Lynn M. Tesser*

Europe´s pivotal peace projects: Ethnic separation and European integration

Abstract

EU enlargement into Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) often intensifies political debates deeply mired in the past. Yet, the collective memories enabling controversy are linked with a largely forgotten source: Western powers' earlier stability strategy centered on the replacement of multinational empires with relatively homogeneous nation-states. Key policy-makers' emphasis on the territorial separation of peoples brought widespread trends towards ethnic unmixing. The shift to the European Coal and Steel Community and European integration for long-term stability contributed to amnesia of the earlier emphasis on ethnic separation for Europe's eastern half – even while reappearing in the recent Balkan conflicts. After outlining the sizeable impact of ethnic separation as a stability strategy, this report explains why the subsequent shift to European integration may unintentionally enhance fears of renewed irredentism. EU enlargement creates an unprecedented opportunity for the return of former minorities – and new opportunities for nationalists to characterize their return as a prelude to revanchism.

1 Introduction

The EU's initial efforts to sign association and free trade agreements with Ukraine contributed to conflict suggestive of Russian irredentism. While Moscow's involvement in Ukraine resists easy categorization, modern European history features numerous campaigns of territorial expansion framed in rhetoric emphasizing the protection of co-ethnics and acquisition of historically significant land. Most recent were the Serb and Croat nationalist campaigns during the Yugoslav wars of dissolution and Armenia's efforts to acquire part of Azerbaijan as the Soviet Union fell apart. Looking back further was the WWII revanchism of Germany, Italy, Bulgaria, Greece and others.

Yet, irredentism in Europe has declined since the great wars. States were often redrawn along national/ethnic lines with many minorities emigrating to 'kin' states, leaving far fewer Germans, Turks/Muslims, Greeks, Serbs and others living beyond the nation-states existing in their name. Revanchism's long shadow nevertheless lingers in the legacy of Western powers' earlier response to

---

* Dr. Tesser joined the Command and Staff College of the Marine Corps University in July 2013 after spending several years teaching and researching in post-conflict societies (Bosnia-Herzegovina in 2008-10 and Cyprus in 2011-12). She has had affiliations with universities in the U.S., Germany, Poland, Finland as well as with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the U.S. Institute of Peace and holds a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Chicago. Portions of this report have been taken from her book *Ethnic Cleansing and the European Union: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Security, Memory and Ethnography* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the individual author and do not necessarily represent the views of either the Marine Corps Command and Staff College or any other governmental agency.

irredentism: the attempted removal of minorities deemed conflict-prone through numerous population exchange, transfer and repatriation agreements, which historian Philipp Ther claims signal a 'Western consensus on ethnic cleansing.'[1] Two justifications were often invoked: lessening the violence surrounding already-occurring expulsions and reducing chances for more irredentism and war. Complementary were postwar border shifts further aligning states and nations.

The West's earlier reliance on ethnic separation as a stability strategy has largely been forgotten. Yet, the collective memories of these mass population movements and related separation policies continue to affect European politics, making the mistrust, antipathies and other obstacles to further EU integration and expansion appear irrational and anachronistic. The EU's post-Cold war successes and emphasis on free trade, non-discrimination and multiculturalism contributes to historical amnesia of the earlier drive to forge homogenous nation-states and an ongoing blindness to its long-term effects. Key international policy-makers emphasized ethnic separation as a path to peace just as the European Coal and Steel Community was later deemed the preferred route.

What happens when two conflicting stability strategies – ethnic separation and then European integration – are pursued sequentially? What are the long-term effects of using minority removal for conflict resolution in tandem with the nation-state principle? These are the primary questions addressed in this report. The main countries considered include Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina with occasional references to Cyprus.

Thirteen states from the former Soviet zone of influence joined the EU since 2004,[2] with enlargement into CEE remaining the world's most successful regional project of policy diffusion. Centered on conditionality, potential member states must align considerable portions of their own domestic governance with EU law and policy in order to gain the benefits associated with membership, including the financial assistance en route to entry. Key are economic reforms fostering integration with the Single Market as well as the adoption of minority protections. Both are assumed to bring long-term stability, while also contributing to a border-effacing EU emphasizing non-discrimination and allowing in principle the free movement of goods, capital and people across internal borders.

EU expansion brings a process unprecedented in scale: the (re)integration of many areas that experienced relatively recent and large-scale ethnic separation centered on identity-based forced migration – what is now often called ethnic cleansing. Ethnic separation in a general sense refers to the territorial distancing of persons associated with particular national or ethnic identities through various means: border shifts, government-directed operations of ethnic cleansing and occasional genocide, flight, and expulsion, or indirect expulsion through the targeting of particular social groups that can lead to a cascade of out-migration in a discriminatory environment. Varying levels of assimilation and discrimination may also contribute to minority departures. Population exchanges, transfers and repatriation sometimes followed to assist in the removal of minorities deemed irredentism-prone. Support for border shifts further aligning states with nations and minority removal for conflict resolution signaled major powers' preference for homogeneous nation-states, particularly in the first half of the 20th century, leaving the incipient international community in the awkward position of fulfilling radical nationalist goals and appearing to condone a usually violent wartime practice.[3]

The EU's relevance stems from its border-effacing policies that challenge the foundations of the earlier order emphasizing homogeneous nation-states. EU enlargement may then be viewed through a lens showing that seemingly contemporary problems and challenges owe, in part, to earlier waves of forced migration and a default Western stability strategy centered on the consolidation of relatively homogeneous nation-states.

Chapters II, III and IV consider ethnic separation in the past century, illuminating how earlier nation-state creation and international sanctioning of minority removal for conflict resolution created incentives for

---

[1]   Ther 2014: 11.
[2]   These include Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia and the Czech Republic as well as the Mediterranean islands of Cyprus and Malta. Later came Bulgaria and Romania in 2007 and Croatia in 2013.
[3]   Yet, separation policies tend to introduce new forms of diversity. Refugees and expellees often find themselves treated with less respect and regarded as outsiders by long-resident co-ethnics given their manifold needs and cultural difference if coming from another country or region, leaving ethnic separation to be more myth than reality.

additional ethnic cleansing – and a tendency to adopt separation for conflict resolution. Chapter V gives an overview of European integration as a stability strategy and EU enlargement in CEE. Chapter VI explains why EU enlargement may contribute to fears of renewed irredentism, while discussing the varied effect of EU anti-separation policies with particular focus on the most potentially contentious reform: the full liberalization of land and property markets to EU nationals. A concluding chapter summarizes the report's main findings and prospects for future remixing in an enlarging Union.

2 The foundations of ethnic separation as a stability strategy

Great powers once prioritized ethnic separation and the consolidation of homogeneous nation-states. Doing so created incentives for ethnic cleansing to claim territory and a willingness among key policy makers to employ ethnic separation as a default conflict resolution strategy prior to the Cold War's onset.

The first half of the 20th century witnessed numerous population exchange, transfer and repatriation agreements removing minorities deemed irredentism-prone in Europe's eastern half. Minority removal was also closely linked with the rise of the nation-state principle as a means for ordering European international relations, commencing with the incipient nation-states of southeastern Europe in the 19th century,[4] an order that vastly elevated the significance of national, ethnic and religious minorities.[5]

Yet, the recognition of new nation-states was not simply a reaction to nationalist activism. Major powers created the preconditions for the proliferation of nationalism by establishing norms for recognition of sovereignty. With European states' ability to decide which territories gain independence, elites desiring to claim lands needed to make their demands in terms that Europeans would understand: that territorially-defined nations existed and were largely defined in terms of ethnicity and/or language, even if highly unrealistic for diverse and intermingled CEE.[6]

Further stress on the nation-state principle came with the great powers' carve up of empires after the First World War, replacing them with a plethora of new or redrawn nation-states, even while debate lingered over the viability of the new order. Woodrow Wilson was a prominent promoter of self-determination as a means to mitigate future war, understood to mean the alignment of the borders of states and nations to prevent internal conflicts and irredentism, while political leaders across the political spectrum increasingly understood national self-determination as the foundation of political legitimacy. WWII and its aftermath then witnessed minority removal through flight, expulsion and population exchanges and transfers on an unprecedented scale, largely in response to defeated revanchist powers' wartime campaigns.

Forced migration became part of 'the vocabulary of peacemaking' in official terms at the time of the 1912-13 Balkan Wars with the population exchange agreements

---

[4] European great powers began to carve out incipient nation-states in the Balkans with the creation of an autonomous Serb principality (1815), an independent Greek Kingdom (1830), an independent principality for Montenegro (1857), and an autonomous Rumanian principality (1861). After 1878, the Bulgarian principality annexed Eastern Rumelia (1885) before declaring independence and obtaining recognition as a kingdom (1908). 1878 also brought official independence for Romania, Serbia and Montenegro and autonomy for Bulgaria.

[5] Minorities' significance appeared in a number of ways: in a tendency for mass Muslim expulsions to accompany the establishment of Christian majority nation-states in the Balkans, in the terms of the 1878 Treaty of Berlin making the recognition of several new states contingent on respect for minority rights, and in a number of 1919-20 treaties formulated under League of Nation auspices recognizing many minorities as 'national' in existing or new nation-states (i.e. Poles, Germans, Magyars, Slovaks).

[6] Gagnon 2006: 17.

of 1913, 1914 and then 1919 and 1923.[7] Most famous was the 1923 Convention for the Compulsory Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations that followed Greece's invasion of western Turkey, intending to forge a 'Greater Greece' extending all the way to Constantinople/Istanbul. Then came the Turkish counteroffensive that spurred the flight of many Greeks/Orthodox believers following the collapse and flight of the Greek army. The Convention aimed to increase refugees' chances of survival by organizing an official population exchange,[8] and sanctioned Turkey's refusal to allow the return of more than a million Greeks/Orthodox refugees forced from or leaving Asia Minor in 1912-1922.

With the Convention, the great powers affirmed the largest population exchange between Greeks/Orthodox believers in Turkey and Muslims in Greece – as religion was used as the main indicator of nationality at the time. Emigration was compulsory – not merely due to increasing assumptions that minorities invite conflict, but because of the enormous brutality occurring during wartime.[9] The significance of the Greek-Turkish exchange lied in a high profile endorsement of homogeneous nation-states and understanding of national minorities as a potential cause of instability and war.[10] Greece soon possessed an overwhelmingly Greek demography, while Turkey embarked on a multi-decade campaign of homogenization through deportations and assimilation according to the belief that a country could only survive in the form of a nation-state.[11] Hard lessons were learned from the

Balkans: the incremental replacement of Ottoman control with Christian nation-states and accompanying mass Muslim expulsions.

With the rise of human rights doctrine, it is indeed difficult today to understand the thinking behind population exchange policy. Then the idea of transferring people was not conceived as counter to human rights, as those moving would be less likely to suffer discrimination in their 'kin' states, and because the rights of those transferred would in principle be honored.[12] The policy also aimed at 'pulling in' nationalities spilling over newly (re)drawn borders and was often preferable to the risk of suffering future waves of territorial expansionism.[13] And rather than conceive of mandatory population exchange as a brutalizing process experienced by hundreds of thousands, it was promoted 'as a legal measure intended to bring peace on the basis of an international treaty and under the auspices of the League of Nations.'[14] Yet, support was not unqualified. Some officials strongly opposed the practice, while others had mixed feelings.

International endorsement of ethnic separation also appeared in the post-WWI border shifts further aligning states and national/ethnic demography. The critically important Treaty of Versailles required Germany to make substantial territorial concessions according to the national principle of majority self-determination. Plebiscites were to determine sovereignty over several areas (Upper Silesia, East Prussia, the Saar Basin), while

---

7   Naimark 2001: 17. Unofficial emphasis on religious/ethnic separation also occurred in 19th century European humanitarian interventions in the Ottoman Empire. Intervening great powers sometimes recommended population removal to lessen the likelihood of repeated massacres, usually regarding a Muslim minority (Rodogno 2012: 33). Three of the four initial population exchange agreements, in fact, concerned Muslims in the Balkans. The first agreement was the 1913 Convention of Adrianople, focused on Muslim and Orthodox/Bulgarian minorities along fifteen kilometers of the Bulgarian-Turkish border even while many had already departed. Turkey then took steps to bring about a population exchange with Greece. The 1914 Greco-Turkish Agreement ensued as well as the establishment of a Mixed Commission to handle the exchange – though the First World War obstructed the agreements' implementation. The third population exchange agreement was the Convention for the Reciprocal Emigration of National Minorities, signed the same day as Bulgaria's postwar peace treaty (the 1919 Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Siene) and ratified in August 1920 – the first bilateral exchange agreement negotiated under international supervision [latter point made by Frank 2007: 19]. The Allies obligated Bulgaria as well as Turkey to make an agreement with Greece allowing the 'voluntary and reciprocal emigration' of their religious and ethnic minorities. The League of Nations also sanctioned and implemented the Convention, the initial exchange executed by the League (Dragostinova 2009: 186). As in the case of other population exchanges and transfers that were mostly voluntary in official terms, expulsion was instead the reality given a harsh postwar context.
8   Ther 2001: 50.
9   There were exceptions such as Muslims in Western Thrace and Greeks resident in Istanbul.
10   Ther 2001: 50.
11   Latter points made by Üngör 2011: 251-252.
12   Jackson Preece 1998: 103-4.
13   Akan Ellis 2003: 43.
14   de Zayas and Marrus 1988: 20.

Germany was required to return a number of disputed lands and cities lacking long-standing German majorities. Other new or redrawn states with borders further aligning states and nations faced similar though less extensive requirements.[15]

Additional sanctioning of ethnic separation came in the peace treaties recognizing new or redrawn nation-states, a time of heightened minority discrimination if not expulsion. Signed with the expectation that many among the minority nationalities would move to their 'kin' states, the treaties featured clauses stipulating that those persons not affiliated with the dominant titular nationality had the right to resettle in another state within a year or two. Though provisions for minority rights were also included in the treaties, host states often ignored them as the great powers showed little interest in their enforcement. The League of Nations then sanctioned the postwar bilateral agreements on organized resettlement.[16] With these treaty terms, the major powers – in Europe and the US – affirmed the use of forced migration well before Hitler.[17]

Yet, the Third Reich is perhaps best known for the practice. Joseph Schechtman, author of works on the mass forced migrations occurring after WWII, observed accordingly that 'there is in many quarters an inkling that the entire concept of transferring population is a spiritual child of Nazi totalitarianism.'[18] Over nine million Germans acquired minority status following the signing of the post-First World War peace treaties,[19] and soon appeared as a source of tension and potential conflict between states with nationally minded elites unwilling to integrate them. *Realpolitik* also contributed to the emergence of the 'minority problem.' Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia emerged as territorial winners, and Germany, Hungary, and Bulgaria as losers, with the Allies giving territorial preferences to the former that did not always follow demographic lines – at least to the extent

that they could be found in the multinational intermingled areas of former empires. Such preferences would help fuel the revisionism in the lead up to the next major war. German minorities and others deemed irredentism-prone had, after all, not been subject to population exchanges at that time. Nor were the exchanges in the Balkans thought appropriate for 'civilized' Europe.[20]

Hitler averred that his proposal for an enlarged German nation-state, one serving as the dominant core of a multiethnic empire, would solve the problem. While some German minorities would be brought in through territorial expansion, many others would be resettled from outside the envisaged borders of an expanded Reich. Nazi policy included 'repatriation' to bring many ethnic Germans living beyond the boundaries of an enlarged German state *Heim ins Reich*, with approximately 600 000 Germans (*Volksdeutsche*) moving into designated areas. Hitler approved a bevy of population exchange agreements in 1938-40 and justified the policy in a 6 October 1939 Reichstag speech when advocating for 'a new order of ethnographical conditions… a resettlement of nationalities in such a manner that the process ultimately results in the obtaining of better dividing lines.'[21] It would be a key element of Hitler's 'New Order' in Europe legitimated, in part, with reference to stability and peace. The intention behind the nominally 'voluntary' exchanges was to fortify Hitler's system of alliances through the extraction of a potential source of tension and to strengthen Nazi control over the newly incorporated territories with incoming settlements of *Volksdeutsche*.[22] Other German minorities would be allowed to remain if judged to strengthen relations with allies or to project a sense of German superiority.[23] With the 1938 Munich Agreement, the great powers also sanctioned new ethnic borders for Czechoslovakia, while high-level British and French politicians proposed a sort of population exchange between Czechoslovakia and Germany that

---

[15]   Exceptional was Hungary's loss of many Hungarian-populated areas under the 1920 Trianon Treaty.
[16]   Kersten 2001: 75.
[17]   Mann 1999: 33. At the same time, the interwar period witnessed what one scholar has termed the 'minorities treaties regime:' the notion that international treaties would best serve minority protection and would be guaranteed by the League of Nations (Musgrave 1997: 37, 41). Yet, great powers' disinterest in enforcement meant that host states often ignored them, while Germany, Italy, and the Allies did not face requirements of adopting such protections for purposes of international recognition (latter point made by Musgrave 1997: 41, 61).
[18]   Schechtman 1962: 389.
[19]   Ibid. 32.
[20]   Cattaruzza 2010: 11, Kersten 2001: 75. Exceptional was France's policy of épuration (purification) intended to push out Germans living in Alsace-Lorraine after the First World War (Ther 2014: 68).
[21]   Quoted in de Zayas 1988: 21. See Tesser 2013: 199 (footnote 32) for a description of the agreements.
[22]   Marrus 1985: 221.
[23]   Cordell and Wolff 2005: 108.

never materialized.[24] The First and Second Vienna Awards (1938 and 1940) ensued with further border alignment along ethnic lines contributing to minority removal *en masse*.

The Soviet Union similarly worked to create a 'new order' across Eurasia – yet one that featured enormous diversity. The Bolshevik leadership's policy was to establish 'national' territories numbering initially in the thousands across the vast expanse of the Soviet Union based on the assumption that satisfying national feelings would not only help spur class-based sentiments, but also diminish prospects for ethnic conflict.[25] The Soviet elite accepted, and likely preferred, diversity in the national territories, ultimately supporting a divide-and-conquer strategy. At the same time, Stalin demonstrated a keen interest in identity-based forced migration. Of the tens of millions deported from 1917 to the 1950s, over nine million endured compulsory removal concentrated in the years 1935-38. Targeted were the securitized identities living in the border regions to diminish the likelihood of treason. These included Estonians, Poles, Germans, Finns, Latvians, Kurds, Koreans and Chinese. Following the 1941 Nazi invasion, the practice escalated dramatically and was utilized until Stalin's death.[26]

There was also the unmixing occurring in the Polish eastern territories (*kresy*) acquired by the Soviets. In July 1944, Stalin made Poland accept the new eastern border in a secret agreement and then to endorse repatriation treaties with the Belorussian, Ukrainian, and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics (S.S.R.s).[27] Combined with many returning from the Reich, those departing the *kresy* would leave well over three million Poles moving to a newly redrawn Poland. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians, Belarusians, Lithuanians and others were also forced or encouraged to 'repatriate' to their respective S.S.R. 'homeland,' even if never having been there. Within the violence and chaos of war, nationalist extremists then took the opportunity to carry out revenge killings and expulsions. Ukrainian nationalists, for example, brutally expelled Poles to help create an independent and homogeneous Ukraine. While Soviet policy similarly appeared less directly affected by repeated international sanctioning of ethnic separation for peace, two potential exceptions include the identity-based deportations and the repatriation agreements contributing to the unmixing of the *kresy*.

Minority removal for conflict resolution in the context of the consolidation of nation-states conveyed a preference for ethnic separation, trends that even affected the Soviet Union. The next chapter shows that the continuing stress on separation made East-Central Europe largely homogeneous – at least in official terms.

3 Ethnic separation in post-WWII Europe

Western powers repeatedly sanctioned minority removal for conflict resolution, leading ethnic separation to become a default conflict resolution policy and creating incentives for the use of ethnic cleansing to claim territory.

Most well-known are the Western Allied-authorized German population transfers from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary affecting roughly six million. British politicians and government advisors in particular made the case for removing Germans from Poland and Czechoslovakia on the basis of Lausanne.[28] The British government commissioned Oxford University panels on population removal, with a request coming in January 1942 for an investigation on lessons learned from population exchanges, particularly the Greek-Turkish exchange and Nazi Germany's resettlement policy.[29] Czech and Polish wartime proposals also named the Lausanne exchange as well as Hitler's *Heim ins Reich* policy as precedents for a mass German transfer.[30] The U.S. government gradually came around to supporting the British line on population removal,[31] while the U.S.S.R. needed little convincing given automatic justification for a Soviet security umbrella over Poland and Czechoslovakia. For Hungary, Stalin

---

[24] Ther 2014: 11, 87.
[25] Martin 1998: 826.
[26] Ibid. 815, 820, 823.
[27] Snyder 1999: 101.
[28] Frank 2007, Cattaruzza 2010: 111, Naimark 2001: 110. Outside of Europe were two key cases, both involving the British Empire: the 1947 partition of India spurring the flight and expulsion of over 12 million and the exodus of more than 800 000 from Palestine in 1948-49. Ther discusses the impact of the nation-state model and previous international sanctioning of minority removal on both cases (2014: 180-202).
[29] Ther 2014: 102.
[30] Frank 2007: 45.
[31] Ther 2014: 130.

urged its inclusion in the Potsdam Agreement to enlarge the scope of land reform, among other reasons, even while Hungary's Germans had not posed territorial questions.[32]

Earlier endorsement of minority removal for conflict resolution did not merely predispose decision-makers towards its repeated use, but also signaled to Polish and Czech authorities that further extraction of Germans prior to the Potsdam conference might well secure desired territorial areas.[33] The total number of Germans moving in the post-WWII era came to roughly fifteen million, with more than ten million alone leaving Poland and Czechoslovakia. When combined with escape, evacuation, the 'wild expulsions' driven by local authorities and desires for revenge, forced migrations helped transform a diverse and highly intermingled East-Central Europe, in particular into nearly entirely ethnically homogeneous areas by 1948.[34] Several other official population transfer agreements concluded after the war were between Hungary and Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R., and Hungary and Yugoslavia.

For Poland, the major internationally sanctioned mass movements include the population transfer affecting over three million Germans going to Germany, the repatriation of about 482 000 Ukrainians to the Ukrainian S.S.R., and the move of over 1.4 million Poles to Poland from areas lost to the U.S.S.R. Further complicating this picture were the border shifts moving the country about 200 km westwards. Poland was forced to cede nearly half the *kresy* to the U.S.S.R., areas that through escape, evacuation, and expulsion would soon become far less ethnically diverse. Compensation came from acquiring the former German eastern territories – the *Ziemie Odzyskane* (Recovered Territories), lands later renamed the western and northern territories and emptied of many majority German areas and settled with Poles from the *kresy* and central Poland.[35] Large-scale forced migration reduced Poland's national minority population from a high near 34 per cent to just over two per cent.[36]

For Czechoslovakia, nearly all Germans concentrated in the Sudetenland left the country in the immediate aftermath of WWII. Over 800 000 fled in the locally driven expulsions, before nearly two million departed shortly in the Allied-approved population transfers. Approximately 70 000-80 000 Hungarians were deported as part of a population exchange agreed by the Czechoslovak and Hungarian governments, albeit independent of the German transfer. Replacing the Germans were about 1.8 million Czechs (Slovaks and others) moving into their homes and taking over their factories and businesses, with tens of thousands of Slovaks coming from Hungary. While not all were strictly compulsory, most of these population movements had the explicit or tacit acceptance of the Western Allies. The roughly 2.1 million expellees and refugees linked to the idea of separation for peace formed a significant proportion of the millions on the move. Their departure helped make the country overwhelmingly Czech and Slovak, in a way realizing earlier nationalist claims of the existence of a Czechoslovakian nation, even with a sizeable Hungarian minority remaining in southern Slovakia. Czechoslovakia also lost part of Carpathian Ruthenia to the U.S.S.R. in 1945, leaving the border change to significantly reduce the country's Ukrainian/Ruthenian population. Following Czechoslovakia's dissolution in 1993, the Czech Republic (as well as Poland) ranks among CEE's least diverse states with more than 90 per cent officially identifying as Czech.

For Slovenia and particularly Croatia, ethnic unmixing appeared in the (post-)WWII and post-Cold War periods. An enlarged Nazi-puppet Croatian state pursued a vicious campaign of homogenization in 1941-45 with Serbs, Jews, Roma and Sinti as major targets. The subsequent exodus of Yugoslavia's Germans and Italians occurred mostly between 1944-55 and owed to multiple factors. Though not resulting from any official agreement on population exchange or transfer, Yugoslav (and Romanian) authorities referenced the Allied-approved German population transfer to justify the removal of remaining Germans. While trends towards ethnic separation affected the Balkans – particularly in the 1912-13 wars and WWI, minority removal for conflict resolution and the consolidation of homogeneous nation-states marked East-Central Europe to a far greater degree in the post-WWII era. Such trends would appear again in the Balkans during the Yugoslav wars of dissolution.

---

[32]   Ibid. 146.
[33]   Tesser 2013: 60, Ther 2014: 152.
[34]   Ther 2001: 57.
[35]   Kersten 2001: 75.
[36]   A contrast of figures from 1939 and 1950 in Eberhardt 2003: 142.

4 Ethnic separation in the post-Cold War Balkans

Ethnic cleansing in the 1990s Balkan wars was influenced, though not determined, by earlier periods of ethnic separation detailed in the previous two chapters. Serbs, Croats, and Muslim Bošnjaks – extremists in particular, tend to remember the ethnic cleansing and killings that occurred during and/or after WWII, and particularly the Serbs whose coethnics experienced the highest murder rate in the Balkans in this earlier wartime period. Decades later nationalist Serb politicians in Belgrade resurrected these memories in an attempt to make Croatian Serbs fearful of the post-Cold War Croatian government – propaganda seemingly confirmed by Croatian President Franjo Tuđman's nationalist rhetoric.[37] Only when the war was well underway did the memory campaign influence Croatian Serbs living outside of rural areas.

Tuđman himself claimed that the Lausanne Treaty's 'successful transfer' of Greeks from Turkey helped Turkey develop into a nation-state,[38] with arguments also made for population transfers exchanging Croats in Serbia with Serbs in Zagreb, Rijeka and Krajina.[39] Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadžić agreed with the idea of moving Serbs in Knin to Serb-held areas in eastern Croatia.[40] Former Macedonian Prime Minister Ljubco Georgievski and some members of the Macedonian Academy of Sciences similarly contemplated the idea of population transfers.[41] Yet, consideration of transfers was hardly limited to nationalist politicians, but a widely discussed topic in the Yugoslav media prior to the country's collapse.[42] Memory of Europe's earlier peace project reappeared with force in the Balkans, while widespread amnesia of the earlier 'Western consensus on ethnic cleansing' brought a tendency in the West to interpret such talk as mere confirmation of irrational and extreme tendencies characteristic of eastern peoples.

Renewed talk of minority removal for conflict resolution also indicates that past drives to remove particular minorities – even if justified largely on the basis of stability, served as templates to be copied for nationalist extremists to increase, or at least secure, territorial holdings. The absence of a significant international reaction to the mass exodus of roughly 370 000 Turks from Bulgaria in 1989 also signaled little likelihood of a response to any future mass displacement.[43] For the international community, all wartime peace plans for Bosnia-Herzegovina endorsed separation – leading several scholars to argue that these proposals spurred further ethnic cleansing to augment anticipated territorial gains, while the Dayton Agreement rewarded Serb, and to a lesser extent Croat expansionist campaigns, by recognizing a Serb autonomous region and majority Croat cantons respectively.

Most analysts target Slobodan Milošević and his accomplices as a key causal force in the Yugoslav conflicts. Yet, the Serb leader only became a nationalist 'gradually and consciously,' through allying with Vojislav Šešelj's radical nationalist party after failing to win an absolute majority in Serbia's December 1990 parliamentary elections[44] – with Šešelj advocating for a Greater Serbia.[45] Milošević's politics emerged out of struggles among the communist ruling elite pitting reformists preferring marketization and greater openness against conservatives desiring to maintain power and to control the process of change. It was the latter, along with anti-communist nationalist parties, that supported paramilitary attacks on multiethnic areas spurring divisive nationalism.[46] The conflict only shifted from campaigns of territorial expansion to ethnic war following media coverage of the attacks and their interpretation in nationalist frames, provoking nationalist reactions from broader segments of society.[47]

---

37   Hayden 1996: 746.
38   Naimark 2001: 171.
39   Silber and Little 1997: 220, 306-7.
40   Ibid. 306.
41   Mulaj 2008: 31.
42   Bell-Fialkoff 1993: 117.
43   Linked with the government's 1984-85 assimilation campaign, large-scale protest erupting in 1989 met government expulsion of activists and intellectuals and the encouragement of Turks' departure.
44   Mungiu-Pippidi 2010: 312.
45   Yet, the Greater Serbia idea was not new but rather linked with earlier national ideologies focused on Serbian territorial expansion that contributed to historical struggles in the Balkans. See Banac 1984 for an overview of the differing concepts of Serbian national identity and interaction with their Croat, Slovene and other nationally-defined counterparts.
46   Gagnon 2010: 24.
47   This is part of Gagnon's main argument (2006).

Economic decline also helped lay the groundwork for conflict and the related independence drives of wealthier Slovenia and Croatia. Yugoslavia's mounting debt crisis led to rising unemployment, shortages of imported goods, falling real wages and a substantial decline in GDP per capita in the late 1980s. The sharp drop from the boom of the 1970s, when foreign loans supported a rise in consumption, made the situation even more painful and set the stage for disputes over how to handle these problems. With media coverage in ethnocentric frames, their debates only fed resentments among the *narodi*, with some appearing to benefit at others' expense.

Wartime ethnic cleansing drew its initial inspiration from Croat and especially Serb extremist aims for territorial expansion via demographic reengineering – and a geopolitical context signaling little likelihood of major power/international community intervention. The goal of Serbian policy in early 1990s was the creation of a 'cleansed' Greater Serbia extending into Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia; later downsized to merely retaining areas the international community allotted to Serb control. Croatian ultranationalist strongholds in Herzegovina and their allies in Zagreb likewise hoped to create an enlarged Croatia extending into Bosnia-Herzegovina through ethnic cleansing, a mission that was limited and restrained when compared with the Greater Serbia campaign. Hardly restricted to Croatian and Serbian nationalists, their Bošnjak and Kosovar Albanian counterparts expressed preferences for ethnic homogeneity within state borders as the primary route to long-term peace.[48]

Croatian Serb nationalists established their own rebel statelet in 1991 – the *Republika Srpska Krajina* (RSK, Republic of Serbian Krajina) – on area comprising 27 per cent of all of Croatia.[49] Zagreb then spent nearly four years in sporadic skirmishes with the Serbs refusing to recognize Croatian sovereignty in areas with sizeable numbers of Serbs) and under the UN flag from 1992-94 the UN Protected Areas) until a much larger Croatian Army arrived in 1995. UN Security Council Resolution 743 of 2 February 1992 established the United Nations Protection Force for the (parts of) municipalities featuring significant numbers of Serbs. Unofficial UN recognition of the self-declared *RSK* thus had UN peacekeepers essentially doing the work of Serb forces in these areas, freeing them to take territory elsewhere, and provided an international imprimatur to *de facto* changes in Croatia's borders. The Croatian government then faced the UN presence in areas posing a clear security threat and from which many Croats had fled.

Resolution of the conflict came only in the summer of 1995. Launched in early May, Operation Flash (*Bljesak*) expelled Serb forces from western Slavonia. Operation Storm (*Oluja*) was the subsequent four-day early August campaign in which the Croatian Army retook the *RSK*, but not eastern Slavonia, Baranja, and western Sirmium that remained under UN control until being reincorporated in Croatia in 1998. Most Serbs leaving Croatia around the time of Operation Storm fled prior to the advancing Croatian Army,[50] making the largest wave of forced migration in Europe after WWII a case of flight rather than outright expulsion. Yet, the burning and looting that damaged more than 20 000 Serb homes indicated that the threat was real and potentially harmful to many Serbs if more stayed behind.[51] Of Croatia's roughly 550 000 Serbs, a majority fled or departed the country during the conflict – approximately 300 000-350 000.[52] Ideas of separation for peace thus had little *direct* impact on post-Cold War Croatia – with the exception of the UN Protected Areas holding significant numbers of Serbs.

Further consolidating wartime demographic change was the postwar second wave of ethnic cleansing through authorities' efforts to block Serb returns and encourage Croat refugee settlement – even with an official right of return.[53] The government run by the *Hrvatska demokratska zajednica* (HDZ, Croatian Democratic Union) made Croat return a primary wartime and postwar aim, with those coming back among the party's core supporters.[54] A number of new laws related to private- and state-owned property put non-Croats at a

48   Banac 2006: 30-31, 34.
49   Bose 2002: 23.
50   Silber and Little 1997: 350, Tanner 2001: 298.
51   Figure from Silber and Little 1997: 352.
52   Figures from Bogosavljević 2000: 116-117.
53   Prewar Croatia was 78.1 per cent Croat, 12.2 Serb, and 2.2 Yugoslav with small numbers of other regional nationalities. Postwar Croatia remains overwhelmingly Croat and features a Serb minority at about 4.5 per cent.
54   Djuric 2010: 1642, 1646.

disadvantage,[55] allowing the use of abandoned properties to provide housing for Croat exiles and refugees.[56] These efforts were complemented by a lack of *genuine* support for return among Serb authorities desiring to maintain and enhance Serb demographic gains in Serbia.[57] Recent estimates indicate that just over half of Croatian Serbs remain living in Croatia.[58]

For Bosnia-Herzegovina, the bulk of ethnic cleansing occurred during and in the immediate aftermath of the 1992-95 war. The conflict began with Serb paramilitaries swiftly gaining control with the help of the federal armed forces under Belgrade's direction, with ethnic conflict again a result rather than cause of the war. Media framing in nationalist terms made campaigns of territorial expansion into an ethnic war after larger segments of society believed and acted in accordance with nationalist interpretations. Demographic reengineering would soon make the declared *Republika Srpskog Naroda Bosne i Hercegovine* (Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia Herzegovina) overwhelmingly Serb – later simply called the *Republika Srpska* (*RS*). Mass population movements then laid the foundation for an ensuing conflict between the previously allied Bosnian Croats and Muslims as well as additional ethnic cleansing occurring in areas under their control. Like their Serb counterparts, extreme nationalist Croats aimed to claim territory through creating overwhelming demographic majorities, making the newly declared autonomous region of *Herceg-Bosna* predominantly Croat.

Yet, Zagreb was divided on its Bosnia-Herzegovina policy. While HDZ extremists endorsed the creation of *Herceg-Bosna*, the party's more middle-of-the-road membership, the army, and oppositional parties put more weight on maintaining Croatia's borders. They tended to problematize the inconsistency between efforts to alter Bosnia-Herzegovina's borders and claims that Croatia's borders should be restored, and saw the Bosnian Muslims as allies against Serb forces rather than as adversaries.[59] The moderates later won with Washington-induced pressure to

form the Muslim-Croat Federation to push back the Serbs after they had been at war from 1992-94.[60] Once this goal was in sight and it became easier to draw relatively neat boundaries (particularly between Serbs and Bošnjaks), the U.S., with segments of the international community in tow, then showed more genuine commitment to bringing the conflict to a conclusion.[61] The resulting 1995 Dayton Agreement combined separation and integration by recognizing an autonomous Serb entity and cantons for Croats and Muslims as well as a right of return for all refugees and internally displaced persons.

Postwar developments have seen the country fracture into Serb and Croat statelets and a Bošnjak-dominated center featuring some Croat areas. Bosnia-Herzegovina similarly witnessed a second wave of ethnic cleansing through efforts to block minority returns, though here 'minority' refers to refugee/internally displaced person moves to prewar homes located in areas where their ethnicity constituted a minority after the war. The country's internal administrative boundaries also inadvertently provided a framework for further minority removal. Postwar attempts to match the three identities demographically to distinct territorial areas involved coaxing or compelling minorities into areas in which they would be the majority – often where Dayton had 'assigned' to that identity.[62] While fiercely contested in the aftermath of the conflict – particularly by Bosnian Serb and Croat nationalists, minority return has not been sufficient to significantly alter the aftermath of wartime and postwar ethnic cleansing. Only some minorities went back to live permanently after nearly all extant properties were returned to their prewar owners. Restitution was nearly complete by 2003, with approximately 200 000 families regaining possession of their prewar properties (or approximately 800 000 people).[63] Minority returns were slow from 1996-99, then more significant in 2000-03 before dropping off in 2004.[64] While UNHCR statistics indicated that 444 000 were minorities of the nearly one million that had gone back to their former residences as of June 2004,[65] their return was only partially permanent

---

[55]   Blitz 2006: 246, Djuric 2010: 1642.
[56]   Serb Refugees 2010: 2.
[57]   Harvey 2006: 96, Banac 2006: 31.
[58]   European Commission 2011: 13.
[59]   Mulaj 2008: 87.
[60]   Bose 2002: 28.
[61]   Silber and Little 1997: 351.
[62]   Pickering 2007: 34-35.
[63]   Williams 2006b: 8.
[64]   Ó Tuathail and Dahlman 2011: 286.
[65]   Williams 2006a: 49.

as many chose to sell or exchange their restituted properties.[66] The international community's ability to help facilitate conditions for minority return also came only around the turn of the millennium with shift to a rule of law approach focusing on individual rights to regain property regardless of intention to return.[67]

The post-WWII and post-Cold War Balkan cases thus differ from East-Central Europe in the lesser degree of international endorsement of minority removal. Yet, the long-term effect of minority removal for conflict resolution in the context of nation-state consolidation should not be overlooked. Repeated population exchanges, transfers and repatriation implied that forced migration may bring territorial dividends. International endorsement of ethnic separation created incentives for the use of ethnic cleansing to claim territory, while also bolstering assumptions of territorial ethnic separation as an effective conflict resolution strategy. The major powers of the European Community attempted to bring conflict to an end during the Yugoslav wars of dissolution, eventually recognizing up to eight new nation-states in the area of Yugoslavia and developing separation-oriented peace plans for Bosnia-Herzegovina that rewarded the most effective ethnic cleaning operations.[68] Separation ironically made a sizeable comeback during the EU's inaugural years. The next chapter considers renewed emphasis on European integration as a path to peace as the conflict ended.

5 The return to European integration as a stability strategy

The recent Balkan wars reinvigorated that idea of European integration as the recipe for long-term peace, even while a number of Western elites were initially reluctant to bring CEE states into a widened EU. When formally announcing eastern expansion in October 2002, European Commission President Romano Prodi remarked that if CEE countries were not allowed to join, then this part of the continent would fall prey to the kind of nationalism that broke Yugoslavia apart.[69] Former external relations commissioner Chris Patten claimed likewise that 'either

Europe exports stability to the Balkans or the Balkans export instability to the rest of Europe.'[70] A survey in *The Economist* reminded readers that 'EU enlargement is part of the same "peace project" that was initially centered on reconciliation between France and Germany.'[71]

Little remembered at the time was the legacy of Western powers' earlier emphasis on ethnic separation for stability. The prospect of EU enlargement into Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovenia and other countries intensified activism among German, Austrian, Italian and Hungarian expellees and refugees, and some corresponding governments, towards making membership conditional on providing a right of return to former properties. Many had been subject to tacit or explicit population transfers in the post-WWII era. Such activism often contributed to fears of renewed irredentism in prospective member states given enduring collective memories of wartime revanchism, and catalyzed by the idea of possible property return *en masse*. With accession negotiations came a more widely publicized right of all EU citizens – including co-ethnics of the former minorities in question – to acquire land and property without government permission, though derogations were often negotiated to delay full implementation.[72] Nor was the legacy of ethnic separation apparent in the use of ethnic cleansing for territorial aggrandization in the Yugoslav wars of dissolution, or in the international community's recognition of new nation-states and reliance on separation in the peace plans for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

European integration remains a major shift from ethnic separation. The formal requirements of joining the EU include adopting the criteria agreed on at the 1993 Copenhagen European Council as well as the *acquis communautaire* (*acquis*), the voluminous body of EU law. The general aspects of the Copenhagen criteria remain: (1) the existence of stable democratic institutions including human rights, protection of minorities and the rule of law; (2) the presence of a market economy capable of withstanding competitive pressures; and (3) the ability to take on all of the requirements that come

---

[66] Stefansson 2006: 117, Williams 2006b: 8
[67] Williams 2006b: 8.
[68] See Tesser 2013: 173 for a description of Europe's main conflict resolution mechanisms.
[69] Meller 2002: A12.
[70] Quoted in Pridham 2010: 8.
[71] A Divided Union 2004: 5. For additional background on European integration as a peace project see Tesser 2013: 5-6.
[72] The diffusion of other Single Market policies and minority rights protections did not tend to bring the same level of anxiety.

with membership, including economic, monetary, and political integration.[73]

Stabilization and Association Agreements (SAAs), the equivalent of the initial Europe Agreements establishing legal frameworks for economic and political cooperation with CEE candidate countries, have been signed with all Western Balkan states (Kosovo excepted). The SAAs are a key part of the Stabilization and Association Process formulated for the countries of the Western Balkans. Other elements include regional cooperation, assistance for democratization, civil society and economic/financial sectors, autonomous trade measures and related trade/economic relations, aid for refugees and IDPs, cooperation with domestic and international justice systems with particular attention to organized crime, and the development of political dialogue.[74] EU enlargement into an area recently witnessing war, coupled with lessons learned from the 2007 admission of Romania and Bulgaria, led to an expansion of conditionality into new areas. The specific conditions for membership appear in the dialogue prospective member states have with the EU as well as in multiple forms of EU documents: progress reports, country-specific and regional strategies, European partnership agreements, and other forms of contractual agreement.[75]

The EU's appearance as a postmodern, post-national economic and political space can be jarring for those accustomed to ethnic separation. While EU membership tends to appeal to moderates and reformists, their adversaries often adopt political rhetoric drawing from memory of irredentism, empire, or other policies of domination to cast EU-mandated reforms as threatening to sovereignty. Key is the fact that prospective member states have no power to formulate the laws and policies they must adopt to join. These countries are then compelled to adopt policies allowing the return of expelled or departed minorities (and all EU citizens of the same nationality or ethnicity), return that nationalists and populists often claim create demographic conditions conducive to revanchism. For the Balkans, robust memory of the recent wars and ethnic cleansing contributes to ongoing questions regarding where international borders should lie, particularly for Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. Border-effacing EU policies are not needed there to stimulate

concerns over sovereignty, though EU pressure for state centralization unintentionally intensified Bosnian Serb nationalists' rhetoric stressing a threat to the autonomy of the Serb entity. The next section explains why countries in southeastern Europe have nevertheless been less likely to witness a *sustained* politics of remixing surrounding EU enlargement than Poland and the Czech Republic.

6 The politics of remixing in Central Europe and the Balkans

The formidable inertia of ethnic separation, collective memory, and the anti-separation pressures of European integration form the structural conditions for a 'politics of ethnic remixing:' political contention surrounding the potential return of an expelled or departed minority under border-eroding EU enlargement or other external pressures for free movement across international borders. It features nationalist and populist politicians claiming that minority return is a threat to sovereignty, or at least control over territory, and suggestive of renewed irredentism. Since minorities living in border areas abutting their 'kin' state were more likely to face postwar pressures to leave, the possibility of their return or even property acquisition by their co-ethnics may breed renewed fears of revanchism. Such contention is the primary observable result of Europe's pursuit of two contradictory peace projects.

With the exception of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo, all countries considered in this report have received or applied for EU membership.

	Europe Agreement or SAA entry into force	Date of EU entry
Poland	1 Feb 1994	1 May 2004
Czech Republic	1 Feb 1995	1 May 2004
Slovenia	1 Feb 1999	1 May 2004
Croatia	1 Feb 2005	1 July 2013
Bosnia-Herzegovina	N/A[76]	N/A

6.1 The politics of remixing in Poland and the Czech Republic

Poland joined the EU in 2004 and experienced an acute politics of remixing during accession negotiations. Many Poles feared the potential loss of the lands acquired from Germany if EU citizens, Germans in particular, obtained

---

[73] Less formalized was the expectation of maintaining good neighborly relations (Smith 2003: 119).
[74] Phinnemore 2013: 22.
[75] Elbasani 2013: 14.
[76] The SAA was signed and ratified in June 2008, though not in force due to unresolved constitutional issues.

unrestricted rights to acquire land and property in domestic markets.[77] Irredentism again appeared possible regarding the western and northern territories – a decade after Poles faced similar anxieties regarding the feared triumvirate of German reunification, a reappearing German minority, and post-Cold War German expellee activism.

Poland remains heavily marked by ethnic separation with the transfer of many remaining Germans after WWII and tacit exchange of Ukrainians for Poles from the lost *kresy*. Beyond justifying the Soviet security umbrella, successive communist regimes' references to wartime German irredentism to portray Germans and other non-Poles as potential fifth columns helped foster enduring memory of revanchism along with a 45-year delay in official recognition of the Polish-German border.

During the time leading up to EU accession, the issue of foreign land ownership increased in importance in Polish politics. While securitized when the center-right *Akcja Wyborcza Solidarność* (AWS, Electoral Action Solidarity) was in power from 1997-2001, foreign land ownership was a political hot potato even when the moderate left-leaning the *Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej* (SLD, Democratic Left Alliance) ruled from 2001-05. Fears of foreign land ownership did not follow purely domestically driven liberalization in the immediate post-Cold War era. The passage of a 1996 law liberalizing foreign property ownership laid the foundation by outlining the circumstances in which foreigners could acquire property without having to apply for authorities' permission. The law's primary impetus stemmed not from domestic interest in land liberalization, but rather from the need to meet OECD and EU membership requirements.[78]

Once EU accession negotiations began, Poland faced pressure to remove all restrictions to EU nationals and controversy over land moved more to the center of political debate.[79] The Polish negotiating strategy was to demand derogations for EU citizens to be able to freely acquire land, most importantly an 18-year waiting period before acquiring agricultural land (and a 5-year wait for non-agricultural property) that became public when Poland began negotiations in March 1998. The argument for these transition periods had two parts. First was the much greater affordability of land in Poland, a fact leading to legitimate concerns over the speculation that could make land unaffordable for Polish citizens (with millions of wealthier Germans nearby). Second was concern over fears of a 're-Germanization' of parts of Poland if Germans acquired land to any significant degree. Adding to the credibility of the perceived threat was an upswing of German expellee mobilization coinciding with the beginning of formal negotiations between Poland and the EU. The particular timing of the Polish government's announcement of the 18-year waiting period made it seem like a quid pro quo to expellee demands that Poland (and the Czech Republic) only be allowed to join the EU after providing property restitution and compensation for suffering.

Poland witnessed a clear change in negotiating strategy favoring speed after Leszek Miller (SLD) replaced Jerzy Buzek (AWS) as Prime Minister in 2001. The 18-year transition period would be replaced by a demand for a 12-year period. Not long after, the government announced that it would allow EU citizens to buy land for leisure purposes after a 7-year transition period, and that EU farmers could buy farmland after a 3-year lease period. This shift sparked criticism that led the government to amend the latter policy to give EU citizens the right to purchase land in western and northern Poland after a 7-year lease period and after a 3-year lease period for the rest of the country. This duel zone idea became part of the final agreement, which was reached in March 2002 – with the 12-year transition period for agricultural land and forests and a 5-year hold on sales of summer homes.

To be sure, the swift escalation in Poland of a perceived 'German threat' as the Cold War came to an end is closely linked with German reunification. Concern was hardly limited to Poland given wider historical experiences with German expansionism.[80] Significant also were the lingering after-effects of successive Polish

---

[77]   There was also sensitivity over regional policy, particularly the concept of creating border-crossing Euroregions.
[78]   Sprawozdanie Ministra 1998: 25.
[79]   Other key issues in Poland's internal debate occurring in the context of EU accession negotiations included aid to farmers and the free movement of labor. These were hardly surprising not merely because of the significant number of Poles engaged in agriculture, but the EU did not want to initially extend the same level of benefits to Polish farmers as their longer-term EU counterparts, and given the insistence of a derogation or transition period before Poles could freely seek work in the EU-15.
[80]   For a discussion of the reaction in a number of European states see Markovits and Reich 1997.

socialist regimes' efforts to cultivate memory of German revanchism and the activism of German expellees. As time wore on, however, threat perceptions centered mostly on potential demographic changes through German expellee return along with the prospect of wealthier Germans buying land. A reunified Germany appeared less worrisome than the potential acquisitiveness of tens of thousands of Germans, though must be considered an important part of the overall geopolitical context.[81] Anxiety also accompanied German appeals to European courts – the European Court of Human Rights and the European Court of Justice– to regain lost properties even after Poland had become an EU member state.[82] While fears have since diminished, Polish nationalists and populists' emphasis on the activism of German expellee organizations provide ever-present wood to stoke Polish fears of a 'German threat' surrounding the western and northern territories.

The Czech Republic joined the EU in 2004 and also experienced a politics of remixing during accession negotiations, with sporadic episodes in subsequent years. Ethnic separation similarly marked the Czech Lands after WWII, especially with the official transfer of most remaining Germans concentrated in the Sudetenland. Memory of the German exodus lingered in Czechoslovakia, with German reunification and an uptick of expellee activism reinvigorating concern over the Sudetenland in the immediate post-Cold War era.

Complicating the Czech case was the need to address the infamous Beneš Decrees, a set of laws issued between1940-46 and signed by Czechoslovak President Edvard Beneš. Most controversial are those that stripped expellees of their citizenship and property.

They immediately followed the Potsdam decision on the transfers and implemented during a period when those departing were also denied their rights as well as protection. Given these circumstances – and the fact that the communists took power later in February 1948, much more responsibility lies in the hands of the Czech democrats and general population for the German expulsions than in postwar communist Poland, with the Decrees remaining a part of the Czech legal system even while the government claims that they no longer have any validity.

The European Parliament passed several resolutions demanding the annulment of the 1945-46 laws legalizing the expulsions – due to a lack of respect for elemental human rights. While the European Commission indicated that the Decrees would not stand in the way of membership, the Parliament's views were more ambivalent given that some German and Austrian members used debates to further pursue the matter.[83] German members of the EP submitted a proposal to consider the Decrees' legality, while some German commentators believed that the Commission had steered the course of negotiations to allow the Czech Republic to avoid certain legal conditions. It met with considerable protest from Czech politicians claiming the proposal as a purely political CDU-CSU move rather than an objective inquiry,[84] though the Czech side did not act in any official capacity.[85]

In February 1999 the Czech government claimed that the Decrees were 'extinct' within its foreign policy concept followed by the Czech Parliament's adoption of the same view.[86] Three years later the German *Bundestag* concluded that the Decrees posed no legal hindrance to the Czech Republic's EU entry after conducting a study,

---

[81] At the same time, anxiety appeared to diminish as Poland's 2004 EU accession faded into memory, particularly as the Polish government negotiated delays on EU nationals' ability to purchase land and property in western and northern Poland. The drop in concern appears even more evident in the western and northern territories than for residents in central and eastern Poland having less direct contact with Poland's western neighbor. This can be gleaned from regional differences in election results in Polish politics. Areas in the north and west (formerly under German rule) more strongly supported the EU and voted for the center-right Civic Platform candidates in 2005 and 2007, while non-urban residents of the former Russian- and Austrian-controlled south and east preferred the populist right-wing Law and Justice Party (Jasiewicz 2008: 20-21). Yet, these results were contradicted in an April 2008 survey on Polish-German relations asking about the greatest burden on the bilateral relationship. 42 per cent of respondents in the western and northern territories indicated the issue of the former German property compared to 38 per cent in the remainder of the country (Stosunki Polsko-Niemieckie 2008: 6-7).

[82] Additional factors unique to Poland are discussed in Tesser 2013: 76-77.

[83] Yet, the Parliament does not influence accession negotiations directly, having the role of determining candidates' preparedness to join.

[84] Wood 2004: 599.

[85] Nagengast 2003: 342.

[86] Ibid.

while the EU commissioned a report to determine their legal compatibility with EU law in 2002. It concluded that the Decrees pose no legal hindrance to entry, stipulating that EU law supersedes any elements informing national law that are discriminatory. The ensuing October 2002 publication of the EP's legal opinion on the Decrees – claiming that they did not pose an obstacle to the country's accession, meant the neutralization of the issue in Czech debates on integration.[87]

From 2001-03 the Decrees were nevertheless ubiquitous in the Czech media for at least two reasons. First was the high profile case of Franz Kinsky, an expellee and member of an aristocratic family who filed 157 lawsuits in Czech courts to reinstate his ownership over confiscated property. Second, 2002 was the high point of controversy over the Decrees as Austria, Germany, Hungary, and the Czech Republic all held national elections. While successive post-Cold War German governments did not support the German expellees in their campaign to make restitution or compensation a condition of the Czech Republic's (and Poland's) EU entry, Austrian Chancellor and People's Party chairman Wolfgang Schüssel and Austrian Freedom Party leader Jörg Haider both raised the issue of the Decrees. Austrian politics at the time witnessed increasing support for Haider and some calls for making Czech entry conditional on their cancellation – a demand that was even part of the coalition agreement of Schüssel's cabinet though never formally stated as a condition.[88] Yet, Schüssel and Haider diverged on policy specifics with Austrian politicians from Haider's Freedom Party then making their support for Czech membership in the EU conditional on the Decrees' revocation, while Schüssel continued to insist that the matter be dealt with bilaterally. Slovakia also faced related demands from Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban prior to the April 2002 parliamentary elections for the country's EU admission to be conditional on the Decrees' annulment.

Since any indication of the Sudetens returning to the borderland area tends to raise alarm on the Czech side, the Decrees remain the sacred cow of Czech politics and were intensively politicized in the pre-accession period. EU conditionality allowing the free movement of capital for property/land purchases also contributed to these concerns. While initially demanding a ten-year 'transition period' for agricultural land, Czech negotiators agreed to a seven-year delay in regard to arable land and five years

for secondary residences. The Decrees were again sharply politicized during the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009. Czech President Václav Klaus invoked them at a moment of high drama, acquiring in the end a political guarantee that the Treaty would not apply to property rights that emerged from the WWII period as well as a Czech opt-out from the EU's bill of rights (the European Charter of Fundamental Rights), proving once again the political utility of the Decrees.

The after-effects of ethnic separation followed by European integration have thus been similar for Poland and the Czech Republic: a degree of insecurity over retaining sovereignty of the former German-majority areas. The next section explains why contention over possible minority return was not as marked in the other cases, at least following the initial postwar period providing an official right of return to former properties.

6.2 The politics of remixing in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina

Slovenia and Croatia joined the EU in 2004 and 2013 respectively. Bosnia-Herzegovina's path towards accession has instead remained at a standstill since the SAA's signing and ratification in 2008. Though the problem appears to stem from Bosnian political leaders' lack of a common vision for the country, this *de facto* oligarchy would lose much power and privilege with the implementation of EU reforms. For this and other case-specific reasons, this section considers why these three countries have not experienced a *sustained* politics of remixing associated with EU enlargement.

At war until 1995, Croatia took few steps towards EU entry in the 1990s and faced only minimal EU/international community pressure to allow the roughly 200 000 Serbs fleeing the advancing Croatian Army in 1995 to return to their homes. Progress was hindered by several factors, including the preferred approach of first Croatian President Franjo Tuđman and his *Hrvatska demokratska zajednica* (HDZ, Croatian Democratic Union) for gaining membership on individual merit rather than as part of the EU's regional strategy.

Slovenia, on the other hand, raced to the head of the pack in the first round of EU eastern enlargement. Its rapid advance to the initial group of EU frontrunners soon slowed when asked to meet an additional condition

---

[87]   Hanley 2004: 536 (footnote 76).
[88]   Madajczyk 2004: 54.

before an association agreement could be approved. Italy demanded the liberalization of property markets to allow pre-1945 Italian owners who left Yugoslavia in the postwar exodus to acquire their former property. With Berlusconi's 1994 electoral victory, the *esuli* (Italian 'exiles') and their politics of memory had found a political audience.[89] Similarly debated were the killings of Italians occurring primarily in Istria in 1943-45 (the *foibe*). Italy witnessed a stream of articles, books and documentaries on the victims of the *foibe* and fate of the *esuli* – introducing the Italian public to a little known issue and providing justification for the Italian government's interest in the exiles.

The right-center government of 1994-95 requested that Slovenia (and Croatia) return properties lost by the departed Italians, refused to accept compensation previously consented to in the 1983 Treaty of Rome, and demanded that Slovenia liberalize its real estate market even before signing the country's Europe Agreement.[90] After Slovenia refused, Italy vetoed Europe Agreement negotiations, claiming that Slovenian law was not in line with EU legislation in regard to land purchases by foreigners.[91] It marked a difficult moment in the new country's effort to join key Western institutions, with a politics of remixing stemming from the activism of political elites rather than exile organizations. Slovenia later agreed to the 'Spanish Compromise' negotiated by the EU Presidency then held by Spain. EU nationals who had lived in Slovenia for a three-year minimum (regardless of time period) would be given preferential access to the domestic real estate market – and all EU nationals able to acquire title to land four years after the Treaty's entry into force.[92] The 1991 Constitution was amended in July 1997, paving the way for inclusion on the European Commission's list of proposed candidates for accession. Italy also lifted its earlier demands for compensation.

Similarly significant were the after-effects of the (post)-Second World War German expulsions – even while the majority of German expellees from the former Yugoslavia came from Serbia's Vojvodina. Austria succeeded in initially making the issue of restitution appear on the EU's accession negotiation agenda, despite Slovenian claims that such policies were not part of the *acquis*. A demand was also made for the repeal of the WWII decrees issued by the Yugoslav wartime congress.[93] At the same time, the strategy of the Austrian government, particularly President Thomas Klestil, focused only on pointing out the potential discriminatory features of a 1991 law allowing Germans to request restitution rather than to challenge the decrees. Subsequent statements from Enlargement Commissioner Günter Verheugen made further clarification in signalling that while the 1991 law at issue would not be discussed in negotiations, any indication of discrimination would be considered.[94]

Slovenian politics at the time of the Italian demands did not show signs of overt nationalism, with the exception of a heated debate in the Slovenian parliament between the 'land-sellers' and the 'land-protectors' over amending the Constitution to allow foreigners to acquire titles to real estate. It signaled that foreign land ownership was indeed a sensitive issue. Related were debates over sacrificing Slovene sovereignty to collective entities such as the EU and NATO. While foreign land ownership raised concerns in this newly independent and tiny country, successive postwar governments did not display significant indication of an Italian or German 'threat' – even with Italian and Austrian governments signaling support for restitution or compensation for the Italians exiles and Germans expellees respectively at varying times on the route to EU entry.[95] Politicians across the political spectrum in this country of only two million likely realized the potential cost of any display of divisive

---

[89]   Ballinger 1999: 79.

[90]   Brinar 1999: 247. The Berlusconi government also proposed a trilateral agreement between Italy, Croatia, and Slovenia for the regulation of minority protections (Šabić 2002: 105).

[91]   An association agreement was later initialed in June 1995 when Italy rescinded its veto the previous March after the Slovenian authorities agreed to change the constitution and related laws concerning foreigners' rights to acquire property. Yet, the agreement was not signed until 1997 given differences over its implementation. Italy demanded guarantees that the Slovenian authorities would act expeditiously on the property issue (Gow and Carmichael 2010: 222-223).

[92]   Bučar and Briner 2005: 96-97. The May 1996 election of Romano Prodi as Italian Prime Minister then helped bring the subsequent withdrawal of the Italian objection to the agreement later that month (Gow and Carmichael 2010: 223).

[93]   The wartime congress enacted a December 1944 directive on the confiscation of enemy property that later gained legal status, reflecting interest in the expulsion of 'disloyal' minorities signaled by most political party representatives toward the end of the war.

[94]   Šabić 2002: 112-113.

[95]   Yet, Slovenia did witness increased xenophobia and anti-European discourse in the second decade of transition, while the border dispute with Croatia in 2009 brought nationalist rhetoric (Boduszyński 2010: 214).

nationalism. Trends changed once entry was assured – though with resistance towards nationalities from other former Yugoslav republics.[96]

For Croatia, 2000 brought a quick turnaround with the passing of Tuđman and the electoral losses of the HDZ. Prospects for EU entry received a marked boost after the success of the *Socijaldemokratska partija Hrvatske* (SDP, Social Democratic Party of Croatia) in the 2000 elections and continued after a moderated HDZ regained power in 2003, though the EU (and international community) have been less insistent on the country concerning Serb minority returns than for Bosnia-Herzegovina. Yet, Croatia's comparatively subdued politics of remixing over the departed Italians came not with the previously nationalistic HDZ, but rather a moderate Stjepan Mesić affiliated with the *Hrvatska narodna stranka – Liberalni demokrati*) (HNS, Croatian People's Party – Liberal Democrats) as well as the SDP.

A high point of Italo-Croatian contention came with Italian President Giorgio Napolitano's February 2007 speech in honor of the exiles' memorial day on 10 February – first celebrated in 2005. The Italian leader pointed to the *foibe* and Italian exodus from Yugoslavia as indication of a campaign of Slavic expansionism employing ethnic cleansing – remarks seemingly confirmed by the Greater Serbia and Greater Croatia campaigns in the 1991-95 wars. Mesić responded with accusations of political revenge, historical revisionism as well as racism (for not making reference to Slovenes or Croatians as distinct nationalities).[97] This brief but bitter exchange between Napolitano and Mesić marked the high point of debate over these issues – at least in the all-important run up to Croatia's 2013 EU entry.

Despite experiencing a period of contentious politics, Croatia (and Slovenia) has not witnessed significant sovereignty concerns or nationalism over the areas from which the *esuli* departed. Its absence has much to do with a steep rise in interest in the Istrian regional identity spanning the city of Trieste and the peninsula occurring in recent years. Featuring Italian, Slovene and Croatian elements, the development of a regional identity has helped insulate Croatian Istria as residents consistently support the regional Istrian Democratic Assembly.[98] Nor have children of the *esuli* embraced their parents' perspective towards the past and longing for return. For the Germans, lower numbers and greater distance from Austria will help temper any concerns over a 'German return.' For the Serbs, the geographical positioning of the former Serb breakaway areas – much of which lie further from Serbia – also help diminish fears over potential Serb return. The politics of remixing over these areas has been muted after the initial postwar years.[99] Zagreb largely blocked Serb return in the crucial period immediately after the conflict and urged Serbs' replacement by displaced Croats.[100] Nor has Belgrade (and Banja Luka) genuinely promoted a right of return in order to maintain enhanced Serb demography in Serbia (and Bosnia-Herzegovina's *Republika Srpska*). Though a majority of Serbs were eventually able to reacquire their homes and properties, many in the end chose to sell them. The particular circumstances surrounding the *esuli* and departed Germans and Serb refugees have also helped mitigate Croatia's politics of remixing, particularly in light of possible increases in Italians in Istria and elsewhere given that Zagreb has recently dropped citizenship requirements for restitution and adopted laws ending discrimination towards EU nationals in the real estate market. Of far greater importance have been international community and EU pressures to hand over celebrated war heroes indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

For Bosnia-Herzegovina, the EU has not been able to bring sustained political moderation in contrast to

---

[96]   Other reasons for the muted political contention over potential German and Italian return in the Slovenian case are discussed in the forthcoming paragraph explaining a similar phenomenon in Croatia as well as in Tesser 2013: 149-150.

[97]   The revisionism charge alluded to aggressive Italian expansionism preceding the Partisan drive to acquire Italian-held territory, with the defeat of Italy as a revisionist Axis power facilitating Yugoslav territorial claims. Demographic reengineering, though central to the Greater Serbia and Greater Croatia campaigns of 1991-95, was not as important for the determination of a new Italo-Yugoslav border in light of a vanquished Italy. The formidable power of revenge and authorities' hope of eliminating the new government's potential enemies also proved partial drivers of the *foibe* and the Italian exodus.

[98]   For a look at regionalism in Istria see Ashbrook 2005, Ashbrook 2006, and Ballinger 2003.

[99]   An exception concerns Vukovar located very near Serbia. Protests in various locations in Croatia have appeared over the posting of bilingual signs mandated when an ethnic minority makes up at least a third of the population in adherence to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages – after the 2011 census indicated that Serbs constitute over one third of Vukovar's inhabitants.

[100]   Djuric 2010: 1639, 1643, 1646, Blitz 2006: 246.

Slovenia and Croatia. Nor have EU pressures been enough to significantly challenge wartime and postwar trends towards ethnic separation and invite a renewed politics of remixing, with entrenched elites unwilling to implement EU-aligned laws and policies that would erode their power and privileges.

The *de facto* EU policy, in fact, appears to be acceptance of ethnic separation along territorial lines while simultaneously laying the groundwork for an expanded Single Market. Despite an ongoing official narrative supporting a multiethnic Bosnia-Herzegovina and domestic-driven reform, a recent report notes that: "EU officials have in fact collaborated with party leaders throughout the recent period of non-reform, providing political cover for obstructionist Bosnia-Herzegovina officials and making it more difficult for Bosnia-Herzegovina citizens to even try to hold their leaders responsible for their (in)actions."[101]

Elites in Brussels and key member states have grown weary of political obstructionism cast in nationalist language, and sometimes appear unaware of local political minutia communicated by repeated urgings to simply reject nationalists in elections. It remains very difficult for citizens to impact parties given that power lies with the non-elected party leaders, party loyalty is a requirement for nearly all major appointments, and entrenched networks of patronage traverse this economically depressed country. Bosnian political elites are also the central players in the enlargement process rather than actors in civil society.[102] Despite the increase in political gridlock beginning in 2006, the EU signed a SAA in June 2008, compromising on EU principles and commitment to spurring reform in Bosnia-Herzegovina with respect to the police and constitutional changes vigorously pushed as a precondition.

EU reforms also set the stage for political battles among Bosnian elites, with conditionality affecting the balance of power among political parties.[103] Constitutional reforms requiring increased state centralization necessary for EU entry, like other required centralizing policies, run counter to the Bosnian Serb nationalist project of maintaining *Republika Srpska's* autonomy – unintentionally intensifying nationalists' political rhetoric.

RS President Milorad Dodik has repeatedly threatened secession, often responding to policies and reforms he defines as disadvantageous for *Republika Srpska* such as centralizing reforms, with Kosovo an important and recent precedent.[104] Though the International Court of Justive did not support sovereignty, the Court's opinion that Kosovo's declaration of independence does not contradict international law appears to set a precedent for separatist claims.

While Bosnia-Herzegovina has made some steps in adopting EU law and policy, the country remains far from the reality of minority rights and free movement of people, goods, capital and services – largely explaining the absence of a politics of remixing associated with EU enlargement. Bosnia-Herzegovina may also avoid the kind of challenges Poland and the Czech Republic experienced in regard to German expellees' lost property – and Slovenia with the Italian and Austrian governments – due to the receding political importance of refugee and property return. While the Sarajevo-Zagreb-Belgrade triangle has only begun to consider wartime issues, postwar refugee return is now of second order significance. Providing an official right to property return has also taken the wind out of the sails of refugee/internally displaced persons mobilization – with over 99 per cent of existing properties returned in Bosnia-Herzegovina according to official figures. This explains why the matter of refugee return has been declining in political significance in recent years – leaving the primary issue how to handle destroyed property and those waiting to return. Bosnian Serb and Croat nationalist politicians also remain keenly interested in keeping refugees of the same respective ethnicities in areas they control – making them unwilling supporters of any *genuine* right of return campaign.

Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina have thus avoided a sustained politics of ethnic remixing associated with EU enlargement for varied reasons – from the influence of Istrian regional identity to minimal implementation of EU anti-separation policies for Bosnia. At the same time, the Yugoslav successor states will face the uncomfortable fact that reintegration will bear some similarity to socialist times with open borders and pressure to de-emphasize nationality. A further enlarged EU would inadvertently create conditions for

---

[101] Basseuner et al. 2014.
[102] Juncos 2012: 63.
[103] Juncos 2012: 62-63.
[104] 108 of 193 UN member states recognize Kosovo's independence.

further rejuvenation of the 'Greater Serbia' project, comparable to the Hungarian right's use of expansion to promote Hungarian 'reunification,' even while recent political developments show Serbia shifting in a pro-EU direction.[105] A shifting balance of power in southeastern Europe also has the potential to negatively affect relations with Bulgaria, Greece and Albania – as power shifts in Serbia's favor tend to do. 'Soft' irredentism is thus another unintended effect of European integration as a border-effacing peace project, linked with the emplacement of the Schengen border control system.[106]

7 Conclusions

Ethnic separation in CEE illuminates the profound influence of the nation-state principle and repeated international sanctioning of minority removal for conflict resolution. European powers' shaping of the new order led to the replacement of highly diverse and intermingled empires with far more homogenous nation-states.

Observers may presume certain irrational and anachronistic tendencies explain why EU accession in CEE brings more dark history to political dialogue than previous enlargements. This report counters such assumptions by claiming: (1) repeated international endorsement of separation created incentives for ethnic cleansing and further use of separation for conflict resolution, and (2) the EU's anti-separation policies – pressures to open land and property markets to EU nationals in particular – present an unprecedented opportunity to allow the return of expelled and departed minorities and their co-ethnics. 'Soft' irredentism only appears with the shifting Schengen border system, when Hungarian politicians aimed to stem potential outmigration of Hungarians in the near abroad and outside of Schengenland into Hungary.

The politics of remixing remains the primary observable result of Europe's pursuit of two contradictory peace projects. Prospects for renewed periods of irredentism appear when former minorities/coethnics linked with once irredentist powers have the ability to acquire property in previously contested areas, often located in border regions. While other factors such as collective memory contribute to the politics of remixing, EU or international pressures for minority return are needed to create perceptions of possible future episodes of irredentism when states would not otherwise allow return. These are the primary external forces applying pressure for minority return, often overlapping with the activist return campaigns of particular governments and/or refugee/expellee organizations.

Variation in EU impact often owed to the impact of intervening variables, such as the 45 year delay in official international recognition of the Polish-German border intensifying perceptions of uncertainty regarding its location, while Czech anxieties over the Sudetenland tend to be less intense. For Croatia and Slovenia, the numerous variables explaining more subdued politics of remixing associated with EU expansion run from the development of an Istrian identity and less EU/international community pressure for Serb refugee return (for Croatia) to the geographic positioning of former German- and Serb-majority areas leading many refugees/expellees to come from areas relatively far from the borders of Austria and Serbia respectively. For Bosnia-Herzegovina, minimal EU policy implementation means less public awareness of the anti-separation aspects of EU policy and therefore lesser likelihood of their politicization. Despite the intervening factors affecting EU influence, the long-term impact of Europe's sequential and contradictory peace projects nevertheless remains an increase in the structural potential for renewed politics of remixing suggestive of irredentism.

Yet, a brief look at potential future remixing conveys some optimism regarding the possibility of contention. A *substantial* degree of ethnic remixing remains unlikely in an enlarging Union. Considering the largest expulsions/transfers, economic differentials and a now a long period of residence in Germany diminish the chances that significant numbers of German expellees or their descendents would want to move back to their or their ancestors' homes. Economic inequality would likewise make many Poles departing from the areas of the former U.S.S.R. unlikely to want to return permanently. Parallel trends toward ethnic separation in the Balkans suggest a similar outcome, though mitigated by the much more recentness of wartime displacement, and less need of learning a new language.

EU anti-separation policy will likely have less impact in the Western Balkans given muted pressure on Croatia for Serb return, little effective pressure to unify a fractured

---

[105]   Less probable would be *genuine* 'Greater Croatia,' 'Greater Albania' and 'Greater Macedonia' projects.
[106]   The Hungarian case indicated that the prospect of a hard border impeding the movement of many Hungarians in the near abroad exacerbated soft irredentism to keep many from immigrating to Hungary. See Waterbury 2008 for an in-depth discussion of this case.

Bosnia-Herzegovina, and significant international recognition of Kosovo's independence in a context of strong Serb-Albanian grievances (even with the EU-brokered April 2013 agreement between Belgrade and Pristina defining the conditions for the devolution of Serb-majority northern Kosovo). The accession of much more homogeneous Slovenia and Croatia, and even a relatively more homogeneous postwar Serbia's recent advances in the pre-accession process, add credence to *de facto* EU acceptance of separation. The inclusion of Cyprus set a precedent in allowing the divided island to join the Union, even though the initial intention had been to provide an additional impetus for a peace settlement. More recently have been compromises on EU conditionality for Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia – and a divided Macedonia invited to begin membership negotiations, talks that continue to be blocked by Greece over the name dispute.[107] The lesser likelihood of expellee and refugee return and EU compromise on anti-separation policies signal diminished prospects for contention over potential minority return.

Another reason to predict the limited impact of EU anti-separation policies is that prospects for enlargement in the near term are not good. The EU Commission's new President Jean-Claude Juncker claims that new member states will not be added in the next five years, while also downsizing the EU Directorate-General for Enlargement to focus more on the EU's neighborhood policy targeting southern and eastern areas. Such policies also weaken the Union's potential impact in the Balkans, while providing room for enhanced Russian influence.

This report has offered a non-linear perspective on the unintended and unwanted consequences of the two major European peace projects, illuminating the long-term effects of the earlier emphasis on separation for stability. Since the EU currently faces formidable challenges that weaken its power, significant improvements in and emphasis on the

enlargement process in the near term are highly unlikely. Yet, larger trends in European history signal the eventual return of conflict to complete the construction of homogeneous nation-states. Sooner or later some political elites will consider greater benefits to stem from conflict than peace and catalyze divisive nationalism through (para)military operations or other means and interpretation of the ensuing violence through nationalist frames. Then larger segments of the societies concerned will get involved in what appears to be an ethnic war, finally transforming the conflict into an ethnic war. Regarding the conflict in Ukraine, the good news for Poland, the Czech Republic and other states in East-Central Europe with minuscule numbers of Russians and land areas of less historic significance for Moscow means less chance of being directly affected by Russian expansionism. The weak states of the Western Balkans may not fare as well.

While this report sheds light on how EU enlargement may enhance perceptions of insecurity, it must not be read as a call for the end of expansion, but simply a need for greater awareness of the influence of earlier Western policy in contemporary threat construction surrounding potential minority/co-ethnic return. Deeper and long-term EU involvement in the Western Balkans could mitigate prospects for a further violent alignment of states and national/ethnic demography if most states in the region are able to join, assuming sustained and active EU engagement and improved economic development that could limit significant Balkan outmigration. Under present circumstances such involvement will only likely appear with the reappearance of conflict in the Balkans.

In the meantime, a shifting Schengen border system will have to be carefully thought through to avoid the Hungarian outcome of enhanced soft irredentism in order to keep Belgrade from divisive rhetoric and policy aimed at vigorous ministering to Serbs in neighboring countries to keep them in place.[108]

---

[107] See Tesser 2013: 32 for a brief overview of EU compromises in the Balkans.
[108] The Serbian parliament passed a law in January 2011 envisioning a more invasive role for Serbia concerning Serbs in neighboring countries.

Bibliography

Akan Ellis, Burcu. 2003. *Shadow Genealogies: Memory and Identity Among Urban Muslims in Macedonia*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs

Ashbrook, John E. 2005. "'Buying the Istrian Goat:' Regionalism and the Economy in Croatian Istria." *East European Quarterly* 39(3): 329-361.

Ashbrook, John E. 2006. "Locking Horns in the Istrian Political Arena: Politicized Identity, the Istrian Democratic Assembly, and the Croatian Democratic Alliance," *East European Politics and Societies* 20(4): 622-658

Ballinger, Pamela. 1999. "The Politics of the Past: Redefining Insecurity along the 'World's Most Open Border,'" in Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, Raymond Duvall (eds), *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, 63-90. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ballinger, Pamela. 2003. *History in Exile: Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Banac, Ivo. 1984. *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1984).

Banac, Ivo. 2006. "The Politics of National Homogeneity," in Brad K. Blitz (ed), *War and Change in the Balkans: Nationalism, Conflict and Cooperation*, 30-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Basseuner, Kurt, Toby Vogel, Valery Perry and Bodo Weber. 2014. "Retreat for Progress in BiH? – The German-British Initative." Sarajevo, Berlin, Brussels: Democratization Policy Council.

Bell-Fialkoff, Andrew. 1996. *Ethnic Cleansing*. New York: St. Martins Press

Blitz, Brad K. 2006. "New Beginnings? Refugee Returns and Post-Conflict Integration in the Former Yugoslavia," Brad K. Blitz (ed), *War and Change in the Balkans: Nationalism, Conflict and Cooperation*, 239-266. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Boduszyński, Mieczysław. 2010. *Regime Change in the Yugoslav Successor States: Divergent Paths Toward a New Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bogosavljević, Srdjan. 2000. "South Eastern Europe and Demographic Ethnocentrism," in Jelica Minić (ed), *South Eastern Europe 2000: A View From Serbia*, 105-121. Belgrade: Stubovi Kulture

Bose, Sumatra. 2002. *Bosnia After Dayton: Nationalist Partition and International Intervention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brinar, Irena. 1999. "Slovenia: from Yugoslavia to the European Union," in Karen Henderson (ed), *Back to Europe: Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union*, 241-258. London: University College London Press.

Bučar, Bojko and Irena Briner. 2005. "Slovenia – Political Transformation and European Integration," in Anselm Skuhra (ed), *The Eastern Enlargement of the European Union: Efforts and Obstacles on the Way to Membership*, 93-133. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag.

Cattaruzza, Marina. 2010. "'Last stop expulsion' – The minority question and forced migration in East-Central Europe: 1918-49", *Nations and Nationalism* 16(1): 108-126

Cordell, Karl and Stefan Wolff. 2005. *Germany's Foreign Policy Towards Poland and the Czech Republic*. London and New York: Routledge

de Zayas, Alfred M. and Michael R. Marrus. 1988. "A Historical Survey of Twentieth Century Expulsions, in Anna C. Bramwell (ed), *Refugees in the Age of Total War*, 15-37. London: Unwin Hyman

"A Divided Union: A Survey of the European Union." 2004. *The Economist* (25 September): 3-16

Djuric, Ivana. 2010. "The Post-War Repatriation of Serb Minority Internally Displaced Persons and Refugees in Croatia – Between Discrimination and Political Settlement," *Europe-Asia Studies* 62(10): 1639-1660

Dragostinova, Theodora. 2009. "Navigating Nationality in the Emigration of Minorities between Bulgaria and Greece, 1919-1941." *East European Politics and Societies* 23(2): 185-212

Eberhardt, Piotr. 2003. *Ethnic Groups and Population Changes in Twentieth Century Central-Eastern Europe*. Trans. Jan Owsinski. London: M.E. Sharpe

Elbasani, Arolda. 2013. "Europeanization Travels to the Western Balkans: Enlargement Strategy, Domestic Obstacles and Diverging Reforms," in Arolda Elbasani (ed), *European Integration and the Transformation of the Western Balkans: Europeanization or Business as Usual*. New York and London: Routledge, 3-21

European Commission, ed. 2011. *Croatia 2011 Progress Report*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Frank, Matthew. 2007. *Expelling the Germans: British Opinion and Post-1945 Population Transfer in Context*. New York: Oxford University Press

Gagnon, Jr. V.P. 2006. *The Myth of Ethnic War: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Gagnon, Jr. V.P. 2010. "Yugoslavia in 1989 and after." *Nationalities Papers* 38(1): 23-39

Gow, James and Cathie Carmichael. 2010. *Slovenia and the Slovenes: A Small State and the New Europe*. London: Hurst & Company.

Hanley, Seán. 2004. "From Neo-Liberalism to National Interests: Ideology, Strategy, and Party Development in the Euroscepticism of the Czech Right." *East European Politics and Societies* 18(3): 513-548.

Harvey, Joanna. 2006. "Return Dynamics in Bosnia and Croatia: A Comparative Analysis." *International Migration* 44(3): 89-114

Hayden, Robert M. 1996. "Schindler's Fate: Genocide, Ethnic Cleansing, and Population Transfers." *Slavic Review*, 55(4): 727-748

Jackson Preece, Jennifer. 1998. *National Minorities and the European Nation-States System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jasiewicz, Krzysztof. 2008a. "The New Populism in Poland: The Usual Suspects? *Problems of Post-Communism* 55(1): 7-25.

Juncos, Ana E. 2012. "Member state-building versus peacebuilding: the contradictions of EU state-building in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *East European Politics* 28(1): 58-75

Kersten, Krystyna. 2001. "Forced Migration and the Transformation of Polish Society in the Postwar Period," in Philipp Ther and Ana Siljak (eds), *Redrawing Nations: Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944-1948*, 75-86. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield

Madajczyk, Piotr. 2004. "The Centre against Expulsions vs. Polish-German Relations." *Polish Foreign Affairs Digest* 2(11): 43-78.

Mann, Michael. 1999. "The Dark Side of Democracy: The Modern Tradition of Ethnic and Political Cleansing." *New Left Review* I/235: 18-45

Markovits, Andrei S. and Simon Reich. 1997. *The German Predicament: Memory and Power in the New Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Marrus, Michael R. 1985. *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press

Martin, Terry. 1998. "The Origins of Soviet Ethnic Cleansing." *The Journal of Modern History* 70(4): 813-861

Meller, Paul. 2002. "European Union Prepares to Add 10 Nations in 2004." *New York Times* (10 October): A12

Mulaj, Klejda. 2008. *Politics of Ethnic Cleansing: Nation-State Building and Provision of In/security in Twentieth-Century Balkans*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books

Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina. 2010. "Europeanization of South-East Europe: The Final Act?," in Alina Mungiu-Pippidi and Wim Van Meurs (eds), *Ottomans into Europeans: State and Institutional Building in South-East Europe*, 305-319. New York: Columbia University Press

Musgrave, Thomas D. 1997. *Self-Determination and National Minorities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Nagengast, Emil. 2003. "The Benes Decrees and EU Enlargement." *European Integration* 25(4): 335-350

Naimark, Norman. 2001. *Fires of Hatred: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

Ó Tuathail, Gearóid and Carl Dahlman. 2011. *Bosnia Remade: Ethnic Cleansing and Its Reversal*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press

Phinnemore, David. 2013. "The Stabilization and Association Process: A Framework for European Integration Enlargment?," in Arolda Elbasani (ed), *European Integration and the Transformation of the Western Balkans: Europeanization or Business as Usual*. New York and London: Routledge, 22-35

Pickering, Paula. 2007. *Peacebuilding in the Balkans: The View from the Ground Floor*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press

Rodogno, Davide. 2012. *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Schechtman, Joseph B. 1962. *Postwar Population Transfers in Europe 1945-1955*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

"Serb Refugees: Forgotten by Croatia?" 2010. Vukovar: Center for Peace, Legal Advice and Psychosocial Assistance; Belgrade: Group 484; Brussels: European Council on Refugees and Exiles

Silber, Laura and Alan Little. 1997. *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation*. New York: Penguin Books

Smith, Karen. 2003. "The Evolution and Application of EU Membership Conditionality," in Marise Cremona (ed.), *The Enlargement of the European Union*, 105-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Snyder, Timothy. 1999. "'To Resolve the Ukrainian Problem Once and For All:' The Ethnic Cleansing of Ukrainians in Poland." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1(2): 86-120

"Sprawozdanie Ministra Spraw Wewnętrznych i Administracji z Realizacji Ustawy o Nabywaniu Nieruchomości Przez Cudzoziemców w 1997 Roku" [The Minister of the Interior and Administration's Report on the Realization of the Law on the Acquisition of Real Estate by Foreigners in 1997]. 1998. Warsaw: Ministry of the Interior and Administration.

Stefansson, Anders H. 2006. "Homes in the Making: Property Restitution, Refugee Return, and Senses of Belonging in a Post-war Bosnian Town." *International Migration* 44(3): 115-139

'Stosunki Polsko-Niemieckie w Opinii Publicznej' [Polish-German Relations in Public Opinion]. (2008) Survey #72 (n=1,101) (Warsaw: CBOS).

Šabić, Zlatko. 2002. "Slovenia and the European Union: A Different Kind of Two-Level Game," in Ronald H. Linden (ed), *Norms and Nannies: The Impact of International Organizations on the Central and East European States*, 91-128. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tanner, Marcus. 2001. *Croatia: A Nation Forged in War*. 2nd ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Tesser, Lynn M. *Ethnic Cleansing and the European Union: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Security, Memory and Ethnography*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013

Ther, Philipp. 2001. "A Century of Forced Migration: The Origins and Consequences of 'Ethnic Cleansing,'" in Philipp Ther and Ana Siljak (eds), *Redrawing Nations: Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944-1948*, 43-74. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield

Ther, Philipp. 2014. *The Dark Side of Nation-States: Ethnic Cleansing in Modern Europe*. Trans. Charlotte Kreutzmüller. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books

Üngör, Uğur Ümit. *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011

Waterbury, Myra A. "Uncertain Norms, Unintended Consequences: The Effects of European Union Integration on Kin-State Politics in Eastern Europe," *Ethnopolitics* 7(2-3): 217-238

Williams, Rhodri C. 2006a. "The Significance of Property Restitution to Sustainable Return in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *International Migration* 44(3): 39-61

Williams, Rhodri C. 2006b. "Post-Conflict Property Restitution in Bosnia: Balancing Reparations and Durable Solutions in the Aftermath of Displacement." Paper presented at the conference on "Internal Displacement in Turkey and Abroad," TESEV International Symposium, Istanbul, Turkey, 5 December

Wood, Steve. 2004. "A Common European Space? National Identity, Foreign Land Ownership and EU Enlargement: The Polish and Czech Cases." *Geopolitics* 9(3): 588-607.

European Policy Analysis available in English

2015

2015:6epa
Europe´s pivotal peace projects: Ethnic separation and European integration
Author: Lynn M. Tesser

2015:5epa
Groundhog Day in Greece
Author: Thorsten Beck

2015:4epa
The Greek elections of 2015 and Greece´s future in the eurozone
Author: Dionyssis G. Dimitrakopoulos

2015:3epa
The diplomatic role of the European Parliament´s parliamentary groups
Author: Daniel Fiott

2015:2epa
Social Policy and Labour Law during Austerity in the European Union
Author: Niklas Bruun

2015:1epa
International Trade Union Solidarity and the Impact of the Crisis
Authors: Rebecca Gumbrell-McCormick and Richard Hyman

2014

2014:9epa
Making Sense of Subsidiarity and the Early Warning Mechanism – A Constitutional Dialogue?
Author: Jörgen Hettne

2014:7epa
A Comparative Framing of Fundamental Rights Challenges to Social Crisis Measures in the Eurozone
Author: Claire Kilpatrick and Bruno De Witte

2014:4epa
Why vote at an election with no apparent purpose? Voter turnout at elections to the European Parliament
Author: Mark N. Franklin

2014:3epa
The EU Budget and Balance of Powers Between the European Parliament and the EU Governments
Author: Sara Hagemann

2014:2epa
Between a rock and a hard place: the future of EU treaty revisions
Author: Carlos Closa

2014:1epa
Scrutiny in Challenging Times – National Parliaments in the Eurozone Crisis
Authors: Katrin Auel and Oliver Höing