What is Peripherisation and what makes Peripheries different?
Peripheries, borderlands – everyday and academic perspectives

- Periphery and boundary both are products of nation state building – in many respects e.g. Joensuu is much more peripheral in national than in global context
- Why to bother to study peripheries?
  - Sites of problem, which preserve conservative values but where the environment is ruined, do not offer decent income but imitate the ways of life from the centers
  - Sites of idyll, where small is beautiful and where the assessment of societal change and development can be done from the distance and deeply
- “It is clear that peripherality is, or should be, a contextual category rather than a mere technical instrument to be employed in the classification of social – mainly economic – space. … peripherality should be a contextual but is also a relativistic category; there are no ‘absolute’ peripheries.” (Paasi 1995, 253-4)
- “The critical perspective [towards state boundaries] is crucial in the contemporary world where the flows of capital and information cross borders easily but where human border crossings are highly selective. Immigrants, refugees and displaced people often face borders and the processes of bordering in different ways than do transnational capitalists, highly educated elites or even tourists.” (Paasi 2013, 2)
What is Peripherisation and what makes Peripheries different?
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Extensive perspectives to peripheries
The dimensions of (the Northern) peripheries

Regional differentiation can be divided into core areas and peripheral areas. We can see this division on different regional scales from global to local. The cores are typically diverse centres of economic growth, political power, culture life etc.

Main characteristics of peripheral regions:

“Peripheral in both a spatial and a social sense means being out of the centre of resources, such as wealth, power, or connection” (Oksa 1995,183).

- geographically remote (distance to/from centers), territorially remote (border areas)
- dependent up on external political and industrial decision-making
- resource-based economy (agriculture, forestry, mining, fishing)
- strong dependence on the state as provider of employment, services, subsidies etc.
- relatively low levels of income, education, health, housing etc.
- culturally traditional
- decline of population, employment, services
- out-migration of young people, aging of the population
- unfavourable climate and geological conditions (archipelago, mountainous etc.)
Peripherality as an expenditure factor: some Finnish features

LOW POPULATION DENSITY AND LONG DISTANCES
A The share of people living outside population centres (the share of people in sparsely populated areas)
B The density of the people living in sparsely populated areas
   - conventional density: average number of inhabitants/km²
   - grid square model of density: average number of inhabitants/populated km²-grids
C Wideness
   - the size of the area
   - the length of general roads
   - the average distance of farms from the population centre

REMOTE LOCATION
D The distance from the population as a demand potential
   - the lack of collaboration possibilities
   - the lack of purchasing power
   - the lack of political power
E The distance to the town centres
F The site of location on the border

OTHER FACTORS OF UNFAVOURABILITY (RELATED TO REMOTENESS)
- bilingualism
- special support for salaries in remote municipalities
Potential accessibility (EU27 = 100)
- 0 < 25 extremely peripheral
- 25 < 50 very peripheral
- 50 < 75 peripheral
- 75 < 100 intermediate, below average
- 100 < 125 intermediate, above average
- 125 < ... central

Nordplus -courses, target-areas in 1999-2013

Nordplus – course themes 1999-2012

27.9. – 8.10. 1999 in Saltdal, Rognan (140 km south-east of Bodø) with a 3-days excursion to Rana, Lurey and Træna: LOCAL RESTRUCTURING OF THE NORDIC WELFARE SOCIETY

2. – 13.10. 2000 in Saltstraumen (30 km east of Bodø) with a 3-days excursion to the Lofoten Islands: INNOVATIONS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORDIC CONTEXT

30.9. – 11.10. 2002 in Røkland (100 km south-east of Bodø) with a 3-days excursion to the Lofoten Islands: SOCIAL CAPITAL, LOCAL MOBILIZATION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORDIC CONTEXT


2. – 13.10. 2006 in Ylitornio with a 3-days excursion to Pajala, Kiruna, Gällivare, Jokkmokk, Boden and Luleå: MOBILITY IN A BRIDGING AND BONDING CAPACITY IN THE NORDIC PERIPHERY

1.-12.10.2007 in Kuusamo with a 4-days excursion to Eastern Lapland and Rovaniemi: MAPPING TACIT KNOWLEDGES. UNDERSTANDING THE TRANSFORMATIONS OF RURAL ECONOMIES

3.-14.11.2008 in Pärnu with a 3-days excursion to Southern Estonia: RESILIENT REGIONS AND PEOPLE: TRANSFORMATION AND ADAPTATION OF LOCAL ECONOMIES

4. – 15.10. 2004 in Ylitornio with a 4-days excursion to Kolari, Enontekiö, Kautokeino, Karasjokk, Utsjoki, Inari and Rovaniemi: NEW DYNAMICS OF ETHNIC AND REGIONAL POLITICS IN THE NORDIC PERIPHERY

5.-16.10.2009 in Valga-Valka with excursions along Via Hansaetica between Tartu and Riga: NEW FORMS OF POSTPRODUCTIVISM, RURAL-URBAN INTERACTION AND REGIONALISM IN BALTIC BORDERLANDS

11.-22.10.2010 in Riga with a 3-days excursion to Eastern Latvia (Latgale): DUALISMS AND DIALOGUES IN BALTI REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY

30.9. – 11.10. 2002 in Røkland (100 km south-east of Bodø) with a 3-days excursion to the Lofoten Islands: SOCIAL CAPITAL, LOCAL MOBILIZATION AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORDIC CONTEXT

15-27.4.2012 in Tartu with a 3-days excursion to Võru and Valga County, Vidzeme and Riga: KNOWLEDGE INSTITUTIONS AND LOCALISED LEARNING IN SPATIAL AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING IN PERIPHERAL FUNCTIONAL URBAN AREAS OF THE BALTIC SEA REGION
Ongoing research project based on Nordplus-courses 1999-2013

1. How the students structure the problems of regional development in the context of peripheral regions?
2. How the argumentation is connected to societal/grand principles and tensions (of e.g. efficiency and equity)?
3. What are main results/findings/observations/remarks in the study papers
4. Problem-solving and recommendations - what explains the orientation and articulation? (Zeitgeist?, EU-guidelines?, best-seller theoretical approaches?, charisma of teaching/supervision?, content of the courses?, intensive course dynamics?, general group dynamics?, group work habits like SWOT-analysis?)
5. The processes of knowledge in expert training and regional development work?
Approaches to study reports

• Periphery (dualisms)
  – global-local, state-municipality, centralization-decentralization, vertical-horizontal, city-countryside, capital-labor, economy-culture, effectiveness-equity

• Competitiveness and welfare (three-fold analyses)
  – competence – connections – concept
  – specialization – productivity – know-how
  – hierarchy – partnership – network
  – having – loving – being

• Would these classifications reach the ideas of intensive development work …?
Peripherisation and regionalisation
Dimensions and examples

• Reforms about how to secure regional equity of urban type of services (border regions are usually peripheral in nature, thus removing borders by creating sub-regional municipalities (larger functional urban-rural regions will decrease peripherisation)
  → more people and/or services on wheels
  ← revaluation of real estate property in the centres of suspended municipalities
  ← Sustainability in terms of economic, social, political, cultural and ecological change

• The renaissance of industries based on natural resources. Mining boom in Finland (e.g. 4 mines in action in Lapland and 7 more will be started up in the near future)

• ”Pop in/pop out countryside/peripheries”

• Broadband networked regionalisation and remote telecommuting work
Towards combined LAU 1 & 2 in Finland?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>LAU 1</th>
<th>LAU 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td><strong>Counties</strong> <em>(Maakond)</em></td>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong> <em>(Vald, linn)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td><strong>Sub-regions</strong> <em>(Seutukunnat / Ekonomiska regioner)</em></td>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong> <em>(Kunnat / Kommuner)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td><strong>Districts, republic cities</strong> <em>(Rajoni, republikas pilsētas)</em></td>
<td><strong>Cities, municipalities, parishes</strong> <em>(Pilsētas, novadi, pagasti)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong> <em>(Savivaldybės)</em></td>
<td><strong>Elderships</strong> <em>(Seniūnijos)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td><strong>Economic regions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td><em>(same as NUTS 3: Counties)</em></td>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong> <em>(Kommuner)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differentiated peripheries and ...
Three perspectives of estimating development/change

• Statistical indicators
  – Certainties at the level of large numbers and averages
  – GNP, HDI …

• Single success stories and failures
  – Options for understanding the mechanisms of change and innovation processes
  – Uniqueness versus general lessons

• Views from the bottom
  – Less developed areas / poor people as critical determinants of “real” development
  – e.g. absolute change of income at the lowest deciles of distribution
Triangle of (local) development/success

(Developed from Almås 1985)

production  consumption  ownership  regulation
Local resources
ANCHOR

CATALYST
Impulse from outside
- business consultant
- project manager
- voluntary worker
- developer-reseacher

ENABLER
Public sector
- legislative reforms and control
- fiscal subvention, support
- programmes, guidance
My cases, Valga/Valka course ‘09

- HapaTornio
  - western periphery
  - manufacturing industry

- Lieksa
  - eastern periphery, remote
  - forestry, forest industry

- Joensuu
  - eastern periphery
  - education

Your cases, Tartu course ‘13

- Misso
- Meremäe
- Värskä
- Aluksne
- Višakas
- Baltinavas

Source: Jukarainen 2002, updated
Case explanations

- **Stagnation of Lieksa**
  - one small local power elite, but separate realms of economic and “expert-based” development
  - awareness of local possibilities has been (too) strong, no need to clarify the opinions of the others – they are already known → stalemate situations without solutions/openers
  - credibility of the mover before the issue → no need the clarify all local (challenging/hidden) potentials
- **Static Joensuu**
  - few local elites, but most of them are strongly dependent on public sector
  - two-fold tendencies: a need for closed cabinet contracts/decision-making as well as mobilization of single-issue movements/resistance
  - development work has taken as granted and as a routine
- **Proactive Tornio-Haparanda**
  - committed and goal-oriented project crossed the elites/branch sectors and, thus, reminded the principles of good/open administrative preparation
  - project itself was rather small, but it created some readiness for success
  - some coincidences/single encounters were crucial for making the project plans as realistic
General explanations

Overlapping memberships in Sotkamo
Source: Oksa & Lehto 2003
General explanations: towards success in every scale of local

• Utilizing the strengths of localism (taking care of a long tradition of bonding social capital)
  – Crucial actors/types of actors: overlapping memberships
• Utilizing the strengths of local state (communicative bridging capital)
  – Crucial actors/types of actors: exchange of roles
• Utilizing the strengths of locality (rational bridging capital)
  – Crucial actors/types of actors: technology – talent - tolerance
...intensive development strategies
From triple to quadra helix?

- Spheres of action
  - rational
  - normative
  - communicative
  - emotional

- Types of knowledge
  - commercial
  - state-oriented
  - academic
  - local

Border studies: three approaches (van Houtum 2000; van der Velde & van Houtum 2000)

• Flows and barriers approach
  – distance (physical, time) /exchange /infrastructures: expenses $\leftarrow$ economic perspective
• Cross-border cooperation approach
  – distance (cultural, political) /interaction /integration: $\leftarrow$ process perspective
• People approach
  – distance (cognitive, affective, mental) /behavior /perception: narrative perspective

• Fourth approach? – Un-/familiarity approach?
  – distance (border is never an answer but a question, van Houtum 2011) /discourse /way of thinking: open borders/borderless perspective
Border crossings: points and persons  (Source FBG 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIRTANIEMI</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAJA-JOOSEPPI</td>
<td>61279</td>
<td>68713</td>
<td>94167</td>
<td>128054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALLA</td>
<td>91172</td>
<td>113884</td>
<td>162647</td>
<td>221933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUUSAMO</td>
<td>28225</td>
<td>37482</td>
<td>42512</td>
<td>44621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURVINEN</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARTIUS</td>
<td>424186</td>
<td>405683</td>
<td>467126</td>
<td>502150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INARI</td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>6141</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMINAHO</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUHOVAARA</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIIRALA</td>
<td>934006</td>
<td>1022496</td>
<td>1281037</td>
<td>1501511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARIKKALA</td>
<td>18037</td>
<td>16636</td>
<td>12804</td>
<td>12637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMATRA</td>
<td>1098712</td>
<td>1320164</td>
<td>1837956</td>
<td>2225563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUIJAMAA</td>
<td>1910715</td>
<td>2315601</td>
<td>3153596</td>
<td>3381843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAINIKKALA</td>
<td>349363</td>
<td>344269</td>
<td>435922</td>
<td>483988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAALIMAA</td>
<td>2453796</td>
<td>2730696</td>
<td>3156469</td>
<td>3495458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHTEENSÄ</td>
<td>7373683</td>
<td>8382491</td>
<td>10648770</td>
<td>11998808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Russian cargo on rails and road 2011

Source: Ministry of transport and communications 2013
Russian sea cargo 2011/2020/2030 & indexes of development by road, rail and

170/210/300
Arrival and departure of lorries according to border station in 2011

Growth index of cargo according to border station
Flows and barriers approach

- Etzkowitz & Leydersdorf (2000): Triple-Helix ← co-operation
- Local/civil mobilization, regional self-reliance, (neo-)endogenous development

* * * * *

- Martinez (1994): alienated, co-existent, interdependent, integrated borderlands
- O’Dowd (2002): border as i) obstacle, ii) corridor, iii) resource, iv) symbol of identity
Cross-border cooperation approach

Four ideal types of cross-border political institutions (Blatter 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental / control</th>
<th>Territorial governance</th>
<th>Functional governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMISSION</td>
<td>CONNECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Actors from the national government</td>
<td>1 Actors from various levels and sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Large scale: national boundaries determine geographic area of cooperation</td>
<td>1 Multiple scales: variable geometry, functional economics of scale determine area of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Broad scope: all-purpose institution, many tasks</td>
<td>1 Narrow scope: single-purpose institutions, few tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Objective interdependencies, material spill-over</td>
<td>1 Subjective synergies, useful combination of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Experts: lawyers and engineers</td>
<td>1 Brokers: planners, developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity-providing / orientation</td>
<td>CONSOCIATION</td>
<td>COALITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional actors</td>
<td>Actors from various levels and sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cascading scales: federalized architecture</td>
<td>1 Fuzzy scale: no specified geographic demarcation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Broad scope: all-purpose institution, many tasks</td>
<td>1 Narrow scope: policy-field specific goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Shared identities, emotional ties</td>
<td>1 Shared beliefs and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Integrators: charismatic leaders</td>
<td>1 Mobilizer: parties and interest groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finland's cooperation with neighbouring Russian areas

• Financing in 2012

In the Budget for 2012, EUR 6 million is reserved for item 24.20.44 (neighbouring area cooperation) under the main title of expenditure of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The appropriation will be used to support projects in the following sectors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>EUR 3 985 000</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and health sector</td>
<td>EUR 713 600</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of economic cooperation</td>
<td>EUR 898 400</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO projects</td>
<td>EUR 320 000</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>EUR 83 000</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>EUR 6 000 000</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People approach

• “The **insiders** of the place are about continuation, humility, appropriateness, memories, today, and tomorrow. **Outsiders** are about control, conservation, and museumization—and usually lack both a physical and a temporal connectivity between and to the places.” (Palang et al. 2009, 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLICIT</th>
<th>EXPLICIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>everyday life</td>
<td>escape, removal, going away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFLECTIVE</th>
<th>FORMATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>place in a memory</td>
<td>the 'becoming' of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSIDER</th>
<th>OUTSIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT HOME, INSIDE OF THE HOME PLACE</td>
<td>existentialistic belonging to a place (sense of place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE OF THE HOME PLACE</td>
<td>behavioral, empathetic travelers’ experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions of a lived place (Karjalainen 1988)

Source: Porteous 1985; Relph 1976
The Presence of the Past along the Polish-German Border (Brym 2011)

• Poland’s western territories have a multicultural history and traces of the German past can still be found in the landscape.

• After the II WW Polish government invested heavily in rebuilding and polonizing the newly acquired territories.

• In both Słubice and Frankfurt-Oder one can find monuments built to display the Soviet influence on society, which reminds of the regions’ shared communist past.

The Fiendship Bell in Frankfurt
The Monument to Russian Soldiers in Słubice

SLIDE TAKEN FROM THE LECTURE OF PAULINA TOBIASZ-LIS (Dr., Ass. Prof., Univ. of Lodz, Poland) IN JOENSUU 4.4.2013
Un/-Familiarity approach

Source: Laine, Jussi (lecture 28.3.2013 in Joensuu). JL thanks Henk van Houtum for the idea!
Modes of familiarity/unfamiliarity

- Nostalgia tourism
- Medical and health tourism
- Recreation: services (spas, skiing resorts); shopping (duty free high quality goods)
- Russians’ second homes in SE Finland
- Cross-border marriages → cross-border family care
- Gas tourism
- Vodka tourism
- Sex tourism
  → opportunistic behavior
  → “colonialist/moralist” behavior
- Economic gaps, social disparities, cultural differences: effective – corrupted, simple - complex
- Visa regimes, lorry queues, real estate & land legislation
Russian tourists and Russian second home owners in SE Finland

The map is based upon research of Dr. Kati Pitkänen (UEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All trips (millions of trips)</th>
<th>Leisure trips (millions of trips)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Finland - 4.41</td>
<td>1. Turkey- 2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turkey- 3.26</td>
<td>2. China- 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. China- 2.43</td>
<td>3. Egypt- 1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Estonia- 1.68</td>
<td>4. Finland- 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Egypt - 1.66</td>
<td>5. Thailand- 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Germany- 1.32</td>
<td>6. Germany- 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Thailand- 0.92</td>
<td>7. Spain- 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spain- 0.78</td>
<td>8. Greece- 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lithuania- 0.76</td>
<td>9. Italy- 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Italy- 0.73</td>
<td>10. Arab Emirates- 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Kati Pitkänen 2013
Cross-border marriages, total amount at the end of 2009

10 400 Finnish-Soviet/Russian/Estonian couples
- 7 300 Finnish-Russian couples

8 200 Finnish-Swedish couples

3 000 Finnish-Thai couples

8 000 Swedish-Finnish couples

2 100 Soviet/Russian/Estonian-Finnish couples

Source: Pöllänen 2013; Statistics of Finland 2010
Number of divorces according to origin of country of wife (a) and husband (b)
Un/-Familiarity: some concluding remarks

• cross-border familiarity as a goal by itself for promoting mobility, integration and community-building
• “egg & hen”-problem: decreasing unfamiliarity & increasing cross-border mobility/interaction → feelings of comfort & lost of curiosity
• mobile and international lifestyles → homogenization of borderlands → immobility
• importance of international differences ↔ heritage, “binding bridges” between “both sides”
• is there an upper-limit of cross-border familiarity/unfamiliarity?

(Spiereings & van der Velde 2013, 4)
Thanks for Your attention!

www.uef.fi