Full Report of Research Activities and Results

Background

Studies of post-communist state-building in Eastern Europe have barely investigated sub-state developments, whether it is the role of elites, institutional choices, differences in democratic practice, policy trends, and the impact of international factors, and in particular the impact of EU accession on elites and institutions. This research project set out to explore two dimensions of transition which had been generally overlooked in the literature on postcommunist transformations:

- What is the place of the sub-state level in democratic consolidation and how has democratic governance been institutionally embedded and practiced at the sub-state level in post-communist Eastern Europe?
- What is the role of international factors in democratic transition, in particular is the impact of the EU enlargement process on developments at the regional level, and specifically the impact of EU conditionality on institution-building in the area of regional policy and on minority protection in the CEECs?

In the wake of the collapse of communist regimes across Eastern Europe, the new post-communist governments moved quickly to introduce democratising reforms at the local government level. However, following these initial reforms, the reform of sub-national governance stalled and with the exception of Hungary, the question of regional reform did not return to the political agenda until the second half of the 1990s. The renewal of regional reform momentum coincided with the commencement of formal negotiations by the candidate countries for membership in the European Union. This project was interested in exploring how far the outcomes of the regional reforms had been shaped by the EU accession process. We sought to differentiate the impact of domestic factors (such as path dependencies from the communist era and previous historical legacies, domestic political struggles over transition, and minority issues) from international factors, in particular accession conditionality emanating from the Commission. Thus, the project aimed to test the significance of convergence pressures, and specifically EU enlargement criteria, for the process of reform in regional governance in Eastern Europe. Our case selection included countries originally in the so-called first wave of candidates (Estonia, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia), one in the second wave (Romania), and two that are unlikely to secure membership (Russia and Ukraine).

Objectives

The original aim of the project was to explore economic and political transition through a comparative study of the role of elites in the institutional design and practice of governance at the sub-state level across six Eastern European post-communist states by focussing on ‘second’ cities. Based on a preliminary analysis of our first round of local elite interviews which were conducted in Pecs, Maribor and Tartu in the summer of 1999, the research team recognised that one of the most critical dimensions of regional policy and sub-national institution-building in the CEECs was the relationship between the
European Union, enlargement conditionality, central governments and local and regional elites. Subsequently, we responded in a dynamic manner to our initial fieldwork by shifting our research efforts increasingly to exploring the nexus between EU conditionality and regional reform. Although the leverage of conditionality is understood as one of the primary means of ‘democracy promotion’, there have been few studies that have systematically analysed the application and impact of conditionality towards the CEECs in specific policy areas or its evolution over time. The research also developed to include a second policy case study by investigating the impact of EU conditionality on minority protection in the CEECs. This was relevant because the territoriality of key minorities in the CEECs was an important domestic constraint or accelerator of regional reform.

Our research project broadly followed the objectives laid out in the original application with some dynamic modification after the initial fieldwork:

The first objective was to devise a taxonomy of sub-national institutional arrangements in post-communist countries, an integral part of which was an assessment of the different reforms introduced since 1989. A taxonomy of sub-national institutional arrangements was developed early on in the project and revised in line with the ongoing changes in Eastern Europe. The most up-to-date version will be published in Hughes, Sasse and Gordon's chapter in the Keating and Hughes book, *The Regional Challenge in Central and Eastern Europe. Territorial Restructuring and European Integration*. (See 'Output' section for details), and the forthcoming OEOS working paper (2003). The latter is currently subject to a revise and resubmit for the *Journal of Common Market Studies*.

Our second objective was to assess the transference of state forms, traditions and administrative practice from EU states to post-communist countries and to examine the impact of EU convergence criteria on democratic progression in Eastern Europe. This objective formed one of the key aspects of our research project as we sought to gauge the impact of EU conditionality on institution-building at the regional level in the CEECs as well as its impact on the evolution of minority protection in the East European region. We report on our findings in the 'Results' section below as well as in many of the project's outputs.

Our third objective was to test Przeworski's hypothesis that geographical proximity to the EU improves the likelihood of a consolidated transition. While it is clear that those countries that are most proximate to the EU (such as Slovenia and Hungary) have achieved a more successful consolidated transition compared to those furthest away, such as Ukraine and Russia, our project did not develop this hypothesis-testing further as we concentrated instead on the examination of the impact of EU conditionality on transition. The presence of non-candidate countries in our country case selection enabled us to compare the outcomes of transition processes in particular policy areas in both candidate and non-candidate countries.

Our fourth objective was to investigate the composition, attitudes and roles of regional and local elites in post-communist states. This objective has been met based on an analysis of the socio-biographical data contained in our local
elite interviews and a profile of our elites will be published in our upcoming Palgrave monograph. Unfortunately we were unable to investigate policy networks in post-communist states using UCINET IV and policy network theory as proposed in our original application due to the poor quality of responses to the network questions during our interviews.

Our fifth objective was to provide detailed information and analysis of a level of governance and elites that are critical for stability and development in the region - to businesses, government agencies and EU policy makers. This has met through our participation in seminars and conferences as well as through the dissemination of our publications (working papers, policy briefings) to Commission officials and diplomats in Brussels, EBRD, officials in the DTI in the UK, and a wide range of practitioners. We optimised the dissemination of our findings through the preparation of policy briefings and participating in end user conferences, seminars and workshops.

Our sixth objective (added as a result of the initial findings) was to explore the role and effectiveness of the European Commission in facilitating the process of institution-building in Eastern Europe. This objective has been met. Some of our results our discussed below and further details can be found in the publications and other outputs emanating from the project.

Methods

Systematic interviewing of local elites
The main empirical tool for our research was a large-scale cross-national comparative study of local elites in key regional cities in Eastern Europe based on systematic interviews conducted in 1999-2001. The questionnaire was developed by James Hughes with the assistance of Peter John. In designing the questionnaire, they were able to draw on the experience of a previous smaller scale ESRC funded project on local elites in Russia and Kazakhstan (R000236652 Post-Soviet Local Elites in Siberia and Kazakhstan). The questionnaire was composed of the following sections: Socio-biographical data; Networks; Influence; Attitudes to Europe; Attitudes to NATO; Attitudes to transition in the city/region/country; Additional biographical information. (A sample questionnaire is attached).

This enabled the researchers to systematically construct a sociological and attitudinal profile of the elite: the current status and responsibilities of respondents, their career background, other personal data, reputed influence of individual elite members and their attitudes to a range of key issues, such as democratisation and marketisation, relations with the centre, ethnic relations attitudes to the European Union and NATO. The large "n" for interviews conducted in each city (in most cases about 75) means that it was possible to draw up fairly comprehensive individual profiles for each city.

Selection of case studies
We sought equivalence in our cases by using two main criteria in the selection of our cities. First we chose key regional 'second' cities in each country: Pecs in Hungary, Maribor in Slovenia, Tartu in Estonia, Cluj in Romania, Katowice in Poland, Lviv in Ukraine and St Petersburg in the Russian Federation. By
opting for the category ‘second’ cities we aimed for equivalence across country cases and sought to minimise the effects of variation between the cases in terms of size and importance relative to each other. In countries, where there was more than one potential option for ‘second’ city we selected cities that were most geographically oriented to the EU and/or had a reputation for being ‘Europeanized’ (culturally, economically, politically, historically). The choice of countries enabled us to carry out a number of tests following the comparative methods, such as tests of differences in elite attitudes between countries involved in negotiations to join the EU and countries, such as Russia and the Ukraine which have little likelihood of joining the EU.

Identification of elite respondents
Elite members in each city were selected as follows. First, we used positional criteria to identify an initial selection of 20-25 individuals for interviewing who were drawn from senior elected and appointed officials in the executive and legislative bodies of each city. After this initial selection, we snowballed out to other elite members using reputational criteria, by asking our initial selection of elites to identify other leading elite members. Using this method we interviewed as many as possible of the elite members identified, most of whom came from regional and local government, business, the mass media, and to a lesser extent, the cultural intelligentsia, up to a maximum of 75 in each city. This mixture of methods is common in elite studies (Higley et al: 1991; Kadushin: 1995). In most cases about one-third of the interviews were conducted by James Hughes and Gwendolyn Sasse and the remainder by local researchers.

Analysis of results
By the end of the project we conducted 446 interviews (74 in Pecs, 72 in Maribor, 66 in Tartu, 76 in Cluj, 76 in Katowice, 27 in St Petersburg and 55 in Lviv). The project became one of the largest studies of elites in Eastern Europe ever undertaken by UK academics. The responses were coded and the results were inputted to SPSS, creating a data set of 363 cases and 115 variables. Claire Gordon carried out the descriptive data analyses which identified the significance of the relationship between sub-national actors and structures and the European Union, and the ambivalence of regional and local elites to the EU in spite of the fact that they stand to benefit substantially from financial assistance through the Structural Funds and in some cases have already received considerable funds through PHARE and other EU aid instruments. Peter John carried out multivariate analysis of the consolidated dataset combining the results from the five candidate countries. (Thus far St. Petersburg and Lviv have been treated as separate cases). This strategy generated enough cases to allow for conventional statistical tests and allowed for the testing of hypotheses across the countries. James Hughes and Peter John then analysed this data to explain attitudes to democracy and the market, using ordered probit models. The analysis grouped the independent variables into theoretical categories of the sociological (age, education, parental occupation), previous regime socialisation (membership of party and apparatchiki), role in the elite (e.g. administration, private sector), level of national identification, extent of international networks and association
memberships. An article on this work is near completion. Some of our findings are discussed below.

**Interviews in Brussels**
30 interviews were conducted in Brussels in December 2000 and March 2001 by James Hughes, Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon with officials in the European Commission, including members of DG Enlargement and DG Regio, and diplomats in the missions of the Candidate Countries to the European Union. This allowed us to disseminate our initial findings as well as to deepen our study of the relationship between the enlargement process and regional policy.

**Results**

**The Regional Gap and Euro-Ambivalence at the Sub-national level**
The analysis of our interviews conducted in Pecs, Maribor and Tartu in the summer of 1999 led us to the conclusion that the process of EU enlargement was a crucial factor in sub-state level developments in the CEECs. However, our interviews also revealed a so-called regional gap in the enlargement process and considerable ambivalence concerning the impact of the European Union at the sub-national level. This disengagement of local elites from the EU enlargement process was highlighted in:

- The general perception among local elites in these cities that the benefits of their relationship with the EU are greater at the national rather than at the local level.
- The limited knowledge among local elites about EU programmes currently underway in their cities and regions.
- The overwhelming evaluation of the EU by local elite members in terms of national-level economic and security referents (free trade, economic cohesion, economic and monetary union, common foreign and security policy) rather than local- and regional-level referents (Structural Funds, Europe of the Regions, subsidiarity).

Local elites are critical at three basic levels in the process of EU integration: firstly, for strategies of compliance in the implementation of EU regulations; secondly, for strategies to embed commitment levels to the integration process itself; and thirdly, to help secure a mobilisation in favour of accession in the forthcoming referenda at the sub-national level. The lack of stakeholding in the enlargement process is potentially an obstacle to its success. These findings were published in a an article published in *European Union Politics*, one of the leading international journals in European Studies (see Outputs section for details).

Given the increasing concentration of the research on the relationship between regionalisation and EU enlargement conditionality and also given the difficulties we encountered in St Petersburg (outlined in section 6 above), the decision was taken to introduce an additional case study city, Katowice in Poland. Contrary to our other case study countries, Poland has introduced a decentralised and democratised tier of government at the regional level. Results from the interviews conducted in Katowice in the second half of 2001 suggested a somewhat different pattern to our initial case study cities.
discussed above. While knowledge about EU programmes currently underway in Katowice and the surrounding region remained rather limited, respondents had more positive attitudes to the benefits of their relationship with the European Union at the local level suggesting possibly either a process of learning over time had taken place or that the self-governments at the regional level in Poland have meant that local elites feel more engaged with the process of EU enlargement.

Local elite attitudes to Europe
The analyses of the data conducted by James Hughes and Peter John replicated earlier findings for Novosibirsk in Russia, that sociological factors and elite position predict attitudes, not communist regime socialisation (Hughes and John, British Journal of Political Science, 2001). It was found that attitudes to transition were predicted by the elite members' international networks and contacts, which appear to indicate a diffusion of attitudes across central Europe. In the case of attitudes to the wider Europe, we found that previous regime socialisation does not predict attitudes, but again a range of network contact variables predict or at least are associated with positive attitudes. Thus those who travel abroad more and receive visitors more tend to be more satisfied with economic transition and have a more positive view about the benefits of their country's relationship with the EU. These findings reinforced the research team's opinions about the potential contradictions between the top-down Commission approach to enlargement which seems to rely on the trickle-down effect at best versus the crucial role of communication and interaction working from the bottom-up in building European integration. Interestingly, those respondents who were dissatisfied with the transition to democracy in their country also tended to have positive views about the benefits of their country's relationship with the EU, suggesting perhaps that these interviewees expect that EU membership will have positive effects on the state of democracy at home. Hughes and John are now working on a paper on 'Elites and Democratization in Post-communist Transition States' which will be submitted in due course to the British Journal of Political Science.

The Commission and Regionalisation in Eastern Europe
Our local elite interviews provided rich and valuable insights into elite attitudes to Europe at the sub-national level, in particular the considerable degree of ambivalence at the local level to Europe and the perception that EU enlargement was overwhelmingly a national-level-Commission interaction. In view of these findings and as part of its investigation of the impact of EU conditionality on policy outcomes in the area of regional policy, the research team also sought to investigate evolving attitudes to regional policy within the Commission itself.

Our examination of the EU's strategy on regionalisation in Eastern Europe -- based on the analysis of EU documentation, and in particular the PHARE reports and Regular Reports as well as 30 interviews with Commission officials and candidate country diplomats in Brussels -- suggests that there was an evolution in attitudes to regionalisation in the European Commission and a tension between competing visions of how regional governance should be reformed in the candidates (both within and across different DGs). This
tension can be summarised as a conflict between the goals of decentralisation versus control and efficiency, between (i) support for decentralized mechanisms for Structural Funds (whether democratic regional government or administrative regions), and (ii) a technocratic emphasis from some in the Commission on a concentration on centralised administration at the national level, thus enabling the Commission to control and evaluate better the efficient use of EU funds and implementation of the acquis communautaire.

This tension over objectives, and the evolution in the Commission's stated preferences for regional fund management in the CEECs, impeded the Commission's ability to operate as an effective, consistent actor in its dealings with Eastern Europe. Moreover, it fuelled misperceptions in the candidates as to whether the Commission wanted them to adopt a particular 'model' of regional governance. Furthermore, the shift in the objectives of the PHARE programme (the principal mechanism for delivering aid to Eastern Europe) after the commencement of accession negotiations from the promotion of systemic change in the CEECs to the promotion of systemic convergence with the EU by targeting assistance on the adoption of the acquis also contributed to the mixed signals being sent and misperceptions in the CEECs. Our interviews with elite actors in the CEECs indicate that the demands emanating from the Commission and PHARE on regional policy were viewed as an inchoate moving target. Despite the Commission's insistence that it has not sought to impose a particular model of sub-national governance structures on the candidate countries, our interviews revealed that many officials in the CEECs believed that in the early phase of the accession negotiations the Commission favoured a decentralized self-governing model of regional government. Over time with the growing appreciation of the lack of administrative capacity to manage funds even at the centre, the Commission's preference shifted to strengthening the capacity of the centralised management of EU funding in the candidates.

The beginning of formal negotiations focused attention on regional reform in the CEECs, but some states such as Poland were developing their own regional governance structures prior to accession. Despite the power asymmetry between the candidates and the Commission in Brussels and the implicit conditionality concerning regional policy, the actual regional reforms were influenced more by domestic factors (historical legacies, domestic political issues). This is evident in the diverse pattern of regionalisation across the CEEC region. Attempts to implant structures from the outside as in the case of Romania collapsed or as in the case of Hungary resulted in a network of regional development agencies which have served as Potemkin structures with little substance and utilised as a cover for clientelism and centralisation by central government. The asymmetrical form of regionalisation that has occurred in the CEECs is, paradoxically a convergence with the diversity of regional governance in the Member States.

EU Enlargement Conditionality and Minority Protection in the CEECs

The exploration of the evolution of minority protection in the CEECs formed the second case study of the impact of EU enlargement conditionality on policy change in Eastern Europe. The ‘Copenhagen criteria’ (1993) have been widely viewed as constituting a successful incentive structure and sanctioning
mechanism for the EU in the promotion of human rights and the protection of minorities. As with regional policy, there have been few attempts to systematically analyse the application and impact of conditionality in the area of minority protection. James Hughes and Gwendolyn Sasse employed a process tracking approach to study the relationship of EU conditionality to changes in minority rights protection in the CEECs. They found that EU conditionality on respect for and protection of minorities is not clearly temporally correlated with the emergence of new political strategies and laws on minority protection in the CEECs. Rather, the Regular Reports, which constitute the EU’s main instrument for monitoring the linkage between conditionality and compliance were characterised by ad hocism, inconsistency, and a stress on formal measures rather than substantive evaluation of policy implementation. The Reports make references to ‘international standards’ or ‘European standards’ without clarifying what they are. Moreover, the emphasis has been on acknowledging the existence of laws and measures rather than the evaluation of their implementation. Although eight of the ten CEECs have significant minority populations, the conditions of only two minority groups are consistently stressed in the Regular Reports: the Russophone minority in Estonia and Latvia and the Roma minorities of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia. The absence of clear benchmarks has created dilemmas for both the EU and the candidates in determining how and when conditionality has been satisfied. The EU is over-reliant on proxies (primarily international bodies such as the Council of Europe and its Framework Convention, the OSCE and NGOs) to help it perform the monitoring functions which subsequently inform its judgements on policy compliance. That EU political conditionality in the case of minority protection was largely ‘declaratory policy’ and a double standard, where a higher standard was expected from the candidates than from Member States, is confirmed by the Treaty of Amsterdam which defines the ‘common values’ of member states. It sets out all of the elements included in the first Copenhagen criterion, which are defined in Article 6 (1) as “liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law”, but expressly excluded “respect for and protection of minorities”.

These two case studies of the impact of the EU’s conditionality on the accession of the CEECs suggest that there are considerable limits to the power asymmetry between the EU and the candidates. In both the case of institution-building at the regional level and minority protection, this has partly been the product of inconsistency, insufficient capacity and poor knowledge within the Commission itself of the different policy areas, as well as a general lack of transparency in establishing guidelines and benchmarks. Nevertheless, particular outcomes, such as those in regional policy and minority protection, have been more influenced by domestic political factors in the candidate countries. In both policy areas, the candidate countries have selected from the menu of accession criteria and, while in some cases have appeared to incorporate them into their domestic legislation, they have implemented policy more in response to domestic pressures.

Activities
Throughout the duration of the grant and beyond, researchers on the project have participated in numerous conferences, workshops and seminars in the UK, Europe and the United States at which they presented ongoing findings and analyses. Full details of these have been entered on the Regard database.

Members of the research team have attended annual conferences organised by the OEOS programme and the final conference in London on March 24, 2003. James Hughes co-organised with Dario Castiglione (University of Exeter) an end of project policy dissemination meeting ‘Institutional Reform, Citizenship and Civil Society in the Enlarged Europe’ which brought together four OEOS project teams at the London School of Economics on 15 March 2003. At the seminar, our project team presented two policy briefings ‘Evaluating Phare as an Instrument of Institution-Building in Eastern Enlargement’ by James Hughes, Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon, and ‘The Impact of EU Enlargement Conditionality on Minority Protection in EU Candidate Countries in Central and Eastern Europe’ by James Hughes and Gwendolyn Sasse.

Members of the research team have been active participants in the ‘Opposing Europe’ network which studies Euroscepticism. Dr. Gwendolyn Sasse on behalf of the LSE contributed to a successful bid to obtain funding for a series of ESRC research seminars on ‘The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism in Contemporary Europe’ awarded to a consortia of universities (Reference no. R451265110). Claire Gordon was involved in the organisation of the Opposing Europe seminar at the LSE in December 2002. We are currently preparing a book chapter ‘The Regional Dimension to Euroscepticism in Eastern Europe’ by James Hughes, Claire Gordon and Gwendolyn Sasse to be contributed to Paul Taggart ed, Opposing Europe: The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism in Contemporary Europe, vol. One: Theoretical, Comparative and Analytical Perspectives to be published by Cambridge University Press.

James Hughes co-organised with Professor Michael Keating of the Department of Social and Political Studies, European University Institute, an international workshop on ‘EU Enlargement and Regionalisation: Comparative Analyses’ at the European University Institute, Florence in May 2002. The organisers have co-edited a book from the papers which is in press. The project contributed two chapters to this book.


Claire Gordon made a presentation on ‘The Promotion of Regionalisation in the Candidate Countries: From Centralisation and Planning to Local Government’ to the Team Europe Seminar on the EU’s Structural Funds and Regional Policy, Brussels, June 2001.
Gwendolyn Sasse organised a workshop States of Transition in Europe: Linking the Internal and International Dynamics of Change at the LSE on 8 June 2001 -- bringing together several project teams from the OEOS Programme and other UK-based academics to explore the practical and theoretical implications of the international dimension of state-building in the countries of Eastern Europe. During this seminar, members of the research team presented papers on the following themes: James Hughes ‘Enlargement and Regionalisation: A Case of Study of Europeanization?’ and Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon ‘Condionality and Regionalisation in Central and Eastern Europe’.

We made two research trips to Brussels in December 2000 and March 2001 during which the preliminary results from our local elite surveys were presented to officials in DG-Enlargement and DG-Regional in the European Commission and to diplomats from the candidate countries’ missions to the EU.

Members of the research team participated in end user events of other OEOS several teams such as two seminars organised by the ‘Fuzzy Statehood’ project at the Royal Institute for International Affairs, and also two seminars by ‘The Outsiders: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and the New Europe.’ In the case of the latter they presented papers at a seminar on ‘Russia and the Wider Europe’ at the London School of Economics in April 2001 on ‘The EU-Russia Common Strategy’ (James Hughes), ‘The EU’s Common Strategies: A Comparison of Russia and Ukraine’ (Gwendolyn Sasse) and ‘Europeanisation and Russia-EU Relations: The View from St. Petersburg’ (Claire Gordon).

Outputs

Books

James Hughes and Gwendolyn Sasse (2004 forthcoming), Europeanization and Regionalization in Central and Eastern Europe, Palgrave OEOS series


Journal articles

www.ecmi.de/jemie/specialfocus.html

James Hughes, Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon (forthcoming), ‘EU Enlargement and Power Asymmetries: Conditionality and the Commission’s Role in Regionalisation in Central and Eastern Europe’, presently under a revise and resubmit for the *Journal of Common Market Studies*.

**Book chapters**


James Hughes, Gwendolyn Sasse, Claire Gordon and Tatiana Majcherkiewicz (2003 forthcoming), ‘Silesia and the Politics of Regionalisation in Poland’ in G. Kolankiewicz (ed.), *Regionalisation in Poland*


**Working papers**


Policy Briefings
James Hughes, Gwendolyn Sasse and Claire Gordon (2003), ‘Elites and Institutions in Local and Regional Governance in Eastern Europe’, One Europe or Several?, Final Newsletter.


Conference papers
The members of the research team have participated in numerous conferences in the UK, Europe and the United States. Details of our conference papers have been entered on Regard.

Data sets
The research has produced two statistical data sets. One in SPSS (consisting of 363 cases and 115 variables, and another in STATA (consisting of 363 cases and 212 variables) We are currently in discussions with Qualidata and the UK Data Archive about the deposit of these data sets in their archive. In addition we have 446 interviews which are available in hard copy.

Impacts
We are not aware of any commercial impacts of the research.

Future Research Priorities
Debates about regional reform are ongoing in many CEECs, in particular as regards the establishment of regional self-government or democratised tiers of government. There are two significant issues involved. Firstly, there is a debate over whether the administrative-statistical structures that have been created, as in Hungary, in response to EU pressures should be transformed into more democratic and more accountable structures of governance. Secondly, there are serious problems with regional self-government in countries with large territorialized minorities (e.g. Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Estonia and Latvia).
We plan to continue to follow these developments and to explore the continuing impact of the relationship between European Union and the sub-national level in Eastern Europe. This will be become even more complex as the candidates finally achieve membership in 2004 and start to be the recipients of Structural Funds. Members of the research team are already researching minority protection regimes in the CEECs/new Member States and how these are being shaped by the interaction of EU and International conditionality on the one hand, and domestic pressures on the other. This issue will be a significant political and security issue in an enlarged EU.
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