Minority Integration in Central Eastern Europe:
An Introduction

Timofey Agarin and Malte Brosig

The accession of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries to the European Union (EU) was anticipated with great expectations. The aspiring member states expected the EU to guarantee economic prosperity and political recognition, while Western countries saw political integration of the continent as a way to secure peace and stability throughout the region. Both sides viewed EU-accession as a tool providing an opportunity to overcome ethnic tensions and irredentism, as well as promoting social cohesion through the process of European integration. However, the optimistic predictions that ethnic conflicts would disappear following economic development and regional integration into the EU, NATO and other organizations did not materialize as had been hoped.

Prior to and following EU accession, CEE countries had to develop their own strategies to accommodate large minority populations on their territories. Today these states provide models of their own to address minority protection and find local interpretations of what integration entails. In spite of the relatively short experience in devising policies relevant (and suitable) to minorities, most of the CEE countries precipitated the change in relations between the state institutions and the societies they govern, that result from development of an ever closer European Union. Interstate treaties, trans-border cooperation and regional initiatives considerably improved the status of minority groups across CEE. All new EU member states have found ways to address political, economic, and social inequalities between their majority and minority residents

Still, many issues remain contested. It appears that every country in CEE provides a plethora of questions to debate inequalities between the majority and minority population. For the members of minority groups across the region there is much more at stake than the majority groups of their countries of residence are prepared to accept in the course of social integration. However, considerable local knowledge is required to develop minority integration in practice. None of the programmes developed by the state aiming at minority integration across the region show overlap in goals, practices or incentives. That is not to say that these approaches to integration are incomparable. Arguably, broad scale generalizations are insensitive to details of local implementation and case-studies provide too much detail at the expense of an overall elegance of narrative. In this volume we sought to strike a balance between the two extremes by providing a detailed narrative underlying

_____

policy-making, but also pointing to potential issues of contention between local, national and European policies.

This volume provides the reader with a detailed account of current challenges in integrating ethnic minority groups in CEE countries. We thereby took great care not to slide into one-sided modes of analysis privileging either the international, national or societal dimension of integration but aim at covering the most important aspects of minority integration across disciplines as different as anthropology, political science, sociology and law. This multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary approach to minority integration, in our view, best covers the complex reality on the ground. We have deliberately decided not to promote a certain theory of integration or concept of multiculturalism which would only account for certain aspects of minority integration but hardly cover the existing complexity of the issue. The volume clearly privileges theoretical, analytical and disciplinary pluralism over deductive monism. Thus the contributions to this volume do not aim at further developing or testing theoretical models of integration in the first place but deliver analytically informed rich empirical examinations of current challenges in ethnic minority integration in CEE. Consequently, the volume follows an inherently inductive orientation uncovering those challenges that international organizations, nation-states, minority groups and mainstream society encounter in the 21st century demarcating a long path to effective equality and integration.

In this volume we bring together the contributions discussing minority integration in countries as diverse as Albania, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Estonia, and Hungary. Our contributors analyze the concepts and interpretations related to minority integration, more frequently than not questioning the outcome of integration efforts in countries under review. In order to provide a comprehensive overview on these issues and debates, we analyze different approaches, advocated by various actors in the field. Throughout the volume our contributors argue that particular ways of accommodating minority groups in CEEC have been developed. Minority integration, as we argue in the volume, reflects on particular histories of minority settlement, relations with external states, engagement of international actors, and decisively, the majorities' perception of "their" nation-states. By and large, where "national citizenship" became more open and embraced, social differences, alongside cultural and linguistic diversity within political community prevailed in developing models more effective than those already in place across Western European EU states.

1.   The European Dimension of Minority Integration

Minority integration issues are currently gaining attention across Europe, particularly since the last two rounds in EU enlargement. Since 2004 the EU has become more diverse than ever: 23 official languages have been regis-

tered in Brussels, 60 indigenous languages are actively spoken in the EU comprising not less than 40 million people and 190 different ethnic minority groups (Toggenburg, 2007, p. 2). The diversity of ethnic belonging almost naturally raises the question of equal opportunity for all members of societies affected, especially when considering disparities between the dominant and non-dominant ethnic groups in most EU member states. The EU's focus on non-discrimination dominates the current discourse on minority rights across the member and non-member states alike. The contributions of our volume suggest that growing attention to social inclusion across the European continent is the outcome of a general shift in the international perception of minority rights issues.

Minority rights in the early 1990s had for a considerable time, been constructed through the prism of security. It was primarily the trepidation of Western European countries towards the potential of ethnic violence and war in the Balkan region which led the EU, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and Council of Europe (COE) to (re)-discover the discourse on minority rights. The war in the former Yugoslavia was perceived to be a threat to security in South-Eastern Europe, potentially spreading beyond the Balkans. The demise of the Soviet Union could also have had unprecedented geopolitical consequences for CEE states. Lasting political and economic transition across CEE countries could destabilize societies, revealing ethnic tensions, previously suppressed by the socialist leadership.

It was in this light that in 1992 the OSCE set up a special body responsible for monitoring and prevention of ethnic conflicts, the High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM). In addition, in 1994 the COE drafted the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) which became the first international legally binding agreement formulating specific minority rights norms. Finally, the so-called Copenhagen EU-accession criteria, elaborated in 1993, made EU-membership conditional on the respect for and protection of minorities. Twenty years on, there is no evidence of ethnic warfare occurring outside of the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Across CEE countries it appears political, economic and social transition has been at least successful enough to prevent ethnic conflict, while continuously improving majority-minority relations.

These achievements give evidence of the positive impact of international engagement in CEE states and societies. The COE's legally binding instruments for minority rights protection, the HCNM's quiet diplomacy, EU membership conditionality and financial support to the states, are essential for the successful promotion of minority integration standards throughout CEE. In this context international institutions establish benchmarks for equal treatment of minority groups throughout the region. Classical state monitoring on the implementation of human rights treaties - such as FCNM, jurisprudence of the European Court for Human Rights, new governance instru-

ments in the case of the EU and social inclusion initiatives advanced by the OSCE in the course of its conflict prevention approach – were all fundamental to securing the interethnic accord across the region.

Indeed, one of the most important functions international organizations can fulfil is the setting of standards which has at least two advantages over individual national standard setting. First, it ensures comparability between cases and avoids bias to a certain group of people or the unique actor constellation in one country. Second, international institutions engage in norm setting as a non-partisan actor who does not pursue its own ethnic interests.

Although international support for integrative measures is often essential for their lasting success, international institutions contribute far less towards enforcement and implementation of these standards on the ground. Generally, international institutions depend on their member states' willingness to implement commonly agreed conventions, declarations, jurisdictions and policy targets. None of the international organizations has its local administrative bodies, which could facilitate, not even to mention, implement integration policies. Even the EU which is by far the world's most active and successful international regulator does not implement any of its regulations and directives, spelt out in well beyond 100,000 pages of the *acquis communautaire*. However, the EU has certainly the most general influence on social inclusion policies in its member states, not least because of its legislative and financial capacities.

The same also holds for the COE and OSCE, which in contrast with the EU, have very limited financial means to support nation-states' integration programmes. These organizations' role is limited to monitoring the implementation of legal standards, giving advice, and providing organizational support for the setting up of integration measures. Despite these limitations the COE and OSCE have much to contribute. Their most valuable role is in the distribution of knowledge on European best-practices and the development of benchmark legislation for sustainable and successful integration measures. This becomes particularly important because of the general lack of experience in setting up minority integration concepts and strategies in CEE. Taking the situation of different minority groups into account, international institutions collect data and provide information on a wide range of situations to its nation-states. They are then expected to devise specific policy-solutions to the problems on the ground that would correspond to European-wide action plans and comply with European legal standards.

The promotion of equal rights and effective equality throughout CEE comprises social, economic, and political integration measures. In this respect, European institutions engage in a multi-level and multi-actor game. While no single international institution dominates the scene, horizontal cooperation provides the greatest potential for cooperation and converges into a

broader European approach to minority rights. The fact that the COE is developing legal standards for minority integration through the FCNM and the jurisprudence of its human rights court is complemented by the EU's policy initiatives on social inclusion and non-discrimination.

Cooperation between the EU, COE and OSCE has been intensifying over the past decade. Since 2001 the EU and COE have been institutionalizing their cooperation in a joint programme line, addressing issues of multiculturalism and social inclusion. At the same time significant differences remain in the activities of the EU and the COE. The EU has not developed a comprehensive set of minority rights but is very active in the field of non-discrimination and social inclusion. The COE, on the other hand, additionally seeks to guarantee minorities' linguistic, cultural and political rights. The relationship between the EU and the COE should thus be seen as that of complementary cooperation on the issues relevant to the legal status of a minority with an overlapping interest in minority integration.

At the vertical axis international organizations seek interaction with both the states and a multitude of domestic actors. This spectrum reaches from multi-national non-governmental organizations to central, regional and local administrative bodies, from local civic initiatives to nearly all sorts of minority pressure groups. Here international institutions create conditions in support of minorities' integration into society by benchmarking, monitoring, mediating, and funding of integration programmes. Admittedly the EU, OSCE, and COE only have limited experience and competence in the area of minority integration, which poses a number of new challenges to the expertise of international organizations in that area. This raises the question of whether the EU, or any other international organization, is capable of generating some base-line for inter-ethnic cooperation across the region? While our contributors do not underestimate the complexity of the question, they argue that only a concerted action at both the international and national levels can guarantee equal opportunity for participation of minorities across the CEE.

2.   The National Dimension of Minority Integration

International organizations involved with supporting social inclusion and promoting equality of minorities play an important role in reducing tensions between the ethnic communities on the domestic level across CEE. Especially noteworthy is the international organizations' effort in setting parameters for good practice towards minority populations. Needless to say, fulfilling this task is not easy at all. The notion of equality can be stretched widely to encompass interpretations as diverse as entitlement for participation in decision-making to prohibition of unequal treatment in the public sphere, from individual-centred affirmative action to group-oriented support of self-government in areas of compact settlement.

_____

Not surprisingly, the lack of normative guidelines at the international level towards minority integration results in deficient practical application of integration at the state level. How divergent approaches to integration should, and how they should not be applied creates real problems in justifying the promotion of specific instruments for minority protection (Patten and Kymlicka, 2003, pp. 32-37). Most of the international organizations involved in minority integration projects have previously advised nation-states to apply pragmatic rules and support policies that have measurable positive impacts on integration. General indicators for minority integration, such as unemployment and literacy rates, proportional representation in private and public sectors of economy, as well as participation and visibility in political institutions were used for this purpose. Parekh summarizes the outcome of equal treatment policies, following which "All citizens should enjoy equal opportunities to acquire the capacities and skills needed to function in society and to pursue their self-chosen goals equally effectually" (2000, p. 211). In this sense, the role of the nation-state in fostering equitable treatment of minorities and majorities is not limited to the distribution of material resources and to provisions of fair access to public goods. Recognition of minority groups as equal partners in policy-making and implementation relies heavily on the equal treatment of individuals, irrespective of their group membership, and their linguistic, cultural or ethnic specificity.

Clearly, the concept of equality is determined by the social environment and relational attitudes of groups engaged in establishing what "equal treatment" means. Being an intersubjectively and relatively defined social good, equality is embedded in the general social and, crucially, political context. It is operationalized and endowed with meanings which make sense to individuals and groups, engaged in the effort of negotiating the terms of cooperation and finally, integration. Therefore the discussion on social justice is central for debating the processes of intergroup relations generally, and integration processes particularly. Minority opinions play an important part in these deliberations, because they allow a more elaborate definition of justice, and oppose perpetuation of institutional equilibria, maintaining the majority's monopoly of power resources.

The problem of equality between the minority and majority is not limited to countries we investigate in the volume. Like the majority of EU states, the polities across CEE are defined in terms of nation-states. From within this context, every state in the region "belongs" to one particular ethnic group, whose name it bears; to the group, whose special relation with "its" state is rarely questioned. At the same time, various European and international organizations sought to initiate institutional changes which would facilitate minority participation in decision-making processes. The EU, COE, HCNM all questioned the monopoly of states' majorities over political resources in "their" countries, suggesting a potential security dilemma should minority

grievances be continuously neglected. On the flip side, even though political actors across CEE were reluctant to question the dominant status of majority groups over minorities in their societies, formal equality between the groups provides the starting point for deliberation on further concessions.

The contributions of the book address this relationship head-on. Most of them conclude that no regulations prescribing equal access of minority groups to political resources are effective in their own right. Instead, financial support and affirmative action are among the resources that make some difference over time, resulting in – possibly, but not necessarily – a multicultural outlook of a given society. Along the lines suggested in the current multiculturalism debate, our authors observe that common civic identity of state citizens, where "constitutional patriotism" dominates over ethnic particularism are not devoid of ethnic criteria (Kymlicka, 2000; Soysal, 1994; Parekh, 2000).

Most definitely, no state which nurtures the civic identity of its citizens over ethnically defined group-memberships is entirely free of bias in favour of its constituent culture. All multicultural societies establish some form of cultural hierarchies in the public sphere, leaving unquestioned the relation between the official state language and minority languages, the core state culture/s and non-core cultures, the state's dominant group and non-dominant communities. In this sense, our contributors observe that unless the states in CEE define their societies in cultural, linguistic, racial and any other exclusive terms, one can hardly speak of accomplished integration.

This does not mean the end of appreciation for cultural differences in societies, but requires challenging the assumption that all individuals have equal resources, irrespective of their personal cultural endowments. As Malloy rightly points out, "the value of culture must be appreciated as a valuable contribution to the individual's development and capability to function in society, especially the individual's capability to act in the economic sphere without risking exclusion" (2005, p. 12). This point is of particular salience throughout the region we study in the book. Here, the cultural markers dominate the design of political institutions and thus require particular attention to minority opinions while addressing the issue of integration.

The debate of unequal resource distribution between the majorities and minorities across CEE states would be incomplete without addressing the role of state-building in creating the basic provisions for the understanding of multiculturalism in the given societies. Where some scholars see institutional design to be of crucial importance for equal access to state resources from minority groups (Linz and Stepan, 1996), others tend to disagree. Political participation, they argue, is crucial to establish the rules of the game and is central for broad-scale democratization in societies (Rueschmeyer et al., 1998). In this context, structural mechanisms available to the members of a minority to improve their position within political settings across CEE is

always defined by the members of the majority, who are – most obviously – reluctant to render some of their structural advantage to other groups. Needless to say, this leaves plenty of room for improving mutual perceptions of majorities and minorities across the region.

However, potential for improvement is most frequently mistaken for deficits of existing institutional design, a point that need not be reproduced here. Instead, additional attention should be granted to analyses of relations between the state- and nation-building, which went hand in hand since the inception of democratic movements against the socialist regimes in all countries across CEE (Brubaker, 1996; Brubaker, 2004; Jenne, 2006; Galbreath, 2005). If state- and nation-building are so closely interlinked, should one treat the challenge of minority integration as a by-product of (post-socialist) democratic transition? Possibly this is the case, but it is not necessarily so. The state approaches to minority integration in all CEE states address many issues which are relevant to minority. And in many cases, even the nationalizing states invite minority groups to cooperate with the existing institutions and majority publics. However, the issues are more likely than not to be defined by majority policy-makers, and the terms of cooperation are also dictated by the dominant group. What we observe throughout CEE is ethnic and cultural diversity that presents a challenge to the current debate of multi-culturalism.

The contributions in this volume suggest, among others that the state-bearing nations continue to perceive themselves to be locked in position, where active steps of protection of the national language, culture and ethno-centric education are necessary. On the other hand, however, our authors demonstrate that there is an anticipation of change in the relations between the core and non-core ethnic communities across CEE countries. The majority and minority are involved in shaping state policies, but the core ethnic community plays a role far more decisive than does a minority. In this context, the members of the minority are expected to adapt to the dominance of the state-bearing ethnic group, its language, and importantly, its visions of political community. The chapters addressing state-policies aimed at integration suggest that non-core groups are expected to accept the position assigned to them by the majority in their state of residence.

The case-studies presented in the second section of our book make clear that issues on which minority communities are invited to deliberate are framed by majorities. In this, minority groups do not feature as equal partners engaged in the process of institutional change. It is in this section of the book that the limits of the state-led approach to societal integration become clearly visible. As our contributors argue, intergroup relations remain tense due to a tight connection between the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic interests of state-bearing group, embedded in design of state institutions. Although the ethno-centric agenda of many CEE states is to a degree balanced by international leverage, state institutions tend to prefer homogeneous societies to be dealt

with, over multicultural ones. This is where, as our contributors suggest, one should look for multicultural solutions in the day-to-day interactions between the individuals of various cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Analyses of relations between the members of majority and minority groups provide some insight into expected outcomes of integration on both sides as well as strategies applicable on case to case basis.

3.   The Role of Society in Minority Integration

To be effective, social integration requires a bottom-line consensus on what individuals involved see as a desirable and necessary outcome. The terms and the expected effects of integration need to be negotiated among and across broad segments of both the majority and minority communities. However, as our contributors observe, majority and minority groups seem to pursue different goals and thus favour different, partially excluding means to achieve societal integration. While the members of the majority regard integration as a tool with which to increase social cohesion and improve institutional performance, the members of minority usually seek to augment group integrity and stability by securing the status of their group.

Scholarly investigations of the claims advanced by the members of majority groups in the course of negotiating the terms of integrations are usually regarded as instruments of nation- and state-building under the conditions of uncertainty (Brubaker, 2004; Burawoy and Verdery, 1999). Particularly, earlier discussions of majority claims emphasize the importance of the legal framework of the state, historical experiences and international legal standards of state sovereignty if formulated for the international consumer (Vachudova, 2005). At the same time, others investigating the rhetoric of majorities' political entrepreneurs produced for a home audience argue that the primary aim of this rhetoric rests with legitimizing majorities' dominance over local minorities (Pridham and Vanhanen, 1994; Nic Craith, 2006). Irrespective of the interpretation sought, majority populations throughout CEE constitute the state-bearing nations and thus exhort significant pressures on members of other groups, who happen to reside on the territory of "their" state.

Therefore most students of post-socialist ethnic relations argue that the emphasis on "special relation" of majority communities with "their" state requires interpretations from a rational choice perspective (Laitin 1998; Wimmer, 2002; Hale, 2008). The interpretations of the policies differ considerably, depending on the strategies majority and minority groups deploy to achieve the best possible outcomes from their interactions. Some claim that nationalizing policies are nothing less than a thinly veiled effort to secure the redistribution of available resources among the members of an in-group (Anderson, 1991; Gellner, 1983; Hechter 2000). Others argue that the majorities opt for nationalizing policies to circumvent ethnic tensions during the

_____

period of institutional change (Connor, 1993; Pridham and Gallagher, 2000). Yet another camp of rational choice interpretations suggests that ethnonational mobilization of the majority is resulting from perceptions of immanent external threat to the state and its constituent group (Fearon and Laitin 2003; Laitin 2007; Saidemann, 2001). All these interpretations can be (and have been) applied to all of the cases studied in this volume. Our contributors, however, claim that it is impossible to understand political rationale behind integration approaches throughout the region without taking seriously the minority/majority relations outside of the formal institutional political arena.

The extent of political, social and economic changes across the region had an immediate impact on the legal status of state-languages, opportunities for minority education, political participation and representation of minority populations. The policy-measures alone, however, fail to account for particular strategies of adaptation favoured by the members of non-dominant groups. Where the members of majority groups were taking the upper hand in determining political reforms and path development of state institutions, many members of minority populations were left estranged from political processes. However, day-to-day interactions, be it in public institutions, at workplace, or in educational facilities remain an integral part of minorities' interaction with the members of majority and improvement of intergroup relations. In a way, the members of minority communities tacitly confirm to the structural limitations on their activities, when they interact with the members of the majority on "their" terms and in "their" language, in institutions designed to serve primarily the majorities' interests. But how far do they accept the terms of interaction? How do minorities address their grievances with institutions in place, when they interact with one another?

The contributions in the section three of the volume suggest that even despite being designed to the disadvantage of minorities, minority groups have considerable leverage to participate in political decision making. The section points out that throughout the region minorities have little say on policy development in their states of residence, despite the fact that some steps have been undertaken during the past decade across CEE to provide additional opportunities for minority participation in public life. Throughout the region states addressed some minority grievances, prompting minority's adaptation to the changing social reality, but there is only a limited framework for non-dominant groups' political participation. Mainly their activities are confined to social cooperation envisaged by the state integration programmes, majority political actors and local initiatives.

This once again indicates that minority participation is not treasured for its intrinsic value, i.e. as positively affecting institutional performance and increasing diversity, but rather as symbolic engagement in affirming decisions, previously made by the members of the majority. Here, the contributions underline that social participation is essential to support minority inte-

gration effectively. However, the contributions also conclude that the majority population continues to see the democratic transition as largely "their" responsibility. So, what does minority integration entail? Is it integration for participation, or integration through participation?

Effectively, the presence of minority groups requires the renegotiation of institutionalized mechanisms for providing social services and ensuring the base-line of economic equality through the lens of social justice. Across CEE majorities, while not directly discouraging minority participation, engage in dialogue with members of minority communities when they cannot address the issues tangent on minority interests because of inadequate institutional capacity. This aspect of majority/minority relations falls increasingly into the EU focus on effective equality, non-discrimination and social justice which represent the corner-stones of minority integration. Indeed, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU dedicates a whole chapter to equality, among other things banning racial discrimination and calling for respect to cultural, linguistic and religious diversity. In this document, the EU acknowledges that the project of European integration can only be successful if membership of an ethnic group does not legitimize social, economic and political marginalization.

This suggests that the individual approach to minority integration, which has been developing throughout the CEE region for the two past decades, finds some correspondence in national policies. Being primarily devised as a positive response to the potential burdening of European external relations, especially security and stability on its Eastern borders, it revolutionized majority/minority relations throughout Europe considerably. The multinational nature of the EU, diversity of its resident population and increasing diversity resulting from incoming migration all require reconsideration of states' relations with their minorities.

While some citizens could blend in and accommodate more effectively under these conditions, those left behind and/or disenfranchised may gradually alienate from society and the democratic political organization of state affairs (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 151). Where some groups of citizens are deprived of effective political participation because of their ethnic belonging, the future of social relations would be particularly uncertain. In many cases involving the status of minorities without a "kin state" international organizations were particularly engaged in drawing the attention of national policymakers to issues of minority needs and living conditions. While the well-being and the status of minority was easily disconnected from security concerns of their states of residence as was the case with Roma, the improvement of status of minorities living of the "wrong side" of a nation-state border was more difficult to negotiate. In this sense, EU enlargement has been conducive for diminishing the fears of minority secession and irredentism, which could undermine state integrity. Persisting social, economic and political cleavages

between ethnic minority communities and majority groups in CEE societies have raised questions related to social justice, economic exclusion and political marginalization.

The contributions in the second section of our volume address the difficulties of 'stranded' minorities in their states of residence such as Magyars in Slovakia, as well as Russian-speakers in Estonia and Latvia. However, the situation of Roma communities across CEE, as is particularly discussed in the section three, fits well into this framework. Both, international institutions and nation-states across CEE have undertaken measures to remedy the persistent exclusion of many Roma communities. It remains to be seen, however, which role each international organization and state agencies can assume in fostering integration of this particular ethnic group. The development of multiple applicable international standards and benchmarks for integration policies are already in place. Nonetheless, Roma exclusion persists across the region with the legal basis for equalizing measures not being fully exploited. The EU Racial Equality Directive and Article 4 of the FCNM enable states to apply affirmative action but it remains largely unclear under which conditions the implementation of such action is compelling.

The notion of effective equality, however, requires interpretation and agreement on its minimal meaning. In some cases, equal treatment of all members of citizenry might adequately sustain differences in society; on other occasions the lack of affirmative action is likely to perpetuate inequality between ethnic groups, rather than induce their equal treatment. Because ethnic minorities across the region differ greatly in their status as well as in their access to political and social resources, only differentiated treatment of groups can ensure individual equality of minority individuals with the members of majority populations (Parekh, 2000, p. 240; Kymlicka, 2003, p. 153). Not only does this apply to day-to-day interaction between the members of the majority and minority populations, but also to state-led approaches to integration and engagement of international organizations with the issues tangent to minority equality.

In this context, sensitivity to cultural differences is decisive in negotiating strategies of accommodation and integration of multicultural societies. Where institutional intervention seeks to provide guidelines and benchmarks for minority integration, international experience in devising instruments for culturally neutral approaches is essential. This holds for international as well as domestic approaches to treatment of minority groups. This requires international actors to justify attempts towards minority inclusion on a normative basis, opening inroads for the inclusion of minorities of various kinds: racial, national, ethnic, cultural, linguistic etc. In the absence of a ubiquitously applicable normative approach guiding international involvement with minority integration at the local or national levels, policies cannot prefer any model of integration once and for all. Instead, approaches to integration must be con-

stantly updated to changing expectations of groups involved and re-adjusted to preliminary results achieved. In this sense, while there is no European master-plan for minority integration in place, room should be made available for developing and implementing innovative approaches applicable outside of each nation-state context.

4.   The Structure of the Book

The volume is analyzing different levels of minority integration in three separate sections. International organizations, such as the EU, OSCE, and COE are playing an important role in the promotion of ideas and norms on ethnic diversity and will be examined in the first place. Nation-states doubtlessly play a crucial role in interpreting international norms and putting them into policies. States can impose preferred concepts of inter-ethnic relations, but they also provide fora for minority/majority conciliation to renegotiate the terms of relations. The contributions also address the role local societies play in accommodating ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity by engaging with the abstract concept of integration practically.

The first part of the book reflects on the role international organizations and international law plays in promoting minority integration policies throughout the region. The involvement of the EU (Riedel), the COE (Morawa and Brosig) and the OSCE (Sabanadze) is scrutinized while discussing particular norms and standards set out by each of these organizations. Especially during EU enlargement international organizations had first to address protection of minorities and develop a legal framework for minority integration. While the three organizations are active in the promotion of liberal norms regulating minority integration standards, relations between the nation-states, the resident minority groups, they pursue different, although not incompatible goals. This section explores the concepts of minority integration, guiding their engagement with minority integration. Furthermore, this section also highlights the very different instruments organizations apply for the promotion of their concept of integration. While the OSCE relies on quiet diplomacy for conflict prevention, the COE uses socialization through monitoring. Finally the EU provides funding for integration projects and makes membership conditional upon the respect of minority protection norms.

The second part of the book discusses steps undertaken in different countries across CEE to facilitate minority integration. The contributors of this part of the book address the political steps initiated by both minority political entrepreneurs, as well as those emanating from the majority dominated political establishment. Here we observe a difference in narratives from majority and minority political representatives in the process of negotiating the terms of minority integration in the framework of the nation-state. The contributions addressing the majority views on minority accommodation

suggest that the dominant groups endeavour to guarantee the central role of their cultures for the state-community. In doing so, the majorities in CEE countries appeal to the principles of multicultural social community emphasizing the importance of a common cultural core, to be accepted by all of the ethnic and linguistic communities resident in the country and willing to integrate. While the debates on multicultural citizenship are common place in CEE today, the contributors indicate that frequently these have been instrumentalized by the state-bearing community to legitimize and perpetuate the hierarchical relations between the resident ethnic groups.

However, policy steps initiated by the minority groups suggest that their representatives act largely in pursuit of greater accountability by the state of their residence. The chapters discussing the involvement of minority political entrepreneurs in Hungary (Tremlett), Albania (Salamun), Estonia (Malloy), Latvia (Agarin) and Slovakia (Regelmann) suggest that the needs of social groups vary according to the history of their presence in the given state. Unfortunately, the contributors to this volume conclude, that cultural and linguistic needs of minorities are rarely met by their states of residence, if they are made with reference to cultural pluralism. As is demonstrated in the contributions, representatives of minority groups which highlight the persistence of social exclusion and segregation are more likely to be marginalized in the national politics, than achieve a notable concession for the group they represent.

The third section of the volume examines social involvement in developing minority integration strategies. The authors in this section suggest that the successful implementation of integration policies and their constant development is highly dependent on the role taken by the majority population. These views are supported by the studies of the Czech Republic (Cashman), Hungary (McGarry) and Macedonia (Nikolic). Furthermore, contributors in this section find that the integration initiatives stall when the state majority is unprepared to take part in the process. Thereby inter-communal dialogue advanced by NGOs or community groups is essential for effective implementation of the national integration programmes and rapprochement between minority and majority groups.

Despite the many challenges minority integration is facing at the analytical level we are investigating in this book, CEE states currently enjoy favourable conditions to achieve this ambitious goal. No doubt, ethnic minorities in today's CEE have more opportunities to participate in political processes and engage in social interaction on terms more favourable to them as ever before. What our contributors see as decisive for guaranteeing equality between the majority and minority partners in the process, however, is the engagement of all actors from the field. The international community, nation-states, society, as well as the minority groups would need to further engage in negotiating the terms of equal treatment for all members of societies affected.

_____

References

Anderson, B. (1991), *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Brubaker, R. (2004), *Ethnicity without Groups*. London: Harvard University Press.

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

Burawoy, M, and K. Verdery (eds.) (1999), *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Connor, W. (1993), "Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethnonational Bond," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16: 373–389.

Fearon, J.D., and D.D. Laitin (2003), "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75–90.

Galbreath, D. J. (2005), *Nation-Building and Minority Politics in Post-Socialist States: Interests, Influence and Identities in Estonia and Latvia*. Stuttgart: ibidem Verlag.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hale, H. E. (2008), *The Foundations of Ethnic Politics: Separatism of States and Nations in Eurasia and the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hechter, M. (2000), *Containing Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenne, E. K. (2007), *Ethnic Bargaining. The Paradox of Minority Empowerment*. London: Cornell University Press.

Kuzio, T. (1998), *State and Nation Building in Ukraine*. London: Routledge.

Kymlicka, W. (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____

—(2000), *Politics in the Vernacular : Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—(2003), "Multicultural states and intercultural citizens," *Theory and Research in Education*, 1(2): 147–169.

Kymlicka, W. and A. Patten (2003), *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laitin, D. D. (1998), *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the near Abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

—(2007), *Nations, States, and Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Linz, J. J., and A. Stepan (1996), *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Malloy, T. H. (2005), *National Minority Rights in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nic Craith, M. (2006), *Europe and the Politics of Language. Citizens, Migrant and Outsiders.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Patten, A. and W. Kymlicka (2003), "Introduction: Language Rights and Political Theory: Context, Issues, and Approaches" in: A. Patten and W. Kymlicka (eds.) *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–51.

Parekh, B. (2000), *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillian.

Pridham, G. and T. Vanhanen (1994), *Democratization in Eastern Europe: Domestic and International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Pridham, G. and T. Gallagher (2000), *Experimenting with Democracy: Regime Change in the Balkans*. London: Routledge.

Rueschemeyer, D., M. Rueschemeyer, and B. Wittrock (1998), *Participation and Democracy, East and West: Comparisons and Interpretations*. Armonk, NY: M.E.Sharp.

_____

Saideman, S. M. (2001), *The Ties That Divide: Ethnic Politics, Foreign Policy, and International Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Soysal, Y. N (1994), *Limits of Citizenship. Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Toggenburg, G. v. (2007), "Europe and the Integration of Integration," *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minorities in Europe*, I/2007.

Vachudova, M. A. (2005), *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage, and Integration after Communism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wimmer, A. (2002), *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict. Shadows of Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.