



CENTRE D'ÉTUDES
ET DE RECHERCHES
INTERNATIONALES



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

BEAR Montreal Summer School 2019
June 17-22, 2019
CÉRIUM, Université de Montréal

Zsuzsa Csergő
Political Science, Queen's University
csergo@queensu.ca

Magdalena Dembinska
Political Science, Université de Montréal
magdalena.dembinska@umontreal.ca

PLU 6910
Between the EU and Russia, Zone of Contestation

One of the defining aspects of post-Cold War European political and social development has been the contestation between the European Union and Russia, which continues to present major challenges for the prospects of peace and democracy on the continent. Most directly affected by this contestation are the states and societies in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), which find themselves at the intersection of European and Russian influence. In this zone of contact, the contestation has major consequences for the resolution of fundamental issues of state stability, democratic consolidation, and minority inclusion.

This summer school, organized by the Jean Monnet [BEAR Network](#) (“Between the EU and Russia: Dimensions of Diversity and Contestation”) in collaboration with CÉRIUM, will address the question of how EU membership and Russian regional politics influence state-minority relations in countries hosting sizeable ethno-cultural minorities in CEE. The focus will be on how state policies, and the willingness of states to accommodate minority claims, are influenced by security concerns associated with EU integration and Russian regional politics; and how different kinds of minority political actors adapt to constraints and strategize in pursuit of minority interests. The summer school will be structured along the following sets of questions:

- How does the relationship with EU and Russia shape intra-state policies of minority inclusion/exclusion in the region? How do states in the region instrumentalize/securitize minority issues? Why are some states more reluctant to accommodate minority claims than others?
- How do EU integration and Russian influence shape minority activism (i.e., the pursuit of collective minority interests) in the region? What explains regional variation in the way minorities organize politically in parliamentary and local politics? Why are some minority elite/parties more effective in negotiating with majority elites/parties than others?
- How do the politics surrounding *de facto states* (e.g., Transnistria) and similar territories of contested sovereignty associated with Russian influence (e.g., Donbas, Crimea) affect the prospects for EU membership in such territories? How does territorial contestation transform interethnic relations in such settings? What are some key external (EU- and Russia-related) and domestic

factors necessary for sustainable peace and democratic development on those territories?

The program takes place in Montreal (Université de Montréal).

It consists of a 6-day learning experience for graduate students, academics, journalists, members of non-governmental organizations, diplomats, policy-makers, and member of the public. Each day will focus on a major theme and will involve: a lecture delivered by an expert (followed by Q&A); and group discussions (seminars), moderated by the lecturer and the co-organizers of the summer school.

READINGS

Readings are mandatory for all students. We expect that students will have read the assigned articles and chapters before the start of the summer school in order for them to be able to actively participate in the discussions. Readings will be made available through our StudiUm site, the Université de Montréal online platform.

EVALUATION

Course requirements for the 3-credit summer school (and for BEAR-sponsored international students) include the following elements:

- **Two reading reports (2 x 15%):** These are analyses of 750 words each on the theme of an am or pm session of the student's choice, based on the required readings. This is not a summary of the texts; it offers a critical reflection on the debates proposed by the texts and is organized around a question and an argument. It should link the texts and compare/contrast their arguments. Reports are due at the beginning of the chosen session.
- **Research Paper (50%):** The research paper must be maximum 4,500 words long (excluding the bibliography) on a topic approved by the instructors. Students are expected to submit a paper proposal via email by **June 28**. The proposal should be maximum 2 pages long, and it should include the following: the research question and brief explanation of its significance; brief justification of case selection, where appropriate; an explanation for the method through which the research question will be answered; and a preliminary list of sources. The papers are due by **July 15**. Please email both proposals and final papers to sashenka.lleshaj@mail.mcgill.ca. Send everything in an editable Word file, and the file name should always include your name. Excellent papers may (with permission) be featured on the BEAR website.
- **Active participation (20%):** Students are expected to have done the assigned readings before class and to participate actively in class discussions.

DEMANDE DE REVISION / REQUEST FOR REVISION

Tout étudiant a droit, dans les quinze jours ouvrables qui suivent la date de communication des résultats, à la consultation de ses copies d'examens et de travaux, selon la forme d'évaluation utilisée. La communication se fait sans déplacement des documents et devant témoin. L'étudiant peut, dans les cinq jours ouvrables suivant la consultation, demander la révision de cette évaluation en adressant une demande écrite et motivée au doyen de la Faculté dont relève le cours. Si la demande est recevable, le professeur en est immédiatement informé. Ce dernier doit réviser l'évaluation, qui peut être maintenue, diminuée ou majorée. Au plus tard trente jours après avoir reçu la demande, le professeur transmet sa décision écrite et motivée au doyen, qui en informe alors l'étudiant. Si la demande n'est pas recevable, le doyen ou l'autorité compétente en informe l'étudiant par écrit dans les 20 jours ouvrables suivant la réception de la demande de révision

Every student is entitled, within fifteen working days of the date of communication of the results, to the consultation of its copies of examinations and works, according to the form of evaluation used. The communication is done without moving documents and in front of witness. The student may, within five working days of the consultation, request the revision of this evaluation by sending a written and

motivated request to the Dean of the Faculty to which the course is affiliated with. If the request is admissible, the teacher is immediately informed. The latter must revise evaluation, which can be maintained, decreased or increased. Not later than 30 days after received the request, the professor transmits his written and motivated decision to the dean, who then informs the student. If the application is not admissible, the Dean or the competent authority informs the student by written within 20 working days of receipt of the request for review.

LA PRÉVENTION DU PLAGIAT / PREVENTION OF PLAGIARISM

Le Département porte une attention toute particulière à la lutte contre le plagiat, le copiage ou la fraude lors des examens. Le plagiat consiste à utiliser de façon totale ou partielle, littérale ou déguisée le texte d'autrui en le faisant passer pour sien ou sans indication de référence à l'occasion d'un travail, d'un examen ou d'une activité faisant l'objet d'une évaluation. Cette fraude est lourdement sanctionnée.

Tous les étudiants sont invités à consulter le site web <http://www.integrite.umontreal.ca/> et à prendre connaissance du Règlement disciplinaire sur le plagiat ou la fraude concernant les étudiants. Plagier peut entraîner un échec, la suspension ou le renvoi de l'Université.

The Department pays particular attention to the fight against plagiarism, copying or fraud during examinations. Plagiarism is the total or partial use, literal or disguised, of another person's text as a reference or a reference in the context of a job, an examination or an activity that leads to subject of an evaluation. This fraud is heavily sanctioned.

All students are invited to consult the website <http://www.integrite.umontreal.ca/> and to read the Disciplinary Regulations on Student Plagiarism or Fraud. Plagiarism can lead to failure, suspension or dismissal from the University.

SCHEDULE & READINGS

Friday, June 14

FOR CREDITED and BEAR STUDENTS ONLY

4pm – 6pm: Preparation session

3744 rue Jean-Brillant, room 550-5

Magdalena Dembinska

Presentation of the syllabus and the objectives of the course, to be followed by a small reception.

All the following sessions will be held at 3744 rue Jean-Brillant, room 580-31.

Monday, June 17

The securitization of state-minority relations in the region

9.00-12.00: NATO, the EU and security relations in Central and Eastern Europe after the Cold War

Jim Goldgeier, American University, Washington D.C.

In the early 1990s, the wars and ethnic cleansing that erupted in the former Yugoslavia caused Western leaders to wonder whether relations among majority-minority groups throughout Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union would create widespread violence across the region. They began to develop plans to use the prospect of membership in the leading Western institutions, NATO and the European Union, to promote peace and prosperity. Countries eager to join the West would have to commit to democracy, a market economy, the rule of law and respect for human rights. By the end of the decade, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic joined NATO; they would soon join the European Union, and other countries followed in their footsteps. How did the prospect of membership in NATO and the EU shape the politics of Central and Eastern Europe, and what

of Russia, which sought to join the West after the collapse of the USSR but was not able to pursue membership in these institutions?

Readings:

- Ronald D. Asmus, Richard L. Kugler and F. Stephen Larrabee, Building a New NATO, *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 1993; available at <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/southeastern-europe/1993-09-01/building-new-nato>
- Christina Balis, “An Autopsy of the Failed Yugoslav Experiment,” *The SAIS Europe Journal*, April 1, 1999; available at <http://www.saisjournal.org/posts/the-lost-hour-of-europe>
- James Goldgeier, “Bill and Boris: A Window into a Most Important Post-Cold War Relationship,” *Texas National Security Review*, August 28, 2018; available at <https://tnsr.org/2018/08/bill-and-boris-a-window-into-a-most-important-post-cold-war-relationship/>

1.30-4.30: The Securitization and De-securitization of Minority Rights in Divided CEE Societies

Angela Kachuyevski, Arcadia University, USA

This short course explores the concepts of securitization and de-securitization, focusing on minority rights in divided societies, where the national identity is contested as the question of who properly belongs in the collective polity, and what it means to be a member of this polity, is in dispute. Securitization occurs when an issue not normally considered a security matter is articulated as an acute threat that justifies extraordinary action. Drawing upon concrete illustrations from Latvia and Ukraine, I explore how Russian policy toward Russian-speakers in neighboring states has securitized issues typically understood under EU norms and agreements as matters of human and minority rights including language, education and cultural preservation. That is, due to Russian policy and action, language, historical memory and education policy have become security issues that pose an existential threat to national identity. Both of these cases, however, despite their significant differences, illustrate that de-securitization is in fact possible if official policy reconciles diverse historical memories and language usage.

Readings:

- Balzacq, Thierry. 2011. “A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions, and Variants” in Thierry Balzacq, ed. *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. London: Routledge.
- Roe, Paul. 2004. “Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization.” *Security Dialogue* 35(3): 279-294.
- Jutila, Matti. 2006. “Desecuritizing Minority Rights: Against Determinism.” *Security Dialogue* 37 (2): 167-185.
- Cheskin, Ammon, and Angela Kachuyevski. 2019. "The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Post-Soviet Space: Language, Politics and Identity." *Europe-Asia Studies* 71(1): 1-23.

Tuesday, June 18

Strategies and instruments of European and Russian influence on state-minority relations

9.00-12.00: Dynamics of Interaction: Europe and Russia within the ‘Quadratic Nexus’

David Smith, Glasgow University, UK

One established conceptual framework for understanding state-minority relations in CEE is Brubaker’s ‘triadic nexus’, which posits a dynamic interaction between fields of ‘nationalising state’, ‘national minority’ and ‘external homeland’ nationalism. Devised in the early- to mid-1990s, this framework was inspired not least by the question of Russia’s relationship to Russian-speaking populations that found themselves living as minorities within neighbouring states following the collapse of the USSR. The nexus has, however, since been enlarged to incorporate an essential fourth element - the role of European and Euro-Atlantic organisations (EU, OSCE, Council of Europe) promoting international standards around ethnic conflict regulation, minority rights and integration. The various instruments devised by these organisations, however, can themselves be understood as products of a contested and contingent political field that dynamically interacts with other elements of the expanded ‘quadratic nexus’. Within this framework, this session will critically assess: the nature of the multilateral instruments devised by international organisations; how and why they came into being; and their

relationship to a field of Russian ‘homeland nationalism’ that is increasingly shaped in opposition to western liberal norms. This will set the scene for later sessions exploring how these fields impact on state strategies and minority activism.

Readings:

- David J. Smith (2002) Framing the national question in Central and Eastern Europe: A quadratic nexus?, *Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 2:1, 3-16.
- Gwendolyn Sasse (2008) The politics of EU conditionality: the norm of minority protection during and beyond EU accession, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15:6, 842-860.
- Marlene Laruelle (2015) Russia as a “Divided Nation,” from Compatriots to Crimea: A Contribution to the Discussion on Nationalism and Foreign Policy, *Problems of Post Communism*, 62:2, 88-97. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10758216.2015.1010902>
- Nevena Nancheva (2016) Imagining Policies: European Integration and the European Minority Rights Regime, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 24:1, 132-148.

1.30-4.30: Claiming the diaspora: Russia’s compatriot policy and its reception by Russian speakers in post-Soviet space

Kristina Kallas, Tartu University, Estonia

The session will focus on the various concepts and policy practices of Russia as a kin-state in relation to Russian-speaking populations in neighbouring countries and beyond. First, concepts such as “Russia as a divided nation” and “Russian World” will be discussed to highlight the various drivers that lead Russia’s diaspora policies. Russia’s internal political struggles to define the borders of post-Soviet Russian nation have resulted in contested concepts that also impact the geopolitical positioning of Russia as well as claiming the diaspora. Second, Russia’s diaspora policies towards its rather diverse diaspora populations will be discussed. First, policies towards Russian-speakers in Baltic countries will be contrasted with policies towards Russian-speakers in Central Asia. Additionally, policies towards Russian diasporas in Western democracies such as Finland, Germany and USA as well as Israel will be addressed. The lecture will open the discussion about whether Russia has “a diaspora policy” or rather “diaspora policies”?

Readings:

- Kristina Kallas (2016) Claiming the diaspora: Russia’s compatriot policy and its reception by Estonian-Russian population. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 15:3, 1-25.
- Natalya Kosmarskaya (2011) Russia and Post-Soviet “Russian Diaspora”: Contrasting Visions, Conflicting Projects. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 17:1, 54-74.
- Vera Zakem, Paul Saunders, and Daniel Antoun, Mobilizing Compatriots: Russia's Strategy, Tactics, and Influence in the Former Soviet Union, *Center for Strategic Studies* (November 2015).

Wednesday, June 19

Impact on state strategies toward minorities

9.00-12.00: State Strategies towards Russian-Speakers in Estonia and Latvia: How Policymakers Frame Europe and Russia in Debates over Citizenship and Language Policies

Jennie Schulze, Duquesne University, US

Since regaining their independence in 1991, Estonia and Latvia have been at the center of pressures from both Europe and Russia to integrate their large Russian-speaking minorities. Citizenship and language policies have been particularly contentious in these societies. Prior to EU accession, policymakers were slow to adopt inclusionary policies toward Russian-speakers in these areas despite mandates from the European Union and significant pressures from Russia. While European institutions are often credited for pre-accession reforms, they have rarely produced significant policy changes alone, and then only when domestic opposition was low. Whenever domestic opposition was high, the use Russian frames in parliamentary debates has been crucial for the passage of more inclusionary policies. In this discussion, we will take a closer look at the evolution of citizenship and language policies in Estonia and Latvia in policy areas where external pressure was high, as well as the ways in which policymakers have framed external actors within parliamentary debates in order to justify their policy preferences. The framing and counterframing of both Europe and Russia explains not only delays

and suboptimal outcomes surrounding “conditional” amendments in these cases, but also the path and form of policies in the post-accession period.

Readings:

- Agarin, Timofey and Ada Charlotte Regelman, “Which is the Only Game in Town? Minority Rights Issues in Estonia and Slovakia During and After EU Accession,” *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 13, no. 4 (2012): 443-461.
- Muznieks, Nils, Juris Rozenvalds, and Ieva Birka, “Ethnicity and Social Cohesion in the Post-Soviet Baltic States,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 47, no. 3 (2013): 288-308.
- Schulze, Jennie, L., “Does Russia Matter? European Institutions, Strategic Framing, and the Case of Stateless Children in Estonia and Latvia,” *Problems of Post-Communism* 64, No. 5 (October 2017): 257-275.

1.30-4.30:

Dominique Arel, University of Ottawa, Canada

Thursday, June 20

Minority activism under the influence of EU and Russia

9.00-12.00: Conditions for minority political agency in post-communist Europe

Zsuzsa Csergő, Queen’s University, Canada

European integration has expanded the space for minority participation in post-communist Europe in multiple political fields – domestic politics; cross-border politics involving kin-states; and European institutions. Yet the opportunity structures created through this process are accessible only to politically resourceful and well-organized minorities, and there is great variation across the region in the ability of minorities to construct political agency. This session will focus on the question of how members of various ethno-cultural minority populations pursue political agency in contemporary Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). We will discuss the meaning of minority political agency, the possibilities created by the Europeanization process, and the constraints faced by minorities living in the centralized unitary nation-states of CEE. We will then focus on the conditions specific to minorities with activist kin-states, against the backdrop of democratic backlash in several countries in the region today.

Readings:

- Licia Cianetti and Ryo Nakai. 2017. “Critical Trust in European Institutions: The Case of the Russian-Speaking Minorities in Estonia and Latvia.” *Problems of Post-Communism* 64 (5): 276-290.
- Peter Vermeersch. 2017. “How does the EU matter for the Roma: Transnational Roma Activism and Social Policy Formation.” *Problems of Post-Communism* 64 (5): 219-227.
- Csergő, Zsuzsa and Ada-Charlotte Regelman. 2017. “Europeanization and Minority Political Action in Central and Eastern Europe.” *Problems of Post-Communism* 64 (5): 215-18.

1.30-4.30: Pathways of Mobilization for National Minorities within the European Union

Myra Waterbury, Ohio University, US

National minorities in EU member states face a number of significant barriers to having their grievances heard and addressed within the European Union. They often suffer marginalization from the political establishment representing the majority population within their home state; they may have to contend with the stigma of ‘securitization’ stemming from their historical ties to a neighboring kin-state; and they tend to face reluctance from other powerful member states when they make demands for more robust collective rights protections. Yet, despite all this, national minority actors continue to utilize the European Union and its various institutions in their attempts to find allies, make claims, and impact domestic and Europe-wide policies on minorities. This session will explore both what minority actors hope to gain by addressing grievances at home through the framework of the European Union, and the various ways in which they seek to do so. The main avenues within the EU for minority activism are those that offer the best opportunities for intra-ethnic coordination, inter-minority cooperation, and enhanced domestic leverage. These include the European Parliament, the recent framework of the Citizens’ Initiatives, and the network of EU and related Europe-wide treaties, documents, and

associations that provide the legal and normative basis for minority rights claims. We will address the possibilities and limits of each of these pathways for national minorities within the EU.

Readings:

- Tamara Hoch Jovanovic, “Rethinking Approaches to Europeanization of Minority Politics” *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* vol. 13, no. 3 (2014): 1-14
- Myra A. Waterbury, “National Minorities and Intra-Ethnic Coordination in the European Parliament: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe.” *Europe-Asia Studies* vol. 68, no. 3 (2016): 391-408.
- Myra A. Waterbury, “Friends in High Places? The Externalisation of Hungarian Minority Rights Claims.” In *The Noble Banner of Human Rights: Essays in Memory of Tom Lantos*, eds. Anna-Maria Biro, Katrina Swett Lantos, Mate Fischer (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Publishers, 2018): 150-182.

Friday, June 21

Territorial contestation and state-minority relations in de facto states

9.00-12.00: Dynamics of de facto statehood: the Eurasian de facto states between patron, parent and the international community

Helge Blakkisrud, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

De facto states, states that have failed to win international recognition, have long been understudied ‘blank spots’ on the map. However, they play critical and contentious roles in international politics: since the end of the Cold War, de facto states have been involved in a disproportionately large number of violent conflicts, resulting in their establishment, change of status, or elimination. Almost all de facto states that survive beyond the first critical years have a powerful ‘patron’ that provides them with security guarantees and a lifeline to the outside world. This has led to a widespread understanding that de facto states are mere instruments in the hands of their patrons. Frequently, post-Soviet de facto states like Abkhazia and Transnistria are described as ‘puppets’ in the hands of a Moscow puppet-master. However, the reality is much more complex. De facto states are heavily dependent on the support – economic and political – provided by their patrons, but to understand the conflict dynamics – or the lack of dynamism – in these so-called ‘frozen conflicts’, we need to explore and acknowledge the agency of de facto state leaders in their manoeuvres between the patron state (Russia), the parent state (Moldova in the case of Transnistria, Georgia for Abkhazia) and the international community (here: the EU).

Readings:

- Bakke, Kristin, Andrew Linke, John O’Loughlin & Gerard Toal, 2018, ‘Dynamics of state-building after war: external-internal relations in Eurasian de facto states’, *Political Geography*, 63: 159–73
- Blakkisrud, Helge & Pål Kolstø. 2012. ‘Dynamics of de facto statehood: The South Caucasian de facto states between secession and sovereignty’, *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 12 (2): 281–98.
- Caspersen, Nina. 2012. *Unrecognized States*. Cambridge: Polity. Chapter 3: ‘Surviving in the modern international system’ and chapter 4 ‘Internal source of unrecognized state-building’.
- Kolstø, Pål & Helge Blakkisrud. 2017. ‘Regime development and patron–client relations: the 2016 Transnistrian presidential elections and the “Russia factor”’, *Demokratizatsiya*, 25(4): 503–28.

1.30-4.30: Internal dynamics of de facto states: ethnic groups and nation-building strategies

Magdalena Dembinska, Université de Montréal, Canada

Patron states are said to be a necessary, although not sufficient, condition to explain the varying degrees of survival of de facto states. Besides geopolitics, scholars acknowledge the importance of internal political dynamics that tend to institutionalise “statehood” despite non-recognition. These dynamics are linked to the de facto authorities’ efforts to legitimize the separatist cause and their own ruling authority among the “people.” Such internal legitimacy depends on the capacity of the authorities to provide for security and welfare as well as on their ability to construct and maintain a shared identity through processes of nation-building. Although all four Eurasian de facto states pursue a set of identity politics that would legitimize the separatist cause, comparing them reveals important differences in boundary-making strategies. While maintaining the image of the enemy central state and of an imminent external threat is a common endeavour, their collective identity-building diverge. Moreover, in ethnically divided societies, such as Abkhazia and Transnistria, any

encompassing identity constructions meet with resistance. This summer school session addresses the mechanisms of inclusion/exclusion of groups and minorities in the state-building efforts in de facto States.

Readings:

- Bakke, Kristin M., John O’Loughlin, Gerard Toal, and Michael D. Ward (2014), « Convincing Sate-Builders? Disaggregating Internal Legitimacy in Abkhazia », *International Studies Quarterly*, 58, 591-607.
- Comai, Giorgio, and Bernardo Venturi (2015), “Language and education laws in multi-ethnic de facto states: the cases of Abkhazia and Transnistria,” *Nationalities Papers*, 43:6, 886-905.
- Dembinska, Magdalena, “Nation-building in Post-Soviet de facto States,” chapter for Peter Rutland and Taras Ray (ed.), *Nation-building in Post-Soviet States*.

Saturday, June 22

9:00-12:00 Simulation Games

1:30-4:00 Round table on session papers

Cocktail offered by CÉRIUM