country (with the country's agreement), for the execution of certain functions [19, p.94].

The areas of remit by the consul and the location of the consulate are determined by treaties between the two countries. A fee is often imposed for the issuance of visas, except work-related and diplomatic visas; the value of the fee is determined by the internal laws and international agreements.

A visa-free regime can be established either as a unilateral setup (for instance, as done by Ukraine regarding citizens of economically developed countries) and on a mutual basis (in accordance with bilateral or multilateral agreements).

Consulates in Europe first appeared in the18th and beginning of 19th centuries. In Russia, for instance, consulates were first founded in 1809 after the signing by Emperor Alexander I of the manifesto about 'About the creation of an Expedition of Consular Affairs'.

It is on the basis of mutuality that the so-called Shengen zone exists, within which citizens are entirely free to move as they wish. Currently the Shengen zone includes 22 out of 27 EU members (all 'old' EU members except Great Britain and

Ireland) and 2 countries of the European Economic Community (Norway and Iceland). Shengen Treaty is the combination of two documents: Agreement for the cancellation of visa control within internal borders and the Convention about the enforcement of the said Agreement.

Both documents have been active since March 1995. The external border of any member-country is also the joint external border of all the countries. Each country meanwhile retains its own visa control system and border control. Transit of goods through the state border, as well as other goods and valuables, and diplomatic post, is conducted by customs authorities.

The most recent expansion of the Shengen zone (21ˢᵗ December 2007—when the zone was joined by 9 countries—Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia and Malta) cost 1 billion Euro. This zone without internal borders now covers over 400 million Europeans.

Countries can also implement simplified procedures for crossing the border by residents of the border areas, as determined by the appropriate international agreement. Special documents are issued in cases of permanent or seasonal employment or education on the neighbouring territory, where the individual owns a property there, for meetings with relatives, visitation of burials, conduct of religious ceremonies etc.

The historical development of borders, as has been shown, is inevitably tied to the history of wars. War is the main and most frequent means of changing borders which designate spatial areas. *Borders and wars*, as has been shown, *have within the societal organism one and the same genetic source. Their historical destiny is also joint-if there were no borders, there would be no wars.*

The name of the zone originates from the small town called Shengen in Luxembourg, where the agreement was reached about the visa-free regime. Shengen is located near the point of confluence of Luxembourg's, Germany's and France's borders.

Frontiers and wars have much in common not only in the historical but also the functional senses. Wars arise from frontiers. As discussed previously, that war is a tool by which borders are changed. It can be said that *wars and its natural opponent, peace, are means of humans' geopolitical existence (related to frontiers).*

Thus, between these three social quantities there is a direct correlation and other connections, which in the context of dynamic changes, create a complex set of interactions. This, in turn, allows to conclude that borders, war and peace both in historical and functional senses, create a *certain social triad.*

As mentioned, any dynamic developments as regards frontiers disrupts interest and is the result of interaction of at least two neighbouring countries. These interests may coincide or differ. This determines the nature of their interaction.

In cases where the countries' interests coincide, the change of borders is done by mutual agreement. Clashes between frontier interests often lead to the rise of disputes. The force-free resolution to a dispute is ensured by the search for mutu-

ally acceptable solutions, and compromises. On the other hand, the use of force within a dispute which had escalated to a conflict directly or indirectly, can occur through the use of secretive special services' operations or psychological pressure against the other country, as well as complete economic blockades.

Sadly, humanity's history had involved relatively few instances of peaceful, force-free solutions to international disputes. Even the well known peace forums were only relatively peaceful: in most cases, they merely gave legal legitimacy to a result achieved through the use of force (usually, armed) or under the duress if force's possible use (with a gun to a signatory's head, so to speak). Therefore, these treaties and conferences have often served as preparatory stages for acts of further violence in international relations.

For instance, almost all peace talks during the age-old conflict between Protestants and Catholics "...were, essentially, only ceasefires; the parties agreed not to stop the conflict but rather to cease the confrontation temporarily. These agreements were intended to set out the conditions, which would later be used as grounds for further armed conflict [19].

Documents, within which, with significant pomp, principles of territorial integrity were declared, as well as those of non-intervention in internal affairs, rejection of forceful solutions in international relations etc. The principles of non interference and integrity of state territory was first formulated during the French Revolution 1789-1794. On 18th July 1790 the French National Assembly accepted a draft declaration which later became the Decree and part of the Constitution. According to this declaration, "the interference of one country within the territory of another threatens the security of all...from now on, the French people prohibit the commencement of any war aimed at enlarging the current territory". In another important document, the Abbot Gregor's Declaration of International Law, which was considered by the Convention in 1795, it was highlighted that "peoples are independent in relation to one another and are also sovereign, regardless of their number or size of their territory" (article 2). Article 10 proclaimed that "each people is the master of their own domain" [20, p.537-540].

It was also declared that territories could only be transferred with the population's consent.

The pathos of these statements did not however inhibit Napoleonic France in its starting of large-scale imperialist conflicts based on the 'revolutionary imperative', leading to armed action throughout Europe. L. Tolstoy had written ironically about the 'peace-loving' nature of the French emperor: "...

Napoleon personally wrote a letter to Emperor Alexander calling him 'Your Supremacy, my brother' and earnestly assuring him that he does not foresee a war and will always love and respect him; while at the same time giving orders intended to accelerate the army's march from the West to the East" [21, p.10].

History had already given its verdict on the 1918 Versailles Treaty. It is typical that it is for purposes of the Versailles system that the shameful Munich farce

had been developed; an event without easy analogies in history. As is well known, due to the Munich agreement between Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy on 29th October 1938, Germany acquired the Sudetenland region.

Czechoslovakia, a large part of whose sovereign territory was to be removed, was not even invited to the conference.

Apparent duplicity has permeated both the content and the tone of the parties' evaluation of their shameful bargain. In the Anglo-German declaration of 30th October 1938, it was stated that "We consider the signed...agreement as a symbol of both sides' willingness to never again wage war against one another. We are determined that all questions which impact our countries must be considered with the use of consultation and we intend to remove any future reasons for disputes, so as to facilitate peace in Europe [22, p.260]. *At that point, only a year remained before the parties declared war.*

These colourful statements are also present in the 6th December 1938 Franco-German Declaration. In particular, it states that "Both governments state that there are no more unresolved issues between the countries relating to territories and formally declare that the border shall remain as it is today" [22, p. 261]. Apparently, based on the contents of the Declaration, *Nazi Germany soon after in 1940 occupied France.*

Without relying on bilateral agreements, the international community sought out new, more effective means of prevention, avoidance of violence, in particular wars, through a system of international relations and a collective security system. This search had led to the creation of the League of Nations in 1919. In Article 10 of the Statute for this organisation, certain norms according to which League members were meant to respect and protect against external attack of territorial integrity and existing political independence of all League members. Moreover, Article 12 stated that if a League member resorts to war, then the member *ipso facto* (due to the fact) is considered to have acted with warlike intent against all other League members [22, p.181].

These undoubtedly important norms however could not quell the expansionist appetites of the largest countries, primarily Nazi Germany, which caused the next World War.

The main thrust of these classical norms of international law have found reflection in the current Charter of the United Nations—the successor of the League of Nations, created in 1945. For instance, the principle of territorial non interference as an intrinsic element of non-aggression was formulated at paragraph 4 of Article 2 of this founding document, stating that "All members of the UN must, in their foreign relations, avoid the threat of force or its use as against territorial integrity or political independence of any country, as well as through any other means incompatible with the United Nations' purposes".

The territorial integrity principle is also contained in other provisions of the UN Charter: principles of peaceful coexistence, respect for sovereignty and sov-

ereign equality of countries (par. 1, Article 2); peaceful resolution of international disputes (par. 3, Article 2); non interference in matters substantively falling within internal competency of any state (par. 7, Article 2); prohibition on aggression and aggressor wars.

In other words, the UN Charter currently prohibits "...any attempts to undermine the territorial sovereignty of countries not only as regards military actions but also without the use of force--through non-military related violent methods– as well as through threats of military or non-military violent actions. Any occupation of territory belonging to another state or changes in state territory conducted through violent actions, are illegal, invalid and cannot be recognised" [23, p.34].

The principle of non-interference with government borders is fixed in other international legal acts also, namely those created to support the world-wide system of security on a regional level.

The most important of these is the Concluding Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, accepted by leaders of 33 European countries, USA and Canada in 1975 in Helsinki, in particular the Declaration of principles which the participants would be restricted by when making decisions. These principles in particular are sovereign equality, respect for rights related to sovereignty, non-use of force or threats fo force; integrity of borders; respect for territorial integrity of countries.

Unfortunately, however, reality has little in common with declarations. For instance, widely recognised principles of international law were completely disregarded by the leadership of the former Soviet Union while conducting armed intrusions into the internal affairs of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. The same applies to leaders of the US when they started the war in Vietnam or the intervention in Iraq. Few people even remember the aforementioned Helsinki Accords following the recent geopolitical shifts in Europe, in spite of the fact it was once considered immutable.

The force which is to blame is the untamed and inexhaustible expansionist drive (regardless of the basis for its justification) of certain countries, in particular their desire to change borders which arises from time to time, under certain historical conditions. This results in war.

War is an extreme form of forceful conflict between countries, a fringe means of resolving international issues, in particular regarding borders, using military methods [24, p.17]. The purpose of the side which starts the war, may not even be change in borders of the

Opponent-state. However, *without disrupting these borders* (in some form) the other goals cannot be achieved. Thus, any war between states is always a *transfrontier action*.

Armed conflict between countries in the course of human history had underone *many forms*. History had encountered numerous forms of unveiled occupation of foreign territories for the purpose of acquiring their riches (for instance, the

armed escapades of ancient Greek and Roman rulers). Many wars have also been portrayed as having religious or ethnic conflicts but were something else in substance. For instance, the Roman Empire's battle with early Christianity, the conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism, the resistance of the European peoples against the Turkish horde etc.

If the history of so called religious wars is considered, it is clear that their declared goals could include the spread of a certain faith, the conversion of the 'apostates to the true faith' or, instead, protection of one's own faith, battle for religious freedoms. International armed conflicts have also occurred to protect the faithful on pilgrimages, to preserve holy places or traditional routes for pilgrimage.

The initiators and participants in such wars consider them to be 'holy'. Meanwhile, the theory is widely cultivated that those who fall in the struggle for religious reasons will be 'saved forever'. This practice was common during the Crusades by Catholicism, but is particularly characteristic of Islam.

Losers in a religious war frequently incur cruel persecution up to the point of physical destruction, the beaten religion is often banned, the country is pillaged, and its territory is annexed. Victors, on the other hand, impose their faith, institute it as the mainstream and generally enrich themselves through their conquest.

Oftentimes religious-messianic banners served only as a cover for genuine causes for intervention against other countries. IN the modern world, geopolitical messiah trends have emerged onto world-wide levels, acquiring new shapes. As noted by researchers, the 20th century became the arena for battle, including frequently militarily, of the three main geopolitical subjects which used messianic ideals for the establishment of dominance. Nazi Germany attempted to rank nations and peoples according to their proximity to the Aryan ideal, as well as to eliminate those who fell short as 'under-developed' ethnic minorities.

Communist USSR for achievement of global dominance cultivated the dogma about the 'chosen' status of certain social strata (proletariat and the poorest country-dwellers), expressed inside the country through genocide against hostile social groups, while in external politics it took the form of 'world wide revolution' and 'global republic of councils'. Finally, the 'Anglo-American' block planned to establish the planet-wide dominance of the USA using an undeclared, yet entirely obvious ranking ('sorting') of countries based on their proximity ('integration') with the values of 'open society'. An interesting analysis of the causes for repetition of international violence and geopolitical motivation of actors made in his study "War as a business project?" A.Halapsis [25]. In the literature can also be found and unexpected forecasts, for example, the fact that global warming by 2050 could increase the number of wars in 1.5 times [26].

Historically, an expansion *of transfrontier wars and growth in military actions' scale have occurred.*

Within the remarkable work by Malcolm Svanston 'Battles and Campaigns', published in 2007 in London [27], the author characterises the main steps in hu-

mans' militarisation. He believes that the first signs of human aggression appeared around 12,000 years after the last Ice Age and following temperature increases. This point can be located due to the portrayal in 34 cave drawings showing groups of people with stone axes within German caves and 59 remains of funeral pyres in mountainous Egypt with remaints of individuals killed by spears. Later, defensive structures appeared.

In Jericho, a population centre near the Dead Sea, one of the oldest defence structures can be seen—with walls 1.8 metres in width and gates 3.6 metres high. The settlement could have shielded around 2000 dwellers. Such defensive buildings were widespread throughout the Middle East.

The beginning of cities' competition began also (around 2,400 BC). For instance, Lugalzagesi had achieved power, King Umma not only controlled the Euphrates and Tigre rivers but reached the coast of the Mediterranean Sea.

Fairly numerous battles have then began to occur. Tactically speaking, the first task was to primarily take control of the landscape where the battle was to take place, and to use the advantages offered by its geography and elevation. Except for certain elite units, military forces consisted of poorly trained men whose only motivation to fight was the fear of their ruler and thoughts of military spoils.

The first professional army in existence belonged to the Egyptian Pharaoh Ahmose, who created it around 1525 BC. Ahmose introduced battle chariots and well trained archers. These skills were further developed by Assyrians, who created the first highly militarised country in the world.

Assyrians lived in the heights of North-Eastern Mesopotamia, in a region that had practically no natural borders and was the target of constant attacks of neighbouring tribes and states. This forced Assyrians to handle their own defence seriously. The ruler Tiglatpilesar III in 745 BC created a very well trained and amply paid professional army. This army did not only safely protect Assyria but also conducted very successful wars of conquest which led to great gains [27, p.6-7].

At the intersection of 4th and 3rd millennia BC when slavery was created, wars were conducted for the purpose of conquering neighbours' land and the attainment of slaves. However, by the time of the Punic wars between Rome and Carthage (3rd-2nd centuries BC), the theatre of armed action encompassed a large territory. Carthage's military leader Hannibal (247-183 BC) in battles with Romans conducted raids across the Pyrenees and Alps, landed in Spain. The Roman leader Julius Caesar in the 1st century BC, fought on the Balkan peninsula, in Egypt and in parts of Asia.

Within the first military campaigns of the early slave era, based on specialists' assessments, several hundred or thousand warriors would take part. It is confirmed by documents that significantly later, in 331 BC, the battle of Alexander of Macedonia against the Persians at Gavgamel, there were 40,000 infantry troops on the side of the Macedonians, 12,000 cavalry pieces, 100 battle chariots and 15 elephants [27, p.121-127].

By comparison, the military actions against Nazi Germany in 1945 involved several continents simultaneously. The front stretched for tens of thousands of kilometres. Naval battles raged across essentially the entire stretch of world oceans. Tens of millions took part in World War 2 (see diagram).

Instruments and tools for waging war were perfected: both personnel and weapons.

With the creation of slavery, there appeared a special social institution—the army. The army is a specialised armed force which is 'tasked' with execution of police functions within society, as well as battling for expansion of territory, protection of borders against external attack.

Initially, armies were recruited only for times of war by constituting groups (militias) of slave owners. All free citizens had a military obligation from age 17 until old age. There was no place for slaves within the armies. Rulers and aristocracy had their personal guard, as well as groups of armed settlers (colonists).

Within the more developed feudal society at the end of the 15th century, militia systems were replaced by a hired army. The hired army was composed of mainly classless individuals and representatives of multiple nationalities. In the beginning of the 17th century, instead of temporary armies, in Western European countries permanent/standing armies began to be used, formed through the hiring or forced recruitment, as well as drafting of citizens.

The process of constituting an army changed radically in France, and then in other countries after the French Revolution in the 18th century. A general national service was instituted with the draft duration of 2 to 6 years. "This allowed the creation of massive armies while still at peace and large personnel reserves were ready for times of war" [27, p.587-637].

This principle of composition has been preserved since in other countries, although highly developed (economically) countries have professional armies based on voluntary service.

Several genuine revolutions have been undergone by weapon systems, also. For a very long time, weapons were limited to bladed weapons 'invented' in ancient times, as well as thrown and blunt weapons (bows, spears, swords etc.) Mobility was ensured by horse cavalry. The first revolution of weapons occurred in the 14th century with the discovery of initially imperfect yet radically different fire arms (cannons and bombards). Its qualitative improvement occurred at the end of the 19th century with the invention of smokeless gunpowder.

There then followed a torrent of revolutionary changes in weapons. For instance, the invention of technical methods of transportation--cars, tanks and their use in conflict; the expansion of war into the skies following the invention of planes, and involvement of the underwater space through the use of submarines. Of course, the creation of atomic and nuclear weapons were a key step, allowing, if necessary, the destruction of any point on earth's surface using ballistic missiles.

The general tendency of these changes in armaments is the inevitable increase in its destructive potential—both of military and civilian targets.

Alongside the aforementioned *inevitable escalation of militaristic society, there is also a corresponding rise in the numbers of casualties* [28, p.320].

Humanity had made relentless attempts to conquer the phenomenon of war, in particular by barring its inception, penalising those who have initiated wars and those most responsible for villainous revision of borders. One of the most important consequences of this process--the institution covering a multitude of jurisdiction (such as the League of Nations and the United Nations) have already been discussed. However, there is another instrument in the toolbox for war prevention, which works by penalising those crimes which have already occurred. This tool consists of international tribunals.

The concept of war crimes was formulated in Article 6 of the Charter for the International Military Tribunal for the Major German War Crimes (1945) and Article 5 of the Statute of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (1946). The category of war crimes as well as transgressions of recognised military conventions, includes:

- cruel treatment of the wounded or the ill;
- using banned methods and tools for the conduct of war;
- senseless destruction of towns and cities;
- pillaging of public or private property;
- killing, torture, deportation and use of forced labour of the civilian population;
- use of hostages, killing of resistance members and other illegal actions.

The rules of responsibility for war crimes registered in many international agreements, such as in art. 111 Washington Conference Resolutions in 1922, art. 29 of the Geneva Convention in 1929, Fourth Geneva Convention in 1949 and others.

The decision on the punishment of war criminals was made even allies during the Second World War. Thus, in the Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943 stated that war criminals will be sent to countries where they committed criminal acts in order that they may be tried and punished.

The most notable event was the Nuremberg Tribunal. The trial of the International Military Tribunal over a group of the major German war criminals held from November 20, 1945 till 1 of October 1946 in the German city of Nuremberg. For the first time in history were punished as criminals' statesmen guilty of preparation, start and conduction of an aggressive war. The tribunal sentenced 12 guilty to death, three - to life imprisonment, four - to various terms of imprisonment. In December 1946, the UN General Assembly reaffirmed the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal.

With regard of persons who have committed war crimes can not be applied the statute of limitations. In a special Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity, which was

adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1968, declared: war crimes and crimes against humanity are the most serious crimes.

War crimes can not also be given the right of asylum. This is fixed in Article 14 the General Declaration of Human Rights.

Today on the cases of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity carried out the International Criminal Court in Hague (ICC). This court was established in 2002 Rome Statute, adopted in 1998 and ratified by 106 countries (USA, Russia and Ukraine have not yet become States Parties to the ICC).

The residence of ICC is located in Hague, as it is often called the Hague Tribunal (not to be confused with The Hague Tribunal for Yugoslavia and the International Court at the UN that are working in the capital of the Netherlands). Court for seven years of existence has not made any decision, but the resonant is the issuance in July 14, 2008 an arrest warrant for Sudan's president on charges of genocide during the conflict in Darfur - Sudan region.

These are major historical milestones of genesis, formation and development of the phenomenon of borders, transborder flows and related phenomena. Done historical overview allows carrying out sociological analysis of the nature of this object, including answering the key questions related to its operation and development:

1. How and why have arisen boundaries?

The conducted analysis shows that the borders - a product of history, which appeared on the stage of development of society, when it became necessary to regulate the spatial existence of private property and the state. With the chang-ing needs of these institutions in the area and there are corresponding cross-border processes. So there is no unchanging borders.

2. What is their future, are they everlasting?

As follows from the answer to the first question, the boundaries are not eternal, they arise under certain social conditions. Thus, in the case of extinction of these conditions, including termination of motivational mechanism struggle for space resources, cross-border flows of both social and spatial phenomenon also should disappear.

3. Are there borders 'bad' or 'good'? ".

On their own borders are not "bad" or "good", the nature of borders, as shown by the historical analysis, is the same. But there is a spatial separation between peoples and States under the influence of various social and geographical circumstances (as identified above): a) find themselves in the midst of endless territorial "showdown" including the use of armed violence and related many victims; b) are cross-border area of relative comfort, away from military conflict, devastation and human tragedy. Some people have a bad geopolitical legend concerning the reputation of other relatively fair and moral.

4. Is there any reason to divide people on the basis of their aggressiveness or peacefulness?

The social nature of transborder processes entities is the same. Spatial needs of their existence gave rise to various forms of cross-border activity. In historical terms a priori difficult to imagine a particular ethnic community who would not participate in the struggle for territorial resource as a defender of his wealth and the role of alien invaders. But noted above social and geographical factors cause varying degree of participation in cross-border processes. Some people are constantly active subjects of geopolitical changes and related military conflicts without parting with a gun most of the time. Others learn about the geopolitical struggles from Third mouth. Some eventually formed the appropriate military skills and there are certain mental changes in other hands-on experience and interest in military affairs is minimal. So, initially aggressive or peaceful primitive peoples there. There are various circumstances in which are formed cross-border their behavior.

5. Is it possible to avoid violent change of borders, in particular by war?

To avoid violence in solving spatial primarily territorial disputes in principle is possible. This option can be implemented in two cases. In the first - if the institution of borders will disappear (the conditions of disappearance are identified), that object will cease to exist confrontation. Second - if it radically changed the motivational mechanism of functioning and development of society.

1.3. Paradigms on development of transborder phenomen

In the development of theoretical reflection on the theme of definition a border and the cross-border flows can be highlighted three main stages: 1) a stage of appearance proto idea of border and its primitive and utilitarian justification; 2) a stage of the theoretical ideas about the phenomenon of borders and their materialisation in cartography; 3) a stage of the detailed concepts of place and role of cross-border flows in the life of society [29].

The first stage to a large extent is associated with the interpretation of boundaries contained in the religious and philosophical systems of Judaism, Christianity, Confucianism, Islam and the liberal tradition. These interpretations have mostly ethical character. In addition, the deliberate and practical usage the idea of borders have found in the Roman Empire particularly, in the hierarchy of settlements, cities, provinces and regions.

In the Middle Ages, in times when control of the cities and territories was gained much more attention, the border issues were of keen interest. This was favoured the improvement of technologies to designate areas on the map. As a result of the efforts of geographers and cartographers, became possible to clearly

mark the contours of physical boundaries. In the «French geographical diction-ary» published 1783 first appeared the term "frontiere" that means "border".

These achievements of scientists have made it possible to put into political practice the demarcation of generally recognized borders of the lands. The first written verified fact of such demarcation was the Treaty of Westphalia between Spain and Denmark. The agreement established the boundaries of the territorial possessions of Britain, France, Denmark, the German principality, Moskovia, Po-land, Turkey, Spain and Sweden. The Treaty of Westphalia marked the beginning of an era of nation-states and nationalism [32, p. 635].

Earlier, during the Renaissance of XV — XVI centuries in the political views one of the tenets of early nationalism is increasingly affirming — the principle of equilibrium of forces that already was justified in ancient times [33]. At the be-ginning of the fifteenth century, the Venetian politician Francesco Barbaro advo-cated an alliance of independent Italian republics on the basis of stable balance of powers. The famous Niccolo Machiavelli also noted that international order in the fragmented Italy remained because there was no hierarchical subordination to a single center. "Some of the new cities and countries that emerged from the ruins of Rome showed great abilities, so that, although none of them prevailed over the other, they still were in such harmony and were so well connected with each other that liberated Italy and defend it against barbarians" [Cited: 34, p. 222].

Gradually, the doctrine of the balance of forces was confirmed on the Euro-pean scale. In the «Political thought concerning the war against Spain» famous Francis Bacon emphasized that maintaining a balance is a task of England, France, and Spain. When the excessive growth of one of them happens, others become more united to restore the balance of power [34, p. 224].

In the negotiations with the Francis I, King of France, the English King Henry VIII urged a partner that he should accomplish the mission of maintaining an equi-librium between France and Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor. French politician Jean Bodin attempted a theoretical justification of the doctrine. In particular, he empha-sized that should prevent the achievement by any state of such a power that would allow it to impose its will as the law of other countries. Thus, "the safety of monarchs and republics is founded on the mutual balance of their forces" [34, p. 223].

The doctrine of the balance of powers had and still has their opponents. In the 80th of the XVI century a prominent representative of the Italian Counter-Reformation Giovanni Boterro hadn't any doubt that people who "are paying so much attention to the balance of forces is worried not about the common good, not the good of Christianity, not the good of the human race; they are not aimed at the particular benefit of a state or nation, but only at the interests of a certain mon-arch" [Quoted by: 35 p. 313-314]. But the arguments of opponents of the doctrine are usually not found wide support.

Moreover, this doctrine was the basis of fundamentally new geopolitical vi-sion of the continent, so to speak, Eurocentrism. The geographical term "Europe"

has become the central concept of the new geopolitics. This term gradually replaced the previous collective terms "Christendom" and "Christianity". Scientists found even chronological framework of this process — the time between 1680 and 1715 years.

In the Peace of Utrecht in 1713 was the last time mentioned Respublica Christiana and there was first noted that its purpose is to maintain the balance of power in Europe. And most importantly, over time the emphasis was not only on the unity of the continent, but also on the independence of its constituent parts — the European countries. The thinkers Penn, Bellers, Leibniz strongly defended and justified the European idea. Not excluded was a project to create the federation of European states. Although existed the eurosceptics, saying with usage of a contemporary language. In the book "The Spirit of Laws" (1748), Charles Montesquieu, while agreeing that European countries are a communion, yet expressed doubts about the possibility of creating a single European state.

The maximum possible he considered the situation where European countries would do well to each other in the peace times, and do a minimum bad during the war [36, p. 283].

The third stage of theoretical reflection of the boundaries that began in the late XIX - early XX centuries meant the appearance of the first systematic concepts. Typically, in the center of the theoretical constructs was nailed a particular factor of the boundaries development.

For example, the paradigm proposed by T. Holdich and M. Lyde was founded on the "advantages" of borders. Depending on how they affect the strengthening or weakening of tension, or even of war between states, they qualified as good and bad [37-38].

The comprehensive analysis of the concepts of borders and cross-border processes since the late nineteenth century did V. Kolosov in his work "Research of the borders: changing perspectives and theoretical approaches" [39]. The scientist identifies two main theoretical approaches that are characteristic to this period: the traditionalist and postmodern.

The traditionalist approach, according to Kolosov, includes historical cartography, and typological, functional and political methods.

Concerning the historical cartography, its main representatives are J. Ancel — France, I. Bowman — US, R. Hartshorn — US, E. Banse — Germany. As part of the research school the empirical data was accumulated, the maps of the economic and social structure of the border regions were detailed, were conducted numerous specific analyzes. All this was of great importance for the delimitation and demarcation of borders in the post-war Europe, and the delimitation of colonial possessions in Africa and Asia.

The typological approach has been used for various classifications of cross-border processes, the study of their evolution and mythology, a comprehensive study and practical application of the concept of boundaries as clearly fixed lines.

This method is actively developed by Lord Curson, T. Houldih, S. Fosett — All UK S. Boggs — United States.

The development of a functional approach was initiated in the early 50's of twentieth century. In its framework it was actively investigated the multilateral influence of borders on the different elements of the natural and social environment. The models of cross-border cooperation at different spatial levels were established, has been substantiated the understanding of borders as multi level and highly dynamic object. This approach is widely used in the border talks and practice of cross-border cooperation, in the delimitation and demarcation of new political borders (including the sea). Famous scientists who follow functionalism is John Prescott — Australia, J. House — UK, J. Minghi — US, M. Foucher — France, H. Blake — United Kingdom , O. Martinez — United States.

Concerning the political method of study boundaries, in the opinion of V. Kolosov it originated in the 1970s. The chief object of analysis is the role of borders in international conflicts. In particular, we study the correlation of attributes of boundaries and their role in the origin, evolution and resolution of border conflicts. In this case, the boundaries are considered as existing reality. The above methodology is important for the resolution of international and cross-border disputes and conflicts, effective peacekeeping. The political approach are presented in particular by H. Goertz and P. Diehl, H. Starr, A. Kirby — all of them are from the USA [39, p. 608-609].

The postmodernist paradigms, according to the researcher are presented by the concepts of borders as social representation, "practical and political perception", the eco-political approach, the theories of a world system and territorial identity, and geopolitics.

The start of the postmodern period is indicated as 80s of the twentieth century.

In terms of social representation borders are seen as a social construction and a mirror of social relations in the past and present, while the cross-border flows are an important element of ethnic, national or other territorial structure. The ideas of social representation are developed in particular by H. Dijkink, E. Berg and S. Oras.

Practical and political perception of a border shoves off from the thesis that political relations determine the transparency of borders, the perception by people and the practice of frontier social activity.

Much attention is paid in this concept to the management of border regions and cross-border cooperation, management of international migration and other cross-border flows, regional politics. Representative of this trend is G. van Autumn Houtum and O. Kramsch — Netherlands, J. Scott — Germany.

The concept of environmental policy treats the relationship between natural and political boundaries. In particular, analyzes the functions of natural and political boundaries as an integrative system, the problems of cross-border management of socio-ecological systems, including the river basins.

The authors of this concept — O. Young, H. White — US N. Kliot — Israel S. Dalby — Canada, S. Horshkov and L. Korytniy — Russia [39, p. 610].

In the center of postmodern theoretical constructs of borders and cross-border processes is the theory of the world system. This theory was developed by sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein in the early 70's of the last century in an attempt to explain the nature and processes of capitalism, the industrial revolution and the complex interdependencies between the first, second and third worlds [40, p. 347-357].

A key thesis of world system theory is the thesis that the world economy should be studied as a whole. Its development is characterized by two major trends: the international division of labor, which is deepening, and improving of transport and telecommunications.

An own understanding of the world integrity has been presented by A. Frank. Analyzing the nature of theoretical construct of A. Frank, P. Kutuyev has said that he attempted to create a new research program, the core of which should be a concept of the world system [42, p. 17-35]. Herewith A. Frank rejected self-developed theorizing about the global capitalist system 1960-1970 years, as well as the ideas of I. Wallerstein and concentrated his attention on the idea of Asian hegemony [43].

The multidisciplinary studies were focused on the historical research of growth of the global system and the modern processes in which it appears.

The main principles of these studies have been specified in the concept of "globalization" that is common in the 90th years of the twentieth century [44]. Usually it is used to refer to the global market in which the financial transactions are instant with a tendency to cover the whole world, plus the transnational business not only sells its products around the world, but also places its production in different countries [45].

The globalization of economics should lead to a reduction in the independence of national domestic economy and thus to weakening a state. It concerns, first of all, the way of people's life and how they do things.

O. Suša reveals the highly controversial nature of globalization processes and identifies the risks that they contain [46, p. 350]. Some researchers believe these risks are almost fatal. For example, M. Naím — the chief editor of the influential American magazine "Foreign Policy" even made a "black book" of globalization [47].

There are a few highlights of globalization.

A technical and economic aspect associated firstly with technology, such as aviation or a phone that made the world "smaller" through the mediation of rapid global communication and exchange, and secondly with the social institutions that enable such interaction. A new technological breakthrough that will stimulate the processes of globalization is expected by the scientics in the twenty-first century. This is in particular:

1) the portable information and communication devices;
2) the intelligent mobile robots and systems;
3) a massive internet "personalization" of goods and services;

4) the expansion of lifestyle "in televisual space" — a work through Internet, also training, purchasing, sales, business processes, etc.;
5) the emergence of "virtual secretaries and assistants" — an intelligent "software" of high level;
6) computerized and personalized healthcare;
7) precision farming (controlled by computer);
8) the alternative energy sources, energy efficiency and "clean technologies";
9) genetically modified organisms [48].

According to I. Wallerstein, the development of global capitalist economy results in an unequal division of the world into the center, periphery and semi-periphery. The central powers, the United States and Japan, are rich and dominate; peripheral states such as Zaire and Bangladesh — the poor and are exploited by the center; semi-periphery states, such as Brazil and China — are between the center and periphery and act as a mediator.

The political direction in the interpretation of globalization is quite diverse. For example, in the theories of integration emphasizes the important role in the globalization processes of a subjective factor, in particular a political will and the political institutions [248]. Aschool of "world politics" focuses on the fact that in the context of globalization such important ideas as development, human rights, citizenship, equality and freedom have become the world standards. Other researchers have debated whether a "new world political order" is qualitatively different from the old state system [50].

The culturological approach to globalization focuses on a variety of factors, including "the marginalization of a man". The theory of "marginalization" was offered by American sociologist R. Park [52]. This theory bases itself on the fact that in today's world the certainty of seats disappeared, and mobility has become a universal phenomenon. Travelling, compared with the earlier eras, is so rapid that the time's value is getting smaller and can be neglected, and the usual boundaries are only minor obstacles. The demarcation lines are losing clarity, unambiguity and consistency, therefore it's more and more difficult to be "on this" or "on that" side of the border, and so the probability of being between the borders, in the intermediate marginal position is increasing. A man becomes a "stranger" on the background of these "diffuse forms of sociality" that don't have stable boundaries and rules. H. Simmel made a "sociology of the stranger" a part of the sociology of space [53].

The important objects of cultural analysis of globalization are the social movements such as feminism and the movement for protection of the environment, besides highlighted is media (particularly, the television and cinema), tourism, popular culture. Is analyzing the cultural patterns such as ethnic group, an individual, a nation, traditions. Global spread received an idea that religion can be an important factor in identifying the different cultural groups, and thus become a powerful nationalistic symbol: Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland, Sikhs

in Punjab, Jews in Israel, Hindi and Buddhists in Sri Lanka, Protestant fundamentalism in the United States, Muslims in Chechnya, and Shia Muslims in Iran. Often, in a popular form, these movements are called fundamentalist movements.

Proponents of the theory of the world system, and researchers focused on different sides of globalization emphasize the direct or indirect influence of processes in the world on the existing borders. The well-known famous Finnish scientist Ansi Paasi in his teaching about the origin and evolution of territorial identity came to the conclusion that the form of "territorial ideology" and the basis of nation-building is nationalism. Nationalism always involves a struggle for territory or protection of the rights to it. The relationships between the state and the nation determine the evolution of the boundaries [54].

Among the systematic views on the nature of the phenomenon of borders the theory of geopolitics lies in shadows. The term "geopolitics" causes many negative associations related to the tragic events of human history in the twentieth century, as will be discussed later. But reincarnation of the borders held in the past decades, and with it the reincarnation of geopolitics, are leading to a gradual "rehabilitation" of this concept.

The doctrine of geopolitics emerged in the late nineteenth century. Swedish scientist Johann Rudolf Kjellen in 1899 introduced a the term "geopolitics" in the work "State as a form of life" [55]. In 1914 he defined the term as follows: the theory of the state as a geographical organism or a phenomenon in space. Later, this definition was developed by K. Haushofer, D. Whittlesey, E. Walsh, S. Cohen, H. O'Tuathail and others.

Current understanding of geopolitics usually relies on the fact that this phenomenon is the theory of international politics that considers the relationships between nations and world politics as caused by the territorial space in which they occur.

Depending on the priorities of geopolitics development, the scientists have identified four stages: 1) the geopolitics "people for imperialist hegemony"; 2) German geopolitics; 3) the geopolitics of the Cold War; 4) the geopolitics after the Cold War [56 p. 6200].

The first stage of geopolitics development is associated with an ancestor of political geography — Friedrich Ratzel. This German naturalist firstly and systematically explored the location in space in the comparative analysis of states, he carried up the basic ideas of geographical determinism. The basic tenets of Ratzel, picked up later by his followers, are highlighted hereafter.

The nations need enough space for their existence — therefore, the conquest and retention of spatial resource is a chief interest among others vital. But the space is limited and static in its nature, while the people and the states exist dynamically due to the increased number of inhabitants. This inevitably gives rise to a struggle for space and is reflected in the lawsuits, conflicts and wars [57]. Ratzel first used the term "living space" ("lebensraum" in German).

Ratzel's theory was used as a "scientific justification" for the economic and military rise of Germany of the late nineteenth century, and its territorial claims against neighbours.

A brilliant representative of the first stage of geopolitical development of thinking is a British geographer H. Mackinder (1861-1947). In his famous report "The Geographical Pivot of History", delivered at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society in London in 1904, he outlined the concept of geopolitical "islands". In his view, a large area covering Europe, Asia and Africa is a "big island", and all other areas are its satellites. Inside the "big island" lies a core — Heartland — the territory from Germany to China, and from the Himalayas to the Arctic. Who owns this kernel — rules over a large island, and who reigns over the big island, will rule over the whole world.

To seize the "core" of the world in 20s-30s of the twentieth century was called Hitler by German ideologists whose activity marked the second stage of geopoliticsdevelopment.AmongthemgainsameticulouslookgeneralHaushofer, who wrote in 1927 a book named "The boundaries in their geographical and political sense" ("Grenzen in ihrer geographieschen und politischen Bedeutung" in German). Being on friendly terms with Rudolf Hess, a Nazi leader who was very close in the 1923-1938 to Hitler — he has done a lot that in the Hitler's book "My Struggle" ("Mein Kampf" inGerman) was founded the fascist doctrines of "Blood and earth" ("Blut und Boden" in German), «Race and space» ("Rasse und Raum" in German), "The life space".

The results of the Second World War re-awakened the interest of Western historians and political scientists to geopolitics. In West Germany was even restored the publishing of Haushofer's infamous "Journal of geopolitics" ("Zeitschrift fűr Geopolitik" in German), the contents of which, however, was deprived of the former odiousness [58].

The postwar period was a period of hard confrontation of East and West, sometimes on the verge of collision. The scale of it increased with the creation of military-political alliances: NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In confronting has been almost all of the world. This circumstances cultivated a geopolitical "domino theory", which was aimed to achieve the military and political objectives in the different regions, from Indochina to the island of Cuba.

The fall of Berlin Wall and the collapse of Soviet Union led to the significant changes in geopolitical concepts. After years of thinking about the bipolar world, it is time to answer the challenges of monocentrism. For example, in the mid 90s of last century, Robert Kaplan substantiated the "theory of chaos". Based on the fact that the world is divided into the rich North and the poor South, the author predicts that the latter, in particular Africa, will be a source of anarchy and various ills [59, p. 6204].

The dominant direction of geopolitical scientific developments has been thinking about American hegemony. One of the most outspoken adherents of the special role of the United States in the world is Zbigniew Brzezinski. It urges

America to take control of three of the "Eurasian chessboard" West — Europe; South — Middle East and Central Asia; East — China and Japan. The weakening of Russia must be permanent to prevent the establishment of its control over the "near abroad", including China and Iran [59].

More and more attention the researchers pay to alternative American hegemony centers of the world, including the Muslim world. The most multi-resonance concept of modern society described in the work of Samuel Huntington "The West and the Rest". His main thesis is the fundamental source of conflict in the world is not economic or political conflicts between nations and peoples, but cultural differences between Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Orthodox and Latin American civilizations [59].

Along with the global geopolitical doctrines, now are holding the numerous applications, operational geopolitical developments. In this regard has been formed a separate theoretical approach, known as "critical geopolitics". The latter, in the opinion of its founder H. Toal [60, p. 12] distinguishes between two levels of geopolitics: high and low. The high level is theoretical in nature and provides a general study of concepts such as a world order, the structure of international relations, etc. "Low" geopolitics is a set of geopolitical concepts, symbols and images of mass media, advertising, film, political cartoons, etc. [61].

Sociological knowledge on geopolitics has been systematized. For example, in some universities, can be studied a course named "Sociology of geopolitics" [62, p. 1365, 1165].

There is a problem in the theoretical reflection of boundaries and geopolitics that sets up the greatest concern. It's a security problem [63, p. 621].

As already noted, in the cross-border cooperation actors come in with a "bifurcated" controversial request: on the one hand, to use for their own benefit "capital", the advantages of communication with foreign partners, on the other — to protect themselves from the risks and threats this communication inevitably carries out.

The concept of security researchers interpreted differently. In the most general sense, it is considered as the preservation of life-supporting systems and the absence of threats to the life of people and their activities [64, p. 15]. Experts say that today security is increasingly used not only as a purely military term, although it certainly includes the combating terrorism and strengthening the external borders, and maintenance of the combat capability of the army. Security often gets the social "dimension", moreover there is even the term "social security" which marks the condition of protection from everyday risks and threats. The social aspects of security include crime, environment, epidemics, drug abuse, and ethnic relations. Thus, safety has become a multidimensional concept that encompasses many social, economic, political and other processes [64, p. 14-15].

Regarding the issue of cross-border processes, the most particular attention is drawn to the fact that border security is a specifically historical concept. For example, in Finland, despite the conflicts in the past, the border with Sweden is seen

generally positive. Border relations with Russia are often regarded as a source of illegal immigration, criminal and other threats. In Russia itself, similarly viewed are the borderlines with some neighbour countries, for example with Kazakhstan, from where expect such threats as drug trafficking, Islamic fundamentalism, illegal migration from Afghanistan and from all over Central Asia. Alternatively, a large part of the political elite and the titular nation of Kazakhstan have fears that cross-border relations with Russia will intensify the irredentism in the regions of state.

In the literature are distinguished two views on border security: traditional and postmodern [64, p. 15].

The traditional understanding of border security has several aspects. Firstly, the border must secure from the potential enemy. To do this, here are concentrated the special troops and introduced a special regime, and its main priority is to provide a guarantee to repel to possible aggression.

Secondly, in the border zone has been established a strict control for cross-border flows. This control is carried out by special units on the border and on the borderline.

Thirdly, one of the features of the traditional approach to border security are the efforts of public institutions to predict and neutralize the potential problems on the borderline.

Fourthly, understanding of the border as a security boundary follows from the protection function of the state as a whole. It is based on the fact that the protection of the interests of border regions is similar to the protection of national interests.

Geoeconomics in this case subjects to geopolitics. On the one hand, political leaders can qualify a particular borderline problem as the national and geopolitical problem and a threat to national security. For example, significant investment in the neighbouring country is sometimes qualified as the economic basis of the separatist movement on the borderline. On the other hand, there may be efforts for explaining some difficulties as the inadequacy to the existing needs of present status of the border region, especially concerning the presence or absence of powers. For example, the problems in development of a particular sector of border economics can easily be explained in terms of too much openness of borders and growth of cross-border trade.

As for postmodern interpretations of border security, they are also quite diverse. The common denominator is a point of view that in the conditions of intensification of international relations, the realization of traditional functions of the border areas, including security, has changed significantly. The border regions should become the engines of economic growth and innovation centres of the state. This is achieved by creating a cross-border systems, such as industrial parks, special economic zones, various joint projects, etc. In result might be overcome the rudimentary phenomena of history and stereotypes (as, for example, between France and Germany).

On the basis of noted common denominator has been changing the understanding of threats to national and regional security.

First, it confirms a belief it's not enough if has been answered the new challenges in terms of military forces, police and paramilitary forces. This is evidence of the fact that despite efforts of powerful armies, the adequate results in fight against illegal migration, international terrorism, drug trafficking and weapons unfortunately hasn't been found today.

Second, the attempts to control the growing cross-border flows only using old methods, associated with increased barrier function of boundaries, are not sufficiently effective, and moreover, they are destructive to society and the economy. The close cooperation of neighbouring countries based on common interests and needs, demilitarization of border areas and open borders just can give good results in the field of security.

Third, according to the postmodern approach to security, governments need to contribute to the development of cross-border cooperation at the local level. National governments can no longer ignore the specific regional interests or make obstacles towards their implementation in the process of cross-border cooperation. Thus, the border security is given a regional dimension.

Fourth, was produced a new understanding of border protection. Due to the intensification of cross-border processes and theirs increasing deployment in depth of territories (international airports, special economic zones, etc.), the struggle with phenomena that threaten the security of the border, should be conducted throughout the country.

Fifth, the issues of border security today may have custody not only of the state but also local authorities and international organizations, and other entities of public life [65, p. 5-14].

International experience of conceptual understanding of cross-border security analyses A. Makarychev [66, p. 15-16]. He does this through the prism of modern theories of international relations. The researcher considers it appropriate to highlight the theoretical reflection of border security problems in the following areas: political realism; theory of rational choice; new institutional theory; functionalism and neofunctionalism; transnationalism; globalism; School of peace research; constructivism; postmodernism; neo-Marxism and the "new left".

Realism is, according to the researcher, one of the oldest school of foreign policy analysis. He examines the international system as "anarchist", one in which crucial meaning have selfish interests of the state. This school, like neorealism later, based on the idea that the world is in a state of perpetual struggle for global hegemony. Thus, the problems of cross-border security are the response to external threats. For example, European integration from this perspective can be seen as a reaction to post-war American and Soviet ambitions. New forms of territorial identity is the way of balancing of a hegemony. Under the terms of realism, weak states are doomed to be grouped against their potential competitors. Otherwise, they will play in international relations a subordinate role.

According to Makarychev, the logic of realism is seen in the position of federal Russian government on the border issues. TThis logic leads inevitably to the dominance of questions of "high politics" in the realm of cross-border cooperation, and deceleration a process of "sub-national regional development" by federal government. Some diplomatic officials said that the increase in cross-border exchanges leads to deformation of Russian international relations, not always justified increase in the number of actors, forcing the regional sentiments of selfishness to the detriment of federal solidarity.

In general, a concept is maintained in the spirit of Realpolitik, considers the problem of border security in the «hard» plane. However, the Chechen war and September 11, 2001 demonstrated conditional separation of safety factors into "soft" and "hard". Terrorism and criminal activities that have always belonged to the "soft" factors, today moved into the category of "hard". Thus, probably is worth go back to the concept of indivisible security, all components of which are interrelated.

The theory of rational choice is in many ways similar to the paradigm of political realism. However, if realism considers government agencies as the main actors, conversely do the "rationalists" seeing individuals in this role. It is alleged, the solution to all political issues, including those related to border security, should be given at the mercy of rational professionals. They will choose the course of action that will lead to optimal results in terms of the costs and outcome.

Makarychev in person is quite sceptical about the postulates of this theory, because he believes that the policy never and in none country is unfolding according to the scenario of "rational model". However, it should be desirable as an ideal object.

According to the new institutional theory about which realists say, the "anarchy" may be corrected with the help of strong and effective institutions, which, in particular, can become a kind of frame for a variety of cross-border alliances. Institutionalists have pondered about the borders through economic relations (for example, in the analysis of routes and technological chains in transporting oil).

Functionalism and neofunctionalism step out from the fact the borders are "integration tools", and should be used regarding to the situation. For successful development of cross-border integration and solving the problems of border security, from the point of view of adherents to that school, should be achieved the growth of so-called functional organizations, based on a non-political, technical soil. It is suggested that non-political experts much more can ensure the creation and distribution (branching) of functional relationships that in result will make conflicts between states unprofitable.

According to the theory of transnationalism, international relations should be seen not only as the interaction of states, but also non-governmental institutions. Transnationalists believe that in view of rationality of applied decisions, the states often lose comparatively to non-state actors. Most importantly, the growing range of interactions between societies is not subjected to state regulation, and this fully

applies to cross-border exchanges. Non-state actors are seeking for expansion of their activities. Evidence of cooperation "over the borders" is trade, "people's diplomacy", transport networks, tourism. This should be considered when solving issues related to border security.

Part of the overall concept of globalization is a theoretical flow, known as the "world federalism". The representatives of this movement claim that the world is slowly but steadily moving toward the formation of a single world community based on shared ethical norms, political and economic principles. So stepping out from the thesis of "the inadequacy of borders", is proposed to enhance the regulation of global technological, social, security and other processes by the institutions, which can be regarded as a prototype of "world government".

It is within the school of "peace research" has been changed a paradigm, i.e. the transition from the consideration of security mainly in the diplomatic and geopolitical contexts to sub-national level. This has unwrapped the issues of risks and threats out of the traditional geopolitical framework related to military confrontation and foreign policy ambitions. Thus, peace research draw attention to the deep social roots of safety phenomenon including language policy and international relations. It is also the state of external borders, transport infrastructure, crime and the extent level of corruption. The security situation affects many social institutions: churches, financial and industrial groups, and various NGOs.

Current understanding of safety in the school of peace research is closely related to the formation of so-called "security communities", including those built on a territorial basis. In England, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and other countries became widespread the term "securitization", which means a description of the constructed nature of the security phenomenon. The importance of securization is that it gives more than the traditional theory, the space for the participation of independent experts and NGOs in debates on security and depriving the state of monopoly in this area.

The school of constructivism emphasizes the process of "region-building" including safe cross-border cooperation is impossible without the intellectual component. Constructivists believe the leaders of this process are "action intellectuals", i.e. experts who want to convert their knowledge into political influence. The scientific elite are seen by constructivists as a counterweight to official authority, for a better understanding of the processes of territorial dynamics, including those that directly determine the level of border security. To achieve this aim, the regional political and academic centres have been creating, which, in turn, enter into the international "network" and information "flows".

Post-modernists believe that many existing communities of people (political, religious, cultural, ethnic, professional) are operating at a scale that is larger than even the largest state entities. Therefore, the political and legal boundaries of nation-states (or "Jacobin States") less correspond to formed models and patterns of life organisation of people's groups. Hence, the widespread of extra-regional,

extra-national and extra-territorial forms of self-structuring of political, economical, social, cultural, ethno-confessional and other processes. Of importance is a thought of Joseph Camilleri who said: "We live in a period of transition to a new form of civil society, where there is no clearly marked borders that are based on the principle of national identity" [65, p. 35]. All this must be considered when planning and implementing security projects in cross-border processes.

The latest trend that is identified by Makarychev in the theoretical reflection of border security issues is neo-Marxism and "new left". Neo-Marxists, in particular, state that in global scale the expansion of transnational capital has led to "the emergence of a quasi-public infrastructure of informal relations between elites as Bilderberg Group, Trilateral Commission, etc. These informal formations have questioned the significance of national borders. Furthermore, noting the crisis in development of modern conceptions of capitalist society, neo-Marxist supporters pay attention to the growth of neo-liberalism as a new form of "control regime", including the queries in functioning boundaries [66, p. 15-16].

As in real life, cross-border processes largely depend on the armed conflicts and social theory, moreover sociology of borders is closely related to the sociology of war. In various interpretations of the phenomenon of war are distinguished religious, naturalistic, psychological, technocratic and other concepts. Herewith has been investigated value, history, types, causes and consequences of wars [67, p. 1166].

One of the first attempts to conceptualize the processes of war were probably he Laws of Manu or Manava Dharma Shastra (c. 500 B.C.) the ancient Indian collection of instructions from the ideology of Brahmanism. Later, similar attempts were made in the 5th century BC in ancient Greece and ancient China. Typically, wars were treated as a natural phenomenon. The ancient Greek philosopher Plato (427-347 B.C.) argued that wars is a natural and continuous state of humanity, because they give slaves without which society cannot exist. Similarly, Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) considered the art of war as an art of purchase slaves. Heraclitus from Ephesus (c. 535-475 B.C.) believed war is a good because only strong and courageous survive it. "War, he argued, is a father of all and a king of all; the ones are selected to become gods, the other – people; it made some slaves, others have become free" [68, p. 46].

From these explanations are significantly different the views of other members of slave-owning democracy: Democritus (460-370 B.C.), Epicurus (341-270 B.C.), Titus Lucretius Carus (99-55 B.C.). They believed that the wars arose from the formation of society. In particular, Titus Lucretius Carus noted that there were no wars, and under war signs were not called thousands of people when people were wild [272].

In the Middle Ages the dominant Christian religion contributed to the interpretation of the phenomenon of war. One of its ideologues Aurelius Augustinus (354-430 B.C.) recognized war as a necessary evil, without which there cannot be Christian peace and justice. War is needed to overcome the "sinner's kingdom" by "divine kingdom". However, at the beginning of the second millennium, the Ital-

ian philosopher Marsilius of Padua in his book "The Defender of Peace" had the courage to say that the main reasons that violate peace and rise wars are excessive encroachment of Roman bishops.

At the time of early bourgeois society the phenomenon of war is getting more "grounded" and loses its divine aura. For example, the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679 A.D.) was looking for sources of war and found them in the own human nature. He marked three main reasons for wars that generates human nature: "firstly, competition; secondly, distrust; thirdly, the desire to become famous" [70, p. 151]. The first reason, said the author, makes attacks on each other in order of swag, the second – for their own safety, and the third – for reasons of honour. People who guided the first reason, use violence to become owners of other people, their women, children and animals; people who are guided by the second reason, use violence in self-defense; the third category of people uses violence in a response to trifles, such as words, smiles, because of disagreement with the opinion and other manifestations of discourtesy [71, c.152].

The prominent German philosopher G. Leibniz (1646-1716 A.D.) believed that wars are inevitable. In his understanding the roots of war lay in unbeatable hostility of people; the rulers play fates of the world as cards; the peace agreements are a temporary truce, and perpetual peace is possible only in the cemetery.

The important ideas about the nature of war made the legendary French educator Jean-Jecques Rousseau (1712-1778 A.D.). One of the main reasons of war, he believed, is income inequality in society, a human desire to accumulate property [71, p. 565-567]. This desire he connected with the nature of man.

In the understanding of Baron d'Holbach (1723-1789 A.D.) wars have been ignited by ideological orientations and mental state of people. Thus, he argued that excess of causticity in fanatic's bile, hot blood of a conqueror, monarch's poor digestion of food, whims of a woman can be a sufficient reason for war [72, p. 260].

A separate approach in the explanation of genealogy of wars are the views of thinkers who are usually referred to as utopian socialists. For example, the leader of the English Diggers John Winstanlay (1609-1652 A.D.) was convinced that the cause of the war is hidden in private ownership [73, p. 203]. Other representatives of this approach are Saint-Simon (1760-1825 A.D.), Owen (1771-1858 A.D.), Fourier (1772-1837 A.D.) followed the idea that private property is a constant cause of wars, leading to competition not only among people, but also states, coalitions of countries, involve them in war [74 p. 9-10].

About the inextricable link between war and politics for the first time claimed G.W.F. Hegel (1770-183 A.D.). He wrote: "The army used to achieve specific policy objectives..." [75, p. 291]. This idea was later fully substantiated by one of the classics of the theory of war – the German general Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831 A.D.). In particular, he said: "War is the continuation of politics by other means... war is not only a political act but also a real instrument of policy, their prolongation by other means. What is it special, applies only to the features of its products

"[76, s.43]. K. Clausewitz believed that war is violence used to force the opponent to submit to his will [76, p. 17]. Another theorist Sebald Rudolf Steinmetz was convinced that the war will never disappear from human history [77, p.19].

Considerable attention to the study of the phenomenon of war, particularly World War II paid one of the founders of the Czechoslovak Republic, its prime minister Edward Beneš. His opinion on this issue he outlined in the work called "War and Culture" [78]. Important for understanding the nature of armed conflict, especially in early societies, is a study of Maurice R. Davie "The Evolution of War" which appeared in the late 20s of twentieth century. Author, based on ethnological and historical research in Melanesia, comes to a shocking conclusion that in the early stages of human development one of the real cause of the war was cannibalism [79, p. 67].

To the problems of genealogy and causes of wars have been dedicated many modern studies [See., for example: 80].

As the United States Army brigadier General V. Couts notes in the fundamental work on the study of the theory of war, there is no doubt that "war is a constituted part of history" [81, p. 15]. However, as emphasized another American researcher R. Benedict, in primitive societies this element of culture was absent. He refers to the observation of Eskimos tribes and Indians of California, who knew what is violence and killing a man, but had no idea about a war as an organized and targeted violence [82 p. 27-29].

From a moral and legal point of view, war is measured as fair and unfair, defensive and offensive. Even Plato appealed to these concepts. As an ideologist of slavery, he argued the legality of wars that were intended to enslave other nations ("barbarians") as well as the suppression of slaves' uprisings. He also praised those who took part in the "Greatest Grand War" – the external war [83, p. 23]. The criterion of war's justice for Aristotle is the correspondence to slave state's interests set out in the law.

With the acceptance of Christianity the concept of fair and legitimate war has got a religious interpretation. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D.) argued that a war in the name of faith, in the name of Catholicism is a product of God's grace, because they are generated by "legitimate reasons" which are sanctified by church, leading by "legitimate authority" and intending to achieve "legitimate objectives". This study first served for crusades and missionary trips.

During the early capitalism, the righteous meaning have only the wars, which were designed to establish bourgeois relations. For example, Hegel considered as necessary and fair the wars of Germany to seize the neighbouring and weaker states. Moreover, he believed that the war has important function of public sanitation. The high value of a war, as Hegel pointed out, is that thanks to it, the moral health of nations is saved. He used a comparison: it's similar to how wind movement prevents lake from a rot, that it would held during a prolonged absence of wind, and so war protects people against decay, which would inevitably result of a long and eternal peace [84, p. 344]. F. Bekon (1561-1626 A.D.) strongly supported

the British colonial expansion. The people, he urged, cannot develop their wealth otherwise than by using other people.

However, in these times were proposed more objective approaches to assessing the fairness and legality of wars. Holbach considered as justified only that war that is being waged for the purpose of the defense. The war, he argued, is fair and inevitable only if it leads to repel the wicked invaders' attack, tame the rage of a nation which is void of understanding [85, p. 459]. German philosopher Immanuel Kant similarly (1724-1804 A.D.) considered as natural the union of states to fight off another state, acting with unfair infringements [86, p.189].

It's possible to see the problem of fair and unfair wars (and the wars of conquest and liberation) is mainly relational, scholastic and sometimes even speculative, as the criteria for their definition is largely subjective and are historical in nature. In clarifying the causes of a war one party usually interprets the event in their own way. In addition, life shows that over time, with the clarification of certain historical events and receiving more information the interpretation of events might change. This sometimes creates appraisals for the formula "all are guilty". An episode with the work of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe is a proof. While discussing the Russian-Georgian armed conflict in 2008, a rapporteur Andreas Gross from Switzerland said that the outbreak of war is a hit into the heart of Europe. He also expressed his belief that a war hasn't innocent people: "You can not survive the war with clean hands. There are no innocents in war" [87].

In terms of scale can be defined local or global wars, between two states or coalitions, short or long. On the basis of usage the weapons, the wars are qualified as limited or total, with usage of ordinary weapons or weapons of mass destruction. There are also static and dynamic wars. When people talk about the targeted manipulation of public opinion and deliberate misinformation of an enemy, the concept of ideological and psychological warfare is used.

Recently, a specific form of military confrontation emerged, which can be called a phenomenon of "geopolitical boomerang".

This phenomenon is typical for recent decades and is associated with the action of two main factors. First, the globalization processes with an opportunity for people and information to traverse large spaces in a short time, thanks to advances in transportation and information sector (modern aircraft, high-speed ground transport types, the global telephone and television network, the Internet, and so on. Second, recent developments in weapons' systems (portable nuclear installations, tools for local chemical and biological attacks, powerful explosive mini-devices, Internet-wars, etc.).

This means that certain geopolitical action in any remote corner of the world hypothetically could have a back reaction towards the country caused this effect.

The phenomenon of "geopolitical boomerang" should be attributed to the new challenges and threats, first such as international terrorism.

Since there are wars, there is also an anti-war ideology and culture. The wars cause tragedies to unlimited number of people and is a true social plague. An ardent preacher of peace and medieval philosopher Erasmus Roterodamus said bitterly: "They say the war is the basis and source of all the glorious feats. In the meantime, what can be more absurd than it... But war brings both opponents more harm than benefit... For a very glorious things – a war – philosophers ...are not needed. Here are needed slackers, pimps, murderers, gangsters, dark men, daft people, debtors and the like dregs of society" [88, p. 107]. In his poetic anti-war manifesto "Bellum" (1517) the protagonist – Peace – mourning the woes and laments the madness of people.

American national bestselling author of the "War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning" – a book about the recent war in the Balkans – Chris Hedges after all seen in a bloody conflict has come to the main conclusion that present ethnic conflicts such as a bloody confrontation between Serbs and Muslims are not the religious wars. They aren't a clash of cultures or civilisations or accumu-lated contradictions. "They are the artificial wars that are generated by the col-lapse of civil society, accompanied by fear and paranoia, and are managing by gangsters, who had risen from the bottom of society and terrorize him..." [89, p. 20].

"Dulce et decorum est Pro Patria mori" – "It is pleasant and honourable to die for their country" – under this noble motto formulated by the ancient Ro-mans, millions of people go to sacrifice for ages, being full of pathos and hero-ism. But whatever vest that wraps up a war (patriotism, justice, revenge, etc.), its content is and will be an act of killing people. A famous Leo Tolstoy in the epic "War and Peace" in despair noted that during the Franco-Russian confrontation in 1812 millions of people, who are denied of their human feelings and his mind, had to go to the East from the West and kill their own nature, as it was a several centuries ago when crowds of people were moving from East to West killing own nature [90, p. 7].

Antiwar ideology justifies the idea that killing people was a kind of social activity of "Homo sapiens», the same as childbirth, education, one of its professions, par, for example, with industrial activity, artistic creativity and more. The society nominates its elite part in the physical sense to kill (if necessary) other people. Before others, intellectual elites, the society puts the task of developing increasingly sophisticated tools of murder.

Therefore, the stability of wars and development of formulas suffered by mankind – "Only the dead have seen the end of war" by Plato, and the Latin "Si vis pacem, para bellum" ("You want peace, prepare for war").

Unfortunately, the anti-war ideology hasn't (and, apparently, cannot have) the exact statistics of military conflicts and their victims from Adam and Eve until now.

But even that documented is truly impressive.

In the large-scale and bloody battle of Cannes in 216 B.C., the decisive event for Punic War between Rome and Carthage, died 48 thousands of Romans and 6 thousands of Cartaginesi [91, p. 19]. World War I (1914-1918 A.D.) took away

almost 10 million lives. During the same World War II (1939-1945 A.D.) in the armies of all countries were mobilized 110 million of people. Were killed 50 million of people and 35 million were wounded [92, p. 353]. After the Second World War due to the appearance of weapons of mass destruction was reached a his-toric border of wars: this means that a third world war could be the last in the history of mankind, because it will lead to physical destruction.

However, as noted by supporters of the anti-war movement, the obtuse-ness of man often knows no boundaries. Today it is well known that in the heat of passion confrontation between world powers in the early 60s of the last cen-tury, during the so-called Caribbean crisis, humanity were one step away from a nuclear war. A war, compared with which the biblical Deluge might seem insignificant man-made phenomenon. Don't want to think might have been other similar situations about which ordinary people simply do not know. Indeed, "Quos vult perdere – demental" – ("Who wants to ruin – deprive of reason").

A double category to "war" is the concept of "peace". In the literature, it is defined as "... the living conditions of coexistence between states, relations be-tween peoples and nations (coalition of states) that are based on mutual consid-eration of the national interests, the conduct of foreign policy using non-violent methods, absence of open military actions (armed struggle) and subject to the mutual contractual obligations" [93].

The researchers emphasize that the peace has always been a large but short holiday to the nations. According to R. Jackson, since 1945 on the planet was only 26 peaceful days [94, p. 201].

In the basis of all activities with the preservation of peace should be imposed The concept of a Culture of Peace, developed by UNESCO and approved by the UN in the late XX century as a global Programme with a view of its implementation in the XXI century by the entire world community, as well as some regional groupings, countries and nations.

1.4. Issues of system sociological reflection of transborder processes

The conducted analysis of paradigms on development of transborder phenomenon indicates the fact that border issue in society cause significant cognitive interest. The scientific community has considerable advances in the analysis of certain aspects of borders and related phenomena. In particular, processed a large array of historical data about the origin of borders. Gain information about their diverse nature and trends. The controversial nature of modern transborder processes in Europe. Analyzed interdependent elements of the triad "border, war and peace" [see: 95-107].

It is encouraging fact that by joint efforts was created significant organizational and human research resources. Today, the world's borders and transborder processes involved in numerous universities, research centers and informal groups. For example, the Association of Borderland Studies brings together more than one hundred academic institutions and government bodies, NGOs from America, Europe, Asia, Africa [108].

Analysis of various aspects of borders and transborder dynamics finds its place on the pages of many scientific journals, such as periodical «International Journal of Migration and Border Studies» [109].

An example of active development transborder issues can be massive international study of opportunities for economic, social and geographic cooperation and regional development around EUROBORDERREGIONS, which is carried out during the years 2011-2015 by 14 universities and research centers from Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Moldova, Norway, Russia, Turkey and Ukraine (main project partner - the University of Eastern Finland) with financial support from EU (Programme FP7-SSH) [110].

In Ukraine the development of issues of transborder relations, especially on its border with the European Union, carried out tillnowadays by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of NAS of Ukraine, led by its director - academician Yu.Pahomov. Uzhgorod department of the Institute and its employees (H.Shmanko, O.Peredriy, H.Dynys, P. Studenyak, I. Syusko, I.Chuchka, I. Ustych and others) for decades laid the good traditions of fruitful scientific collaboration with colleagues from Hungary Slovakia, Romania.

It is widely known research school on the analysis of the latest geopolitical processes, headed by S.Vidnyanskyy Head of the Department of World History and International Relations at the Institute of History of Ukraine of NAS.

Scientists of the Institute for Regional Studies of the National Academy of Sciences (Lviv), including its director V.Kravtsiv and a leading researcher fellow N.Mikula have been conducted thorough research on the various aspects of the relationship of regional and cross-border development, especially in the context of Ukrainian-Polish relations.

Active theoretical and practical work on European integration of Ukraine exercise Uzhgorod National University (V.Pryhodko, I.Artomov, E.Kish, M.Lendel and others) and Uzhgorod Branch of the National Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of Ukraine (Director S.Mytryayeva).

In short, in studying the social life cross-border phenomena there are significant factual, conceptual and organizational achievements.

However, any knowledge is limited by time. Its scope and quality largely depends on the cognitive means used to obtain it. The more advanced, more efficient means, the more diverse and deeper, or, in other words, the richer the knowledge is. This fully applies to the theoretical reflection of cross-border processes.

Today, on the author's opinion, there remain *a number of important issues affecting the very essence of modern border and cross-border processes, that are still unsolved.* These are not scholastic questions. Answers would allow avoiding confusion and errors in theoretical research, and hence the confusion in practice.

First of all, *this is about a clear identification of the basic concepts that reflect the cross-border phenomenon*. Because, as is known, the methodology requires compliance of passport properties of the objet and the concept.

First of all, *the content and structure of modern cross-border processes* requires to be adequately categorically displayed. Without it, it is impossible to understand the mechanism of their operation and development. More specifically, the question is as follows. Due to the relatively underdeveloped cross-border processes and their primitive forms, on the one hand, and the fact that they usually occurred in areas directly adjacent to the border on the other hand - *the cross-border communication for a long* time (until recent decades) was associated with the border communication.

However, under the influence of revolutionary technical and technological changes (in particular the emergence of fundamentally new means of transport and communication) and associated globalization and dynamism of social development in the second half of the last century, *the scope, intensity and diversity of cross-border processes have increased manyfold*.

Under these conditions, "to squeeze in" a fundamentally new quality of cross-border communication in the Procrustean bed of the concept of "border relations" ("boundary connections"), as is often done in theoretical studies and policy documents, was completely wrong from a scientific point of view, and counterproductive – from the practical viewpoint.

The conceptual reflection of phenomena associated with borders has some large "white spots", evident by the fact that research and political-legal documents *often indicate one and the same phenomena by different concepts*. For example, today a large number of terms circulate describing business cooperation across borders, like "cross-border cooperation", "border relations", "trans-border cooperation", "interterritorial cooperation", "interregional cooperation", "transnational cooperation" etc.

By itself, the diversification of concepts is positive, but *it must be based on the reflection of real differences of objects and their precise de*finition. Otherwise a chain of related problems can happen, when *uncertainty of generic concepts bring about confusion in understanding the specie*s.

In support of this, it is appropriate to recall the situation that took place at the Forum of the European states heads of statistical offices and researchers – the International conference "Development of the European Statistical System within Eastern Partnership - Directions and Strategy" (m.Krakiv, Poland, 2011). In discussions participants operated extensively the concept of "cross-border statistics", which should reflect processes of communication across borders. However, the question of what is the meaning of this term and which scope of phenomena it displays, nor Eurostat nor the participants could give a clear answer. This is not

surprising, because statistics only evaluates in quantitative form some objective phenomenon, in this case the ones related to borders. *If there is no common understanding of phenomena, it is clear that there will be no adequate statistical display of them.*

Another example of the *substitution of notions*. In 2002, the Federal Assembly of Russia ratified approved in 1980 European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities. However, the official translation of documents into Russian instead of the term «transfrontier cooperation» uses the term "cross-border cooperation".

Thus, the legislator significantly narrowed the notion of "transborder" [111]. The same interpretation of the term is given in the official translation ratified by Russia in 2008 of the "Protocol number 2 to the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities concerning inter-regional cooperation" [112]. Even earlier the term "cross-border cooperation" was recorded in the main intrastate document governing external relations of the regions – the "Concept of cross-border cooperation in the Russian Federation" approved by the Government of the Russian Federation in 2001 (law on this subject has not yet adopted) [113].

Sometimes the use of border related terms has a clearly visible *political expediency.* For example, only this can possibly explain the fact that the number of countries covered by the policy of the European Union and reflected in the concept of "Eastern Partnership", the "East-most" of the Eastern states – Russia – is not included [114].

Unfortunately, there are cases when the designation of certain boundaries or geopolitical realities uses *the quirky blend of scientific impropriety and political engagement.*

This state of affairs in the analysis and management of modern cross-border processes, of course, results from many factors. However, in my opinion, there is one main determining factor that the problems of adequate reflection of cross-border effects are not solved. This factor is that today mainly specific aspects and parameters of cross-border processes are under study in a holistic way they are not studied. This, in turn, prevents effective management of modern cross-border processes, first, in terms of maximizing their positive potential and minimizing the associated related threats and challenges.

Scientists become increasingly aware that theoretical border problems should be translated into practical developments *on a totally new level – from primarily one-factor analysis to interdisciplinary research.*

As put by famous expert on political geography and geopolitics, President of the international Geographical Union V. Kolosov emphasized, geography came to be the first science dealing with border areas. Two main branches of geography – physical and socio-economic geography – dealt with border problems and their delimitation in particular. Geography pioneered the study of political borders.

The history of mankind is the history of wars, and most wars aimed at changing the borders. Therefore, without studying the history of wars one cannot study

the history of frontiers. The so-called new political geography that emerged in the mid-70s of the 19th century and is closely related to other social sciences, including political science and international relations, explores the impact of borders and their stability on the resolution of territorial disputes and conflicts, and on peace. Those and other areas of knowledge, according to V.Kolosov, should provide an interdisciplinary approach to the study of borders [115, page 606].

In turn, other prominent scientist E. Brunet-Jailly, believes that the development of interdisciplinary theory of borders should take advantage of four equally important analytical dimensions: 1) the impact of market and trade flows, 2) the political activity of various levels of government at joint borders, 3) special political impact of border communities, and 4) the specific culture of the latter [116, page 634].

The sociological display of borders and cross-border flows is carried out. It takes place both at the level of theoretical analysis of these phenomena, and on the level of applied empirical sociological research. Results of the latter are detailed in the body of work. In terms of the theoretical social developments, today they are usually intertwined with other areas of knowledge of the cross-border events phenomenon (history, political geography, geopolitics, economics, etc.) and are not yet singled out as a separate branch of sociological knowledge[4]. Proof of this is the recent and thorough study of new cross-border processes, authored by well-known European experts, including sociologists, such as J.Scott [117-118].

Interdisciplinary, multi-factor analysis requires a reliable methodological support. Otherwise it will not be successful. According to the author, in order to reflect the essence of modern cross-border processes, *one should be guided by the methodology of system study of society (system methodology), that is a set of methods, techniques or operations aimed at a systemic theoretical and practical acquisition of social reality.*

This choice is conditioned by three main factors.
1 System methodology as a tool for integrative analysis today is in position to adequately reflect the natural, organic unity of a very different nature of factors affecting the borders - from the subjective to the material.
2 System methodology that provides an analysis of both functional and dynamic characteristics of objects is able to reveal the complex mechanism of cross-border processes operation and development.
3 Finally, a system methodology, that has a powerful apparatus of practical developments that can translate the limologic[5] research from primarily descriptive to the practically necessary category.

The truth is real only as a system - already in his time said G. Hegel [120, p. 132-133]. The confusion and contradictions pertinent to the wide range of modern

---

[4] Literature includes materials such as by J.Borocz which in studying the cross-border events operates the term «sociology of borders» [26], which, however, is not yet widespread and widely accepted.
[5] Limology (Latin limes – boundary, border) – the science dealing with borders

sociological theories generate an undeniable conclusion: social phenomena should be considered as "systems", - as emphasized the father of modern science about systems L. von Bertalanffy [121, s.31-32].

The discovery of the phenomenon of system, nonadditive quality of nature and society should be among the mankind's most important discoveries.

Formation of systemic developments and system methodology as a new direction of research in science characterized the second half of the 20th century.

The main objective of the systemic research is considered to be the analysis and design of various types of systems on the one hand and on the other hand management of natural systems. *The main research principle of systemic research is to examine objects, events, processes of the objective world as a system, that is as a set of interrelated components that create certain integrity.*

The importance of systematic studies is defined by two groups of interdependent factors. *One of them has an objective and practical nature and is associated with a sharp strengthening of integral objects properties in the current conditions.* No doubt, the structure integrity itself is common and constant feature of phenomena of objective (including social) reality. However, the level of development of the systemic properties of objects at different stages of history and human nature has been uneven.

The integrity level of objects, phenomena and processes steadily increased with the world's progressive development, with increased level of its organization (complication of relations). Important role in accelerating this natural historical process was played by emergence and steady growth of human's *purposeful activity*.

This is especially apparent with contemporary radical scientific and technological changes. The subject's activity that significantly increased today caused a radical change in the ratio of natural and artificial beginnings for the benefit of the latter. Based on the achieved scientific discoveries and technological inventions, people in many natural systems, not without success, modifies certain parts of the structure to influence the behavior of all organic integrity or even give it a new quality desired by a person.

Reproduction of analogs to natural structures was the start of complex artificial objects construction. Analysis, accounting and use of integrative quality became therefore urgent need of human activity. *Ignoring consistency of objects, phenomena and processes from the practical viewpoint became impossible, and in many cases - even dangerous.* Due to the extremely high degree of phenomena interdependence the modern world became systemically vulnerable. Examples of this vulnerability are violation, deformation or even destruction of the many ecosystem balances.

There is a strengthening trend of ever increasing level of organization, structure complexity of objects, processes and phenomena of objective reality. Naturally, with this growing trend the practical interest in system research also grows.

In close relationship with objective and practical circumstances, and largely on their basis, the second group of factors that determine the importance of system research is developing.

This refers to circumstances relating to deepened natural and social science research, which is immanently developing. *At some stage of this process the* necessary theoretical preconditions for shaping up qualitatively new - systemic research – *were formed*. These prerequisites included theory of atomic structure, important discoveries of structural linguistics, and other scientific achievements. In light of these natural science data, it became apparent that *the system property is one of the main features of the essence of objects, phenomena and processes of objective reality, which largely determines the quality of their identity*. New science of cybernetics emerged with the main task to develop principles of control of complex dynamic systems of natural and artificial origin. The significance of the "art of system thinking" is increasingly emphasized [122]. The terms "system", "system approach" "system analysis" have now become synonymous with the cutting edge approaches in the study of social reality.

However, it must be noted that the appeals to consistency (relevant or otherwise) began to turn into a kind of research fashion, which of course is not benefiting the science.

The study of society today needs production of a separate system methodology with its specific categorial-conceptual apparatus, methods, procedures and so on. But the most urgent requirement is to significantly strengthen the practical orientation, the implementation component of system methodology.

Some progress in this direction is already there. In particular, papers of leading scientists-systematists identify main levels of system methodology: general (system-philosophical knowledge), special (system approach, systems theory), single (system analysis). According to V.N.Sadovskyy, philosophical methodology "is crucial for all forms and types of methodological knowledge and every more general methodological level is decisive for the level of methodologies that develop less generalized statement" [123, p.37].

Second half of the 20th century was a period of a tremendous upgrowth of system and methodological knowledge. It was then when a classic work of L.fon Bertalanffy on general systems theory "General Systems Theory" and the outstanding work of T. Parsons "Social system" appeared. In 1972, the United States and the Soviet Union created in Vienna an International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. In the Soviet Union, in 1967, initiated by Academician D.Hvishiani a Union Institute for System Studies of the State Committee for Science and Technology was set up – a unique at that time structure, which, in general, managed to avoid ideological censorship and implement the highest quality systemic and methodological developments. These developments today can serve as a model for systemologists. The successor of this research institution was Institute for System Analysis of Russian Academy of Sciences, founded in 1992. From 2006 a Russian scientific school "Philosophy and methodology of systems research" led by V.N.Sadovsky was in operation.

In Ukraine in recent decades the aspect of studying complex natural and social systems associated with synergy actively developed. This problem is par-

ticularly highlighted in the works of L.D.Bevzenko [124], V.Y.Suhakov [125], A.V.Svidzynsky [126]. Due to the efforts of systemologists led by M. Zhurovsky, new ideas were developed for applied systems analysis, including in terms of the social reality [127-128].

Also active work for anchoring advanced knowledge of systems theory and system methodology to the learning process in universities and other higher education institutions took place. Training manuals, such as by Yu.P.Surmin [129], V.M.Ohrimenko and T.B.Voronkova [130], and the introduction of special courses, in particular on philosophical or sociological faculties (Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv National University) contributed to this.

Today there is also a large array of applied, specific-system studies of social processes. A strong organizational capacity for these studies has been formed. According to estimations, in the world there is about a hundred scientific journals dedicated to systems topics (for example, well known by experts "International Journal of General Systems" [131] issued from 1974). Scientists actively involved in the analysis of methodological and applied aspects of system organization are more than a thousand in number [132].

This, in my opinion, gives grounds to conclude that the system research of society has been constituted into a relatively independent, powerful sphere of theoretical and methodological reflection of social reality and transformative human activity – *social systemology or social systems science*[6].

In the most general terms *social systemology (social science system)* can be defined as the science about the systemic property of society. Social systemology (social system science) took the first major steps in understanding the system of social organization. But still in front on it are many serious problems that need to be resolved [134].

Currently the philosophical status of system methodology does not have a convincing characteristics. Essential features, principles of a systemic approach are not singled out; currently its characteristics are extremely diverse, often contradictory. The correlation of the system approach and traditional forms of social cognition are not studied sufficiently.

Existing versions of the social systems theory incompletely reflect the system content and particularly the form of social reality. This often leads the authors to make unproductive conclusions heuristically-wise (such as common declarative-trivial statements that "the object of study is systemic in nature"). Interrelation be-

---

[6]   Each of these terms has its origin. According to the researchers of the systems theory history, the concept of "Systemology" (from al-Greek. Σύστημα - whole consisting of parts; logos (from the Greek. Λόγος – "word", "thought", "sense", "concept") was first used in 1965 to denote by I.B.Novyk the theory of systems organization. Later this concept was used by other scientists, including V.T.Kulyk, B.S.Fleisman, V.V.Druzhynin, D.S.Kontorov [40]. This definition is currently being used mostly in the former Soviet Union states, although it has spread among specialists in Western Europe and America. Yet scientific society in these countries has the term "systems science" dominant which represent an interdisciplinary theory that studies the essence of complex systems in nature, society and science. Without going into a detailed analysis of the concepts of "systemology" and "system science", the author believes that in general, the content can be regarded as identical.

tween different levels of system-social methodology, including its philosophical and sociological "foundation" and applied "floors", are still not yet conceived fully.

And what is most important is that the system-methodological knowledge in many senses is too abstract, it lacks the necessary tangent lines to specific theoretical and practical aspects of social life.

All this indicates that philosophical and sociological research (systems-philosophical methodology, system approach, the theory of social systems) is seriously lagging behind compared to the area of applied system methodology (systems analysis). Perhaps this can explain a recently happening fading interest in the problems of systems research, compared with their rapid, almost triumphant development in the second half of the 20th century. As is known, it gives some grounds to make a conclusion about a crisis of system methodology [135, p.8].

Therefore, in the system study we should step away from mainly applied analysis of system issues to researching large-scale and at the same time very specific theoretical and methodological problems. This should done primarily in the interests of improving the efficiency of the applied issues development that desperately lack quality theoretical and methodological materials.

Thus, it is clear that *in the theoretical reflection of modern cross-border processes there are some contradictions that need to be addressed*, including contradictions:
- Between complex, integrated nature of phenomena associated with space-border regulation of activity, and the dominant in the today's research literature mainly their one-factor analysis;
- between many sociological and other studies of cross-border phenomena and their insufficient methodological support;
- Between the need in identified and justified systemic research methodology of cross-border processes and low level of codified systemic-methodological knowledge about them;
- Between the need for a broad theoretical and practical application of the system methodology and uncertainty of the main instruments and algorithm of its social implementation.

The presence of these contradictions is also confirmed by the findings of scientists and public institutions. Thus, Ukrainian scientist N.Mikula notes that "...currently in domestic science there are no system studies of cross-border regions and cross-border cooperation" [135, p. 9]. The importance of using systems methodology for analyzing the entire set of problems related to borders is emphasized by FRONTEX – the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union [136].

2. SYSTEM FOR SOCIOLOGICAL SERVICES OF SLOVAK-UKRAINIAN TRANSBORDER COOPERATION AND ITS COMPONENTS

System for sociological services of slovak-ukrainian transborder cooperation has its own structure, which can be seen in the light of different criteria. In terms of component composition this system *is a set of components (units)*:

а) Informational;

б) Institutional and organizational component;

в) Personel.

2.1. Informational component

Information unit of the system for sociological services of slovak-ukrainian transborder cooperation includes theoretical, empirical, sociological, information-al segments.

2.1.1. The theoretical component of sociological service of TBC

Sociological reflection of transborder cooperation can be carried out by different methods. One of the most effective method is the system analysis of TBC. This analysis is carried out through the System for indexation and monitoring of TBC (SIM) developed by the Institute for transborder cooperation and its partners.

System for indexation and monitoring of TBC (SIM) – is a set of theoretical activities that ensure *correct analysis and comparison of commonand distinctive features and development trends of* cross-border cooperation (CBC) *aimed at improvement of its performance, primarily by optimizing management.*

The SIM is based on the developed by the Institute for transfrontier cooperation (Uzhgorod, Ukraine) system of indexation and monitoring oftransborder cooperation in Europe (MIS) which is *a universal model for analysis and optimization of cross-border cooperation* both at the new Eastern border of the European Union as a whole and in certain other its individual segments, in particular. This system was presented and discussed at the International scientific conference "The effectiveness of cross-border cooperation through international monitoring and coordination of national entities", held in the framework of the project "Borders for people"

of the ENPI CBC Program Hungary-Slovakia-Romania-Ukraine 2007-2013 (Uzhgorod, April 8-9, 2011).

Having considered comments and suggestions made by experts the SIM was fine-tuned and approved by the project partners.

The set of indices which is used, as well as their quality and quantity indicators, maximally considers methodological approaches approved by the European Union institutions (in particular, of General Directorate on Regional Policy) and which are used by them in project design at the new Eastern border, and in ENPI Program development in the fi rst place.

However, the SIM is not limited by only this set of information. For the first time, it provides for the *synthetic analysis* of quality and quantity sides of transfrontier cooperation development, allowing by this to obtain *maximally full and adequate information* about this phenomena.

Having got this information, management subjects at various levels are able to develop and adopt *most effi cient* political decisions.

The proposed *set of evaluation criteria* (e.g., statistical evaluations) in the medium and long-term monitoring studies may be somewhat modified.

But to *ensure the accuracy of comparative analysis* of the level of transborder cooperation its key criteria in all cases of practical application *should be uniform.*

The chronological frameworks for the *starting* study of this or that index are identifi ed by experts depending on the characteristics of the latter.

The **object** of indexation is transborder cooperation of neighboring regions of Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, and Ukraine.

Indexation of TFC *is a tool of political analysis of transfrontier cooperation based on index construction method.*

Indexation and conducted on it base monitoring of transborder cooperation *are information base and guarantee* for a signifi cant improvement in activity coordination of national entities of TBC both in diff erent spheres (political, economic, humanitarian, informational) and diff erent levels (macro- , mezzo -, and micro).

For example, in political and administrative area at the macro level - the level of interstate relations - it can significantly increase the effectiveness of existing coordinating bodies, such as Interstate commissions on CBC).

Index (from Latin indico – I indicate) of TFC** is an indicator (relative value, expressed in unit fractions or percent) that *quantitatively characterizes dynamics of transborder cooperation as well as serves for its comparison in various regions of Europe.*

General index of TFC - indicator of the level of *object development in general.*

Special index of TFC - indicator of level of development *of one or another group of characteristics (parameters) of an object.*

Single index of TFC - indicator of *level of development of specifi c (individual) characteristics of an object.*

Relevance of index – *importance* of index, *its* share *in sets of other, sequent indexes.* The necessity to consider the relevance of particular index arises due to the

fact that sequent indexes play in cross-border cooperation development *unequal system forming role*. This should be reflected in its assessment by establishing *the difference in the number of points*, which measure particular index.

General index "Level of cross-border cooperation development between neighboring regions of Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Ukraine" is constructed on the basis of special indices by way of their composition and calculation of average index. It is defi ned on a scale of 1 to 10.

Special indexes are based on single indices by way of their composition and calculation of average parameter. It is defi ned on a point scale. In relation to general index the special indices are regarded as sub-indices.

Special indexes of general index are the following:
- geographic and demographic environment
- historic, political and spiritual factors
- legal basis
- conflict-causing factors - risks and challenges
- infrastructural characteristics
- contacts between people
- economic cooperation
- integrated borders management and its safety
- improvement of environment quality

Single indices *are constructed on the basis of quantity and quality measurements (assessments)* of specifi c object features. It is assessed on a point scale. Single indices are sub-indices in relation to general and special indices. Single indices are *concretized by minimal amounts* – **indicators.**

The systems approach to the analysis of the current transborder cooperation was supported by the expert community. This is avidenced by the presentation of SIM at the representative international forums. In addition, the developed methodology has been implemented at other segments of European borderland, particularly at the Norwegian-Russian [117], the Finnish-Russian, Polish-Russian [118] borders.

2.1.2. The empirical sociological support of TBC

Parameters of transborder cooperation which were described above are largely objective. But since carriers of transborder cooperation are people with their inherent judgments and estimations, *the analysis of transborder phenomena excluding subjective components of CBC would be incomplete*.

What are the assessments of the border functioning by the citizens from neighboring countries, what they want to change in the existing order of things, what is expected of transborder cooperation in the near future and perspective?

The answers to these similar questions allow us to establish the feedback in the process of transborder flows management, without which it can not be effective.

The empirical sociological reflection of transborder cooperation means analysis of the formation and development of the empirical sociological knowledge about this phenomenon, and researches the techniques and methods used in empirical sociological cognition of this important phenomenon of social reality.

In what state is actually sociological reflection of cross-border processes?

First, consider the activities in this area of the European Union. Known that the study of public attitudes in this association has been authorized state structure, called the Eurobarometer. **Eurobarometer** (Eng. *Eurobarometr)* - International Project of regular opinion polls carried out under the auspices of the European Commission [137]. One of the main partners Eurobarometer is a group Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) - the world leader in market research "in order" [137].

Analysis of the Eurobarometer published over four decades and especially in recent years (after the EU enlargement to the East) materials shows that, unfortunately, none of them are special studies border issues, especially those devoted to cross-border processes at the new Eastern border of the European Union. Only one study, conducted in 2006 and dedicated to the study of the effects of EU enlargement in the form of tangent and raised some issues of borders and the functioning of the modern development of border regions [138].

It is - quite surprising, because outside of due care was a layer of critical problems that cause persistent debate in the European Union (first of all it is - the problem of migration and security). For comparison, another agency of the European Union, which is responsible for Statistics - Eurostat - in recent years very actively and purposefully engaged in development issues quantify cross-border processes ("cross-border statistics"), first at the new Eastern border of the EU [139]. This problem is particularly was dedicated to Pan-European Conference leaders statistical agencies and researchers, held in Cracow in 2011rotsi. Definitely European leaders developing cross-border issues statistics is Polish scholars and practitioners led by Professor Joseph Olenskym, who has long headed the Polish Statistical Office.

In one way or another social research issues of border and cross-border cooperation were also conducted separate countries that not long ago joined the European Union and Ukraine are neighbors. It refers to Hungary, Slovakia, Romania and Poland.

For example, in Hungary this research work is carried out by the Budapest University by Loránd Eötvös (LLC "Arios» of informatics, consulting and services) [140], and the Institute of Social Sciences TARKI [141]. In Belarus concrete sociological studies of transborder processes, including local border traffic, done by Belarusian Institute for Strategic Studies [142].

Concerning Ukraine, the problems of border and cross-border processes, of course, could not and cannot fail to interest of our sociologists. Even back in 1988 in Uzhhorod State University was established one of the first in Ukraine laboratory for sociological studies, which actively engaged well known today Ukrainian

sociologists, in particular PhD, associate professor of Uzhgorod National University O. Palin and Doctor of Social Sciences, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Sociology in NAS of Ukraine, Director of Social and Political Studies «SOCIS» O.G. Stegnij. Laboratory also was assist by Doctor of Social Sciences, Senior Researcher, Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, CEO of TNS Ukraine M.M. Churylov. Laboratory has gained certain material impact on cross-border processes of interethnic and interfaith relations in the border region.

Unfortunately, very limited resources prevented conduction of complete research on border issues.

Second, more successful attempt to make such a study was done in 2007. Then the newly created Institute for transborder cooperation initiated the pilot survey «New Eastern Border of the European Union: the issue of transparency, security and cross-border cooperation (Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and Ukraine)». This study was performed under the direction of the candidate of sociological sciences, Professor P.V. Tokar [143].

To organize this research have been involved research centers, governmental and non-governmental organizations, local governments, foundations and NGOs – about 10 institutions in four countries - participants of the project (Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and Ukraine).

To its organization were involved in research centers, governmental and non-governmental organizations, local governments, foundations and NGOs – in total 10 offices in four countries - members of the project (Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Ukraine).

Through the efforts of the organizers and participants of the project, including more than 30 different specialists, 60 interviewers and team leaders were interviewed 712 respondents aged 18 to 75 years from 14 villages and 4 cities in Zakarpattia and Lviv, Ukraine, 8 villages and 2 cities of Lublin and Podkarpackie Voivodeship, Poland, 8 villages and 3 cities Kosice and Presov regions of Slovakia, 6 villages and 2 cities of Szabolcs--Szatmár area of Hungary.

Obtained expert opinions of 115 respondents from among scientists, border guards, customs officers, politicians, members of local government and other specialists. The survey results are representative of all the main characteristics: gender, age, education, ethnicity, religion, occupation and other respondents.

Regarding the level of international relations between Poland, Slovakia, Hungary and Ukraine, the 64.3 percent of respondents from these countries optimistically rated them as high, above average or average. Almost the same assessment were given to the level of transborder cooperation - 60.9 percent. Considerably cautiously responded surveyed residents from border regions to the question "What the impact made accession of Poland, Slovakia and Hungary to the European Union on the development of transborder cooperation with Ukraine?". 46.7 percent of respondents consider this influence as positive and 39.1 percent rated it negatively or rather negatively. More restrained is the answer to the question of

how it would influence to the development of cross-border cooperation introducing new regulations on public service at the border. 46.3 percent of respondents consider it negative, 21.4 - could not answer this question [143].

The results of this study provide rich information about the current state of cross-border cooperation between these countries, comparative analysis of the level of development, evaluation of consular and border services. However, unfortunately, and this study was limited both by time and financial resources.

Certain aspects of the modern cross-border cooperation are reflected in other Ukrainian sociologists study conducted at central and regional levels, not only in the West but also on the eastern border of Ukraine. Thus, in the international project with the financial support of the European Union INTAS (INTAS) in 2005-2007 was conducted study of the influence of transborder cooperation on business development in the western regions of Ukraine. The method of this study was the in-depth interviews for case studies using semi-structured circuits [144].

Significant opportunities for large-scale and comprehensive work on sociological reflection of modern cross-border processes opens the project «Borders through the eyes of people», performed by the Institute for transborder cooperation and its partners within the EU ENPI program in the segment of the Hungary-Slovakia-Romania-Ukraine.

Overall objective was to form sociological service of transborder cooperation of neighboring regions of Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine. Specific objectives: 1. Set up International Center of Sociologic Analysis of Transborder Cooperation (ICSA) as a special mechanism of joint monitoring of transborder processes which secures reliable feedback between transborder cooperation management bodies and its direct participants – population of neighboring regions of Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine; 2. Build capacity of transborder cooperation actors in the sphere of sociologic analysis and efficient use of its results, in particular: - develop special methodology and tools for the sociologic research of transborder cooperation, - develop training package "Sociology of transborder relations" for its introduce in higher educational institutions of border regions of Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine; Conduct initial international sociologic survey of transborder cooperation of neighboring regions of Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine and submit it to decision makers

Project implementation period: 06.2012 - 05.2014.

Applicant: Institute for transborder cooperation, Uzhgorod, Ukraine

Partners:
- KIUT Association for Regional Development, Zahony, Hungary,
- Uzhgorod national University, Uzhgorod, Ukraine.

The project was implemented via involvement leading experts, sociologists from Ukraine, Slovakia, Hungary and Romania.

At the heart of sociological reflection of modern transborder phenomena is the methodology of system study of society, including its basic principles: the principle of unity of social actors, activities, relationships; principle of social reason; functional-genetic principle. These principles, in turn, are implemented in qualitative verbal model of social system that serves as the master key to the methodological analysis of the diversity of social phenomena, among other things those associated with border and transborder processes.

It is an important requirement to modern methodology of concrete sociological research is appropriate implementation of potential capacity. While maintaining the necessary level of its uniformity, this methodology should provide a particular applicant (depending on the specific needs and conditions - organizational, financial, time, etc.) with a required "corridor of freedom" in the choice of research tools that is enough to make this choice invariant. In this regard, the study package along with the classical way to interception of information through mass questionnaire (face to face) in the same time include "simpler" form of obtaining sociological knowledge - an expert and a telephone survey. Issues of using combined techniques of social research are thoroughly analyzed by O.V.Pelin [145].

Conducting sociological research in different cultures and subsequent comparative analysis of the results requires consideration of a number of researchers methodological features. These features have been identified by experts under the guidance M.M.Churylov. This, in particular, is the following.

The concept of equal value is crucial in conducting and assessment the results of cross-cultural study [146]. Equivalence in this study can be defined as a state or condition of similarity in the conceptual sense and empirical methods between cultures, which makes it possible to compare these crops. The question of equivalence belongs to each individual aspect of any sociological study, but in the case of the latter in different cultures and countries having highly specific requirements such as comparability of language and translation, cultural existence sets of reactions in the empirical data.

The main problem of cross-cultural research is to test the equivalence of general theoretical background and the significance and importance of specific hypotheses put forward. Elucidation of equivalence or non-equivalence of hypotheses allows answering the question: how important hypothesis is for members of one culture or how significant it is to humans from other cultures.

Among the numerous methodological problems of cross-cultural research are: determining the type of study, the definition of culture, the formation of the sample, the definition of variables, language barriers and research procedures.

The most common type of cross-cultural study of hypothesis testing is to compare two or more crops on a certain variable (actual subject of study). Another species of this study establishes the cause of cultural differences, when the researcher measures the other variables that may be associated with the established differences. In this approach, culture is a common definition, which itself has no

explanatory value and brings together all kinds of behavior differences between cultural groups. Therefore, from a methodological point of view, culture can be considered a wide range of often poorly related independent variables.

Thus culture as nonspecific variable should be replaced with more specific variables to explain significant cultural differences. Such variables are called environment variables and must be measured to determine the extent to which they can be statistically explained by cultural differences. If the environment variable does not explain all the differences between cultures other environment variables should be included in these research to explain not disclosed until the differences between cultures until all differences will be explained.

In cross-cultural research units of analysis can serve the country or culture. The source of empirical data can be respondents' representatives of these cultures, but often this kind of data is cumulative or averaged for each culture, and these values are used as the basis for each crop. This type of research belongs to Environmental Review and analysis of culture. Examples of analysis of the environmental research can serve as cultural values of different cultures.

It is necessary to take into account differences in the interpretation of the results obtained on the basis of research of environmental or individual level. The relationship between cultural variable and selected environmental variables on the level does not necessarily mean that such a relationship exists at the individual level. Such a relationship can exist or not exist at the individual level within the culture being studied, and if there is, it may be both direct and reverse. These methodological principles were implemented in the preparation of questionnaires for specific sociological survey of CBC. An example of the questionnaire can be questionnaire for mass survey that is contained the Guide on sociological research methodology.

Thus, empirical sociological reflection of transborder cooperation and practical use of the results of empirical sociological information is an important part of the sociological service of CBC.

2.1.3. Informational services

Since the empirical sociological study of slovak-ukrainian cross-border cooperation started, the problem of information and reference support has occurred acutely. First it revealed itself in the fact that the experts operate with sociological research concepts in different languages: English, Slovak, and Ukrainian. They should have been provided, first, with a multilingual dictionary of sociological terms, secondly, it was necessary to prepare a glossary of terms used in the study.

There was prepared a basic list of terms in English, which was then translated by experienced experts in the respective national languages. A trilingual Dictionary of sociological terms is included in the manual.

2.2. Institutional and organizational provision

The institutional and organizational unit comprises a network of research and scientific practical institutions to ensure the development of theoretical and practical aspects of social monitoring and the hardware and software needed for these institutions.

While implementing the project there has been established cooperation of various organizations and institutions that could become the basis for creating an international network of institutions for sociological monitoring of cross-border cooperation. It may be joined by: the International Centre for CBC Sociological Analysis, which operates under the aegis of the Institute for Cross-Border Cooperation, TNS-Ukraine, SOCIS, the UzhNU Institute for Integration Studies – on the part of Ukraine; the Institute of Sociology and the Centre for Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences; Kosice and Prešov universities – on the part of Slovakia.

2.3. Staff component at the System on sociological services of slovak-ukrainian transborder cooperation

As far as management is concerned, the project "Information Support and Implementation of Innovative Approaches to CBC of Slovakia and Ukraine" was implemented by the employees who acquired necessary experience in managing sociological research. This expertise can be successfully applied in future work on organizing the CBC sociological monitoring.

Besides, there has been formed a powerful asset of international experts that included, in particular, the leading experts of neighbouring countries. These include: on the part of Ukraine - Doctor of Sociology, a leading researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, General Director of TNS Ukraine M.Churilov, Doctor of Sociology, a leading researcher of the Institute of Sociology of NAS of Ukraine, Director of the Centre for Social and Political Studies "SOCIS" O. Stegniy, Doctor of Sociology, Professor, Head of Department of history and theory of sociology at the National Ivan Franko University of L'viv, N.Chernysh, Director of the Institute for Transfrontier Cooperation, Doctor of Sociology, Professor of Uzh-NU, Ambassador S. Ustych, PhD (Philosophy), Associate Professor of Uzhgorod National University O.Pelin; on the part of Slovakia – a leading researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences L. Faltyan, a senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences M. Strusova, a senior researcher at the Institute of Social Sciences SAS M.Haydosh.

In order to prepare future professionals in cross-border cooperation sociological analysis there has been developed a methodological training package for higher educational institutions in the border regions of Slovakia and Ukraine. This package includes a syllabus of the course "Sociology of cross-border processes" and lecture materials.

3. MONITORING EMPIRICAL SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF SLOVAK-UKRAINIAN TRANSBORDER COOPERATION AND ITS RESULTS

3.1. The results of the monitoring empirical sociological research in the Transcarpathian region (Ukraine)

Questionnaires received[7]: 500. Distributed to interviewers: 500 questionnaires. Questionnaires returned: 498. SPSS filters passed: 467.
Sample: general population.
Method: random number.
Region: all regions – 13, all the cities – 10, settlements over 2,500 inhabitants.

Q-UA 1.

How many years have you been a permanent resident in this region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	All life			66.4	
	More than 20 years			10.5	
	Less than 5 years			9.9	
	From 10 to 20 years			9.6	
	From 5 to 10 years			3.4	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 2.

How many years have your family been a permanent resident in this region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	All life			71.2	
	More than 20 years			10.1	

7   See: Анкета для масового опитування громадян України (проект «Інформаційне забезпечення та імплементація інноваційних підходів у транскордонному співробітництві Словаччини і України» в рамках програми Sk08 – транскордонне співробітництво: "Словаччина-Україна: співпраця через кордони") // Посібник з емпіричного соціологічного дослідження словацько-українського транскордонного співробітництва .– Ужгород: ITC, 2017.

			6.8
Less than 5 years			6.8
From 10 to 20 years			5.7
Hard to say /refusal to answer			3.5
From 5 to 10 years			2.7
Total			100.0

Q-UA 3.

How important to you personally and your family are the relations of your area's residents with the residents of the neighbouring countries border territories?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Less important			34.7	
	Important enough			33.2	
	No value			19.1	
	Very important			10.9	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 4 .

In your opinion, how much are you informed about the current relations of Transcarpathian residents with the residents of the Slovak countries' border territories?

			Проценти		
Valid	Not well informed		48.6		
	Not informed at all		35.3		
	Well informed		13.7		
	Hard to say /refusal to answer		2.4		
	Total		100.0		

Q-UA 4.1

In your opinion, how much are you informed of cross-border cooperation in the framework of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) (2007-2013) and European Neighbourhood UIS (2014-2020)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not informed at all			56.3	
	Not well informed			36.4	
	Well informed			6.3	

			Valid Percent	
Hard to say /refusal to answer			1.0	
Total			100.0	

Q-UA 4 .2

How much do you think you are informed about the projects of Slovak-Ukrainian cross-border cooperation, funded by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and the state budget of the Slovak Republic?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not informed at all			59.3	
	Not well informed			33.0	
	Well informed			5.0	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 5 .

From what sources do you usually get information about relations between the residents of your region and the border territories of neighbouring countries?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Internet			23.1	
	Local TV			18.4	
	Local publications			15.8	
	National television			12.1	
	Local radio			9.5	
	Don't receive information at all			7.6	
	Communication with relatives/ friends/colleagues			5.4	
	Nationwide publications			4.5	
	Personal experience (travels/vacations/ business contacts or cultural/ sport events)			2.4	
	Conferences/seminars attended			.6	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			.4	
	Інше			.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 6.1.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information from TV- programmes of neighboring Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes			56.4	
	No			22.2	
	Don't use			21.4	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 6 .2.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information on the radio of neighboring Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			36.2	
	Don't use			34.1	
	Yes			29.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 6 .3.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information from publications of neighboring Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't use			38.2	
	No			34.1	
	Yes			27.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 7 .

In your opinion, how objectively do the media highlight the topic of the relationship among the residents of neighbouring countries' border areas?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Partly objectively			53.3	
	Quite objectively			16.4	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			15.6	
	Not objectively at all			14.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 8 .

In your opinion, after the enlargement of the European Union to the East whose interests does cross-border cooperation match primarily?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Primarily, the interests of all the European Union			27.9	
	Primarily, interests of Ukraine			23.2	
	Mutual interests of the EU, Ukraine and its neighboring countries, in particular Slovakia			19.5	
	Primarily, the interests of neighboring countries to Ukraine, in particular Slovakia			13.6	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			11.7	
	No the interests of any country			3.2	
	Other answer			.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 9 .

What impact do historical relations of Ukraine and Slovakia have on the modern cross-border cooperation of the neighbouring regions?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Rather positive			54.4	
	Definitely positive			26.2	
	Rather negative			9.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			8.7	
	Definitely negative			.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 10.

How can you evaluate the level of cross-border cooperation of neighbouring regions of Slovakia and Ukraine in the economic sphere (cross-border trade. investments. etc.)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Average			58.9	
	High			28.7	
	Low			6.7	
	Hard to say			5.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 11.

Do you have relatives or friends in a neighbouring country?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			61.3	
	Yes			36.5	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 12.

How often do you have to visit a neighbouring Slovakia that borders your region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Had never been			46.3	
	Several times per year			23.0	
	Once for a few years			22.0	
	Several times per month			6.4	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 14.

How satisfied are you with the opportunities to visit a neighbouring Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/ Don't visit neighbouring countries			44.7	
	Partially satisfied			19.7	
	Completely satisfied			19.2	
	Equally satisfied and dissatisfied			8.2	
	Partially dissatisfied			3.7	
	Absolutely dissatisfied			2.8	
	Hard to say/refusal to answer			1.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 15.

Did you have any problems when leaving to neighbouring Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/ Don't visit neighbouring countries			47.9	
	No			33.1	

	Yes			17.0
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.0
	Total			100.0

Q-UA 16.

If problems arised, what kind?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/ Don't visit neighbouring countries			56.5	
	Long crossing standby			14.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			13.6	
	Problems with obtaining visas			8.5	
	Problems related to customs control			2.8	
	Problems related to passport control			2.0	
	Other answer			1.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 17.

Please evaluate the Customs Service of Ukraine that provides crossing the border with Slovakia.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			31.7	
	Satisfactory			26.5	
	Good			16.4	
	Unsatisfactory			10.3	
	Very bad			8.8	
	Very well			5.7	
	Hard to say			.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 17.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of Ukraine Ukraine that provides crossing the border with Slovakia.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			31.0	
	Satisfactory			21.8	
	Good			21.5	
	Unsatisfactory			11.6	

			Very bad	6.6	
			Very well	6.6	
			Hard to say	.9	
			Total	100.0	

Q-UA 17.

Please evaluate the work of other services of Ukraine that provides crossing of the state border with Slovakia.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			31.6	
	Good			22.0	
	Satisfactory			20.7	
	Bad			11.6	
	Very bad			6.7	
	Very well			5.4	
	Hard to say			2.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 18.

Please evaluate the work of the Customs Service in Slovakia that provides crossing of the state border with Ukraine.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			40.5	
	Good			22.5	
	Satisfactory			16.4	
	Very well			9.4	
	Unsatisfactory			6.1	
	Very bad			3.9	
	Hard to say			1.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 18.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of Slovakia that provides crossing the border with Ukraine.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			41.2	
	Good			20.6	
	Satisfactory			15.3	

			Valid Percent	
	Very well			13.1	
	Unsatisfactory			6.2	
	Very bad			2.9	
	Hard to say			.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 18.

Please evaluate the work of other services of Ukraine that provides crossing of the state border with Ukraine.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			46.0	
	Good			20.4	
	Satisfactory			12.9	
	Very well			11.3	
	Unsatisfactory			4.2	
	Very bad			2.7	
	Hard to say			2.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 19.

Please evaluate the work of the General Consulate of Slovakia in Uzhhorod, which provides the residents of Transcarpathian region with visa services.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			43.9	
	Good			24.6	
	Satisfactory			12.6	
	Very well			11.1	
	Unsatisfactory			4.1	
	Hard to say			2.2	
	Very bad			1.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 20.

What, in your opinion, are the flaws in the border and customs services of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/Don't visit			28.4	
	Corruption (bribery) among employees			22.1	
	Slow and indifferent service			12.6	

			Valid Percent	
	Insufficient level of logistic support		10.8	
	Insufficient level of service culture		9.1	
	High levels of bureaucracy		7.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer		5.6	
	No flaws		3.0	
	Other answer		.6	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 21.

What, in your opinion, are the flaws in the border and customs services of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/Don't visit			36.5	
	Slow and indifferent service			17.9	
	No flaws			14.0	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			9.2	
	Insufficient level of service culture			6.8	
	High levels of bureaucracy			6.3	
	Corruption (bribery) among employees			5.9	
	Insufficient level of logistic support			2.6	
	Other answer			.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 22.

In your opinion, to what extent are the national minority rights (different nationalities) secured in Transcarpathian region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Mainly secured			51.9	
	Entirely secured			24.0	
	Rather unsecured			16.5	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			3.9	
	Completely are not secured			3.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 23.

How in your community relate to the representatives of national minorities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Generally tolerant (respectfully), sometimes there are conflcts			49.6	
	Fully tolerant (respectfully)			43.3	

			Valid Percent	
Treat not tolerant (withour respect)			5.0	
Hard to say /refusal to answer			2.1	
Total			100.0	

Q-UA 24.

What is your attitude towards mixed marriages with representatives of other nationalities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Completely positive			36.9	
	Neutral			30.5	
	Positively			24.0	
	Mostly negative			5.6	
	Completely negative			2.4	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 26.

How in Transcarpathian region the rights of different religious denominations (people of different faiths) are secured?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Mainly secured			46.2	
	Entirely secured			37.0	
	Rather unsecured			8.7	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			5.0	
	Completely are not secured			3.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 27.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on language grounds in your locality?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			75.3	
	Yes			18.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 27.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on ethnic grounds in your locality?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	No			80.9	
	Yes			12.3	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			6.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 27.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on religion grounds in your locality?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	No			75.3	
	Yes			16.3	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			8.4	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 28.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on language grounds in Slovakia?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	No			47.2	
	Don't know/didn't attend			39.8	
	Yes			9.1	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			3.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 28.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on ethnic grounds in Slovakia ?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	No			50.3	
	Don't know/didn't attend			40.9	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			4.6	
	Yes			4.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 28.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on religion grounds in Slovakia ?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			51.7	
	Don't know/didn't attend			40.6	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			4.4	
	Yes			3.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 29.

How can you evaluate the level of your region's cross-border cooperation with neighbouring states' regions in fighting natural disasters and in environmental protection (joint construction of flood control structures, implementation of environmental programs. etc.)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Average			52.6	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer/don't know			21.5	
	Low			14.4	
	High			11.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 30.

How can you evaluate the level of Transcarpathian region's cross-border cooperation with the neighbouring countries' regions of Slovakia in the fight against crime (the fight against smuggling, illegal migration, corruption. etc.)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Average			47.7	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer/ don't know			21.7	
	Low			19.4	
	High			11.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.1.

How much the careful preservation of historical, cultural and religious sites, ancestral graves are important for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia ?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			43.7	
	Important			24.6	
	Rather important			17.8	
	Unimportant			8.7	
	Unimportant at all			4.1	
	Hard to say			1.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.2.

How much the freedom of religion, free access to divine service on both sides of the border are important for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			44.4	
	Important			25.1	
	Rather important			16.8	
	Unimportant			8.4	
	Unimportant at all			4.4	
	Hard to say			.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.3.

How important is the tradition of a large number of mixed marriages who live on both sides of the border for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Rather important			29.4	
	Important			28.1	
	Very important			17.6	
	Unimportant			13.3	
	Unimportant at all			10.5	
	Hard to say			1.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.4.

How important is the joint emergency response, joint conservation measures and management of vital resources for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			48.4	
	Important			29.1	
	Rather important			13.1	
	Unimportant			5.3	
	Unimportant at all			3.1	
	Hard to say			1.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.5.

How important is the clear, transparent implementation of the law on the status of cross-border regions, to promote the free movement of people and goods across the border for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			46.6	
	Important			26.6	
	Rather important			16.8	
	Unimportant			4.8	
	Unimportant at all			3.2	
	Hard to say			2.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.6.

How important is the network of modern and inexpensive means for communications (mobile and Internet access) for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			39.1	
	Important			28.2	
	Rather important			16.2	
	Unimportant			9.2	
	Unimportant at all			5.0	
	Hard to say			2.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.7.

How important is the fact that the border regions should work as a single economic space, the volume of cross-border trade is a significant and ever-expanding for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			47.7	
	Important			27.0	
	Rather important			14.0	
	Unimportant			6.5	
	Unimportant at all			2.8	
	Hard to say			2.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.8.

How important is the absence of visas for border crossing for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			69.1	
	Important			11.3	
	Rather important			9.0	
	Unimportant			5.2	
	Unimportant at all			2.8	
	Hard to say			2.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 31.9.

How important is the sufficient number of checkpoints for a quick border crossing for the population of Transcarpathian region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			62.5	
	Important			17.6	
	Rather important			12.8	
	Unimportant			3.0	
	Unimportant at all			2.6	
	Hard to say			1.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.1.

Do you personally have enough confidence that there will be no ethnic conflicts?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough		40.9	
	Hard to say enough or not		37.2	
	Enough		18.0	
	Not interested		3.9	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.2.

Do you personally have enough mutual understanding between people of different nationalities?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		34.1	
	Not enough		33.5	
	Enough		29.6	
	Not interested		2.8	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.3.

Do you personally have enough opportunities to be engaged in national culture ?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough		48.5	
	Hard to say enough or not		31.2	
	Not enough		14.4	
	Not interested		5.9	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.4.

Do you personally have enough work that is suitable?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough		40.0	
	Enough		30.5	
	Hard to say enough or not		24.7	
	Not interested		4.8	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.5.

Do you personally have enough opportunities to have additional income?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			43.8	
	Enough			26.7	
	Hard to say enough or not			24.0	
	Not interested			5.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.6.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to work with full dedication?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			32.5	
	Hard to say enough or not			32.4	
	Not enough			30.2	
	Not interested			4.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.7.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to spend holidays fully?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			35.3	
	Enough			33.9	
	Hard to say enough or not			24.6	
	Not interested			6.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.8.

Do you personally have enough valuable leisure avtivities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			38.1	
	Hard to say enough or not			29.9	
	Not enough			24.2	
	Not interested			7.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.9.

Do you personally have enough the required clothing?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			53.1	
	Hard to say enough or not			21.9	
	Not enough			15.0	
	Not interested			10.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.11.

Do you personally have enough all necessary furniture?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			54.7	
	Hard to say enough or not			20.3	
	Not enough			14.5	
	Not interested			10.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.12.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to buy the most necessary products?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			59.2	
	Hard to say enough or not			21.8	
	Not enough			13.0	
	Not interested			6.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.13.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to eat according to your to personal tastes?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			45.5	
	Hard to say enough or not			24.7	
	Not enough			24.5	
	Not interested			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.14.

Do you personally have enough good accommodation?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough		49.2	
	Hard to say enough or not		23.0	
	Not enough		22.7	
	Not interested		5.1	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.15.

Do you personally have enough fair evalution of the person's merits to society?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		33.6	
	Not enough		32.8	
	Enough		26.3	
	Not interested		7.3	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 31.16.

Do you personally have enough observance of human rights in the country?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough		32.7	
	Hard to say enough or not		32.7	
	Enough		31.1	
	Not interested		3.5	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.17.

Do you personally have enough norms and values that unite people in the state and society?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		33.9	
	Enough		31.9	
	Not enough		26.7	
	Not interested		7.5	
	Total		100.0	

Q-UA 32.18.

Do you personally have enough ability to live in the new social conditions?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			38.2	
	Enough			31.0	
	Not enough			24.6	
	Not interested			6.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.19.

Do you personally have enough confidence in personal abilities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			48.0	
	Hard to say enough or not			29.4	
	Not enough			19.3	
	Not interested			3.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.20.

Do you personally have enough determination in achieving personal goals?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough			47.7	
	Hard to say enough or not			26.6	
	Not enough			22.0	
	Not interested			3.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q-UA 32.21.

Do you personally have enough confidence in future?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			40.8	
	Hard to say enough or not			28.2	
	Enough			26.6	
	Not interested			4.4	
	Total			100.0	

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC UNIT

D-UA 1.

Gender of the respondence

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Female			53.1	
	Male			46.9	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 2.

What is your age?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	18			10.3	
	20			9.0	
	19			7.7	
	21			5.1	
	23			3.2	
	22			3.0	
	37			2.8	
	38			2.8	
	36			2.6	
	25			2.4	
	32			2.4	
	40			2.4	
				2.1	
	26			2.1	
	27			2.1	
	28			2.1	
	29			1.7	
	31			1.7	
	30			1.5	
	33			1.5	
	34			1.5	
	41			1.5	
	43			1.5	
	48			1.5	
	35			1.3	
	42			1.3	
	45			1.3	

17			1.1
24			1.1
39			1.1
47			1.1
50			1.1
53			1.1
55			1.1
57			1.1
44			.9
46			.9
49			.9
51			.9
63			.9
52			.6
64			.6
67			.6
69			.6
16			.4
58			.4
62			.4
65			.4
66			.4
68			.4
70			.4
71			.4
73			.4
74			.4
54			.2
56			.2
59			.2
60			.2
61			.2
72			.2
75			.2
76			.2
80			.2
Total			100.0

D-UA 3.

What is the highest level of education you have received?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Complete secondary education (Certificate of complete secondary education for 10-11 secondary school forms)			24.2	
	Vocational education (School, college, technical school)			20.8	
	Complete higher education (specialist)			19.7	
	Complete higher education (master)			14.2	
	Basic higher education (bachelor)			13.6	
	Junior secondary education (Certificate for the 8-9 high school forms)			3.0	
	Additional training on the basis of full secondary education (professional, comprehensive course, etc.)			2.8	
	Incomplete primary education (less than 4 years of secondary school)			1.5	
	Postgraduated academic degree			.2	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 4.

How would you describe your family situation?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Married			44.8	
	Single, never lived with a partner			25.2	
	Single, currently live with a partner			8.9	
	Widower/widow			4.0	
	Refusal to answer			3.7	
	Single/unmarried, previously resided with a partner			3.5	
	Divorced			3.3	
	Remarriage			2.6	
	Dispersed			2.4	
	Other answer			1.7	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 5.

What is your current occupation?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Paid employment (employee, self-employed, seasonal work, temporary work, family business, entrepreneur)			53.9	
	Education (not paid by the employer), including holidays			24.3	
	Without work but actively looking for			6.7	
	Retired (by age)			4.3	
	Housework,caring for children or others			3.4	
	Retired or unable to work through illness			3.0	
	Other answer			2.0	
	Without work, I want to work but I am not actively looking for			1.3	
	Refusal to answer			1.1	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 6.

What type of professional activity do you belong to?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Professional work, specialist, an occupation that requires higher education (doctor, teacher, engineer, etc.)			34.1	
	Senior and middle managers (director, head of the department, etc., who have subordinated personel)			12.2	
	Self-employed, farmer (business owner)			11.7	
	Working in agriculture			9.0	
	Skilled worker (master, mechanic, electrician tools, manufacturer, driver, salesman)			8.2	

			Valid Percent	
	Employee, including government, mid- and low rank (secretary, clerk, office manager)			7.7
	Refusal to answer			5.7
	Unskilled workers (handyman, laborer, maid, security guard)			4.5
	Employee, including government, high-ranking			3.7
	Police, customs, military, border guard, etc.			1.7
	Other answer			1.5
	Total			100.0

D-UA 8.
Characteristics of your family's wellbeing

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Enough only for bare necessities			47.2	
	Enough for everything we need			24.7	
	We live in full abundance			11.9	
	Refusal to answer			9.1	
	Enough only for food			7.1	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 9.
To what nationality do you personally belong to?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Ukrainain			89.8	
	Hungarian			3.2	
	Rysun			3.1	
	Refusal to answer			1.3	
	Jew			1.0	
	Slovak			.6	
	Romanian			.4	
	Other answer			.4	
	Rom			.2	
	Total			100.0	

D-UA 10.

What language do you oftener speak at home?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Ukrainian		93.7	
	Other		3.7	
	Hungarian		1.3	
	Russian		.9	
	Romanian		.2	
	Refusal to answer		.2	
	Total		100.0	

D-UA 11.

Have you ever relegated to a particular religion or belief?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes		86.4	
	No		9.1	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer		4.5	
	Total		100.0	

D-UA 12.

What kind of religion or belief do you personally belong to?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	To the Orthodox Church (patriarchy is not important)		54.4	
	To the Greek Catholic Church		18.4	
	To the Roman Catholic Church		7.0	
	The other Christian churches (Jehovah's Witnesses, Saturdays, Church of Christ, Pentecostal, etc.)		3.9	
	I consider myself just an Orthodox Christian faiths without discrimination of		3.7	
	Atheist		3.5	
	Refusal to answer		3.5	
	To the Protestant Church		2.8	
	I consider myself a Christian without division into denominations		2.2	
	Other answer		.4	
	To the Muslim faith		.2	
	Total		100.0	

D-UA 13.

How often do you attend religious services besides the wedding or funeral?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Once a week			23.9	
	Only on certain holidays			21.3	
	About once a month			18.7	
	Every 2 or 3 months			11.5	
	About once a year			8.9	
	More than once a week			7.6	
	Refusal to answer			4.6	
	Less			2.8	
	Never			.7	
	Total			100.0	

3.2. The results of the monitoring empirical sociological research in Kosice and Prešov self-governing territories (Slovakia).

Questionnaires received[8]:   500. Distributed to interviewers: 500 questionnaires.
Questionnaires returned: 448. SPSS filters passed: 427
Sample: general population.
Method: random number.
Region: Eastern Slovakia (Kosice and Presov regions), cities – Snina, Mikhalovtse, Sobrantse, Rozhnyava, Trebishov, Poprad, Levocha, Kezhmarok, Stara Lyubovnya, Sabinov, Bardejov, Mezhylabortsi, Stropkov, Svidnik, Vranov, Helnitse.

Q-SK 1.

How many years have you been a permanent resident in this region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	From 10 to 20 years			31.6	
	All life			63.2	
	More than 20 years			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

---

8 See: Анкета для масового опитування громадян України (проект «Інформаційне забезпечення та імплементація інноваційних підходів у транскордонному співробітництві Словаччини і України» в рамках програми Sk08 – транскордонне співробітництво: "Словаччина-Україна: співпраця через кордони") // Посібник з емпіричного соціологічного дослідження словацько-українського транскордонного співробітництва .– Ужгород: ІТС, 2017.

Q- SK 2.

How many years have your family been a permanent resident in this region?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	All life			52.6	
	From 10 to 20 years			15.8	
	More than 20 years			15.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 3.

How important to you personally and your family are the relations of the residents of the Slovak Republic with the residents of the Ukrainian border territories?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Less important			36.8	
	No value			31.6	
	Important Enough			15.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 4.

In your opinion, how much are you informed about the current relations of Slovak residents with the residents of the neighboring countries' border territories?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not well informed			57.9	
	Not informed at all			26.3	
	Well informed			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 4.1.

In your opinion, how much are you informed of cross-border cooperation in the framework of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) (2007-2013) and European Neighbourhood UIS (2014-2020)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not informed at all			57.9	
	Not well informed			26.3	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 4.2.

How much do you think you are informed about the projects of Slovak-Ukrainian cross-border cooperation, funded by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and the state budget of the Slovak Republic?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not informed at all			57.9	
	Not well informed			31.6	
	Well informed			10.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 5.

From what sources do you get information about relations between the residents of Slovak and Ukrainian neighbouring regions?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Internet			21.1	
	Local publications			15.8	
	National television			15.8	
	Radio			15.8	
	Don't receive information at all			10.5	
	Local TV			5.3	
	Conferences/ seminars attended			5.3	
	Personal experience (travels/vacations/ business contacts or cultural/ sport events)			5.3	
	Hard to say / refusal to answer			5.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 6.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information from TV- programmes of neighboring Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes			94.4	
	No			5.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 6.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information on the radio of neighboring Ukraine?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes		58.8	
	No		23.6	
	Don't use		17.6	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 6.

Do you have an opportunity to receive information from publications of neighboring Ukraine?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Yes		27.8	
	Don't use		66	
	No		6.2	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 7.

In your opinion, how objectively do the media highlight the topic of the relationship among the residents of Ukraine and neighbouring Slovakia's border areas?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Partly objectively		52.6	
	Quite objectively		36.8	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer		5.3	
	Not objectively at all		5.3	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 8.

In your opinion, after the enlargement of the European Union to the East whose interests does cross-border cooperation match primarily?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say /refusal to answer		31.6	
	Mutual interests of the EU, Ukraine and its neighboring countries, in particular Slovakia		21.0	
	Primarily? Firstly, the interests of all the European Union		15.8	

				15.8	
Primarily?, interests of Ukraine				15.8	
Primarily?, the interests of neighboring countries to Ukraine, in particular Slovakia				15.8	
Total				100.0	

Q- SK 9.

What impact do historical relations of Slovakia and Ukraine have on the modern cross-border cooperation of the neighbouring regions?

		Частота		Valid Percent	
Valid	Rather positive	9		47.4	
	Hard to say	6		31.5	
	Definitely positive	3		15.8	
	Rather negative	1		5.3	
	Total	19		100.0	

Q- SK 10.

How can you evaluate the level of cross-border cooperation of the Transcarpathian region with the neighbouring regions of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			52.6	
	Average			31.6	
	High			10.5	
	Low			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 11.

Please evaluate the customs service of Slovakia.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			66.7	
	Satisfactorily			16.7	
	Very well			11.1	
	Good			5.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 12.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of Slovakia.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			66.7	
	Satisfactorily			11.1	
	Well			11.1	
	Very well			11.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 13.

Please evaluate the work of other services of Slovakia that provide crossing of the state border.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			77.8	
	Unsatisfactory			5.6	
	Good			5.6	
	Very good			5.5	
	Hard to say			5.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 14.

Please evaluate the work of the Customs Service of Ukraine.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			73.7	
	Satisfactory			15.8	
	Unsatisfactory			5.3	
	Hard to say			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 15.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of Ukraine.

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			78.9	
	Satisfactory			10.5	
	Unsatisfactory			5.3	
	Hard to say			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 16.

Please evaluate the work of other services of Ukraine that provide crossing of the state border

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Didn't visit			78.9	
	Hard to say			10.5	
	Satisfactory			5.3	
	Good			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 17.

What, in your opinion, are the flaws in the border and customs services of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/Don't visit			73.7	
	Slow and indifferent service			10.5	
	High levels of bureaucracy			5.3	
	Corruption (bribery) among employees			5.3	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 18.

What, in your opinion, are the flaws in the consular, border and customs services of Slovakia?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/Don't visit			63.2	
	Hard to say /refusal to answer			15.8	
	Corruption (bribery) among employees			10.5	
	High levels of bureaucracy			5.2	
	Insufficient level of service culture			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.1.

To what extent is the careful preservation of historical, cultural and religious sites, ancestral graves important for the population of your region and the border areas of neighboring areas of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			36.8	

			Valid Percent	
	Hard to say		31.6	
	Important enough		15.8	
	Important		10.5	
	Unimportant at all		5.3	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 19.2.

How important is it for the people of your region and for the residents of the border regions of Ukraine to remove barriers for visiting sights and graves on both sides of the border?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			26.3	
	Important enough			21.1	
	Important			21.1	
	Hard to say			21.1	
	Unimportant at all			5.2	
	Unimportant			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.3.

To whar extent are the freedom of religion, free access to divine service on both sides of the border important for the population of your region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			38.9	
	Hard to say			27.8	
	Important			22.2	
	Important enough			11.1	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.4.

How important is the common history of the region on both sides of the border for the population of your region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			26.3	
	Important enough			21.1	
	Important			21.1	
	Hard to say			21.1	

			Valid Percent	
	Unimportant at all			5.3
	Unimportant			5.3
	Total			100.0

Q- SK 19.5.

How important is the tradition of a large number of mixed marriages who live on both sides of the border for the population of your region and the border areas of neighboring countries of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			36.8	
	Unimportant			26.3	
	Unimportant at all			10.5	
	Important enough			10.5	
	Very important			10.5	
	Important			5.4	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.6.

How important are the joint actions in emergencies such as natural disasters (floods), coordination and common management procedures for providing vital resources for the residents of your area and for residents of border regions of Ukraine when borders lose their practical value?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			42.1	
	Hard to say			21.1	
	Important enough			15.8	
	Important			10.5	
	Unimportant at all			5.3	
	Unimportant			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.7.

How important is the clear, transparent implementation of the law on the status of cross-border regions, to promote the free movement of people and goods across the border for the population of the border regions of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			31.6	
	Enough important			26.3	

			Very important			21.1	
			Important			15.8	
			Unimportant			5.2	
			Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.8.

How important for the residents of your region and for residents of border regions of Ukraine is the modern, technically perfect and quick way to transport across the border?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Important			27.8	
	Very important			27.8	
	Important enough			16.7	
	Unimportant			11.1	
	Hard to say			11.0	
	Unimportant at all			5.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.9.

How important is the network of modern and inexpensive means for communications (mobile access) for the residents of your region and the residents of the border regions of Ukraine?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			36.8	
	Important			21.1	
	Hard to say			21.0	
	Important enough			15.8	
	Unimportant			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.10.

How important for people in your area and for residents of border regions of Ukraine is free and inexpensive access to the Internet?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			38.9	
	Enough important			22.2	
	Important			16.7	
	Hard to say			16.7	
	Unimportant at all			5.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.11.

How important for people in your area and for residents of border regions of Ukraine to have the opportunity for border regions to operate as a single economic space significantly and consistently expand the scope of cross-border trade?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			31.6	
	Important			26.3	
	Very important			15.8	
	Unimportant at all			10.5	
	Unimportant			10.5	
	Rather important			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.20.

How important for people in your region and for residents of border regions of Ukraine is the lack of visas at the border crossings in both countries (no permits for local border traffic regime for border residents of both countries)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			52.6	
	Very important			15.8	
	Unimportant			10.5	
	Important			10.5	
	Unimportant at all			5.3	
	Rather important			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.21.

How important is the sufficient number of checkpoints for a quick border crossing for the population o your region and the border areas of neighboring regions of Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say			47.4	
	Very important			21.1	
	Important			15.8	
	Unimportant at all			5.3	
	Unimportant			5.2	
	Rather important			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 19.22.

How important for people in your region and for residents of border regions of Ukraine is that more people will work on both sides of the border?

Valid				Valid Percent	
Valid	Very important			47.4	
	Hard to say			26.3	
	Important			15.8	
	Unimportant			5.2	
	Rather important			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SL 20.

In your opinion. to what extent are the minority rights secured in your area?

Valid				Valid Percent	
Valid	Rather secured			31.6	
	Mainly secured			26.3	
	Entirely secured			21.1	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			21.0	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SL 21.

How in your community relate to the representatives of national minorities?

Valid				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			42.1	
	Fully tolerant (respectfully)			21.1	
	Generally tolerant (respectfully), sometimes there are conflcts			21.1	
	Treat not tolerant (withour respect)			15.7	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SL 22.

What is your attitude towards mixed marriages with representatives of other nationalities?

Valid				Valid Percent	
Valid	Completely positive			47.4	
	Neutral			36.8	
	Completely negative			10.5	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SL 23.

What is your attitude towards people which are coming to work in your city?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Rather positive			52.6	
	Neutral			31.6	
	Completely positive			10.5	
	Completely negative			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SL 24.

Whether in your city provided an opportunity for representatives of ethnic minorities to receive basic education on their own language?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Partly secured			36.8	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			31.6	
	Rather secured			21.1	
	Entirely secured			5.2	
	Unsecured at all			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 25.

How in your region the rights of different religious denominations (people of different faiths) are secured?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			41.2	
	Entirely secured			29.4	
	Mainly secured			29.4	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 26.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on language grounds in your locality?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			82.4	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			17.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 27.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on ethnic grounds in your locality?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			52.9	
	Yes			41.2	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 28.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on religion grounds in your locality?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	No			70.6	
	Hard to say/refusal to answer			23.5	
	Yes			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 29.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on language grounds in Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/didn't visit			64.7	
	No			29.4	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 30.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on religion grounds in Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/didn't visit			64.7	
	No			29.4	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 31.

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on religion grounds in Ukraine?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Don't know/didn't visit			64.7	
	No			29.4	
	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 32.

How can you evaluate the level of Slovakia region's cross-border cooperation with neighbouring states' regions of Ukraine in fighting natural disasters and in environmental protection (joint construction of flood control structures, implementation of environmental programs. etc.)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			52.9	
	Average			35.3	
	High			11.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q-SL 33.

How can you evaluate the level of Slovak region's cross-border cooperation with the neighbouring countries' regions of Ukraine in the fight against crime (the fight against smuggling, illegal migration, corruption. etc.)?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say/ refusal to answer			52.9	
	Average			29.4	
	High			11.8	
	Low			5.9	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.1.

Do you personally have enough confidence that there will be no ethnic conflicts?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			42.1	
	Hard to say enough or not			31.6	
	Enough			21.0	
	Not interested			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.2.

Do you personally have enough mutual understanding between people of different nationalities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			36.8	
	Not enough			31.6	
	Enough			31.6	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.3.

Do you personally have enough opportunities to be engaged in national culture?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			63.2	
	Enough			26.3	
	Not enough			10.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.4.

Do you personally have enough opportunities to have additional income?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			52.6	
	Enough			21.1	
	Hard to say enough or not			21.1	
	Not interested			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.5.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to work with full dedication?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			47.4	
	Hard to say enough or not			31.6	
	Not interested			15.7	
	Enough			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.6.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to spend holidays fully?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		66.7	
	Not enough		22.2	
	Not interested		11.1	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 34.7.

Do you personally have enough valuable leisure avtivities?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Not intrested		36.8	
	Hard to say enough or not		36.8	
	Enough		15.8	
	Not interested		10.6	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 34.8.

Do you personally have enough the required clothing?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		27.8	
	Not interested		27.8	
	Not enough		22.2	
	Enough		22.2	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 34.9.

Do you personally have enough all necessary furniture?

			Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not		31.6	
	Not intrested		26.3	
	Not enough		21.1	
	Enough		21.0	
	Total		100.0	

Q- SK 34.10.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to buy the most necessary products?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			36.8	
	Enough			26.3	
	Not intrested			21.1	
	Not enough			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.11.

Do you personally have enough opportunity to eat according to your to personal tastes?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			42.1	
	Not intrested			26.3	
	Not enough			15.8	
	Enough			15.8	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.12.

Do you personally have enough good accommodation?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			47.4	
	Hard to say enough or not			31.6	
	Enough			15.8	
	Not intrested			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.13.

Do you personally have enough fair evalution of the person's merits to society?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			42.1	
	Enough			31.6	
	Hard to say enough or not			26.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.14.

Do you personally have enough observance of human rights in the country?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			42.1	
	Enough			31.6	
	Not enough			21.1	
	Not intrested			5.2	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.15.

Do you personally have enough norms and values that unite people in the state and society?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			52.6	
	Not enough			26.3	
	Enough			15.8	
	Not interested			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.16.

Do you personally have enough ability to live in the new social conditions?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			57.9	
	Enough			15.8	
	Not interested			15.8	
	Not enough			10.5	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.17.

Do you personally have enough confidence in personal abilities?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Hard to say enough or not			47.4	
	Not enough			21.1	
	Not interested			21.1	
	Enough			10.4	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.18.

Do you personally have enough determination in achieving personal goals?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			57.9	
	Hard to say enough or not			26.3	
	Not interested			10.5	
	Enough			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

Q- SK 34.19.

Do you personally have enough confidence in future?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Not enough			42.1	
	Hard to say enough or not			42.1	
	Not interested			10.5	
	Enough			5.3	
	Total			100.0	

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC UNIT

D-SL 1.

Gender of the respondence

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Female			61.1	
	Male			38.9	
	Total			100.0	

D-SL 2.

What is your age?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	18			10.3	
	20			9.0	
	19			7.7	
	21			5.1	
	23			3.2	
	22			3.0	
	37			2.8	

38			2.8
36			2.6
25			2.4
32			2.4
40			2.4
			2.1
26			2.1
27			2.1
28			2.1
29			1.7
31			1.7
30			1.5
33			1.5
34			1.5
41			1.5
43			1.5
48			1.5
35			1.3
42			1.3
45			1.3
17			1.1
24			1.1
39			1.1
47			1.1
50			1.1
53			1.1
55			1.1
57			1.1
44			.9
46			.9
49			.9
51			.9
63			.9
52			.6
64			.6
67			.6
69			.6
58			.4
62			.4
65			.4
66			.4

68			.4	
70			.4	
71			.4	
73			.4	
74			.4	
54			.2	
56			.2	
59			.2	
60			.2	
61			.2	
72			.2	
75			.2	
76			.2	
80			.2	
Total			100.0	

D-SL 3.

What is the highest level of education you have received?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Vocational education (School. college. technical school)			12.4	
	Junior secondary education (Certificate for the 8-9 high school forms)			30.0	
	Complete secondary education (Certificate of complete secondary education for 10-11 secondary school forms)			42.3	
	Complete higher education (master)			15.3	
	Total			100.0	

D-SL 4.

How would you describe your family situation?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	Single. never lived with a partner			10.5	
	Other			11.6	
	Married			67.4	
	Refusal to answer			10.5	
	Total			100.0	

D-SL 7.

Characteristics of your family's wellbeing

		Frequen-cy	Percent	Valid Percent	Accumulated percent
Valid	We live in full abundance	10	52.6	52.6	52.6
	Enough for everything we need	6	31.6	31.6	84.2
	Refusal to answer	2	10.5	10.5	94.7
	Enough only for bare necessities	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0	

D-SL 12.

How often do you attend religious services besides the wedding or funeral?

				Valid Percent	
Valid	More than once a week			44.4	
	One a week			27.8	
	Approximately once a month			16.7	
	Refusal to answer			11.1	
	Total			100.0	

3.3. Analysis of the main results of the monitoring empirical sociological research in the border regions of Slovakia and Ukraine

In the framework of the project "Information management and implementation of innovative approaches to CBC of Slovakia and Ukraine" there have been developed the tools for monitoring empirical sociological research, which sets the objective to explore and learn the main components of the Slovak-Ukrainian CBC through the prism of public opinion poll in neighbouring Slovakia and Ukraine.

Based on the EU-adopted definition of "cross-border cooperation", which is defined as any joint actions aimed at strengthening and deepening good-neighbourly relations among territorial communities or authorities within the jurisdiction of two or more contracting parties and, for this purpose, at concluding necessary appropriate agreements or reaching relevant arrangements, it should be emphasized that it is through public opinion support of this process that the main

orientations and change tendencies in the relations of the border areas can be identified.

The questionnaire, developed by a group of experts for the sociological study, comprised a number of questions (blocks of questions) according to the indicators that can evaluate cross-border processes by their core subjects – residents of border regions, those who were the first to be affected by the recent geopolitical changes on the Eastern border of the EU.

The survey questions concern the assessment of both the current functional status of the border and population's interactions on its both sides, as well as personal behavioural values and motivations of people living in border areas.

The project also conducted the monitoring empirical sociological research in Slovakia and Ukraine, designed to test the designed methodology of sociological support of the Slovak-Ukrainian cross-border cooperation and its individual processes.

The survey was conducted by means of personal questioning (face to face) of the respondents who live in the border area of Slovakia or Ukraine.

Further we will provide a set of empirical data collected during this study to compare them in terms of border agents' attitudes to the same questions and processes in these countries.

How many years have you been a permanent resident in this region?

The study revealed that among the respondents in the border areas of Slovakia and Ukraine, the vast majority of the population - 63.2% and 66.4% respectively – have been the permanent residents in these areas for all their lives. The share of the people who have lived here less than 5 years accounts for only 8% and 9.9%.

This suggests that people living in the border areas should be classified as permanently available population on the defined territories where various NGOs and public governance bodies can focus their activities to improve the situation in cross-border cooperation.

How important to you personally and your family are the relations of your area's residents with the residents of the neighbouring countries border territories?

It should be noted that people living near the border, mark the sufficient importance of personal interaction with residents of neighbouring countries' border areas.

However, there is observed a significant difference in this indicator: in Slovakia - (in different categories) – up to 52%, in Ukraine - (in different categories) - up to 77%.

Do you have relatives or friends in a neighbouring country?

The importance and necessity of relations among residents on both sides of the border between Slovakia and Ukraine have been also confirmed by the fact

that many people have their own relatives or close friends in neighbouring countries. There are such people in both countries: in Slovakia - 26.3%, and more in Ukraine - 36.5%.

Besides, there can be traced interconnection of two factors: the more people have relatives and friends in the neighbouring country, the more important is their relationship with residents on the other side of the border.

How often do you have to visit a neighbouring country that borders your region?

57.9% of respondents in the border regions of Slovakia never had to visit Ukraine.

21.1% of respondents do this once every few years, and only 10.5% - several times a year.

For comparison:

46.3% of respondents in Transcarpathia never had to visit Slovakia.

However, 22.2% of respondents do this once every few years, and as much as 23.0% - several times a year.

As can be seen, the balance of traffic between the border regions is clearly positive in favour of the Ukrainian territory.

The explanation for this phenomenon seems simple - the European Economic Area is open and considerably more attractive for households of Slovak border area where they show greater activity.

What was the purpose of your travel?

For 15% of Slovaks the purpose of travel was tourism and economic tourism (shopping). For another 10.5% it was a visit to relatives and friends.

21.1% of Transcarpathian population visited the border areas of Slovakia for tourism, 12.4% - to visit relatives, friends, and 5.1% - for economic tourism.

As can be seen, motivational differences of visits are not very significant. Remarkably, only 9.5% of Transcarpathians travelled to Slovakia with a business purpose, while Slovaks did not record such an objective in the survey at all.

How satisfied are you with the opportunities to visit a neighbouring country?

The number of Slovaks who were fully satisfied amounted to 10.3%, those partially satisfied – 5.3%.

The situation is slightly better on the Ukrainian side. The number of Transcarpathians fully satisfied with their visit to Slovakia makes 19.1%, those partially satisfied - 19.8%.

Nevertheless, the level of satisfaction with the opportunities to visit a neighbouring country is low.

Did you have any problems when leaving to neighbouring Ukraine?

21% of residents of Slovakia border regions, who wanted to visit Zakarpattya, had no problems. There were 5.3% of those who had.

33.1% of Transcarpathians also had no problems while implementing their wish to visit Slovakia. 17% of Transcarpathians had problems.

21.3% of Slovaks had problems with customs control, for 14.8% of Ukrainians the biggest problem was the long waiting line to cross the border.

Remarkably, only 8.5% of Transcarpathians had difficulty to obtain visas.

Please evaluate the customs service of your own country.

16.7% of Slovaks evaluate the work of their customs as "satisfactory", 11.1% - as "very good" and 5.6 % - as "good".

So almost all Slovak respondents are positive in their assessments of this service's activities.

It is a different matter in Ukraine. There is a high share of negative assessments of the customs authorities: "unsatisfactory" - 10.3%, "very bad" - 8.8%. Positive evaluations account for only about 30%.

Please evaluate the customs service of a neighbouring country.

The work of the Ukraine customs authorities was evaluated as "satisfactory" by 15.8% of Slovaks, and "unsatisfactory" – by 5.3%.

Ukrainians evaluate the work of Slovak customs generally positively: "good" – 22.5%, "satisfactory" – 16.4%, "very good" - 9.4%. Negative evaluations were as follows: "unsatisfactory" - 6.1%, "very bad" - 3.9%.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of your own country.

About 33% of Slovaks evaluate the work of their border guards positively. There were no estimates of "unsatisfactory" expressed.

Ukrainians gave a high percentage of negative assessments of their border service functioning: "unsatisfactory" - 11.6%, "very bad" - 6.7%. Positive evaluations account for only about 40% of all respondents.

Please evaluate the work of the Border Service of a neighbouring country.

10.5% of Slovaks questioned evaluated the work of the Ukrainian border service as "satisfactory", 5.3% - as «unsatisfactory».

Ukrainians evaluate the work of the Slovak border guards as follows: "good" – 20.6%; "satisfactory" – 15.3%; "very good" - 13.1%. Negative evaluations were as follows: "unsatisfactory" - 6.2%, "very bad" - 2.9%.

What, in your opinion, are the flaws of the border and customs services in your country?

Slovak respondents believe that the biggest problems of these services are: *"corruption (bribery) of workers" - 10.5%, "the high level of bureaucracy" - 5.3%, "slow and indifferent service" - 5.3%.*

Ukrainians have the same opinion about these services in their own country: *"corruption (bribery) of employees" – as much as 22.1%, "slow and indifferent service" - 12.6%, "high level of bureaucracy" - 7.8%.*

What, in your opinion, are the flaws in the border and customs services of a neighbouring country?

Commenting on the Ukrainian services Slovaks responded as follows: in the first place - "slow and indifferent service" - 10.5%, then - "corruption (bribery) of workers" - 5.3%, "the high level of bureaucracy" - 5.3%.

Ukrainians mentioned the following concerning the Slovak services: in the first place - "slow and indifferent service" - 17.9%, then - "the high level of bureaucracy" - 6.3%; "corruption (bribery) of workers" - 5.9%.

Thus, according to the ordinary people's estimates on both sides of the border, the main problems of customs and border authorities are not the problems of logistic support, which are so much discussed (although they certainly need to be addressed), but the level of the work organization and responsibility of staff.

Please evaluate the work of the General Consulate of Slovakia in Uzhhorod, which provides the residents of Transcarpathian region with visa services.

The Ukrainians' estimates are generally positive: "good" - 24.6%, "satisfactory" - 12.6%, "very good" – 11.6%. However, there is also an assessment of "unsatisfactory" - 4.1%.

To what extent do you consider yourself informed of the current relations between the inhabitants of your region and the residents of neighbouring countries' border territories?

To establish a coherent and fruitful relationship between the residents of border areas of Slovakia and Ukraine the information component of such relationships should be considered. To establish contacts among people on different sides of the border it is an important to reach the level of awareness about relations between neighbouring countries and overcome some information blockade. According to the study, according to respondents of each country, they consider themselves not well informed or not informed at all about the same level: Slovaks - 83%, Ukrainian - 84%.

This is an unsatisfactory level, which indicates the low efficiency of the information component of the Slovak-Ukrainian border cooperation.

How much do you consider yourself informed of cross-border cooperation under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) (2007-2013) and European Neighbourhood UIS (2014-2020)?

According to this indicator the awareness situation is even worse: the respondents who are not well informed or not informed at all are about the same level: Slovaks - 94%, Ukrainians - 92%.

How much do you think you are informed about the projects of Slovak-Ukrainian cross-border cooperation, funded by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and the state budget of the Slovak Republic?

The results of this awareness indicator are also similar: respondents who are not well informed or not informed at all are about the same level: Slovaks - 88%, Ukrainians - 82%.

From what sources do you usually get information about relations between the residents of your region and the border territories of neighbouring countries?

The main sources from which Slovak borderland population receives information about Ukraine, above all, include the Internet - 21.1%, their country's national TV - 15.8%, local and national print media (newspapers, magazines) - 15.8%.

For residents of Transcarpathia the primary sources of information are also Internet - 23.1%, local television - 18.4%, and, interestingly - personal communication with their relatives - 5.4%.

The following fact is quite revealing and positive: the share of people who do not receive information about the life of the neighbouring country is quite low: in Slovakia – 10.5%, in Ukraine - 7.6%.

In your opinion, how objectively do the media highlight the topic of the relationship among the residents of neighbouring countries' border areas?

Most respondents (in Slovakia - 57%, in Ukraine - 69%) believe that the media depict the relationship between the border regions objectively. This is a very positive evaluation.

In your opinion, after the enlargement of the European Union to the East whose interests does cross-border cooperation match primarily?

The largest number of respondents in Slovakia, who have defined their opin-

ion, (21.1%) believes that it matches the mutual interests of the EU, Ukraine and neighbouring countries, including Slovakia.

In Ukraine, the largest number of respondents, who have defined their opinion, (27.9%) believe that it matches the interests of the entire European Union and Ukraine - 23.2%.

This means that in the border regions of Ukraine the awareness outreach concerning the objectives of the EU Eastern Partnership Program should be strengthened.

What impact do historical relations of Ukraine and Slovakia have on the modern cross-border cooperation of neighbouring regions?

This issue is a very important parameter of the current state and prospects of Ukrainian-Slovak cross-border cooperation, as complex historical legacy can produce serious complications of international and interregional relations. This is proven, in particular, by the problems that have recently occurred in relations between Poland and Ukraine.

It is very positive that 62% of Slovaks and 80% of Ukrainians questioned believe that the historical relations have a positive impact on the Slovak-Ukrainian CBC.

This is a significant potential and a guarantee of its successful development.

How can you evaluate the level of cross-border cooperation of neighbouring regions of Slovakia and Ukraine in the economic sphere (cross-border trade, investments, etc.)?

Among the Slovak respondents only about 48% (average - 31.6%, the highest - 10.5%, the lowest - 5.3%) were able to identify their position in general. The majority - 52.6% - do not have such a viewpoint.

Ukrainian respondents also show significantly different results. Among them about 95% (average - 58.9%, the highest - 28.7%, the lowest - 6.7%) were able to identify their position. Only 5.8% had difficulties to decide.

These data obviously reflect various vectors of the entities' economic interest: Slovak ones - towards strengthening its position in the EU, Ukrainian ones – towards penetration into these markets (including through Slovakia).

In this connection, it is obvious that Ukraine should have taken care to provide Slovak entrepreneurs with such preferences that would trigger their interest to work in the Ukrainian border territories.

What is your attitude towards people who come from Ukraine to work in your city?

More than 90 percent of all Slovaks surveyed generally positively evaluate this phenomenon, and only 5.3% are quite negative.

How can you evaluate the level of your region's cross-border cooperation with neighbouring states' regions in fighting natural disasters and in environmental protection (joint construction of flood control structures, implementation of environmental programs, etc.)?

52.9% of Slovak respondents do not have any information about such cooperation. 35.3% rated it as "good", 11.8% as "very good".

Responses of Transcarpathian respondents are very similar: 21.4% do not have any information, 52.6% rated it as "good", 14.3% as "very good".

How can you evaluate the level of your region's cross-border cooperation with the neighbouring countries' regions in the fight against crime (the fight against smuggling, illegal migration, corruption, etc.)?

52.9% of respondents in Slovakia do not have their own opinion on this subject, that is, are not informed. 29.4% rated it as "good", 11.8% as "very good".

The same question was answered by the Ukrainian respondents as follows: 21.7% have no information at all, 47.6% rated it as "good", 11.2% as "very good".

In your opinion, to what extent are the minority rights secured in your area?

Slovak respondents believe that they are "mainly secured" – 26.3%; "fully guaranteed" – 21.1%; another 21.1% are hesitant to answer.

Ukrainians answer this question as follows: "secured in general" – 51.9%, "fully secured" - 24.0%. *But there are also critical evaluations: "rather not secured" - 16.5% and even "not fully secured" - 3.7%.*

Did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on ethnic grounds in your locality?

52.9% of Slovak respondents did not face such phenomena. However, 41.2% gave the answer "yes."

If consider the coincidence in the questionnaires, this is obviously connected with the problems of Roma people.

Concerning the Ukrainian respondents, the 80.9% of them gave the answer "no", and 12.3% - "yes."

We can assume that the final evaluation is largely due to discussions around the "Ruthenian issue" in Transcarpathia.

When traveling to the neighbouring state's region did you personally or your family members or relatives face discrimination on ethnic grounds?

29.4% of those who visited Ukraine gave the answer "no", 5.9% had difficulty to answer.

As far as the Ukrainians are concerned, they gave the following answers: 50. %3 - "no", 4.2% - "yes."

However, the following question about international relations suddenly receives an anxious response both in Slovak and in Ukrainian regions.

Do you personally have enough confidence that there will be no ethnic conflicts?

As much as 42.1% of Slovaks questioned replied that there is "not enough" confidence, another 31.6% consider it "hard to say if it is enough, or not." Only 21.1% say it is "enough."

There is even more difficult situation in Transcarpathia. Here, respondents gave the following answers: 40.9% - "not enough", 37.2% considered it "hard to say enough, or not." Only 18.0% said it is "enough."

This discrepancy in positive assessments of the current state of international relations in the border regions of Slovakia and Ukraine, and great uncertainty about their fate in the future, perhaps, can only be explained by external factors threatening impact: on the one hand, acute migration crisis in the European Union, on the other by the Russian annexation of Crimea and events in eastern Ukraine.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above-analysed results of the monitoring empirical sociological research, conducted within the framework of the project *"Information management and implementation of innovative approaches to CBC of Slovakia and Ukraine"* some conclusions can be drawn concerning not only the current situation on the border of Slovakia and Ukraine but also the need for further study using the sociological tools of public opinion polls on opposite sides of the new eastern borders in general.

The population of the border areas has its own specific features, which, despite livelihoods on opposite sides of the border, due to several factors, bring these people in a cell – as direct subjects of cross-border processes.

It reveals itself in the fact that residents of border areas are actively involved in the cultural, historical, family and economic relations with the population on the other side of the border.

Therefore, to understand, study and organize cross-border cooperation it is also important to consider the opinion of the population living near the border. Usually, evaluation of certain groups' opinions and the comparative analysis are impossible without involving sociological support to the cross-border cooperation processes on the border of Slovakia and Ukraine.

The sociological part of the project was realized in an extremely short time. In the course of work, many organizational, methodological and methodical problems had to be solved simultaneously. Therefore, the project team do not exclude the occurrence of certain bottlenecks or even errors during its implementation. *However, its authors certainly do not doubt the achievement of the sociological research overall objective.*

REFERENCES

1. European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Co-operation Between Territorial Communities or Authorities / - Strasbourg: Division des publications et des documents, 1980.

2. Ustych S. An important unification of the Continent . Transfrontier cooperation in Europe / S. Ustych, A.Rovt // Človek a Spoločnost. - Časopis SAV.- 2011. - Roč. 14. č.1 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу:http://www.saske.sk/cas/zoznam-rocnikov/2011/1/5915/.

3. The Text of Magna Carta [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/magnacarta.asp.

4. Fawcett C.B. Frontiers. A Study in Political Geography / C.B. Fawcett. – Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1921.

5. Глазычев В. Limes novum / В. Глазычев |// Отечественные записки. - 2002. - №6 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2002/6/2002_06_29-pr.html.

6. Ученые выяснили, что Китайская стена длиннее на несколько тысяч километров [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.ua-reporter.com/print/52764.

7. Черняк Е.Б. Вековые конфликты / Е.Б. Черняк. - М.: Международные отношения, 1988.

8. Пашуканис Е. Государственные границы / Е. Пашуканис // Энциклопедия государства и права. - М., 1925-1926.

9. Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromvell with Elucidiation by Thomas Carlyle – L., 1904.

10. Черняк Е.Б. Вековые конфликты / Е.Б. Черняк - М.: Международные отношения, 1988.

11. Bismarck O. Die gesammelte Werke / O.Bismarck. – Berlin, 1923-1933.-V.XI.

12. Хрестоматия по новейшей истории (документы и материалы). Т.1. - М.: Издательство социально-экономической литературы, 1960.

13. Смоленский П. Дипломатия и границы / П. Смоленский. - М.: Международные отношения, 1965.

14. Клименко Б.М. Нерушимость границ – условие международного мира/ Б.М. Клименко, Н.А. Ушаков. – М.: Наука, 1975.

15. Оппенгейм Л. Международное право. Т.1. / Л. Оппенгейм. – Л., 1948.

16. Граница: понятие и термины // Отечественные записки. - 2002. - №6 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2002/6/2002_06_29-pr.html.

17. Приграничные конфликты и споры // Отечественные записки. - 2002. - №6 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2002/6/2002_06_29-pr.html.

18. Паспортні новини // *Діло.* - 2009 . - 14 *липня* [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://delo.ua/archive/issue/866/.

19. Черняк Е.Б. Вековые конфликты / Е.Б. Черняк. - М.: Международные отношения, 1988.

20. Французская буржуазная революция 1789-1794 гг. - М.- *Л.*, 1941.

21. Толстой *Л.Н.* Война и мир / *Л.Н.* Толстой. Собрание сочинений в двенадцати томах. – М.: Художественная литература, 1972. - Том V.

22. Хрестоматия по новейшей истории (документы и материалы). Т.1. - М.: Издательство социально-экономической литературы, 1960.

23. Клименко Б.М. Нерушимость границ – условие международного мира / Б.М. Клименко, Н.А. Ушаков – М.: Наука, 1975.

24. Clausewitz. Vom Kriege. Erstes Buch: Über die Natur des Krieges / Clausewitz [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.clausewitz.com/readings/Vom Kriege1832/Book1.htm.

25. Халапсіс А. Війна як бізнес-проект? / А. Халапсіс // Наукове пізнання: методологія і технологія. – 2013. – Вип. 1 (30). – С.191-195.

26. Глобальное потепление к 2050 г. может увеличить число войн в 1,5 раза [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.ua-reporter.com/print/139104.

27. Swanston M. Významně bitvy a taženi / M. Swanston. – Brno: Computer Press, 2008. – 328 s.

28. Хрестоматия по новейшей истории (документы и материалы). Т.1. - М.: Издательство социально-экономической литературы, 1960.

29. Устич С.І. Соціологічні парадигми транскордонних процесів / С.І.Устич // Вісник Львівського університету. Серія соціологічна. – 2013. – Вип. 7. – С.313 – 324.

30. Buchanan A. States, Nations and Borders. The Etics of Making Boundaries / A. Buchanan, M. Moore. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 226 p.

31. Anderson M. Frontiers: Territory and State Formation in the Modern World / M. Anderson. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 185 p.

32. Brunet-Jailly E. Theorizing Borders: An Interdisciplinary Perspective / E. Brunet-Jailly // Geopolitics. – 2005. - № 10. - P.633 – 670.

33. Гревес П. Проблема политического равновесия в классической античности / П. Гревес //XIII Международный конгресс исторических наук - М.,1970. - С. 28-31.

34. Черняк Е.Б. Вековые конфликты / Е.Б. Черняк. - М.: Международные отношения, 1988.

35. Bouwsma W. J. Venice and the Defense of Republician Liberty / W. J. Bouwsma. – Berkeley, 1968.

36. Черняк Е.Б. Вековые конфликты / Е.Б. Черняк. - М.: Международные отношения, 1988.

37. Holdich T. H. Political Frontiers and Boundary Making / T. H. Holdich. - London: MacMillan, 1916. – 234 p.

38. Lyde L. W. Some Frontiers of Tomorrou: An Aspiration for Europe / L. W.Lyde. - London: A.&C. Black, 1915. – 184 p.

39. Kolossov V. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches / V. Kolossov // Geopolitics. – 2005. - № 10. - P.606 – 632.

40. Wallerstein I. The Modern World-System / I. Wallerstein. - New York: Academic Press, 1974.

41. Hall T. D. World-system theory / T. D. Hall – The Social Science Encyclopedia. Edited by Adam Cuper and Jessica Kuper. - London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

42. Кутуев П. Мировая система как предмет социологического анализа: новая исследовательская программа Андре Гундера Франка / П. Кутуев // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. – 2007.- №2.

43. Frank A.G. ReORIENT:Global Economy in the Asian Age / A.G. Frank. – Berkeley, 1998. – 372 p.

44. Пахомов Ю.Н. Пути и перепутья современной цивилизации/ Ю.Н. Пахомов, С.Б. Крымский, Ю.В. Павленко. – К.: Международный деловой центр, 1998. - 432 с.

45. Цивилизационная структура современного мира: в 3-х томах. Т.1. Глобальные трансформации современности / ред.: Ю. Н. Пахомов, Ю. В. Павленко. - К.: Наукова думка, 2006. - 686 с.

46. Suša O. Globalizace v sociálnich souvislostech současnosti / O. Suša. – Praha: Filosofia, 2010.

47. Naím M. Černá kniha globalisace / M. Naím. - Praha: Vyšehrad, 2008. – 303 s.

48. Небермудский треугольник РУС: новые формы жизни после кризиса [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/4b1aa58b78cc8/.

49. Anderson A. Territory and State Formation in the Modern World / A. Anderson. - Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996. - 375 p.

50. A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics. 2nd Edition. – London: Routledge, 2004. – 781 p.

51. Barša P. Síla a rozum. Spor realismu s idealismem v moderním politickém myšlení / P. Barša. - Praha: Filosofia, 2007.– 432 s.

52. Баньковская С. Чужаки и границы: к понятию социальной маргинальности / С.Баньковская // Отечественные записки. - 2002. - №6 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2002/6/2002_06_29-pr.html.

53. Simmel G. Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung / G. Simmel. - Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1992. – 289 s.

54. Paasi A. Territories, Boundaries and Counsciousness: The Changing Geografies of the Finnish-Russian Border / A. Paasi. - New York: John Wiley, 1996. – 370 p.

55. Kjellen R. Der Staat als Lebensform / R. Kjellen. - Leipzig, 1899. – 362 s.

56. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. – Volume 9.2001. Amsterdam – Paris – New York – Shannon – Singapore – Tokyo.- 2001. - P.6200.

57. Mackinder H.J. Democratic Ideals and Reality / H.J. Mackinder. - New York, 1942. - 189 p.

58. Zeitschrift für Geopolitik in Gemeinschaft und Politik. – 1957. - № 28.

59. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. – 2001. -Volume 9. 259. Ibid.

60. Toal G. Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space/ G.Toal. - Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

61. Kolossov V. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches.

62. Geopolitiká // Velký sociologický slovnik. – Praha:Vydavatelství Karolinum, 1996.

63. Kolossov V. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches.

64. Макарычев А.С. Пространственные характеристики трансграничной безопасности: концептуальные контексты.

65. Camilleri J. Rethinking Sovereignty. – Contending Sovereignties. Redefining Political Community / Camilleri J. - London, 1990.

66. Макарычев А.С. Пространственные характеристики трансграничной безопасности: концептуальные контексты / А.С.Макарычев //Безопасность и международное сотрудничество в поясе новых границ России. - Москва: НОФМО, 2002. - С.15 – 91.

67. Válka // Velký sociologický slovnik.

68. Гераклит. Фрагменты / Гераклит // Материалисты Древней Греции. - М.: Политиздат,1955.

69. Тит Лукреций Кар. О природе вещей / Тит Лукреций Кар [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.nsu.ru/classics/bibliotheca/lucretius.htm.

70. Гоббс Т. Левиафан // Т. Гоббс. Избранные произведения в двух томах. - М.: Мысль, 1991. - Т.2.

71. Руссо Ж.-Ж. Общественный договор / Руссо Ж.-Ж. // Антология мировой философии. В 4-х томах. Т. 2. Европейская философия от эпохи Возрождения по эпоху Просвещения. - М.: Мысль, 1970.

72. Гольбах П. А. Система природы, или о законах мира физического и мира духовного / П. А. Гольбах. // Избранные произведения в двух томах. - М., 1963. - Т.1.

73. Уинстелли Дж. Избранные памфлеты / Дж. Уинстелли. - М.-Л. ,1950.

74. Война и армия: философско-социологический очерк.- М.: Воениздат, 1977.

75. Гегель Г. Философия истории / Г. Гегель // Сочинения в 14 томах. - Москва, Ленинград: Государственное социально-экономическое издательство, 1935. - Т. 8.

76. Clausewitz. Vom kriege. Erstes Buch: Über die Natur des Krieges.

77. Steinmetz S.R. Die Sociologie des Krieges / S.R. Steinmetz. - Berlin: Stolz, 1929.

78. Beneš E. Válka a kultura. Studie z filosofie a sociologi války / E. Beneš. - V Praze, 1922.

79. Davie M. R. The Evolution of War. A Study of its Role in early Societies / M. R.Davie. - London – Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press,1929.

80. Kondylis P. Theorie des Krieges / P. Kondylis. – Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1988.

81. Coats W. J. Armed Force as Power. The Theory of War Reconssidered / W. J. Coats. - New York: Exposition Press, 2005.

82. Benedict R. Patterns of Culture / R. Benedict. - New York: New American Library, 1950.

83. Платон. Законы / Платон // Полное собрание творений Платона в 15 томах. - Петербург: Academia, 1923. - Т.XIII.

84. Гегель Г. Философия права / Гегель Г. // Сочинения в 14 томах. - Москва, Ленинград: Государственное социально-экономическое издательство, 1934. – Т. 7.

85. Гольбах П. А. О внешней политике, о войнах, мире, договорах и т.д. / П. А.Гольбах. // Избранные произведения в двух томах. – М.: Издательство социально-экономической литературы, 1963 - Т.2.

86. Кант И. Трактаты о вечном мире / И. Кант. - М., 1963.

87. Удар в серце Європи [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.unian.net/news/print.php?id=276096.

88. Роттердамський Е. Похвала Глупості / Е. Роттердамський. - К.: Основи, 1993.

89. Hedges Ch. War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning / Ch. Hedges. - New York: Anchor Books, 2003.

90. Толстой Л.Н. Война и мир / Л.Н. Толстой // Собрание сочинений в двенадцати томах. – М.: Художественная литература, 1987. – Т. V.

91. Военная история. - М.: Воениздат, 1971.
92. Война // Дипломатический словарь. - М: Политиздат, 1971. - Т.1.
93. Война и мир [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://slovari.yandex.ru/ dict/voinaimir/article/yandex_new/1013.html&stpar1=1.9.
94. Jackson R.J. NATO and Peacekeeping / R.J. Jackson. - L.: Routledge, 2004.
95. Fawcett C.B. Frontiers. A Study in Political Geography Oxford / C.B. Fawcett. – London: At the Clarendon Press, 1921. – 187 p.
96. The Europe of regions. From French-Italian-Swiss Partnership to Cooperation with Eastern Europe/ Project director Claude Haegi. – Geneve: Georg Editeur SA, 1995. – 286 p.
97. Глазычев В. Limes novum / В. Глазычев // Отечественные записки. - 2002. - №6 [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2002/6/ 2002_06_29-pr.html.
98. Макарычев А.С. Пространственные характеристики трансграничной безопасности: концептуальные контексты / А.С.Макарычев //Безопасность и международное сотрудничество в поясе новых границ России. - Москва: НОФМО, 2002. - С.15 – 91.
99. Secure Borders: The European Experience - A Roundtable with Jonathan Faull. - New York: EWI, 2004. – 152 p.
100. Building an area of security and freedom in the wider Europe through integrated border management: Conference Report. - New York: EWI, 2004. – 258 p.
101. Cichocki B. The Eastern External Border of the Enlarged European Union / B.Cichocki. – Warsaw: Batory, 2004. – 153 s.
102. Rozšiřováni EU - zkušenesti a potencial: Podkladový materiál ke konferenci.- Praha: Centre for democracy, 2005. – 89 s.
103. Устич С. Сутність сучасних транскордонних процесів та їхнє категоріальне відображення / С. Устич // Український соціологічний журнал. – 2013. – № 1-2. – С.28-40.
104. Устич С.І. Кордон, війна та мир в долі сучасного світу. Тріада життя чи колапсу? / С.І. Устич. – Ужгород: Карпати, 2010.- 342 с.
105. Communication and European Frontiers. - Debrecen - Oradea: Oradea University Press, 2011. – 219 p.
106. Ex borea lux? Learning from the Finnish and Norwegian Experience of Cross-border Cooperation with Eastern Neighbours. - Prague: ISD, 2012. – 120 p.
107. Мікула Н. Міжтериторіальне та транскордонне співробітництво / Н.Мікула. - Львів: Арал, 2012. - 394 с.
108. Association for Borderlands Studies [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://absborderlands.org/.
109. International Journal of Migration and Border Studies [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.inderscience.com/jhome.php?jcode=ijmbs.
110. Euroborderregions [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.euborderregions.eu/.
111. Европейская рамочная конвенция о приграничном сотрудничестве территориальных сообществ и властей [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу:http:// www.szrf.ru/doc.phtml?op=1&nb=00_00&year=2009&iss_id=179&doc_id=22...
112. Протокол №2 к Европейской рамочной конвенции о приграничном сотрудничестве территориальных сообществ и властей, касающийся межтерри-

ториального сотрудничества [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу:http://www.szrf.ru/doc.phtml?op=1&nb=00_00&year=2009&iss_id=179&doc_id=22...

113. Концепция приграничного сотрудничества в Российской Федерации //Собрание законодательства Российской Федерации. – 2001.- №8.- С.35-64.

114. Спільна заява Саміту Східного партнерства у Празі [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://eu.prostir.ua/library/234749.html?print.

115. Kolossov V. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches / V. Kolossov // Geopolitics. – 2005. - № 10. - P.606 – 632.

116. Brunet-Jailly E. Theorizing Borders: An Interdisciplinary Perspective / E. Brunet-Jailly // Geopolitics. – 2005. - № 10. - P.633 – 670.

117. The EU – Russia Borderland. New contexts for regional co-operation / Edited by Heikki Eskelinen, Ilkka Liikanen and James W. Scott. - Oxford: Routledge. - 2013. - 238 p.

118. Trans-border economies – new challenges of regional development in democratic world / Editors: Marek Cierpal-Wolan, Jozef Olenski, Waclaw Wierzbieniec. - Jaroslaw: PWSTE. - 2013. – 195 p.

119. Borocz J. Dual dependency and the informalization of external linkages: the case of Hungary / J. Borocz // Research in Social Movements, Coflicts and Change. - 1992. - P. 22-35.

120. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Энциклопедия философских наук - Философия природы / Г.В.Ф.Гегель. Сочинения в 14 томах. – М.: Государственное издательство, 1934. - Т. 2.

121. Берталанфи Л. Общая теория систем – обзор проблем и результатов / Л.Берталанфи // Системні исследования: ежегодник. - 1979. - С.4-35.

122. Макдермотт И. Искусство системного мышления: необходимые знания о системах и творческом подходе к решению проблем / И. Макдермотт, Дж. О'Коннор [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://vocv.at.ua/_ld/0/65_AS.pdf .

123. Садовский В. Н. Системный подход и общая теория систем: статус, основные проблемы и перспективы развития / В. Н. Садовский //Системні исследования: ежегодник. - 1979. - С. 37-85.

124. Бевзенко Л. Д. Социальная самоорганизация. Синергетическая парадигма: возможности социальных интерпретаций / Л. Д. Бевзенко. — К.: Ин-т социологии НАН Украины, 2002. — 347 с.

125. Сугаков В. Й. Основи синергетики / В. Й.Сугаков. — К.: Обереги, 2001. — 287 с.

126. Свідзинський А.В. Синергетична концепція культури / А.В. Свідзинський. – Луцьк: Вежа, 2008.– 696 с.

127. Згуровський М.З. Системний аналіз: проблеми, методологія, застосування / М.З. Згуровський, Н.Д. Панкратова. – К.: Наук. думка, 2005. – 744 с.

128. Згуровский М.З. Исследование социальных процессов на основе методологии системного анализа / М.З. Згуровский, А.В. Доброногов, Т. Померанцева. – К.: Наук. думка. – 221 с.

129. Сурмин Ю. П. Теория систем и системный анализ: учеб. пособие / Ю. П. Сурмин. — К.: МАУП, 2003. — 368 с.

130. Теорія систем та системний аналіз: методичні вказівки до практичних занять / уклад. В.М.Охріменко, Т.Б.Воронкова. – Харків: ХНАМГ, 2012. - 24 с.

131. International Journal of General Systems [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу:http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=ggen20#.U4wrcrnWhhg.

132. List of systems scientists [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_systems_scientists.

133. Волкова В.Н. Из истории теории систем и системного анализа / В.Н. Волкова. – СПб.: Изд-во СПбГПУ, 2004. – 210 с.

134. Ворона Ю. Системология. Основания системологии / Ю. Ворона [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: – http://exintel.org/DOC/SYS-LOG.EXE.

135. Мікула Н. Міжтериторіальне та транскордонне співробітництво.

136. Risk analysis [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www. http://www. frontex.europa.eu/intelligence/risk-analysis

137. Eurobarometr [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm.

138. Attitudes towards European Union Enlargement [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm. 139. Eurostat [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home/.

140. Кордонне дослідження 2011. - [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.ariosz.hu/.

141. Summary of the Hungarian-Ukrainian Case Study [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.tarki.hu/en/.

142. Дождутся ли белорусы смягчения визового режима с ЕС [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.facenews.ua/articles/2014/239138/.

143. Токар П. Нові реалії сучасних кордонів / П. Токар. – Ужгород: КП «Ужгородська міська друкарня», 2008. – 317 с.

144. Перспективы развития предпринимательства и трансграничное сотрудничество: анализ взаимовлияния на примере западноукраинских областей / Н.Исакова, О.Красовская, В.Грига, Ф.Велтер, Д.Смоллбоун // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. – 2008. - №2.- С. 151-164.

145. Пелін О.В. Комбіновані методи дослідження соціальних проблем Карпатського єврорегіону / О.В. Пелін // Соціальні технології: актуальні проблеми теорії та практики. – 2013. - Вип.59-60. - С.192-196.

146. Стегній О.Г. Методологічні складності крос-культурних досліджень / О.Г.Стегній // Український соціум. – 2013. - №2 (45). – С. 99 – 112.

147. Краснов В. М. К понятию общества как социальной системы / В. М. Краснов // Филос. науки.- 1977.- № 2. – С.75-89.