

HOW DIFFERENT IS THE "NEW EUROPE"? PERSPECTIVES ON STATES AND MINORITIES

André Liebich

Professor of International History and Politics,
Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva
andre.liebich@graduateinstitute.ch

Abstract

The new members of the European Union have embraced many characteristics of the Union's older members. In respect to what might be described as conceptions of the nation, one senses persistent differences. These come out most apparently in attitudes and policies towards both traditional and immigrant minorities. The new EU members have displayed extreme reluctance to countenance state-wide multilingualism, federalist arrangements, or, indeed, any form of territorial autonomy for historic minorities, in contrast to recent accommodation patterns in the old EU. The article argues that this reluctance may be attributed to state fragility, historically founded on the relatively brief and, in most cases, interrupted statehood of the new EU members.

The article further suggests that isolation in the Communist period and the absence of an overseas imperial legacy have left the new EU members without the experience of a non-European minority immigrant population. As a result, these countries' sense of national identity has not yet been challenged by the need to position themselves vis-à-vis non-Europeans. In the face of such inevitable future challenges, these countries may be expected to resist multicultural claims and to re-affirm their commitment to national homogeneity thus demarcating themselves further from older EU members.

This article proposes to inquire into some key historical differences between the "old" and the "new" members of the European Union — that is, those who joined the EU in May 2004 and in January 2007 – with particular reference to the status of and attitudes towards minorities, primarily historical national minorities but also new immigrant minorities, in the "New" Europe.

The new members of the European Union have embraced many of the values of the Union's older members. They generally share a commitment to regular elections, constitutional arrangements, market mechanisms, personal mobility, consumer culture. Whatever malfunctions arise in these areas, it may be retorted that these malfunctions are not always or entirely alien to the older members of the Union and that discrepancies between the older and newer members are only ones of degree. In other respects, however, notably in what might be described as conceptions of the nation, one senses persistent and substantial differences between what the unregretted

Donald Rumsfeld referred to as the "Old" and the "New" Europe.¹ These differences come out most apparently in attitudes and policies towards both traditional and immigrant minorities.

With regard to traditional minorities, the new EU members have displayed extreme reluctance to countenance state-wide multilingualism, federalist arrangements, or indeed any form of territorial autonomy for historic minorities, in contrast to recent accommodation patterns in the old EU. This article suggests that this reluctance may be attributed to perceptions of state fragility, historically founded on the relatively brief and, in most cases, interrupted statehood of the new EU members.

With respect to immigrant minorities, one of the most striking differences between the societies of the "Old" and "New" Europe lies in their relative experience of a non-European immigrant population. Isolation in the Communist period and, more enduringly, the absence of an overseas imperial legacy mean that these countries' sense of national identity has not been challenged by the need to position themselves vis-à-vis former colonial peoples or alien cultures.

This article will attempt to develop the claims made above and to present some evidence on their behalf. It will do so by comparing a number of significant variables relating to state construction, state organisation, state policies with respect to language, state experience of expansion, and state permeability with respect to overseas migration. The article concludes that differences between the "two Europes" are deeply anchored in differing historical experiences and that these differences find their expression both in existing institutions and in contemporary values relevant to minority-majority relations,

The Literature

There is a significant literature suggesting that the historical experience of the new EU members, even before the division of Europe after 1945, ran along separate lines from those of most European states further west. Scholars have made this point in various ways. The English Marxist, Perry Anderson, argues that a fundamental division within the continent lies in varying experiences of serfdom. At the time when serfdom was disappearing in Western Europe it was being recreated, in a process known to historians as a "second serfdom", in Central and Eastern Europe. The absolutist state that emerged in early modern times compensated for the disappearance of serfdom in the West; further to the East, it consolidated serfdom.² Sociologists and political scientists of a historical bent, such as Andrew Janos, have identified the peculiarity of a region, largely corresponding to that of the new post-

¹ Steven R. Weisman, "U.S. Set to Demand that Allies Agree Iraq is Defying U.N.," *New York Times* 23 January 2003.

² Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: Verso, 1979).

communist members of the EU, in its vain long-term attempt to modernize and catch up with the West.³ E. Garrison Walters specifically posits "Otherness" as the fundamental trait of this region in his fine historical survey and Larry Wolff has read this "otherness" back into the intellectual history of Europe.⁴ In partial contrast to such radical demarcation (but in stark contrast to clichés about "one Europe"), a number of other scholars have located the specificity of the area that Donald Rumsfeld has been pleased to call the "New" Europe in its intermediate or 'in-between' quality. "Eastern European conditions, but with defective Western-like structures", is how the Hungarian historian, Jenő Szücs, describes the second of his "three Europes".⁵ Though the "new" Europe may be one of three (or more) Europes, historians do seem inclined to revert to binary oppositions. With regard to varieties and experience of nationalism, for example, the multiple historical and geographical zones drawn up by Ernest Gellner and originally proposed by E. H. Carr are overshadowed by the thesis of two nationalisms: "civic" and "ethnic", or "Western" and "non-Western".⁶ This is Hans Kohn's classical thesis, formalized later by John Plamenatz. Much criticized by recent students of nationalism, it has proved tenacious when applied to Central and Eastern Europe.⁷

Late States

The first variable we shall consider in comparing the "Old" and the "New" Europe is that of state formation or the emergence and persistence in state form of the various members of the present European Union. Notwithstanding myths of state antiquity still prevalent in the "New" Europe and the indignant reaction which a comparison such as the one provided in figure 1 arouses, it is clear that modern statehood came late to the New Europe and this statehood has proven a fragile institution.

³ Andrew C. Janos, *East Central Europe in the Modern World: The Politics of the Borderlands from Pre- to Postcommunism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000). See also the seminal collection of essays in Daniel Chirot (ed.), *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

⁴ See, for example, E. Garrison Walters, *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988). On the historical construction of otherness, see Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization in the Mind of the Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995).

⁵ Jenő Szücs, "Three Historical Regions of Europe. An Outline", in John Keene (ed.), *Civil Society and the State* (London: Verso, 1988). See also Szücs, *Les Trois Europes*, preface by Fernand Braudel; translated from Hungarian by Véronique Charaire, Gábor Klaniczay and Philippe Thureau-Dangin (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1985). A similar argument is made by Krzysztof Pomian, *L'Europe et ses Nations* (Paris: Gallimard, 1990), and in his article "Les Particularités historiques de l'Europe centrale et orientale", *Le Débat* 63 (January–February 1991). It is not only Central Europeans who make this argument as can be seen in Alan Palmer, *The Lands Between: A History of East-Central Europe since the Congress of Vienna* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson), 1970.

⁶ Ernest Gellner, *Encounters with Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), chapter 2.

⁷ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1944); John Plamenatz, "Two Types of Nationalism", in Eugene Kamenka (ed.), *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).

Figure 1. Continuous Statehood

“Old” EU Members	“New” EU Members
<i>France (fifth century)</i> <i>Denmark (ninth century)</i> <i>Sweden (tenth century)</i> <i>Portugal (twelfth century)</i>	
<i>Spain (1492)</i> <i>Netherlands (1581)</i> <i>United Kingdom (1707)</i> <i>Greece (1830)</i> <i>Belgium (1831)</i> <i>Italy (1861)</i> <i>Luxembourg (1867)</i> <i>Germany (1871)</i>	<i>Romania (1878)</i>
<i>Finland (1918)</i> <i>Austria (1919)</i> <i>Ireland (1922)</i>	<i>Bulgaria (1908)</i> <i>Poland (1918)</i> <i>Hungary (1918)</i>
	<i>Cyprus (1960)</i> <i>Malta (1964)</i>
	<i>Lithuania (1991)</i> <i>Latvia (1991)</i> <i>Estonia (1991)</i> <i>Slovenia (1991)</i>
	<i>Czech Republic (1992)</i> <i>Slovakia (1992)</i>

At the outset of World War I, less than a century ago, only two of the new members of the EU existed as a state. One of these two states, Bulgaria, had become sovereign only six years before World War I. The other state, Romania, had been a state for a generation but it was to acquire a completely new configuration after more than doubling in size between 1914 and 1920. To be sure, at least three present-day countries had enjoyed independent statehood in the early modern period: Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic (the latter once known as the Kingdom of Bohemia).⁸ Lithuanians and Bulgarians might argue too that they were once not only

⁸ The case of Hungary may be considered less clear-cut than that of Poland and Bohemia inasmuch as Hungary was treated, at least on a formal level, as a separate crown land by its imperial Habsburg

independent states but also extremely extensive ones. These states, which reached their apogee in the fourteenth century, belong, to the pre-modern period and have only a scant geographical relation to their present-day counterparts.⁹ This is even more the case for the legendary ninth-century Great Moravian Empire, which, by a considerable leap of the imagination, might be seen as the ancestor of present-day Slovakia.

In short, ninety years ago, three of the ten ex-communist new members of the EU had not experienced independent statehood in centuries and five of these had never known statehood or — in the debatable case of Lithuania and even more debatable case of Slovakia — had never known statehood in modern times. Five of the ten new members were to acquire statehood after World War I, but three (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) lost it for a period extending over half a century. The Baltic states' attempt to show continuity by reviving constitutions and citizenship laws from their previous existence has not proven convincing. Three others first became states after the fall of Communism. The very least that can be said is that statehood is a recent experience for these new EU members.

In contrast, at the beginning of World War I, twelve of the fifteen "old" members of the EU enjoyed well-established statehood. In some cases, the antiquity of these old members as states reaches so far back that it is difficult to set a founding date. When would one date the founding of the French state, for example? Even when one can set a specific moment — for example, the Act of 1707 joining England and Scotland and thus creating the United Kingdom — such presumptive accuracy is misleading; obviously, there was an English state well before the Act of Union. Even Italy and Germany, relative newcomers among the old EU states, could refer back to traditions of past statehood. They were formed around older core states, Piedmont and Prussia, and they had known at least two generations of modern statehood before most of the new EU members were established.¹⁰

sovereigns. Moreover, from 1867 to 1918 Hungary enjoyed considerable autonomy within the framework of Austria-Hungary. No one considered this to be full independence. See, for example, Ignac Romsics, *Hungary in the Twentieth Century* (Budapest: Corvina, 1999). One might argue too that Poland has only enjoyed continuous statehood since 1945 as the country was wiped off the map, as it had been in 1795, in 1939 notwithstanding the legal continuity provided by the wartime Polish government in exile until it was replaced by the Communist régime in 1945.

⁹ Or even linguistic relation in the case of Lithuania: The language of chancellery was a Slavonic ancestor of contemporary Belorussian.

¹⁰ Among the old EU members, Finland and Ireland are the most notable exceptions. They are, in many ways, like the new EU states but, for geographical reasons (in the case of Ireland) and for historical reasons (in the case of Finland), they have found themselves on the other side of the divide. Austria, difficult to define even in Habsburg times, is a particularly interesting case but one which I cannot pursue further here. On German traditions of statehood before 1871 see, for example, Joachim Whaley, "Thinking About Germany, 1750–1815: The Birth of a Nation", *New Series 66 Transactions of the English Goethe Society*, (1997), 53–71. On Italian traditions of statehood, restored by way of the communes as of the eleventh century, see Luigi Salvatorelli, *Sommario della Storia d'Italia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1938).

Does it matter that the new members of the Union have come into existence as states within living memory and that statehood has proven a sometimes transient acquisition? As we are already discovering, the recent and fragile character of their statehood has far-reaching implications for these countries' attitudes towards sovereignty and integration. A commentator has remarked pithily – and tellingly – that "the new EU states came into the Union to strengthen their nation state not to give it up."¹¹ Poland, whose national anthem begins, "Poland has not yet [sic] perished while we are alive", is only one of the countries experiencing doubts and a bout of nostalgia for its pre-EU past.¹² If Poland, by far the largest of the new EU member states with its population of nearly forty million, reminds itself that it may "perish", as, in fact, it did throughout the long nineteenth century. It is not surprising that smaller countries would suffer even more acute existential anxiety. This is what the highly-considered Hungarian intellectual, István Bibó, has called the "distress of the small states of Eastern Europe"—that is, anguish at the prospect of the disappearance of one's own people and country.¹³ Bibó was thinking of his native Hungary, long troubled by its linguistic and historic isolation in the area. His diagnosis is even more telling for those small new EU members — such as the three Baltic countries and Slovenia, whose combined populations are smaller than that of Greece or Portugal.¹⁴ One can hardly blame the new EU members for showing vigilance in regard to propositions, such as a European Constitution, that might be seen as limiting a recently acquired, often lost and always brittle independence. Brussels and the Union as a whole will simply have to cope with this reality.

While bearing such considerations in mind, from the point of view of our concern here, the salient consequence of late statehood is the assumption that the (recent) state is the instrument and the expression of the (pre-existing) majority nation. Whereas modern nationalism arose within already established states in most of the old countries of the EU, in the area of the new EU members, nationalism preceded statehood and led to state creation.¹⁵ The contrast lies between an historical

¹¹ Canadian philosopher John Ralston Saul, on "The World Today," BBC International Service, 10 June 2005.

¹² Nostalgia both for its Communist and its anti/pre Communist past. Viz. Karolina Slovenko, "Post-communism Nostalgia in Poland. Nostalgia for Polish People's Republic," *Change and Resistance* 2006/12 downloaded from <http://changeandresistance.blogspot.com> on January 10th 2008, and "A Swamp of Paranoid Nostalgia," *The Economist*, 5 July 2007.

¹³ István Bibó, "The Distress of the East European Small States (1946)", in Karoly Nagy (ed.), *Democracy, Revolution, Self-Determination* (Boulder: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1991), 13–69.

¹⁴ The considerations of size and demography underscoring Bibó's characterization of "small states" do constitute a factor. Most of the new EU states are small but, as we have seen, even the biggest, Poland, is anxious. As Wojciech Sadurski has put it wittily in commenting on an earlier version of this article, the Poles never liked the Marxist theory of the 'withering away of the state' because they were afraid their state would be the first to wither away. Readers of Tadeusz Konwicki's cult novel, *Mala Apokalipsa* will recall the haunting image of the Polish red-and-white flag becoming increasingly red as the hero wanders around late-communist Warsaw.

¹⁵ Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1977), establishes this distinction as one between the "Old

experience where states created nations, as against one where nations created states. Moreover, this contrast imposes itself upon the chronological differences already discussed. The old EU states have had generations, even centuries, to carry out their "nationalizing" task, in Brubaker's sense of this adjective.¹⁶ The new states must undertake this task in conditions of urgency and weakness. If one accepts Ernest Gellner's definition of the modern doctrine of nationalism as the belief that political and national units should coincide, the old EU states consider this a description of their own past, whereas the new EU members see this definition as an injunction for the present and the future.¹⁷

Of course, the old EU states are not nearly as homogenous as their dominant national narratives would suggest: several have recently come to recognize this fact by pursuing policies of multiculturalism and setting up regional and federalist institutions (see below).¹⁸ The difference with the new EU states, however, is that the latter are the direct beneficiaries of the modern doctrine of national self-determination. These states have been created, in a burst of Wilsonian or post-Wilsonian idealism, for the express purpose of endowing a given nation, defined essentially in linguistic terms, with its own state.¹⁹ No wonder all of the inhabitants of the new EU member states see the state as the property of the titular, majority nation. The majority nation considers the state its own, and the minorities consider it as belonging to "others", identifying with it only in a negative sense or not at all.

Separate Languages

The recent and oft endangered statehood of the new EU countries affects not only attitudes but linguistic patterns. Language is a second key variable distinguishing the "New" and the "Old" Europe. Among the old EU countries, four are multilingual at the state level. Four others are multilingual at the provincial or regional level. Of the new EU members, only Malta and the anomalous case of Cyprus, neither of which

Continuous Nations" and the "New Nations". See also Andre Liebich, "Nations, States, Minorities: Why is Eastern Europe Different?" *Dissent* (Summer 1995), 313–317.

¹⁶ Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁷ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 1.

¹⁸ 'Old' Europe institutions, however, such as the pre-1989 European Community and the pre-1989 Council of Europe, saw no need to include minority questions in their purview and they tended, initially, to consider these a problem only for the East. See Andre Liebich, "Ethnic Minorities and Long-term Implications of EU Enlargement", in Jan Zielonka (ed.), *Europe Unbound: Enlarging and Reshaping the Boundaries of the European Union* (London: Routledge, 2002), 117–136; and "Janus at Strasbourg" *Helsinki Monitor* 10:1 (1999): 9–19.

¹⁹ Even the expressly multinational states, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, sought to define a single state nationality. Inter-war Czechoslovakia recognized not 'Czechs' and 'Slovaks' but only 'Czechoslovaks', in part also to conceal the numerical strength of its German population. The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes soon (1928) abandoned that cumbersome name in favour of 'Yugoslavia'. Under Communist rule, 'Yugoslav' was promoted as a nationality (or nation, in the accepted usage).

belongs to the ex-communist group that interests us here, qualify as bilingual states, although Cyprus might be properly considered an instance of parallel monolingualism

Figure 2. Plurilingualism.

	State-wide trilingualism or bilingualism	Regional or provincial bilingualism
'Old' EU Members	<i>Belgium</i> <i>Luxemburg</i> <i>Ireland</i> <i>Finland</i>	<i>Spain</i> <i>Italy</i> <i>United Kingdom</i> <i>The Netherlands</i>
'New' EU Members	-- -- -- <i>Malta</i> <i>(Cyprus)</i>	-- -- --

In the new EU countries, the rule is the national language is the exclusive possession of that state. Although it may be spoken by minorities outside that state – such is the case most prominently for Hungarian but it is true, to a lesser degree, for other languages – only the eponymous state recognizes it as an official state language . "To each state one language, to each language one state," is the reigning principle.²⁰ Contrast this "isomorphism" of state and language with the case in the Old Europe where the national language in eleven of the twelve states (the exception being Finnish) is also an official language of at least one other country.

Reluctant autonomies

The specificities of state formation have introduced a significant third variable distinguishing the "Old" and the "New" Europe, that of internal autonomy structures. Three of the old EU members are federal states and six, possibly seven, are unitary states with broad regional autonomies.²¹ In contrast, all of the new EU members are

Figure 3: sharing languages

²⁰ Tomasz Kamusella has made the point that every Slavic country must have its own Slavic language; for example, instead of Serbo-Croatian, we now have Serb, Croatian, Bosnian, soon Montenegrin. This assertion is true for a larger area as we see here. Kamusella, "The Triple Division of the Slavic Languages: A Linguistic Finding, A Product of Politics or an Accident" IWM Working Paper no. 1/2005 (Vienna 2005) and "Poland: The Reluctant Shift from a Closed Ethnolinguistically Homogeneous National Community to a Multicultural Open Society," in Elena Marushiakova (ed.) *Dynamics of National Identity and Transnational Identities in the Process of European Integration* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008 *forthcoming*), pp. 1-25.

²¹ The seventh state is, surprisingly, France, where an emerging special status for Corsica defies centuries-old French traditions of centralization. With regard to the remaining states I have classified as unitary without autonomy, Stefan Troebst has pointed in discussion, correctly but whimsically, that the all-male monastic community of Mount Athos in Greece enjoys a special autonomous status.

Language	Official state language in EU	Official language elsewhere	<i>Language</i>	<i>Official state language in EU</i>	<i>Official language elsewhere</i>
English	United Kingdom Ireland Malta	overseas	<i>Bulgarian</i>	<i>Bulgaria</i>	
French	France Belgium Luxemburg	overseas	<i>Czech</i>	<i>Czech Rep</i>	
German	Germany Belgium Austria Luxemburg	Switzerland	<i>Estonian</i>	<i>Estonia</i>	
Italian	Italy	Switzerland	<i>Hungarian</i>	<i>Hungary</i>	
Portuguese	Portugal	overseas	<i>Latvian</i>	<i>Latvia</i>	
Spanish	Spain	overseas	<i>Lithuania</i>	<i>Lithuanian</i>	
Dutch	Netherlands Belgium	overseas	<i>Maltese</i>	<i>Malta</i>	
Danish	Denmark	Norway	<i>Polish</i>	<i>Poland</i>	
Swedish	Sweden Finland		<i>Romanian</i>	<i>Romania</i>	
Greek	Greece Cyprus		<i>Slovakia</i>	<i>Slovak</i>	
Finnish	Finland		<i>Slovenian</i>	<i>Slovenia</i>	

unitary states; none concede any regional autonomy at all.²² Even a Hungarian attempt in the mid 1990s to find grounds for favouring territorial autonomy (outside Hungary) in a Council of Europe recommendation was decisively rejected by the other parties concerned.²³ The notion of "indivisibility of territory", invoked with reference to post-Soviet conflicts, applies to the new EU members, though, mercifully, without the accompanying violence.²⁴

Figure 4. Type of State: unitary, quasi-federal, federal.

	Federal	Unitary States with Regional Autonomies	Unitary State
'Old' EU Members	<i>Austria</i> <i>Belgium</i> <i>Germany</i>	<i>Italy</i> <i>Spain</i> <i>Finland</i> <i>Portugal</i> <i>United Kingdom</i> <i>Denmark</i> <i>(France)</i>	<i>Luxembourg</i> <i>Ireland</i> <i>Sweden</i> <i>Greece</i> <i>Netherlands</i> ²⁵
'New' EU Members			<i>Poland</i> <i>Czech Republic</i> <i>Slovakia</i> <i>Hungary</i> <i>Lithuania</i> <i>Latvia</i> <i>Estonia</i> <i>Slovenia</i> <i>Cyprus</i> <i>Malta</i>

²² Only Hungary has introduced a system of cultural non-territorial autonomy, which works poorly but is intended to serve as an example to its neighbours. A pertinent critique included in the Framework Convention on National Minorities "Shadow Report" submitted by the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, "Report on the Situation of Minorities in Hungary" September 1999, at the European Centre for Minority Issues website (www.ecmi.de). Note that Hungary's Office of National and Ethnic Minorities was closed in January 2007, its mandate being transferred to the office of the prime minister.

²³ This was Recommendation 1201 of the Council of Europe relating to an additional protocol on minorities in the European Convention of Human Rights. Article 11 of the Recommendation could be interpreted as calling for territorially-based minority institutions. This matter delayed signature of the Hungarian-Slovak treaty required as a pre-condition for EU integration. The solution was found in affixing differing interpretations of Recommendation 1201 to the treaty's instruments of ratification. See Andre Liebich, "Les minorités en Hongrie et les Hongrois en Slovaquie", in *Nationalismes en Europe centrale et orientale: conflits ou nouvelles cohabitations?* sous la direction de Maximos Aligisakis et alia (Geneva: Institut européen de l'université de Genève, 1997), 118–130.

²⁴ Monica Duffy Toft, *The Geography of Ethnic Violence: Identity, Interests and the Indivisibility of Territory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

²⁵ The Netherlands consists of the Kingdom and two other units but, as these are overseas territories, I shall count these among post-imperial possessions.

			<i>Bulgaria</i> <i>Romania</i>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------

The contrast established here between the old EU members and the new EU states in terms of openness to — versus suspicion of — regional or federalist arrangements is, in some ways, paradoxical. On the one hand, it is France, a key old EU member, that prides itself on being a “one and indivisible” republic, with the same formula applied in the constitutions of two other old members, Spain and Italy. Nevertheless, this has not prevented the latter two countries from introducing wide regional autonomy and from seeing even France move in that direction.²⁶ On the other hand, the area of the new EU members has been, historically, a region of disparate provinces, loosely ruled from an imperial centre, as well as a region of intense, widespread multilingualism. Some of the most imaginative solutions for the co-existence of different peoples, such as Austro-Marxist schemes of cultural or non-territorial autonomy, have come from this area.²⁷

The paradox has a rational and historical explanation. In this part of Europe, autonomy (rather than independence) and multilingualism are identified with past periods of dependence and a lack of sovereignty. Precisely because these features were so prevalent in the era preceding the national state, they are shunned today as irrelevant or threatening. Even more immediately, this area has witnessed the ignominious fiasco of socialist federalism. All three socialist federations (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union) have collapsed, tearing apart the countries in question. Even the much praised and smooth ‘velvet’ separation of Slovakia from the Czech Republic aggravated minority problems and coarsened political life in both countries. It is pointless to argue that these socialist experiences were inauthentic examples of federalism. For the majority or titular nations of the area, the message is clear. Federalism or regional autonomy, whatever its form, is a stepping stone towards the disintegration of the state.²⁸ This is also the reason why the fairly numerous and often effective ethnic minority parties – Hungarian parties in Slovakia and Romania and the Turkish Rights and Freedom Movement in Bulgaria, being the most important – have never succeeded in winning territorial autonomy for

²⁶ See footnote 20 above. French policy seems to be to concede more in practice, through internal regulation, than France is willing to concede in international instruments, such as the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities, which it has not signed and the European Charter on Regional and Minority Languages, which it has not ratified. The policy of most of the new EU members seems to go in the other direction: concede in international instruments but withhold internally.

²⁷ See Tom Bottomore and Patrick Goode (eds.), *Austro-Marxism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

²⁸ There are only two examples of territorially autonomous units established in the post-Soviet world after the fall of communism, Gagauzia in Moldavia and Crimea in Ukraine. The latter amounts to the restoration of an earlier autonomy. On these cases, as well as on minorities in post-communist Europe in general, see Andre Liebich, *Les Minorités nationales en Europe centrale et orientale* (Geneva: Georg, 1997).

their constituencies, even when they were playing the role of coalition kingmaker on the national level.²⁹

Ironically, for those who see the area as one of nationalist instability, thoroughgoing separatism is certainly less prevalent in the new EU states than it is in some of the old EU countries, such as Spain or Belgium. Separatist violence is unknown in the new EU members, unlike the case in Spain or Ireland. Nonetheless, the anxiety of the new EU states with regards to separatism, irredentism and future state disintegration remains undiminished in spite of evidence that it is unfounded. The underlying attitude of these states comes out in two recent cases where regional autonomy movements, the Silesians in Poland and the Moravians in the Czech Republic, have sought to organize. They have been condemned and repressed by Warsaw and Prague in a reflex movement that might well be described as atavistic.³⁰ Even attempts by Hungarians in Romania to seize the propitious circumstances generated by Romanian uncertainty about fulfilling EU accession conditions to pressure Bucharest into granting territorial autonomy proved fruitless.³¹

Admittedly, the new EU members have a better record with respect to signing and ratifying the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on National Minorities (FCNM). Three old EU members have not ratified it, (Belgium, Greece, Luxemburg), one waited ten years to ratify (Netherlands) and one (France) has neither signed nor ratified. The discrepancy, however, is more apparent than real.³² In the period leading up to EU membership, the candidate states were under intense pressure to adopt the FCNM. There are indications that they did so reluctantly and that, in many cases, they continue to pay only lip service to the provisions in this document. Certainly, this is the impression one gathers if one reads not only the official reports submitted to the

²⁹ Even the scholarly literature on the subject tends to underestimate the peculiar paradox of power combined with impotence that characterizes the ethnic minority parties. See Judith Green Kelley, *Ethnic Politics in Europe: The Power of Norms and Incentives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

³⁰ The European Court of Human Rights in Strasburg supported Warsaw's position against recognizing the Silesian movement. See "Poles Apart", 3 September 2003, at www.masterpage.com.pl, and "Gorzelik and Others vs Poland Referred to Grand Chamber", MINELRES, at lists.delfi.lv/pipermail/minelres. On the Moravian case, see "Czech Commissioner Criticized Over 'Moravian Ruling'", *RFE/RL Newslines*, 13 December 2000. The Czech Commissioner for Human Rights Peter Uhl, who recommended against including Moravian representatives on the Slovak Council of Nationalities inasmuch as the Moravians were not recognized as a nationality, was (at one time) a leading human rights activist.

³¹ On Hungarian attempts to make concessions towards regional autonomy a condition for Romania's entry into the EU, see "Szekler Regional Autonomy Plan Submitted to Romanian Parliament", *RFE/RL Newslines*, 27 February 2004, and "Hungarian Opposition Official Says Budapest Must Back Autonomy in Romania", *RFE/RL Newslines*, 13 April 2004.

³² With respect to the other major European treaty related to the issue of linguistic minorities, the European Convention on Minority and Regional Languages, the situation is approximately similar with three "Old" EU countries (Belgium, Greece, Ireland) and four "New" EU countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) neither signing nor ratifying and two "Old" and two "New" countries not ratifying (France, Italy, Malta, Poland).

Council of Europe by FCNM signatory states but also the NGO parallel or shadow reports.³³

Recent scholarly literature has inquired into the depth and durability of the new EU members' commitment to minority rights.³⁴ All authors attribute importance to the 'conditionality' factor in determining the behaviour of EU candidate states towards minorities during the period when these states were called upon to show their conformity to membership criteria. They agree, too, that degrees of conformity have varied: with high marks attributed to Hungary and Poland, and low marks to Latvia and Slovakia, for instance. There is disagreement over whether the process of monitoring human rights within the EU and other types of pressures will continue to keep the spotlight on minority issues. It is tacitly recognized, however, that there is no obligation and that there will therefore be no effective pressure to introduce such particular forms of minority rights as territorial autonomy or federalization.

It may also be pointed out that in most new EU member states minorities are numerically less significant than they have ever been. The historical minorities that, in many ways, defined the face of East Central Europe—the Jews and the Germans—have been reduced to a shadow of what they once were. The exception to this affirmation are the Roma. At present, approximately one million strong in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary combined, but about as many in Bulgaria and possibly as many as two million in Romania, The Roma are the most truly transnational and numerically substantial minority in the new EU countries.³⁵ One must also note the very peculiar circumstances of the three Baltic Republics, where

³³ In addition to the official reports submitted to the Council of Europe by signatory states, ECMI has published a series of NGO parallel or shadow reports that provide another, usually more critical, perspective. Such reports are available at

www.ecmi.de/doc/Parallel_Reports_Database/ for the Czech Republic (some specific failings), Hungary (good legislation but some poor implementation), Latvia (failure to apply the FCNM in good faith), Poland (generally good marks), Slovakia (improving but some way to go), as well as for Greece (poor marks). The new EU countries are encouraged in such lip-service by the failure of several old EU countries to practice what they preach in terms of minority protection and by the general absence of EU norms that would apply to actual rather than prospective EU members. On such double standards see Bruno de Witte, "Politics Versus Law in the EU's Approach to Ethnic Minorities", in *Europe Unbound*, 137–160.

³⁴ Kyra Topidi, "The Limits of EU Conditionality: Minority Rights in Slovakia", *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 1 (2003): 1–38; Peter Vermeersh, "Minority Policy in Central Europe: Exploring the Impact of the EU's Enlargement Strategy", *Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 3:2 (2004): 3–19; Gwendolyn Sasse, "EU Conditionality and Minority Rights in Central and Eastern Europe", Paper presented at the Conference 'Nations, Minorities and European Integration', European University Institute, 7–8 May 2004; Lynne M. Tesser, "The Geopolitics of Tolerance: Minority Rights under EU Expansion in East-Central Europe", *East European Politics and Societies* 17:3(2003): 483–532.

³⁵ On the Roma in the new EU states and *vis-à-vis* the EU, see Will Guy (ed.), *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001). The figures cited here may be conservative. For varying statistics, see Andre Liebich, "Counting and Classifying Minorities" in *Socialisme, cultures, histoire: itinéraires et représentations, mélanges offerts à Miklos Molnar*, textes réunis par Jasna Adler et Lubor Jilek (Bern: Peter Lang, 1999), 190–207.

Russian speakers number close to two million.³⁶ The implications of these specificities for policies of autonomy or federalism are ambiguous. In the old EU states, federal status has been granted both to very small minorities such as the Germans in Belgium, who pose no threat to the integrity of the state, and to substantial minorities, such as the Catalans or Basques in Spain, who are too numerous and visible to be denied territorial status. Among new EU members, the reaction of the states has been guarded: whereas larger minorities are considered too dangerous to justify departing from the model of the unitary state, small minorities are too insignificant to do so.

Distant empires

A fourth variable relevant to understanding the differences between the "New" and the "Old" Europe with respect to minorities is their relative experience of the non-European world. It is this factor that creates a line of continuity between the attitudes discussed above toward historic national minorities and attitudes towards more recent immigrant minorities.

The area of the new EU states consists of countries that have known imperial regimes only too well. It should be noted, however, that these countries have never participated in the processes of overseas expansion and colonial empire that have marked Europe so profoundly.³⁷ As we have seen above, these states did not exist as states in the heyday of European colonial expansion. Moreover, this area as a whole was bypassed by the globalization of early modernity because of geographical factors that included inaccessibility to the Atlantic coast and/or for historical reasons, notably intra-regional wars and absorption into land based empires, such as Muscovy or the Ottoman empires.³⁸ In contrast, ten of the fifteen old members of the EU have acquired, at one time or another, an overseas empire. Indeed, four of these countries still possess some remnants of such an empire. As we have seen, five "old" EU languages are still spoken outside Europe (see figure 3); this cannot be said of any of the "new" EU languages.³⁹

³⁶ Inasmuch as many of these Russian-speakers are not citizens, they are not counted in formal legal terms as constituting part of a minority. For a recent study, see Yves Plasseraud, *Les Etats Baltiques: Les sociétés gigognes, la dialectique minorité-majorités* (Crozon: Editions Armeline, 2003).

³⁷ Max Weber claimed that: "The historical development of modern 'freedom' presupposed a unique and unrepeatable constellation of factors, of which the following are the most important: first, overseas expansion..." cited in David Beetham, *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 46. I am not prepared, however, to argue Weber's case.

³⁸ Malta constitutes something of an exception, though it too, remained anchored in a Mediterranean rather than an Atlantic system, with an anachronistic political regime until the end of the eighteenth century.

³⁹ Remaining overseas possessions for the United Kingdom are Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Monserrat, the Pitcairn Islands, Saint Helena, the Turks and Caicos Islands. For France, French Guiana, French Polynesia, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, New Caledonia, Réunion, Saint Pierre and Miquelon, Wallis and Futuna. For Denmark, the Faroe Islands and Greenland; for the Netherlands, the Dutch Antilles and Aruba. Languages spoken outside Europe are, of course, Dutch, English, French, Portuguese and Spanish.

Figure 5. Overseas Empires.

‘Old’ EU Members	France United Kingdom Denmark Belgium Portugal Italy Spain Germany Netherlands Sweden
‘New’ EU Members	---

The absence of a tradition of overseas expansion means that the non-European world is historically unfamiliar to the peoples of the new EU member states. This reality has been re-enforced by the legacy of four decades of communist rule. Communist state policies in that period did not favour immigration (or emigration, for that matter). Cultural isolation was the rule. The Communist camp did experience rapid economic growth for several decades. It did not, however, enjoy the same boom period of prosperity — roughly the twenty-five years before the first oil crisis in 1973 — that made Western Europe so attractive to outsiders. Above all, it did not react to growth by opening itself up to overseas immigration as did many of the old EU member states. In those countries that had possessed overseas empires, the former colonies were prime sources of immigration.⁴⁰ This was the case for formal reasons, connected with individual former colonial subjects’ legal status and preferential state-to-state arrangements, or for informal reasons, such as acquired language knowledge and earlier familiarity with the metropolis.

Strangers in our midst

A striking and visible consequence of such developments, as any casual visitor will notice, is the markedly lower proportion of foreigners and, in particular, of non-Europeans in the new EU states. The following statistics take account of all resident foreigners in each EU country, including those from a neighbouring country or another EU state. They thus incorporate such recent categories as the much-feared "Polish plumber" in France as well as Ukrainian labourers in Poland. It may be properly assumed, however, that a high proportion of these foreign residents are non-Europeans. The proportion of non-European foreigners among all foreigners in the

⁴⁰ The German case is anomalous. Though Germany did once possess an overseas empire, the mass of its considerable foreign population does not come from that area.

"New" Europe is certainly less than that in the "Old" Europe but, even if (for the sake of argument) the proportions were similar these non-Europeans would hardly be visible on the demographic landscape of the "New" Europe because of the dramatically smaller overall proportion of foreigners there.⁴¹

Figure 6: Foreigners

"Old" EU Members			"New" EU Members		
Residents with Foreign Citizenship (2006)			Residents with Foreign Citizenship (2006)		
	%			%	
Germany	8.8	7 289 149	Poland	app 1.8	app 700 000
Spain	8.9	4 002 509	Latvia ⁴²	19.5	456 758
France	5.8	3 510 000	Czech Republic	2.5	258 60
United Kingdom	5.6	3 425 000	Estonia	17.1	242 000
Italy	4.5	2 670 514	Hungary	1.5	156 160
Belgium	8.7	900 500	Cyprus	12.8	98 000
Greece	8.3	884 000	Slovenia	0.3	48 968
Netherlands	4.2	691 337	Lithuania	0.1	32 862
Sweden	5.3	479 899	Bulgaria	1.3	26 000
Ireland	7.4	314 100	Romania	0.6	25 993
Portugal	2.8	276 000	Slovakia	0.5	25 563
Denmark	5.0	270 051	Malta	2.7	11 000
Luxembourg	40.4	181 800			
Austria	9.7		826 013		
Finland	2.3		121 739		

Source: epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu (consulted June 6 2008)

In fact, the contrast between the old and new EU may be even more important than citizenship-based statistics allow because of the relatively easier processes of naturalization in key old EU countries, such as France (though, until recently, not in

⁴¹ Earlier statistics compiled by Eurostat before enlargement counted "non EU citizens residing in the EU states" and, for the countries which have joined the EU recently, they counted "population born abroad, excluding those born in a neighbouring country." The discrepancy between the "Old" and "New" Europe was as striking as that shown on the most recent table presented here. Another particularly relevant question, but one which cannot be answered here, for lack of reliable data, is the comparative size of the illegal migrant population.

⁴² The extremely high number of "foreigners" in Latvia and Estonia is due to the number of ex-Soviet citizens, globally referred to as "Russians" but, in fact, Russian-speakers of various ethnic groups, who have not been naturalized.

Germany).⁴³ Many fairly recent migrants are already incorporated, statistically, in the native population.

In the new EU states, not only is citizenship, generally, more difficult to acquire but the very idea that these may be countries of non-European immigration (or even immigration as such) is something of a novelty. In the Communist period, Africans or Asians living in the new EU countries were, typically, students or diplomats. If they married local spouses, this usually led to the emigration of the couple rather than the permanent settlement of the foreign spouse. There was also a small number of Vietnamese migrants and an even smaller number of Chinese, byproducts of socialist solidarity and the needs of the labour market, who came to what was then Eastern Europe and have remained there.⁴⁴

To be sure, since the fall of communism, there has been an influx of workers into the area from neighbouring countries, such as Ukraine. There has also been a movement of people from further afar who see the new EU countries as a transit point towards the West. But as the figures here show, the number of these immigrants is insignificant. Such recent and limited experience of foreigners has certainly not prepared people in these countries for daily life where they find themselves living and working side-by-side with a significant number of people from distant lands and cultures. Resistance to immigration, from whatever source, is considerably higher in the new EU countries than in the old ones.⁴⁵ This is the case even though research shows that exclusionist attitudes rise with the number of migrants in a country and one would therefore expect resistance to be higher in the old EU countries than in the new ones.⁴⁶

This strangeness of the non-European world to the new EU, as opposed to its presence in the mental map of much of the old EU, is more than a matter of comparative

⁴³ See Rainer Bauböck, Bernhard Perchinig, & Wiebke Sievers (eds.) *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe* (Amsterdam: IMISCOE Research and Amsterdam University Press, 2007).

⁴⁴ "Disappearing in the Crowd: Vietnamese Immigrants in Poland" Cafébabel, 14 September 2006 [original title: niewidzialne trzydziści tysięcy: Wietnamczycy w Warszawie] <<http://www.cafebabel.com/en/article.asp?T=T&Id=8039> (consulted 25 March 2008). Kimberly Ashton, "Vietnamese Seek Czech 'Eden,'" *Prague Post*, 17 October 2007; Allan M. Williams, "Vietnameses Community in Slovakia," *Sociologia* 37:3 (2005), 249-274. Colin O'Connor, "Is the Czech Republic's Vietnamese Community Finally Starting to Feel at Home?" <<http://www.radio.cz/en/article/91826>> 29 May 2007 (consulted 25 March 2008); "Evolution in Europe; Vietnamese in Bulgaria: Bitter Times" *New York Times*, 25 March 2008.

⁴⁵ The old EU ten (excluding Luxemburg) show a score of 63.2% in resistance to immigrants, with a spread running from 25.7% for Ireland to 79.5% for the former West Germany. Comparable figures for the nine new EU states (including the former East Germany) are 77% with a range from Slovenia's 68.6% to Bulgaria's 86.1%. Five of the new members score very close to or higher than the former West Germany. Mérove Gijsberts, Louk Hagendoorn and Peer Scheepers (eds.), *Nationalism and Exclusion of Migrants: Cross-National Comparisons* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

⁴⁶ Marcel Coenders, Marcel Lubbers, Peer Scheepers, *Majorities' Attitudes Towards Minorities in (Former) Candidate Countries of the European Union: Results from the Eurobarometer in Candidate Countries 2003*, Report 3 for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Ref. No. 2003/04/01.

statistics. Somewhat flippantly, one might say that the difference is visible in the dazzling varieties of cuisine to be found in the old EU states. There are surely more Indonesian restaurants in Amsterdam, Indian restaurants in London or North African restaurants in Paris than there are in all the new EU states put together. More seriously, however, one may say that, in the area of the new EU, the presence of non-Europeans does not constitute part of the landscape of daily life as it does in the old EU countries. Well over eight out of ten poll respondents (85%) in the old EU say that they do not find the presence of people of another nationality, race or religion disturbing.⁴⁷

This is not to say that in the old EU post-colonial minorities live harmoniously with their former colonizers.⁴⁸ Quite the contrary, as we have seen in the case of France's North African population and elsewhere. It does mean, however, that Muslims, for example, are part of the social equation in the old EU unlike in the new EU area.⁴⁹ It also means that attitudes towards the non-European world differ between the old and the new EU states. The intelligentsias of the new EU countries do not bear the burden of a bad conscience *vis-à-vis* the Third World, as do their old EU counterparts. Indeed, among the legacies of the Soviet period is a mindset that once considered assumption of responsibility for the miseries of the Third World to be a ploy of Soviet foreign policy and that categorized Third World citizens whom one saw in the new EU countries as privileged individuals. A pervasive sense of historical victimhood through the Central and East European area appears to generate resentment of, rather than empathy with, claimants to victimhood throughout the post-colonial world.⁵⁰

Ironically perhaps, the new EU members are therefore more Eurocentric than the old EU. They can also be described as more Western-oriented and more provincial.

⁴⁷ *Eurobarometer*, Report 53, October 2000, 88, at europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo.

⁴⁸ About 45% of poll respondents feel there are too many foreigners in their country but, judging from the figures given above (8 of 10 respondents do not find the presence of other people disturbing) the overwhelming majority accepts this fact as part of the order of things. *Eurobarometer*, Report 48, March 1998, at europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo. Even a poll showing widespread racism in the old EU concludes that such racist sentiments coexisted with "a strong belief in the democratic system and respect for fundamental social rights and freedoms. A majority felt society should be inclusive and offer equal rights to all citizens, including those from immigrant and minority groups." Barry James, "EU Survey Finds Wide Racism", *International Herald Tribune*, 20 December 1997, at www.iht.com/IHT/BJ/97.

⁴⁹ In Denmark, 70% of the foreign-born population is Muslim; in the Netherlands, there are 500,000 Muslims corresponding to 5% of the population. "Xenophobia in the European Union", Written Statement by the Society for Threatened Peoples, 59th Session of the Commission of Human Rights, 17 March–25 April 2003, at www.gfbv.de/gfbv_e/uno/geneva03. In Germany some 40% of the close to 6,000,000 resident foreigners are Muslim. An interesting conference held recently on Muslims in Europe does not look beyond the then-existing borders of the EU. Richard Barltrop, "Muslims in Europe, Post 9/11: Understanding and Responding to the Islamic World", Conference Report, St. Antony's College and Princeton University, 25–26 April 2003.

⁵⁰ The category of victimhood in the new EU states is a subject until itself. See most recently, Slavenka Drakulic, "Die Welt als Milchkuh," *Der Standard* [Supplement], November 2007. One finds no trace of the guilt-ridden Western tiersmondistes denounced by Pascal Bruckner, *La Tyrannie de la pénitence. essai sur le masochisme occidental* (Paris: Grasset 2006).

Inevitably, such a world view directly affects attitudes towards local minorities as well. Most people today no longer have any recollection of a time when Jews and Germans constituted important communities in the area. Attitudes to these largely vanished minorities cover a range of sentiments: indifference, ignorance and curiosity are probably the most common. With regard to existing minorities, however, sentiments are often crudely and strongly expressed. One is readily shocked by the linguistic and political insensitivity of people in the former communist countries, especially in relation to those from whom there is a significant cultural distance. Throughout the area, Roma are routinely referred to as “blacks”, a term which spells out otherness and, in the language codes of the speakers, inferiority.⁵¹ Britain's Race Relations Chief has expressed shock at the negative attitudes of East European immigrants in Britain to Blacks and Asians.⁵² Even as the most prosperous new members, the Slovenians, were entering the EU they were demonstrating their callousness towards a minority population by voting overwhelmingly (94%) to deny rights to former Yugoslav citizens, many of them Muslim, resident in Slovenia for at least a decade.⁵³

“Meat-and-dumplings xenophobia”, is how one journalist has described sentiment towards migrants in Central and Eastern Europe, adding that “these are societies not used to foreigners, rather than societies against them”,⁵⁴ This assessment may be read as both encouraging and disturbing.

Conclusion

If one can map a geography of values, as I have suggested here, this will be a polysemantic geography of fluid and changing contours. The differences between the old EU members and the new EU members do not resound to the advantage of the former alone. The absence of a long tradition of statehood leaves room for institutional creativity. Official and even societal aversion to formal autonomy for regional or national minorities have not prevented the emergence of vigorous social movements challenging such aversion. The absence of a history of overseas empire and colonialism means that the new countries of the EU have one fewer historical burden to bear. And the fact that they do not (yet?) have substantial immigrant

⁵¹ For example, polls show 91% of Czechs have “negative views” towards the Roma and 54% of Hungarian police officers believe criminality to be a genetic feature of the Roma identity. “Racism and the Roma” at no-racism.net/article/435. A recent study of youth attitudes in Poland finds that the lowest rate of acceptance of others is in regard to Gypsies (the term used in the study) and for Arabs, with the former somewhat lower than the latter. Anna Karwinska, “‘Us’ and ‘Them’: Youth Attitudes towards Ethnicity in Poland”, in Thanasis D. Sfikas and Christopher Williams (eds.), *Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 125–144.

⁵² “Our ‘racist’ migrants; attitudes of East Europeans are stuck in the 1950s, claims equality chief Phillips,” *Daily Mail*, 24 October 2006.

⁵³ “Slovenes Reject Renewed Residency Rights for Former Minorities”, *RFE/RL Newslines*, 5 April 2004.

⁵⁴ Luke Allnutt, “Inflows to the East Are a Problem Too: the EU Migration Debate”, *International Herald Tribune*, 21 April 2004.

communities means that they may succeed in avoiding the confrontations experienced by their Western neighbours, such as France and, more recently, the Netherlands.

At present, there is an inclination to evaluate the new EU members solely according to the norms, perceptions and experiences of the old EU countries. Broadly speaking, the old EU countries offer two models for dealing with minority-majority relations. The first pattern is the French "Republican" solution which seeks to transcend any differentiation between minority and majority by offering a common and universal model of citizenship; the second is the *faux*-multiculturalist policy, attempted by the United Kingdom and others, which encompasses minorities in its civic landscape as an addition to rather than a reformulation of its established national identity. Outside Europe, there is also a third, trans-Atlantic model, that of "hyphenated citizenship" which, ironically, may be more potentially relevant to the countries of the "New" Europe than either of the "Old" European models but which is not under discussion anywhere in Europe.

In fact, none of these models "fits" the situation of the states that have recently joined the EU. The point of the arguments I have made in this article is that the countries of the "New" Europe must be evaluated on their own terms rather than through the lens of others. To be sure, we are not speaking of immutable entities. Quite the contrary. The process of EU integration will change the new member states and, it should be recognized, will change the old member states as well. My concern here has been to sketch the point of departure for this process. In the final analysis, however one assesses the respective historical experiences of the old and the new EU states, these experiences must be factored into any serious discussion of the European Union as it exists today, including any consideration of the future of relations between Europe's majorities and its minorities.*

Bibliography

- Allnutt, Luke, "Inflows to the East Are a Problem Too: the EU Migration Debate," *International Herald Tribune*, 21 April 2004.
- Anderson, Perry. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: Verso, 1979.
- "A Swamp of Paranoid Nostalgia," *The Economist*, 5 July 2007.
- Barltrop, Richard. "Muslims in Europe, Post 9/11: Understanding and Responding to the Islamic World", Conference Report, St. Antony's College and Princeton University, 25–26 April 2003.

* An earlier French language version of this article is to be published in Andre Liebich and Basil Germond, (dirs.) *Construire l'Europe: Mélanges en hommage à Pierre du Bois* (Paris-Geneva: Presses universitaires de France, forthcoming)

- Bauböck, Rainer, Bernhard Perchinig, & Wiebke Sievers, eds. *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*. Amsterdam: IMISCOE Research and Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Beetham, David. *Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Bibó, István. "The Distress of the East European Small States (1946)," in *Democracy, Revolution, Self-Determination*, ed. Karoly Nagy. Boulder: Atlantic Research and Publications, 1991.
- Bottomore, Tom and Patrick Goode, eds. *Austro-Marxism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Bruckner, Pascal. *La Tyrannie de la pénitence. essai sur le masochisme occidental*. Paris: Grasset 2006.
- Chirot, Daniel, ed. *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Coenders, Marcel, Marcel Lubbers, Peer Scheepers. *Majorities' Attitudes Towards Minorities in (Former) Candidate Countries of the European Union: Results from the Eurobarometer in Candidate Countries 2003*. Report 3 for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Ref. No. 2003/04/01.
- "Czech Commissioner Criticized Over 'Moravian Ruling'", *RFE/RL Newslines*, 13 December 2000.
- de Witte, Bruno. "Politics Versus Law in the EU's Approach to Ethnic Minorities," in *Europe Unbound. : Enlarging and Reshaping the Boundaries of the European Union*, ed. Jan Zielonka. London: Routledge, 2002.
- "Disappearing in the Crowd: Vietnamese Immigrants in Poland," *Cafébabel*, 14 September 2006; available at www.cafebabel.com/en/article.asp?T=T&Id=8039.
- Drakulic, Slavenka. "Die Welt als Milchkuh, " *Der Standard* [Supplement], November 2007.
- Eurobarometer*, Report 48, March 1998, available at europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo.
- Eurobarometer*, Report 53, October 2000, 88, at europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo.
- European Centre for Minority Issues, *Parallel_Reports*, www.ecmi.de/doc/Parallel_Reports_Database/.
- "Evolution in Europe; Vietnamese in Bulgaria: Bitter Times," *New York Times*, 25 March 2008.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Encounters with Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Gijsberts, Mérove, Louk Hagendoorn and Peer Scheepers, eds. *Nationalism and Exclusion of Migrants: Cross-National Comparisons*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

- “Gorzelik and Others vs Poland Referred to Grand Chamber,” MINELRES, available at lists.delfi.lv/pipermail/minelres.
- Guy, Will, ed. *Between Past and Future: The Roma of Central and Eastern Europe*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001.
- “Hungarian Opposition Official Says Budapest Must Back Autonomy in Romania,” *RFE/RL Newslines*, 13 April 2004.
- James, Barry, “EU Survey Finds Wide Racism,” *International Herald Tribune*, 20 December 1997; available at www.ihf.com/IHT/BJ/97.
- Janos, Andrew C. *East Central Europe in the Modern World: The Politics of the Borderlands from Pre - to Postcommunism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Kamusella, Tomasz. “Poland: The Reluctant Shift from a Closed Ethnolinguistically Homogeneous National Community to a Multicultural Open Society,” in *Dynamics of National Identity and Transnational Identities in the Process of European Integration*, ed. Elena Marushiakova. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008
- Kamusella, Tomasz. “The Triple Division of the Slavic Languages: A Linguistic Finding, A Product of Politics or an Accident,” *IWM Working Paper* no. 1/2005, Vienna 2005.
- Kelley, Judith Green. *Ethnic Politics in Europe: The Power of Norms and Incentives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Kimberly Ashton. “Vietnamese Seek Czech 'Eden,’” *Prague Post*, 17 October 2007.
- Kohn, Hans. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Konwicki, Tadeusz. *Mala Apokalipsa*. London: Index on Censorship, 1979.
- Liebich, Andre. “Counting and Classifying Minorities” in *Socialisme, cultures, histoire: itinéraires et représentations, mélanges offerts à Miklos Molnar*, eds. Jasna Adler et Lubor Jilek. Bern: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Liebich, Andre. “Ethnic Minorities and Long-term Implications of EU Enlargement,” *Europe Unbound: Enlarging and Reshaping the Boundaries of the European Union*, ed. Jan Zielonka. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Liebich, Andre. “Janus at Strasbourg,” *Helsinki Monitor* 10:1 (1999): 9–19.
- Liebich, Andre. “Les minorités en Hongrie et les Hongrois en Slovaquie”, in *Nationalismes en Europe centrale et orientale: conflits ou nouvelles cohabitations?* eds. Maximos Aligisakis et alia. Geneva: Institut européen de l’université de Genève, 1997.
- Liebich, Andre. “Nations, States, Minorities: Why is Eastern Europe Different?” *Dissent* (Summer 1995): 313–317.
- Liebich, Andre. *Les Minorités nationales en Europe centrale et orientale*. Geneva: Georg, 1997.

- O'Connor, Colin. "Is the Czech Republic's Vietnamese Community Finally Starting to Feel at Home?"; available at www.radio.cz/en/article/91826 29 May 2007.
- "Our 'racist' migrants; attitudes of East Europeans are stuck in the 1950s, claims equality chief Phillips," *Daily Mail*, 24 October 2006.
- Palmer, Alan. *The Lands Between: A History of East-Central Europe since the Congress of Vienna*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.
- Plamenatz, John, "Two Types of Nationalism," in *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea*, ed. Eugene Kamenka. London: Edward Arnold, 1976.
- Plasseraud, Yves. *Les Etats Baltiques: Les sociétés gigognes, la dialectique minorité-majorités*. Crozon: Editions Armeline, 2003.
- "Poles Apart", 3 September 2003; available at www.masterpage.com.pl.
- "Racism and the Roma;" available at no-racism.net/article/435.
- "Slovenes Reject Renewed Residency Rights for Former Minorities," *RFE/RL Newslines*, 5 April 2004.
- "Szekler Regional Autonomy Plan Submitted to Romanian Parliament", *RFE/RL Newslines*, 27 February 2004.
- "Xenophobia in the European Union", Written Statement by the Society for Threatened Peoples, 59th Session of the Commission of Human Rights, 17 March–25 April 2003; available at www.gfbv.de/gfbv_e/uno/geneva03.
- Pomian, Krzysztof. "Les Particularités historiques de l'Europe centrale et orientale," *Le Débat* 63 (January–February 1991): 53-61.
- Pomian, Krzysztof. *L'Europe et ses Nations*. Paris: Gallimard, 1990.
- Romsics, Ignac. *Hungary in the Twentieth Century*. Budapest: Corvina, 1999.
- Salvatorelli, Luigi. *Sommario della Storia d'Italia*. Turin: Einaudi, 1938.
- Sasse, Gwendolyn. "EU Conditionality and Minority Rights in Central and Eastern Europe", Paper presented at the Conference 'Nations, Minorities and European Integration', European University Institute, 7–8 May 2004.
- Saul, John Ralston. "The World Today," *BBC International Service*, 10 June 2005.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1977.
- Sfikas, Thanasis D. and Christopher Williams, eds. *Ethnicity and Nationalism in East Central Europe and the Balkans*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- Slovenko, Karolina. "Post-communism Nostalgia in Poland. Nostalgia for Polish People's Republic," *Change and Resistance* 2006/12; available at <http://changeandresistance.blogspot.com>.
- Szücs, Jenő. "Three Historical Regions of Europe. An Outline," in *Civil Society and the State*, ed. John Keene London: Verso, 1988.

- Szücs, Jenő. *Les Trois Europes*. Preface by Fernand Braudel. Translated from Hungarian by Véronique Charaire, Gábor Klaniczay and Philippe Thureau-Dangin. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1985.
- Tesser, Lynne M. "The Geopolitics of Tolerance: Minority Rights under EU Expansion in East-Central Europe", *East European Politics and Societies* 17:3(2003): 483–532.
- Toft, Monica Duffy. *The Geography of Ethnic Violence: Identity, Interests and the Indivisibility of Territory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Topidi, Kyraki "The Limits of EU Conditionality: Minority Rights in Slovakia", *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 1 (2003): 1–38.
- Vermeersh, Peter "Minority Policy in Central Europe: Exploring the Impact of the EU's Enlargement Strategy", *Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 3:2 (2004): 3–19.
- Walters, E. Garrison. *The Other Europe: Eastern Europe to 1945*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988.
- Weisman, Steven R. "U.S. Set to Demand that Allies Agree Iraq is Defying U.N.," *New York Times*, 23 January 2003.
- Whaley, Joachim. "Thinking About Germany, 1750–1815: The Birth of a Nation," *Transactions of the English Goethe Society New Series* 66, (1997):53–71.
- Williams, Allan M. "Vietnamese Community in Slovakia," *Sociologia* 37:3 (2005): 249-274.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization in the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.