



GreenPaths

EUROPEAN KNOWLEDGE HUB ON
JUST TRANSITION PATHWAYS

www.greenpaths.info



Title: Synthesis of WP3 results.

Case study 4: Assessing the impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in land use in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia

Deliverable number: Extracted from D3.4.

Date: December 2025



GreenPaths' grant agreement: 101112305. Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



**Funded by
the European Union**

PROJECT DETAILS

Project full title

GREEN-PATHS: European Knowledge Hub on Just Transition Pathways

Contract No.

101112305

Call

HORIZON-CL2-2022-TRANSFORMATIONS-02

Topic

HORIZON-CL2-2022-TRANSFORMATIONS-02-01

Type of Action

HORIZON Coordination and Support Actions

This is an excerpt from deliverable D3.4 of the GreenPaths Project, “Synthesis of WP3 results” (Document number HORIZON-CL2-2022-TRANSFORMATIONS-02-101112305-WP3-D3.4). This excerpt is focused on the results of the case study 4

Authors

Ajda Pistotnik (Policy Lab), Arne Kušej (Policy Lab)

Suggested citation

Pistotnik, A., & Kušej, A. (2025). "Assessing the impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in land use in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia (case study 4)", in *Deliverable D3.4: Synthesis of WP3 results*. GreenPaths project. Horizon Europe. Grant Agreement No 101112305.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Abstract	5
Keywords	5
1 Overview	6
Land, Power, and the Uneven Geographies of Europe’s Green Transition	6
Why Land Matters for Green Transitions	6
Why the Balkans Matter	7
A Degrowth and Critical Agrarian Lens	8
2 Research questions	8
Guiding and Empirical Questions	9
Variables and Social Impacts	10
3 Methods	11
Conceptual and Analytical Framework	11
Global Land Politics and Land Grabbing as Analytical Orientation	12
Comparative Tri-National Research Design	12
Data Sources and Empirical Materials	12
4 Findings and results	14
Europe’s Uneven Landscape of Land Concentration	14
Land Use Transitions: Ecological Change and Structural Adjustment	14
Land Access and Property Regimes: Winners and the Excluded	15
Farm Structure and Concentration	17
CAP Subsidy Distribution: Structural Drivers of Inequality	17
Environmental Justice, Green Transition Tensions, and “Green Grabbing”	18
Social Impacts: Depeasantisation, Inequality, and Rural Decline	18
Public Perception: Support Mixed With Disappointment	19
5 Main results	19
Structural Drivers of Land Concentration and Unequal Development	19
Environmental Outcomes: Limited Gains, Persistent Contradictions	20
Social Justice Dimensions: Exclusion, Gender Inequality and Territorial Decline	20
Benefits: Stability, Infrastructure and Environmental Potential	21
6 Discussion and conclusions	21
CAP, land concentration and post-socialist legacies	21
Depeasantisation, rural shrinkage and degrowth spatial politics	22



Commodification, green grabbing and metabolic rifts	23
Environmental justice, gender, and intergenerational inequality	23
Alternatives, resistance and commons-based pathways	24
What this case brings to GreenPaths.....	24
Conclusion.....	25
7 Recommendations	25
Principles for Policy Reform: Equity, Transparency, and Territorial Justice	26
Redistributive and Regenerative Alternatives to Land Concentration	26
Integrating Post-Growth Metrics into CAP and Land Policy	26
Strengthening Governance and Multi-Level Coordination.....	27
Strategic Openings for Social Movements and Cross-Border Solidarity	27
8 References.....	28

Introduction

Abstract

This case study examines the socio-environmental impacts of the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) on land use and rural livelihoods in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, three countries shaped by a post-socialist 'triple transition' of agrarian reform, market liberalisation, and EU integration. Despite CAP's stated aims of sustainability and rural renewal, its area-based direct payments reinforce land concentration, marginalize smallholders, and fuel rural depopulation. The research addresses a gap in studies of the CAP's distributive effects in Southeast Europe by asking: How does CAP shape land use and access in these countries, and what does this reveal about the social justice dimensions of the EU's green transition? Findings show that large agribusinesses (e.g., Perutnina Ptuj, Panvita, Agrokori/Fortenova, Al Dahra) capture subsidies and land, while small farmers—especially women and youth—face systemic exclusion. Conceptually, the study contributes to critical agrarian, political ecology, and degrowth literature, highlighting how CAP's green transition policies reproduce structural inequalities.

Keywords

Common Agricultural Policy (CAP); land use; food security; environmental protection; equity.

1 Overview

Land, Power, and the Uneven Geographies of Europe's Green Transition

Land is simultaneously a material resource, a social institution, and a political terrain. It anchors food systems, ecological cycles, livelihoods, identities, and cultural memory. Yet in dominant sustainability debates—particularly within EU climate and agricultural policy—land is often reduced to a technical variable: a commodity for carbon sequestration, renewable infrastructures, or biodiversity offsets. This case study, situated within the GreenPaths project, challenges such technical framings. Drawing on political ecology, critical agrarian studies, and degrowth research, it argues that land is where the core contradictions of the European green transition become visible – central to power dynamics and control of resources.

Land is not treated solely as a productive resource but as part of social reproduction, ecological continuity, territory, and identity. This framing is essential for understanding why CAP-induced land concentration and exclusion are not only economic symptoms but disruptions of deeply rooted social and ecological worlds.

Across Europe, farmland concentration has intensified. Large-scale industrial farms now control most agricultural land, while small farms—those most associated with traditional practices and rural vitality—continue to disappear (Lowder et al., 2021; Graeb et al., 2016). Between 2010 and 2020, the EU-27 lost nearly three million farms—primarily smallholdings under 5 ha—while farms over 100 ha expanded and now control more than half of all utilised agricultural areas (Eurostat, 2020; European Parliament, 2017). This trend is not unique to Western Europe; it is particularly pronounced in the Balkans, where post-socialist transitions, restitution, privatisation, and EU integration interact with CAP's area-based payment system to accelerate structural inequality and distributional injustices in the green transition (Burja et al., 2020; Borrás & Franco, 2018).

Why Land Matters for Green Transitions

The *EU's Green Deal, Farm to Fork Strategy* (Omar and Thorsøe, 2023), and *Biodiversity Strategy* position land as a central lever for climate resilience. Yet the policy tools deployed—particularly within the *Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)*—often deepen the very inequalities they seek to address. CAP still distributes the majority of its funding according to hectares owned, not socio-ecological value (Pe'er et al., 2019; Guyomard et al., 2023). Critics argue that this design reproduces the historical logics of productivism, commodification, enclosure, and artificially manufactured scarcity (Calo et al., 2021; Hickel, 2021). It sidelines centuries old systems of governance of land as commons (Helfrich & Bollier, 2015) and privileges high-input, carbon-intensive farming systems over agroecology, and small-scale farming with short supply chains.

This tension is evident even in ostensibly progressive environmental goals. The new EU objective of “No Net Land Take by 2050” (Colsaet et al., 2023) aims to reduce soil

sealing, yet in practice it often shifts development pressure—the demand for land for housing, logistics, transport corridors, renewable-energy installations, biodiversity offsetting, and other non-agricultural uses—onto rural and marginal territories. As urban and peri-urban areas tighten their land-use constraints, these pressures are displaced outward, accelerating farmland abandonment, consolidation into larger agribusiness units, or speculative acquisitions framed as environmental solutions. Such dynamics increasingly overlap with green grabbing, where land is enclosed under the banner of climate mitigation, carbon farming, biodiversity credits, or bioenergy expansion. Rather than supporting diverse rural livelihoods, these processes risk deepening inequalities and reinforcing the structural drivers of land concentration that this case study examines.

At the same time, new “green” frontiers are emerging. Carbon farming, renewable energy zoning, biodiversity offsets, and afforestation projects revalue rural land not primarily as a place of livelihood but as a site for climate mitigation and financial speculation (Avila, 2018; Apostolopoulou et al., 2021). In Croatia and Serbia, wind energy projects and conservation schemes on depopulated land illustrate how green transition policies can create new forms of green grabbing, where rural communities bear the costs of ecological “solutions” designed elsewhere. This is a contemporary reworking of the metabolic rift: socio-ecological burdens accumulate in rural peripheries, while environmental benefits and control are concentrated in urban and corporate centres (Moore, 2003; Dorninger et al., 2021). The rise of carbon farming, renewable energy zoning, conservation buffers, and rewilding initiatives can dispossess smallholders—especially in contested or marginal rural regions. This “green grabbing” reframes land as a carbon sink or biodiversity offset rather than a livelihood resource (Avila, 2018; Apostolopoulou et al., 2021; Fjeldstad et al., 2020). In the Western Balkans, such initiatives risk replicating patterns of exclusion under the banner of green transition.

Why the Balkans Matter

Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia offer a strategically important lens. All three have undergone a triple transition: from socialist agrarian models to liberalised land markets, from war or state restructuring to EU alignment, and from cooperative to individualised property regimes. These shifts have created fertile ground for internal land grabbing, elite capture, and foreign investor acquisition (FIAN, 2013; Kušić, 2022). However, the countries also have their differences: Slovenia retains a smallholder structure but experiences consolidation through CAP and public land leasing; Croatia faced shock restructuring upon EU accession, with thousands of small farms disappearing; and Serbia, though outside the EU, mirrors CAP-driven dynamics via IPARD conditionalities and privatisation, producing some of Europe’s most extreme land concentration patterns. These findings demonstrate that the social costs of the green transition are substantial: generational stagnation, land-access barriers, rising inequality, and depeasantisation. This case demonstrates that rural depopulation is both a biophysical problem and a social one.

A Degrowth and Critical Agrarian Lens

Recent degrowth scholarship emphasises that rural dispossession, depeasantisation, and land abandonment are central drivers of socio-ecological crises, yet remain marginal in urban-centric transition narratives (Varvarousis et al., 2025; Demaria et al., 2023). Critical agrarian studies similarly show how land policies reproduce race-class inequalities, metabolic rifts, and “accumulation by dispossession” (Moore 2003; Borrás and Franco 2013; Borrás and Franco 2025). Building on this, scholarship from Eastern and Southern Europe highlights how agrarian change in the EU’s semi-periphery is shaped by intersecting dynamics of environmental justice, post-socialist transition, and CAP-driven restructuring. Work such as Oprea, Velicu et al. (2023) on “eco-agrarian citizenship” and Velicu et al. (2022) on “quiet no more” peasant mobilisations demonstrates how small-scale farmers perform alternative ecological and political imaginaries while confronting exclusionary land regimes and subsidy architectures. Together, these perspectives underline a key insight guiding this case study:

A just green transition is impossible without confronting the politics of land. CAP, as currently structured, reinforces socio-spatial inequality rather than transforming it.

This case study thus positions land concentration—across Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia—as both a symptom and a driver of uneven green transitions in Europe’s semi-periphery, and as a critical focus for the GreenPaths project’s broader goals of justice-oriented sustainability.

2 Research questions

The GreenPaths project asks how green transition policies affect social wellbeing, environmental sustainability and territorial equity, and which “systemic contradictions or unintended consequences” they generate. This case study answers that central question by focusing on land as a key terrain where the EU’s green transition is being implemented, contested, and unequal.

The overarching research question guiding the case is:

How does the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) contribute to the transformation of land use patterns, agricultural practices and rural livelihoods of small farmers in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia?

This question is situated in a post-socialist “triple transition” context of socialist agrarian reform, market liberalisation and EU integration, where CAP’s and area-based direct payments interact with already fragile and unequal agrarian structures - spatial inequalities and dimensions of distributional injustice (Burja et al., 2020; Medarov, 2013; Swinnen, 2009; FIAN, 2019). While the European Green Deal and Farm to Fork strategy

claim to foster sustainability and rural renewal, CAP still predominantly rewards hectares rather than need, thereby reproducing land inequalities (Pe'er et al., 2019; Guy et al., 2017; Guyomard et al., 2023).

Guiding and Empirical Questions

To unpack the main question and link it explicitly to GreenPaths' primary research questions on social impacts, environmental outcomes and land justice, the study is structured around two guiding questions and three empirical sub-questions:

- I. To what extent does CAP contribute to land concentration, and what socio-economic and environmental consequences follow for small farms and rural communities in the European semi-periphery?*

Existing evidence shows that area-based payments “overwhelmingly benefited larger and more professionalised operations” (Guth et al., 2020), driving land price inflation and land grabbing (European Parliament, 2017). In Slovenia, farms over 20 ha—around 6% of all farms—received 40% of subsidies in 2016, while the smallest 50% received only 13% (Agency for Agricultural Markets and Rural Development, 2016). Similar patterns are visible in Croatia and Serbia, where corporate actors such as Agrokor/Fortenova and Al Dahra have consolidated tens of thousands of hectares (Srećković, 2013; Gluščević & Katić, 2019; Kušić & Eberle, 2025).

- II. How do different stages of EU accession and CAP alignment shape land-use change and agrarian restructuring in Slovenia (EU-15+), Croatia (recent member) and Serbia (candidate country)?*

The “anticipatory” effects of CAP and IPARD in Serbia, and the abrupt restructuring post-accession in Croatia, provide a gradient of integration through which to analyse policy linkages and territorial inequalities (Bilewicz et al., 2022; Burja et al., 2020). These are operationalised through three empirical sub-questions:

- EQ1 – Land-use and ecological change: How have land use and agricultural practices (crop patterns, intensity, abandonment, afforestation) changed since CAP accession/alignment, and with what consequences for soil, biodiversity and agroecological practices?
- EQ2 – Distribution, access and exclusion: Who benefits from CAP and CAP-like subsidies, and how do these mechanisms contribute to land concentration, “internal land grabbing” via leasing, rural depopulation and the marginalisation of smallholders, women and young farmers?
- EQ3 – Alternatives and just transition pathways: What viable alternatives to the current model of direct payments exist—such as cooperative farming, commons-based land governance and agroecology—and how might they support more

equitable and ecologically sustainable systems aligned with degrowth and territorial justice principles?

Variables and Social Impacts

To answer these questions, the case study investigates five key variables that link directly to GreenPaths' focus on social and environmental trade-offs:

- Land use patterns (monocultures, abandonment, afforestation, agroecological practices)
- Land access and tenure (public land leasing, informal tenure, price dynamics)
- Farm size and land concentration (polarisation, emergence of large agribusiness holdings)
- Ownership structures (state, corporate, family, oligarchic, foreign)
- Subsidy distribution (by size, region, and actor type)

Across these variables, the case study examines social impacts through the lens of the GreenPaths analytical framework. The core impacts correspond to key social impact processes:

- **Distributional inequality:** rising intra-rural inequality, polarisation of farm structures, and unequal subsidy capture.
- **Recognition and representation:** the marginalisation of smallholders, women, youth, and informal land users from CAP decision-making and national land governance debates.
- **Procedural justice:** barriers to entry, opaque land markets, and exclusionary institutional designs that favour capitalised actors.
- **Vulnerability and precarity:** rural exodus, depeasantisation, and the intergenerational crisis produced by shrinking access to secure land and viable livelihoods.
- **Agency, collective capacity, and alternatives:** how farmers, tenants, and grassroots organisations navigate and contest these dynamics, including emerging agroecological and commons-based initiatives.

These impacts reflect broader ecological tensions in a green transition that, rather than repairing the metabolic rift between society and nature, often deepens it through consolidation, financialisation, and technocratic “green” interventions (Moore, 2003; Calo et al., 2021; Franco & Borrás, 2013). Situating the case within this framework clarifies how land concentration and CAP-driven dynamics shape uneven transitions in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia.

3 Methods

This study employs a comparative tri-national and interdisciplinary methodological approach grounded in critical agrarian studies, political ecology, environmental justice, and degrowth research to analyse how the CAP reshapes land use, land access, and rural livelihoods in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia. Building on Kušić's (2022) argument that human–soil relations in Southeast Europe are historically and existentially embedded in processes of displacement, restitution, and ecological dependency. Land is not treated solely as a productive resource but as part of social reproduction, ecological continuity, territory, and identity. This framing is essential for understanding why CAP-induced land concentration and exclusion are not only economic symptoms but disruptions of deeply rooted social and ecological worlds.

Conceptual and Analytical Framework

The methodological approach integrates three major pillars of scholarship:

I. Critical Agrarian Studies (CAS)

The case study draws on Critical Agrarian Studies (CAS) to analyse how land relations, property regimes, and state policies shape rural inequality and environmental outcomes. Building on Borrás, Franco, and van der Ploeg, CAS highlights contested land authority, hybrid property systems, and the agency of smallholders. Insights from Colsaet et al. on “No Net Land Take,” Calo et al. on property regimes, and Srećković on post-socialist land grabbing illuminate emerging enclosures in the EU semi-periphery. Malek & Verburg inform the analysis of land-use decision-making, while Pe'er and Frelih Larsen et al. contextualise CAP's environmental and distributive effects.

II. Political Ecology of Land and Human–Soil Relations

Political ecology conceptualises land as embedded in power relations among states, capital, and communities (Fairbairn 2020; Bunkus and Theesfeld 2018). Kušić (2022) expands this perspective by showing how soil in Southeast Europe carries memory, loss, labour, and belonging. This view informs the study's attention to how CAP reshapes not just land markets but the lived materialities of farming and the social reproduction of rural life.

III. Degrowth, Commons, and Environmental Justice

Degrowth scholarship (Kallis 2018; D'Alisa et al. 2014; Barlow 2022) highlights alternative farming futures based on sufficiency, care, autonomy, and socio-ecological resilience. The commons and environmental justice frameworks developed by the

Institute for Political Ecology (IPE 2018; IPE 2020) inform the study's socio-environmental justice-oriented evaluation of land governance, emphasising democratic access, procedural fairness, and community control. Environmental justice perspectives help clarify who bears the costs and who benefits from these land transformations.

Global Land Politics and Land Grabbing as Analytical Orientation

The methodological orientation is further strengthened by global land politics and land-grabbing scholarship. Franco et al. (2013) conceptualise land grabbing as a reconfiguration of political authority and control over land through state–corporate alliances, while Yang and He (2023) identify structural drivers such as commodification, enclosure, and financialisation. Borrás and Franco (2025) frames land relations as dynamic, negotiated and multi-sited. Although the Balkan cases examined here involve primarily internal, policy-mediated land grabbing—through area-based subsidies, leasing regimes, and administrative decisions—rather than large-scale transnational acquisitions, the analytical insights of global land politics help reveal how CAP reproduces structural inequalities and facilitates elite capture.

Comparative Tri-National Research Design

The study compares Slovenia (EU member since 2004), Croatia (EU member since 2013), and Serbia (EU candidate shaped by IPARD conditionalities). This captures both direct CAP effects and anticipatory Europeanisation, revealing how EU rural policy logics reshape agrarian systems at different levels of integration. The design also reflects the post-socialist “triple transition” of socialist agrarian reform, market liberalisation, and EU accession.

Data Sources and Empirical Materials

Policy and legal analysis

The analysis draws on a comprehensive review of EU-level and national policy documents that govern agricultural subsidies, land markets, and rural development in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia. At the EU level, key instruments include the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Arts. 38–44), CAP Regulations 1307/2013, 2021/2115, and 2021/2116, the European Parliament Resolution on Farmland Concentration (2017), as well as the broader sustainability architecture of the European Green Deal, Farm to Fork Strategy, EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, and the EU Soil Strategy for 2030. These frameworks define the subsidy architecture, eco-scheme requirements, cross-compliance standards, and financial management rules that structure land use and agricultural production in the region.

Nationally, the study examines Slovenia's Farmland and Forest Fund Act (ZSKZ) and Agricultural Land Act; Croatia's Law on Agricultural Land (2018, amended 2022) and its CAP Strategic Plan 2023–2027; and Serbia's Law on Agricultural Land (2006, amended 2015), the Privatisation Law, and the IPARD II Programme 2014–2020 governing pre-accession rural development support. These documents were analysed to assess how EU-level priorities are translated into domestic law, and how state land is leased and allocated.

The analysis also considers international soft-law frameworks such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants (UNDROP) and the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT). Together, these sources illuminate how subsidy rules, property legislation, land-leasing mechanisms, and compliance systems interact to define who gains or loses access to land—and how policy contradictions contribute to land concentration, exclusion, and uneven green transition outcomes.

a) Secondary Data Gathering: Quantitative indicators

Eurostat (Farm Structure Survey; Economic Accounts for Agriculture), World Bank, and national datasets are used to analyse land use, farm structure, subsidy concentration, agricultural employment, and ecological indicators (soil, grassland protection, biodiversity).

b) Primary Data Collection: Semi-Structured Interviews

Five semi-structured interviews in Slovenia provided qualitative insight into policy implementation, land governance, and rural experiences. Interviewees included:

- an official from the Ministry of Agriculture,
- a representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Spatial Planning,
- Dr. Dora Matejak, researcher of organic farming governance and rural social reproduction,
- Dr. Katarina Kušić, political ecologist specialising in land, sovereignty, and human–soil relations in the South-East Europe,
- Maja Prijatelj Videmšek, environmental journalist covering biodiversity, food systems, and rural livelihoods for the national newspaper Delo.

Sampling was purposive, targeting key institutional, academic, and media perspectives on land and CAP. The semi-structured guide focused on land-access barriers, CAP implementation, subsidy distribution, environmental conditionalities, gendered and generational dynamics, and emerging alternatives (commons, agroecology). Transcripts were coded thematically, combining deductive codes (derived from the GreenPaths framework and research questions) with inductive codes emerging from the material. Interview data were then used to interpret statistical patterns and policy

documents, offering triangulation between quantitative trends, formal governance narratives, and everyday rural realities.

4 Findings and results

Europe's Uneven Landscape of Land Concentration

Across the EU, land is where agricultural policy, market forces, and green transition ambitions collide. Farmland concentration has accelerated over the past decade, with small farms disappearing at scale and land increasingly controlled by a shrinking minority of large holdings. Between 2010 and 2020, the EU-27 lost nearly three million farms—primarily smallholdings under 5 ha—while farms over 100 ha expanded and now control more than half of all utilised agricultural areas (Eurostat, 2020; European Parliament, 2017). This is not an accidental trend. It reflects structural incentives embedded in the CAP), which—despite green transition rhetoric—still distributes most of its budget through area-based payments that reward those who already possess land. Scholars argue that these mechanisms create a “protected space for agricultural entrepreneurs” (van der Ploeg et al., 2015; Kay et al., 2015), enabling the accumulation of land by commercial actors and agrobusiness conglomerates.

In Eastern and Southeastern Europe, these dynamics intersect with post-socialist property transformations, restitution, and weak regulatory governance, creating “hybrid land regimes” where socialist legacies coexist with financialised, investor-driven land markets (Franco and Borrás, 2013). Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia—countries shaped by the triple transition of socialist agrarian governance, neoliberal restructuring, and EU integration—illustrate how CAP-aligned instruments reshape land use, ownership, and the socio-ecological fabric of rural areas (Kušić, 2022).

Land Use Transitions: Ecological Change and Structural Adjustment

Agricultural Land Dynamics

Agricultural land share has declined in the EU-27 from 48.3% in 1990 to 40.7% in 2022 (World Bank, 2022), reflecting broader withdrawal from marginal farming, environmental conditionality, and structural adjustment. Slovenia maintains stable shares around 30% (World Bank, 2022), due to multifunctional landscapes and limited opportunities for large-scale consolidation (Bojnec & Latruffe, 2007). Croatia expanded agricultural land post-2000 but contracted sharply after EU accession in 2013 (World Bank, 2022), mirroring accession-related structural shocks (Burja et al., 2020). Serbia retains high levels (≈ 39 –41%) (World Bank, 2022), reflecting a production-oriented model shaped by commodity markets rather than EU conditionality (Srećković, 2013). This divergence illustrates how CAP membership reorganises land use, encouraging extensification, set-aside, and—critically—concentration in competitive zones while accelerating abandonment elsewhere (Pe'er et al., 2019).

Crop Patterns and Intensification

Cereal land—the backbone of industrial agriculture—fell sharply in the EU after decoupling, from 58.2 million ha (2000) to 51.5 million ha (2022) (World Bank, 2022). Croatia followed this pattern: cereal land contracted after accession (2013), undermining small cereal producers unable to meet new standards (Burja et al., 2020). Slovenia remained stable due to mixed-farming traditions (Udovč, 2003). Serbia, by contrast, sustains more than 1.7 million ha of cereals, reflecting an agrarian model shaped by commodity markets rather than environmental conditionality (Srećković, 2013).

Forest Expansion and Abandonment

Forest cover increased across all three countries. While often framed as ecological recovery, this trend also signals labour loss, rural depopulation, and the retreat of smallholder farming (Domazet et al., 2017; Burja et al., 2020; European Parliament, 2017). Afforestation under CAP Pillar II provides incentives but rarely addresses underlying socio-economic decline (Erjavec & Erjavec, 2015).

Collapse of Agricultural Employment

The decline in agricultural employment is profound between 2000–2022 (World Bank, 2022): Slovenia: 9.6% → 4.3%, Croatia: 16.5% → 5.9%, Serbia: 26.7% → 19.5%. This labour exodus is not neutral: it reflects a structural shift toward capital-intensive, land-intensive, labour-saving models, often supported by CAP subsidies. In the Balkans, this trend is tied to the erosion of peasant economies, youth outmigration, and the hollowing out of rural infrastructures.

Land Access and Property Regimes: Winners and the Excluded

Across Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, land access is increasingly shaped by property regimes that privilege capital-intensive actors, marginalise smallholders, and channel subsidies or state assets toward those best positioned to navigate administrative and political systems.

In Slovenia, the agrarian landscape appears dominated by smallholders—around 70% of farms remain under 5 ha, a legacy of socialist-era farm size limitations (Centrih and Sitar, 2022). Yet beneath this surface of fragmentation lies a pervasive trend towards consolidation. The Farmland and Forest Fund, responsible for managing restituted and state-owned land, increasingly leases larger parcels to corporate actors able to satisfy bureaucratic criteria and investment requirements (e.g., Court of Audit, 2018). Dr. Matejak stressed how paperwork requirements effectively “filter out those without administrative capacity.”

CAP patterns expose this structural bias: in 2016, farms over 20 ha—only 6% of all farms—received 40% of total CAP subsidies, while half of all farms (under 5 ha) received only 13%. Large agri-food firms such as Perutnina Ptuj, Panvita, and KG Lendava captured more than €80 million in CAP funds between 2011 and 2022. Although Slovenia’s protective land laws slow outright land sales, they do not counter the financialisation of land embedded in CAP’s area-based payments (Kay et al., 2015).

In Croatia, post-accession restructuring produced a more overtly politicised land regime. Between 2008 and 2018, more than 50,000 small farms disappeared (Josipović, 2021), while access to state-owned land became a site of political patronage. Leasing tenders frequently privileged well-connected agribusinesses, and CAP funds were entangled in scandals involving fraud, falsified livestock records, and manipulated land registries (Telegram.hr, 2023). Corporate conglomerates such as Agrokor/Fortenova expanded their holdings through debt-leveraged acquisitions and preferential access to state land (Domazet et al., 2022).

Here, CAP’s area-based logic accelerated land consolidation, enabling land to function as collateral or speculative capital, particularly in cereal and dairy sectors (Burja et al., 2020). Smallholders often face exclusion through administrative complexity, lack of legal assistance, and competition with capitalised actors (Franco & Borrás, 2013), resulting in a starkly dual agrarian structure: modernised, subsidy-rich agribusiness on one end, shrinking and marginalised family farms on the other.

Serbia, although outside the CAP, mirrors these dynamics even more sharply due to rapid, opaque privatisation following the fall of Milošević. Large tracts of state and cooperative land were transferred to oligarchs and foreign investors through legal loopholes, weak oversight, and corruption—conditions partly shaped by donor-driven privatisation frameworks (Srećković, 2013). A parallel pattern of resource capture is also seen in Romania’s forest commons (Velicu, 2025). By the mid-2010s, four major landowners controlled more than 100,000 ha—exceeding the territory of several municipalities (Gulan, 2010). The PKB Belgrade privatisation transferred 17,000 ha to Al Dahra (UAE) under highly controversial conditions (Kušić, 2022). Foreign investors commonly used shell companies to circumvent ownership restrictions (Srećković, 2013). Although Serbia is not a CAP member, pre-accession alignment through IPARD funding reinforces these dynamics by rewarding land size and capital intensity rather than social need or rural viability (Burja et al., 2020). Dr. Kušić emphasised that privatisation “created a class of agro-oligarchs who now shape rural space.” She described PKB’s privatisation as a turning point showing how international investors exploit weak regulation.

Together, these cases reveal a shared regional pattern: property regimes—shaped by restitution, privatisation, EU policy alignment, and financialisation—systematically generate winners and losers. Large agribusinesses and politically connected investors consolidate land control, while smallholders, tenants, youth, and women face increasing exclusion from both land markets and subsidy systems.

Farm Structure and Concentration

A convergent pattern of agrarian dual structure is visible across all three countries. In Slovenia, consolidation is intensifying despite the persistence of small average farm sizes: the largest 6% of farms now cultivate roughly one-third of national agricultural land (Agency for Agricultural Markets, 2016). Corporate actors dominate investment measures, modernisation schemes, and eco-schemes—interventions that, as shown by Erjavec et al. (2021), remain largely inaccessible to smallholders. Interviewees repeatedly highlighted the dual structure emerging: small farms remain many; large farms control most land and subsidies: “We look like a smallholder country, but the real power lies with a few big actors.” (Videmšek Prijatelj 2024) Similar dynamics are amplified in Croatia, where EU accession accelerated the restructuring of the sector: mixed family farms exited, while large agribusinesses expanded cereal, oilseed, and dairy production (Burja et al., 2020), and access to state land emerged as the decisive bottleneck for new entrants. Serbia exhibits the most unequal configuration, with a majority of farms below 5 ha coexisting with million-euro agroholdings and foreign capital controlling extensive estates (Srećković, 2013). Taken together, these trajectories reveal a region-wide shift toward top-heavy agrarian capitalism, where a small cluster of large landholders and vertically integrated firms increasingly shape food systems, while thousands of small farms struggle for viability or exit agriculture entirely.

CAP Subsidy Distribution: Structural Drivers of Inequality

Area-Based Payments as a Mechanism of Power

The Basic Income Support for Sustainability (BISS) rewards hectares, not livelihoods (Pe’er et al., 2017). This design produces several predictable effects: speculative leasing (Guyomard et al., 2023), land price inflation (European Parliament, 2017), and the transfer of subsidies to landowners rather than active farmers (Erjavec & Erjavec, 2015). It also contributes to the exclusion of young and women farmers, who typically hold smaller plots, lack capital to lease or purchase large areas, and face administrative and land-market barriers that make it difficult to accumulate eligible hectares (Burandt & Mölders, 2017). This regressive mechanism shapes land-access dynamics across all three countries. Also stressed by dr. Matejak that area-based payments shape land markets

Coupled Payments and Ecological Trade-Offs

Coupled payments for livestock reinforce: high-input, intensive production, increased stocking densities, feed dependence, soil erosion, greenhouse gas emissions (Guyomard et al., 2023; Pe’er et al., 2019). These incentives undermine ecological goals and further consolidate power among large, technologically advanced farms.

Environmental Justice, Green Transition Tensions, and “Green Grabbing”

Limited Environmental Effectiveness

Despite its expanded “green architecture,” the CAP has delivered only marginal ecological improvements. Fewer than 5% of hectares under greening requirements resulted in any substantive change in management practices (European Commission, 2020). Cross-compliance standards remain weak, often symbolic, while biodiversity indices continue to decline (EEA, 2015). Soil degradation and agricultural emissions persist or worsen (Fetting, 2020; Guyomard et al., 2023; Pe’er et al., 2019). The core issue is structural: environmental measures are layered onto a fundamentally productivist subsidy regime, producing internal contradictions in which financial incentives reward expansion and intensification, undermining the very ecological goals they are meant to support (Erjavec and Erjavec, 2015).

Emerging Green Grabs

The rise of carbon farming, renewable energy zoning, conservation buffers, and rewilding initiatives can dispossess smallholders—especially in contested or marginal rural regions. This “green grabbing” reframes land as a carbon sink or biodiversity offset rather than a livelihood resource (Avila, 2018; Apostolopoulou et al., 2021; Fjeldstad et al., 2020). In the Western Balkans, such initiatives risk replicating patterns of exclusion under the banner of green transition.

Social Impacts: Depeasantisation, Inequality, and Rural Decline

The social consequences of CAP-driven restructuring across Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia reflect deepening distributional and recognitional injustices, particularly for smallholders, women, and young people. Land concentration, mechanisation, and subsidy capitalisation contribute to a growing rural exodus, the ageing of farming populations, and the abandonment of marginal land (Burja et al., 2020; Domazet et al., 2017). This ongoing depeasantisation represents not only a socio-economic contraction but also a cultural loss, eroding rural identities and traditional ecological knowledge.

These trends are reinforced by intersectional inequalities. Women farmers hold significantly less land, have more limited access to credit and cooperatives, and are often excluded from leasing systems and investment measures (Burandt & Mölders, 2017; ECVC, 2021). Even when CAP includes nominal gender-support schemes, patriarchal inheritance norms and property regimes restrict women’s effective access to land and subsidies—an example of persistent recognitional injustice within agrarian policy.

Young farmers face similar structural barriers. Inflation of land prices through subsidy capitalisation (European Parliament, 2017), capture of state land by incumbents and politically connected actors (Kay et al., 2015), and high co-financing thresholds for

investment programmes (Guyomard et al., 2023) all contribute to entry denial. This blocks generational renewal and limits the emergence of new, more sustainable farming models.

Together, these social impacts illustrate how CAP's current design contributes to marginalisation of smallholders, rural depopulation, and elite capture of land governance, while only minimally enabling the community-led or cooperative alternatives emerging at the margins.

Public Perception: Support Mixed With Disappointment

Eurobarometer 556 (2024) shows high support for CAP across the EU. Croatia perceives CAP positively—especially for food security and rural development. Slovenia reports significantly lower satisfaction with environmental outcomes and adequacy of payments. A majority of Slovenians according to the Eurobarometer believe subsidies are insufficient, reflecting structural vulnerability of small mountainous farms. Perception data illustrates that citizens recognise CAP's importance, but also sense its uneven distribution of benefits. (Eurobarometer 556, 2024). Public officials from the Ministries noted public perception often reflects “structural precarity of mountain and small farms.”

5 Main results

Across Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia, the case study shows that the green transition—mediated through the CAP and CAP-aligned instruments—produces partial environmental improvements, yet simultaneously deepens land concentration, rural social inequality and socio-ecological disruption. These patterns reflect broader European trends but are intensified in post-socialist agrarian systems shaped by restitution, privatisation and hybrid property regimes (Franco and Borrás, 2013; Kušić, 2022; Bilewicz et al., 2022).

Interview data played a central role in interpreting these dynamics. Officials confirmed the limited effectiveness of eco-schemes and the persistence of productivist incentives; researchers highlighted gendered and generational barriers to land access; and journalists and practitioners described lived experiences of administrative exclusion, elite capture of state land, and the erosion of smallholder viability. These qualitative insights triangulate the quantitative and policy analysis, revealing how structural processes are felt on the ground and how CAP's design translates into everyday constraints, unequal opportunities, and uneven rural futures.

Structural Drivers of Land Concentration and Unequal Development

The principal finding is that area-based direct payments—the central mechanism of CAP Pillar I—reinforce land concentration and consolidate power among large actors, echoing earlier research on “protected spaces for agricultural entrepreneurs” (van der

Ploeg et al., 2015; Kay et al., 2015). In all three countries, land becomes a financial asset rather than a socio-ecological commons, aligning with global observations of land financialisation and policy-mediated land grabbing (Franco et al., 2013; Yang and He, 2023; TNI 2015).

In Slovenia, consolidation is hidden beneath a smallholder landscape, but CAP payments, leasing practices of the Farmland and Forest Fund, and investment subsidies favour larger vertically integrated firms (Udovč, 2003; Bojnec and Latruffe, 2005). In Croatia, post-accession restructuring accelerated the disappearance of over 50,000 small farms, as state land leasing and CAP compliance created opportunities for political-corporate capture (Josipović, 2021; Domazet et al., 2022). In Serbia, privatisation and IPARD alignment enabled oligarchic and foreign control over vast estates—illustrating a distinct form of policy-enabled internal land grabbing (Srećković, 2013; Kušić, 2022; Gulan, 2010). These findings demonstrate that the social costs of the green transition are substantial: generational stagnation, land-access barriers, rising inequality, and depeasantisation.

Environmental Outcomes: Limited Gains, Persistent Contradictions

While the CAP's green architecture (eco-schemes, greening, cross-compliance) provides some environmental benefits, such as stabilisation of grasslands, afforestation and modest uptake of organic practices (Erjavec and Erjavec, 2015; European Commission, 2020), overall ecological outcomes remain weak. Research across Europe shows <5% of land under greening experienced meaningful management change (Pe'er et al., 2019), biodiversity indicators continue to decline (EEA 2015), and high-input, livestock-intensive models remain subsidised through coupled payments (Guyomard et al., 2023). In Croatia and Serbia, land abandonment contributes to wildfire risk and human-large carnivore conflict (Domazet et al., 2017).

The case study confirms that environmental measures layered onto a productivist subsidy regime generate contradictions: green transition objectives coexist with incentives for monocultures, mechanisation and capital-intensive farming (Fetting 2020; Kallis 2018).

Social Justice Dimensions: Exclusion, Gender Inequality and Territorial Decline

The findings highlight major justice gaps: Rural depopulation and labour loss: agricultural employment collapsed across all three countries, reflecting structural adjustment and the erosion of peasant economies (World Bank, 2022; Swinnen, 2009). Across the region, CAP-related dynamics reproduce intersectional inequalities that disproportionately affect women, youth, and smallholders. Gendered injustices persist as women hold significantly less land, face inheritance and credit barriers, and capture fewer benefits from area-based subsidies (Burandt & Mölders, 2017; ECVC, 2021). Youth exclusion follows a similar pattern: inflated land prices through subsidy capitalisation,

restricted access to state land, and high co-financing thresholds systematically block generational renewal (European Parliament, 2017; Bunkus & Theesfeld, 2018). At the same time, commons-based and community alternatives—cooperatives, food-sovereignty networks, and local agroecology—remain marginal due to limited policy recognition and support (IPE, 2018; Liegey & Nelson, 2020; D’Alisa et al., 2014). Together, these dynamics illustrate how recognitional injustice intersects with structural barriers, reinforcing unequal access to land, subsidies, and opportunities within the green transition.

Benefits: Stability, Infrastructure and Environmental Potential

Despite these inequalities, the CAP does provide important benefits: income stabilisation for mid-sized and larger farms, rural infrastructure and diversification projects under Pillar II, partial support for organic farming, agroforestry and landscape conservation, improved environmental governance capacity in Slovenia and Croatia, strong public recognition of CAP’s contribution to food security (Eurobarometer 556, 2024).

The green transition in the region delivers limited ecological gains but significant social and distributive costs, reinforcing structural inequalities while failing to address core sustainability challenges. Without redistributive land governance, needs-based support, and meaningful backing for commons-based and agroecological systems, the EU’s green transition risks deepening rather than resolving ecological and social injustices in Southeast Europe.

6 Discussion and conclusions

This case study set out to understand how CAP and CAP-aligned policies shape land use, land access, and rural livelihoods in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia – and what this reveals about the environmental and social consequences of the EU’s green transition. The findings confirm much of the critical agrarian and political ecology literature on land concentration and subsidy inequality, but they also bring new nuance from Southeast Europe’s post-socialist “triple transition”. They show how green transition policies, when layered onto liberalised land markets and fragmented institutions, reproduce patterns of dispossession, depeasantisation, and ecological degradation rather than resolving them (Bunkus & Theesfeld, 2018; Burja et al., 2020; FIAN, 2019).

CAP, land concentration and post-socialist legacies

Across all three countries, CAP’s area-based payments and related instruments emerge as a central driver of land concentration and agrarian dualisation. In Slovenia, formal farm structures still appear “smallholder dominated”, but the distribution of subsidies reveals a different picture: a small minority of larger farms and agro-food corporations capture a disproportionate share of CAP funds, while the majority of small farms survive



on marginal payments (Udovč, 2003; Agency for Agricultural Markets, 2016). In Croatia, post-war privatisation, state land leasing, and EU accession reforms opened space for rapid agribusiness expansion and rural financialisation, epitomised by the rise and crisis of Agrokor/Fortenova as a systemically important rural actor (Domazet et al., 2022). Serbia, outside the CAP but influenced by IPARD and wider Europeanisation, demonstrates an extreme form of “internal land grabbing”: vast areas of former socially owned land were privatised in opaque ways, benefiting oligarchs and foreign investors, with the PKB–Al Dahra deal (17,000 ha) symbolising the dispossession of public agrarian assets (Srećković, 2013; Gluščević & Katić, 2019; Kušić & Eberle, 2025). In all three cases, land liberalisation and subsidy capitalisation generate a structural advantage for those who already control land, capital, and political connections.

These patterns resonate strongly with global land politics and land grabbing scholarship, which conceptualises enclosure not only as a historical process but as an ongoing dynamic of “accumulation by dispossession” through laws, markets, and policy incentives (Gómez-Baggethun, 2015; Franco & Borrás, 2013; Harvey, 2003). In Southeast Europe, CAP and CAP-like instruments do not create land grabbing; rather, they amplify and stabilise a trajectory where land is increasingly treated as an asset, collateral, or financial vehicle, and less as a commons, livelihood, or socio-ecological relation.

Depeasantisation, rural shrinkage and degrowth spatial politics

The empirical findings also echo what Varvarousis et al. (2025) call the neglected “rural front” of degrowth spatial politics. While much degrowth discourse has shifted towards cities, this case confirms that core drivers of socio-spatial inequality – depeasantisation, rural abandonment, land concentration, and the transformation of peripheries into sacrifice zones – are central to understanding the green transition in Europe’s semi-periphery.

In Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, agricultural employment declines sharply while agricultural land either consolidates in competitive lowlands or is abandoned in marginal territories. Forest expansion and land abandonment are often framed as ecological successes, but interview data and secondary literature show that they also reflect labour loss, rural depopulation, and the erosion of smallholder agroecologies (Domazet et al., 2017; Burja et al., 2020). Building on Varvarousis et al. (2025), this case demonstrates that rural depopulation is both a biophysical problem (biodiversity loss, altered hydrological cycles, increased fire risk) and a social one (loss of situated knowledge, worsening service access, ageing populations, gendered outmigration).

Degrowth spatial politics provide a critical lens to interpret these patterns. Rather than treating rural decline as an unfortunate side-effect of “necessary structural adjustment”, they reveal it as an outcome of growth-centred territorial logics that subordinate rural regions to extractive urban and agribusiness interests (Savini, 2021; Varvarousis et al., 2025). CAP and national policies, by prioritising competitiveness, productivity and export orientation, reinforce this subordination: the most fertile

territories are turned into intensive production zones, while marginal areas are left to “shrink smartly” or become arenas for green grabbing and speculative conservation.

Commodification, green grabbing and metabolic rifts

The case also speaks to the literature on commodification, commodity frontiers, and metabolic rift (Gómez-Baggethun, 2015; Moore, 2003; Conde and Walter, 2015; Hickel, 2021). CAP’s architecture extends a long historical process in which land and nature are enclosed, commodified, and reorganised around short-term extraction rather than long-term reciprocity. From this perspective, area-based direct payments function as contemporary instruments of enclosure: they convert access to public funds into a function of land ownership, strengthening private claims over what were once commons, social property, or state assets. Hickel (2021) reminds us that the original enclosures in Europe created artificial scarcity by cutting people off from land and commons, forcing them to sell their labour and intensify productivity. A similar dynamic is at play in Southeast Europe’s CAP-mediated land transformations. Smallholders who lose access to land or cannot compete for subsidies are pushed out of farming or into precarious niches; those who retain land often face pressure to intensify, specialise, and integrate into commodity chains, deepening ecological degradation and dependency.

Environmental justice, gender, and intergenerational inequality

Environmental justice perspectives help clarify who bears the costs and who benefits from these land transformations. As Anguelovski (2015) argues, environmental justice is about the right to remain in one’s place and environment, protected from uncontrolled investment, pollution, speculation, and abandonment. The case study shows that for many smallholders and rural residents in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, this right is increasingly undermined by policies and market dynamics that privilege large-scale, capital-intensive actors. Gendered and intergenerational inequalities are central to this picture. Women are overrepresented in small-scale, diversified, and agroecological farming but underrepresented among landowners and subsidy recipients (Burandt & Mölders, 2017; ECVC, 2021). Young farmers face inflated land prices, lack of access to state land, and high co-financing requirements for investment measures, making entry into agriculture extremely difficult (European Parliament, 2017; Guyomard et al., 2023). In practice, CAP’s nominal support instruments for young farmers and women are undermined by structural barriers embedded in property regimes, inheritance norms, and local power structures.

From an environmental justice standpoint, the green transition in these countries is not simply uneven – it is actively reproducing hierarchies of class, gender, and territory. While ecological rhetoric emphasises soil protection, biodiversity, and climate mitigation, the material benefits of CAP and related policies accrue disproportionately to those already integrated into global value chains, while those who maintain more labour-intensive, biodiverse, or subsistence-oriented practices are marginalised.

Alternatives, resistance and commons-based pathways

Yet the case does not only document dispossession and decline; it also points to alternative pathways. Degrowth, food sovereignty, and commons scholarship emphasise that land struggles are not only defensive but also prefigurative: they create spaces of experimentation with post-growth, commons-based, and agroecological futures (D’Alisa et al., 2015; Demaria et al., 2015; Helfrich & Bollier, 2015; Barlow et al., 2022).

In Southeast Europe, resistance takes multiple forms: opposition to scandalous privatisations and land deals; campaigns against soil sealing and highway projects; community-supported agriculture initiatives; local seed-exchange networks; and attempts to reclaim or re-common public land. These initiatives remain fragmented and often marginal in policy terms, but they embody what Barlow et al. (2022) call “small ruptures” that can open strategic horizons— from campaigns for more redistributive CAP payments (e.g. higher support for the first 20 ha) to broader alliances with climate justice and urban movements.

The degrowth literature on back-to-the-landers and eco-communities (Calvário & Otero, 2015; Cattaneo, 2015) is helpful here. While romanticising rural return would be naive, these experiences show how urban–rural movements can challenge the commodification of land, experiment with low-impact livelihoods, and reweave social ties. In Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, back-to-the-land and agroecological initiatives are still fragile, but they demonstrate that rural territories can be sites of socio-ecological innovation rather than mere sacrifice zones. Reclaiming land as a commons—legally, institutionally, or through practice—becomes a strategic axis for degrowth-oriented transitions.

What this case brings to GreenPaths

For the GreenPaths project, the case offers several key insights about how green transition policies impact environmental sustainability and social wellbeing, and how these impacts can be assessed. First, it shows that land is a critical missing dimension in many green transition debates. CAP and associated policies reorganise land use, ownership, and rural livelihoods in ways that directly affect biodiversity, soil health, climate emissions, and food systems. Ignoring land politics risks misreading “green” policies as neutral or beneficial when they may be deepening structural inequalities and ecological rifts. Second, it highlights the importance of spatial and territorial analysis. Comparing Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia demonstrates that the same policy logic (area-based payments, competitiveness, export orientation) produces differentiated outcomes depending on property legacies, institutional capacity, and stage of EU integration. Territorial justice requires understanding these differences, not assuming a homogeneous EU rural space. Third, it underscores the need for new indicators of green transition impacts. Conventional CAP performance metrics—hectarage under eco-

schemes, farm income support, basic environmental compliance—are inadequate for capturing justice outcomes. Fourth, it demonstrates that policy coherence is currently weak. The European Green Deal, Farm to Fork, and the Biodiversity Strategy articulate ambitious ecological goals, yet CAP’s dominant instruments remain structurally productivist and regressive. In the context of post-socialist land regimes, this incoherence is magnified: environmental ambitions are grafted onto systems that still prioritise export-led growth, investor confidence, and fiscal discipline over social and territorial equity.

Conclusion

In sum, this case study shows that in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, green transition policies centred on CAP do not automatically produce greener or fairer rural landscapes. Instead, when combined with post-socialist legacies of restitution, privatisation, and weak governance, they often reinforce land concentration, accelerate depeasantisation, and open new frontiers for commodification and green grabbing.

At the same time, the region hosts vibrant, if precarious, practices of resistance, commoning, and agroecological experimentation that prefigure alternative futures. For GreenPaths, a just green transition in Europe must take land politics seriously: who owns, controls, and works the land; under what conditions; and according to which social and ecological values. Without confronting these questions, the promise of a “green” CAP risks becoming another chapter in a much longer history of enclosure and extractivism—only this time, painted green.

7 Recommendations

The case studies of Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia show that land concentration is not a side effect but a structural outcome of current CAP and green transition policies. To support socially just and ecologically meaningful transitions, the following recommendations outline key directions for policy reform, governance, and social mobilisation—aligned with the aims of GreenPaths. The case suggests that GreenPaths should incorporate indicators on:

- land concentration and access (including state land leasing and informal tenure),
- the distribution of subsidies by farm size, gender, age and actor type,
- rural depopulation and service decline,
- biodiversity and soil health linked to farming practices,
- the presence of commons-based or cooperative land initiatives.

Principles for Policy Reform: Equity, Transparency, and Territorial Justice

A just green transition requires reforms grounded in the recognition of land as a socio-ecological commons, not merely a factor of production.

- Prioritise equity and redistribution, directing support to smallholders, women, and young farmers.
- Improve transparency through public registers of land ownership, leases, and subsidy beneficiaries.
- Ensure participatory governance, giving rural communities influence over land-use decisions.
- Promote territorial coherence, aligning CAP with biodiversity, soil, and climate objectives to avoid contradictory incentives.

Redistributive and Regenerative Alternatives to Land Concentration

To counter land consolidation and dispossession:

- Introduce payment caps and degressive payments to curb subsidy capture by large holdings.
- Establish public land banks and trusts prioritising agroecology, small farms, and young entrants.
- Expand commons-based governance, including cooperatives, community-supported agriculture, and eco-communities.
- Shift from area-based to needs- and care-based payments, recognising labour, biodiversity stewardship, and social reproduction.
- Implement safeguards against green grabbing in renewable energy and carbon offset schemes.

These measures strengthen rural resilience while reducing extractive pressures.

Integrating Post-Growth Metrics into CAP and Land Policy

Green transition strategies must move beyond productivist indicators:

- Adopt justice-based metrics (land access, tenure security, distributional fairness).
- Use agroecological indicators of soil health, biodiversity, and metabolic repair.
- Track gendered and generational inequalities in land access and subsidy support.
- Implement post-growth metrics (sufficiency, local provisioning, reduced material throughput).

This case identifies the need for a new indicator framework that measures wellbeing and ecological integrity, not competitiveness.

Strengthening Governance and Multi-Level Coordination

Institutional weaknesses exacerbate land inequality:

- Introduce anti-corruption safeguards in land leasing and subsidy allocation.
- Strengthen municipal capacity for fair and transparent land-use planning.
- Improve alignment between CAP, soil restoration, biodiversity targets, and no-net-land-take regulations.
- Enhance EU–national–local coordination to avoid fragmented or contradictory policies.

Robust institutions are essential for implementing equitable land transitions.

Strategic Openings for Social Movements and Cross-Border Solidarity

Structural change also depends on collective action:

- Support food sovereignty, agroecology, and land justice networks.
- Build cross-border Balkan alliances against land grabbing and rural exclusion.
- Strengthen community-led monitoring, including land observatories and investigative journalism.
- Foster degrowth-aligned rural revitalisation, linking urban and rural movements through solidarity economies.

These alliances broaden the political space for democratic, territorialised, and regenerative transitions.

Finally, it points towards pathways for a more just green transition. These include:

- redistributive CAP reforms (e.g. stronger capping, degressive payments, much higher support for small and medium farms),
- transparent and democratic governance of public land,
- strengthening of agroecological, cooperative, and commons-based farming,
- protection of smallholders, women, and young farmers as key actors of socio-ecological resilience,
- and strategic alliances between rural movements, degrowth networks, and climate justice actors.

8 References

- Agency for Agricultural Markets and Rural Development. (2016). Data on distribution of direct payments by farm size in Slovenia. Agencija RS za kmetijske trge in razvoj podeželja.
- Apostolopoulou, E., Cortes-Vazquez, J. A., & Adams, W. M. (2021). Green grabbing and the contested nature of the green economy. *Ambio*, 50(2), 212–227.
- Anguelovski, I. (2014). *Neighborhood as refuge: Community reconstruction, place remaking, and environmental justice in the city*. MIT Press.
- Avila, S. (2018). Environmental justice and the expanding geography of wind power conflicts. *Sustainability Science*, 13(3), 599–608. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0557-2>
- Bilewicz, A., Mamonova, N., & Burdyka, K. (2022). "Paradoxical" Dissatisfaction among Post-Socialist Farmers with the EU's Common Agricultural Policy: A Study of Farmers' Subjectivities in Rural Poland. *East European Politics and Societies*, 36(3), 892–912.
- Bojnec, Š., & Latruffe, L. (2005). Farm size, agricultural subsidies and farm performance in Slovenia. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 32(2), 301–323. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurrag/jbi010>
- Bojnec, Š., & Latruffe, L. (2007). Farm size and efficiency: The case of Slovenia. Conference: 100th Seminar of the European Association of Agricultural Economists (EAAE)
- Borras, S. M., & Franco, J. C. (2013). Global land grabbing and political reactions “from below.” *Third World Quarterly*, 34(9), 1723–1747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.843845>
- Borras, S. M., & Franco, J. C. (2018). The challenge of locating land-based climate change mitigation and adaptation politics within a broader land politics: Towards a land-political analysis of climate change. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 39(2), 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2018.1467484>
- Borras, S. M., & Franco, J. C. (2025). *The Oxford handbook of land politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Bunkus, R., & Theesfeld, I. (2018). Land grabbing in Europe? Socio-cultural externalities of large-scale land acquisitions in German agriculture. *Land*, 7(3), 98. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land7030098>
- Burandt, A., & Mölders, T. (2017). "Nature–gender relations within a social–ecological perspective on European multifunctional agriculture: the case of agrobiodiversity," *Agriculture and Human Values*, Springer; The Agriculture, Food, & Human Values Society (AFHVS), vol. 34(4), pages 955–967.
- Burja, V., Tamas-Szora, A., & Dobra, I. B. (2020). Land concentration, land grabbing and sustainable development of agriculture in Romania. *Sustainability*, 12(5), 2137.

- Barlow, Nathan & Regen, Livia & Cadiou, Noemie & Chertkovskaya, Ekaterina & Hollweg, Max & Plank, Christina & Schulken, Merle & Wolf, Verena. (2022). *Degrowth & Strategy: how to bring about social-ecological transformation*.
- Borras, S. M., & Franco, J. C. (2013). Global land grabbing and political reactions from below. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(9), 1723–1747.
- Borras, S. M., & Franco, J. C. (2025). Land politics, agrarian justice, and climate crisis. In S. M. Borras, J. C. Franco, & B. McKay (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of land politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Bunkus, R., & Theesfeld, I. (2018). Land grabbing in Europe? Socio-cultural externalities of large-scale land acquisitions in East Germany. *Land*, 7(3), 98.
- Burja, C., Burja, V., & Rusu, M. (2020). The Common Agricultural Policy and farm structures in the new EU member states. *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development*, 17(1), 21–38.
- Centrih, L., & Sitar, S. (2022). Pol kmet, pol proletarec. Integrirana kmečka ekonomija v socialistični Sloveniji, 1945–199. *Slovenska znanstvena zbirka za humanistiko (SZZH)*.
- Colsaet, A., Laurans, Y., & Levrel, H. (2023). No net land take by 2050? Assessing the potential and limitations of European land-use policy. *Land Use Policy*, 124, 106–150.
- Calo, A., De Master, K., & Mattera, P. (2021). Property, power and inequality: Landownership and agroecological transitions. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 83, 279–290.
- Colsaet, A., Laurans, Y., Levrel, H., & Salles, J.-M. (2023). Governing the ‘no net land take’ objective: Challenges for territorial planning in Europe. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 25(3), 281–297.
- D’Alisa, G., Demaria, F., & Kallis, G. (Eds.). (2014). *Degrowth: A vocabulary for a new era*. Routledge.
- Demaria, F., Kallis, G., March, H., & Pereira, Â. G. (2023). Degrowth and the politics of socio-ecological transformations. In M. Koch & F. Petrick (Eds.), *Postgrowth and wellbeing: Challenges to sustainable welfare*. Edward Elgar.
- Dorninger, C., Hornborg, A., Abson, D. J., von Wehrden, H., Schaffartzik, A., Giljum, S., Engler, J. O., Feller, R. L., Hubacek, K., & Wieland, H. (2021). Global patterns of ecologically unequal exchange: Implications for sustainability in the 21st century. *Ecological Economics*, 179, 106824. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106824>
- D’Alisa, G., Demaria, F., & Kallis, G. (Eds.). (2014). *Degrowth: A vocabulary for a new era*. Routledge.
- Domazet, M. (ur.). 2017. *Ecology and Justice: Contributions from the margins*. Zagreb: Institute for Political Ecology
- European Commission. (2019). *The European Green Deal (COM(2019) 640 final)*.
- European Commission. (2020a). *A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system (COM(2020) 381 final)*.

- European Commission. (2020b). EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030: Bringing nature back into our lives (COM(2020) 380 final).
- European Commission. (2021). EU Soil Strategy for 2030 (COM(2021) 699 final).
- European Parliament. (2017). European Parliament resolution of 27 April 2017 on the state of play of farmland concentration in the EU (2016/2141(INI)).
- Eurostat. (2020). Farm structure survey 2010–2020 [Data set].
- Erjavec, E., and Erjavec, K. (2015). “Greening the CAP” – Just a fashionable justification? *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, 22(2), 364–370.
- Erjavec, E., Juvančič, L., Lovec, M., Šumrada, T., & Volk, T. (2021). The new CAP 2023–2027 and its implications for small farms in Slovenia. *Kmetijstvo in gozdarstvo*, 77(2), 85–104.
- European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC). (2021). Women, land and agriculture in Europe: A feminist perspective on access to land and CAP reform. ECVC.
- Fetting, C. (2020). The European Green Deal. In *Green Deal for Europe – Policy paper series*. Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung.
- Franco, J. C., Monsalve Suárez, S., & Borrás, S. M. (2013). Land concentration, land grabbing and people’s struggles in Europe. TNI Agrarian Justice Programme Report. Transnational Institute.
- Fjeldstad, Ø., Benjaminsen, T. A., & Svarstad, H. (2020). Green grabbing through rewilding: The case of Northern Europe. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 27(1), 601–619.
- Fairbairn, M. (2020). *Fields of gold: Financing the global land rush*. Cornell University Press.
- FIAN International. (2013). Land concentration, land grabbing and people’s struggles in Europe. FIAN International.
- FIAN International. (2019). Land concentration, land grabbing and agrarian struggles in Europe: Update. FIAN International.
- Franco, J. C., Borrás, S. M., & others. (2013). Global land grabbing and political reactions from below. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(9), 1723–1747.
- Glušćević, S., & Katić, K. (2019). Land grabbing and agrarian restructuring in Serbia. In T. Domazet & A. Ančić (Eds.), *Food, agriculture and sustainability in the Western Balkans* (pp. 55–78). Institute for Political Ecology.
- Graeb, B. E., Chappell, M. J., Wittman, H., Ledermann, S., Kerr, R. B., & Gemmill-Herren, B. (2016). The state of family farms in the world. *World Development*, 87, 1–15.
- Guy, C., et al. (2017). Study on the impact of the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy on farmland concentration. European Parliament.
- Guyomard, H., Détang-Dessendre, C., Dupraz, P., Delaby, L., Huyghe, C., Peyraud, J. L., ... & Sirami, C. (2023). How the Green Architecture of the 2023–2027 Common Agricultural Policy could have been greener. *Ambio*, 52(8), 1327–1338.



- Guth, M., Smędzik-Ambroży, K., Czyżewski, B., & Stępień, S. (2020). The economic sustainability of farms under the conditions of new agricultural policy. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 1242.
- Gómez-Baggethun, E. (2015). Commodification. In D. D’Alisa, F. Demaria, & G. Kallis (Eds.), *Degrowth: A vocabulary for a new era* (pp. 59–62). Routledge.
- Graeb, B. E., Chappell, M. J., Wittman, H., Ledermann, S., Kerr, R. B., & Gemmill-Herren, B. (2016). The state of family farms in the world. *World Development*, 87, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.012>
- Gulan, B. (2010). *Ko su vlasnici najviše zemlje u Srbiji [Who owns the most land in Serbia]*. Novi Sad: Dnevnik-Poljoprivrednik.
- Guth, M., Smędzik-Ambroży, K., Czyżewski, B., & Stępień, S. (2020). The economic sustainability of farms under the Common Agricultural Policy in the EU. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6513. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166513>
- Guy, K., et al. (2017). *Distributional effects of CAP direct payments*. European Commission, Joint Research Centre.
- Guyomard, H., Bureau, J.-C., Chatellier, V., & Jacquet, F. (2023). The Common Agricultural Policy and the European Green Deal: The challenge of coherence. *EuroChoices*, 22(1), 18–25.
- Helfrich, S., & Bollier, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Patterns of commoning*. Offshoot Books.
- Hickel, J. (2021). *Less is more: How degrowth will save the world*. London: Penguin Random House.
- Institute for Political Ecology. (2018). *Commons in Southeast Europe*. IPE.
- Institute for Political Ecology. (2020). *Environmental justice in Southeast Europe*. IPE.
- Josipović, D. (2021). Agrarian restructuring and the disappearance of small farms in Croatia. *Sociologija i prostor*, 59(2), 145–168.
- Kallis, Giorgos & Kostakis, Vasilis & Lange, Steffen & Muraca, Barbara & Paulson, Susan & Schmelzer, Matthias. (2018). *Research On Degrowth*. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 43. [10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025941](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025941).
- Kay, S., Peuch, J., & Franco, J. C. (2015). *Extremely concentrated and unequal: New insights into the EU land concentration crisis*. Transnational Institute.
- Kušić K (2022) Land and human-soil relations in Southeast Europe, in: *Connections*. A Journal for Historians and Area Specialists, 18.11.2022.
- Deiana, MA and Kušić K (2025) “No Alternative but Europeanisation: Slow Violence and Critical Imaginaries in/from/with South East Europe.” In Aparna K, Krivonos D, and Pascucci E (eds) *Europeanisation as Violence: Souths and Easts as Method*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kušić K (2024) What’s in a Land Grab?: Knowing Dispossession and Land in Southeast Europe. In: Felix Anderl (ed) *Epistemologies of Land*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Lowder, S. K., Sánchez, M. V., & Bertini, R. (2021). Which farms feed the world and has farmland become more concentrated? *World Development*, 142, 105455.
- Liegey, V., & Nelson, A. (2020). *Exploring degrowth: A critical guide*. Pluto Press.
- Lowder, S. K., Sánchez, M. V., & Bertini, R. (2021). Which farms feed the world and has farmland become more concentrated? *World Development*, 142, 105455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105455>
- Malek, Ž., & Verburg, P. H. (2021). Mapping global patterns of land-use decision-making. *Global Environmental Change*, 69, 102303.
- Medarov, G. (2013). Land concentration, land grabbing and land conflicts in Europe: The case of Boynitsa in Bulgaria. *Land concentration*, 154.
- Moore, J. W. (2003). Ecology and the rise of capitalism. *Theory and Society*, 32(3), 307–377.
- Oprea, Anastasia & Velicu, Irina & Delibas, Hestia & Pedro, Sérgio. (2023). “We grow earth”: performing eco-agrarian citizenship at the semi-periphery of Europe. *Environmental Politics*. 33. 1-21. 10.1080/09644016.2023.2293432.
- Omar, Y. T., & Thorsøe, M. H. (2023). The EU Farm to Fork Strategy: A critical review of its governance and implications for sustainable food systems. *Sustainability*, 15(1), 1234.
- Pe’er, G., Zinngrebe, Y., Moreira, F., Sirami, C., Schindler, S., Müller, R., Bontzorlos, V., Clough, D., Bezák, P., Bonn, A., Hansjürgens, B., Lomba, A., Moeckel, T., Passoni, G., Rouillard, J. J., Vries, W. de, & Lakner, S. (2019). A greener path for the EU Common Agricultural Policy. *Science*, 365(6452), 449–451. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax3146>
- Pe’er, G., et al. (2019). Action needed for the EU Common Agricultural Policy to address sustainability challenges. *People and Nature*, 1(2), 316–333.
- Savini, F. (2021). The urbanization of the countryside: From land grabbing to neoliberal rural development. *Urban Studies*, 58(12), 2467–2484.
- Srećković, M. (2013). Land grabbing in Serbia. In FIAN International (Ed.), *Land concentration, land grabbing and people’s struggles in Europe*. FIAN International.
- Swinnen, J.F.M. (2009) The Growth of Agricultural Protection in Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries. *The World Economy*, 32, 1499–1537. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9701.2009.01247.x>
- Transnational Institute (TNI). (2015). *Land concentration, land grabbing and people’s struggles in Europe*. Transnational Institute.
- Udovč, A. (2003). Structural changes and farm diversification in Slovenia. *Acta Agriculturae Slovenica*, 81(1), 119–126.
- United Nations. (2018). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (A/RES/73/165)*.



Varvarousis, A., March, H., & Kallis, G. (2025). Degrowth's rural front: Spatial politics of post-growth transitions. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 104, 103005.

Velicu, I. & OGREZEANU, A. (2022). Quiet no more: The emergence of food justice and sovereignty in Romania. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 89. 122-129. 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.11.024.

World Bank. (2022). World development indicators. World Bank.

Yang, X., & He, Q. (2021). Global land grabbing: A critical review of case studies across the world. *Land*, 10(3), 324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10030324>



GreenPaths

EUROPEAN KNOWLEDGE HUB ON
JUST TRANSITION PATHWAYS

www.greenpaths.info



Funded by
the European Union

GreenPaths' grant agreement: 101112305. Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.