



**SCHOOL OF HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS**

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS PROGRAMME

INTP/POLS211: SPECIAL TOPIC: GOVERNING DIVIDED SOCIETIES

CRN 15527

TRIMESTER 2 2009

13 July to 15 November 2009

Trimester dates

Teaching dates: 13 July to 16 October

Study week: 19 to 23 October

Examination/Assessment period: 27 October to 14 November

NB. Please note that you should be able to attend the examination for INTP/POLS 365 at the University at any time during the formal examination period.

Lecturer: Dr Fiona Barker

Room: MY505

Phone: 5759

Email: fiona.barker@vuw.ac.nz

Office Hours: Office hours will be announced at the first lecture and posted on my office door and on Blackboard.

Lecture Times: Monday, Wednesday 16:10 – 17:00

Lecture Venue: Hunter LT220

Tutorial Times/Venue: These will be arranged in the first week of lectures. Information on the tutorial times and venues will be communicated in lecture and posted on Blackboard.

Course Delivery

This course is taught by way of two lectures a week and a tutorial. The lectures will introduce the key concepts and theories relevant to each week's readings. They will concentrate on giving students an analytical framework for understanding and assessing how societies manage difference. They will also give detail on particular case studies relevant to the themes being covered. Weekly tutorials will begin in Week 3. Tutorials are intended to consolidate students' understanding of the key concepts and to facilitate students' reactions to the weekly readings. The second goal of tutorials is to study in more depth the details of country case studies. To that end, some tutorials will be replaced by documentaries or feature films on particular country cases. These will be analysed and critiqued in the subsequent week's tutorial. The final examination will be held during the Trimester 2 examination period, which runs from 27th October to 15th November 2009.

Communication of additional information

Additional information or information about any changes to the course timetable or programme will be announced in lectures and posted on Blackboard. Students should check Blackboard regularly for communication of important information related to the course.

Course content

Many countries are characterized by linguistic, ethnic or religious divisions that result from patterns of state formation, colonization, immigration, and border-shifting. In this course we examine how “divided societies” such as Lebanon, Canada, Northern Ireland and Bosnia-Herzegovina are governed. How, and *how successfully*, have states responded to “deep diversity”? We study various responses to difference, including integration, federalism, devolution, electoral laws, consociationalism and partition. Why do leaders choose certain strategies, and with what consequences? What are the particular challenges of “institutional engineering” in post-conflict situations or when international actors become involved? We also consider underlying questions about which goals (e.g. democracy, stability) *should* be prioritized in the accommodation of difference.

Learning objectives

After passing this course students should be able to do the following:

- Recognize and use concepts central to the study of diverse societies, such as “ethnicity”, “nation”, “federalism”, “consociationalism”. This understanding will be tested in the in-class test and the final examination.
- Compare and critique the institutional and policy responses of states in societies with linguistic, ethnic or religious divisions; and understand and explain the consequences that these different institutional and policy choices have for social and political outcomes in diverse societies. You will demonstrate fulfilment of this objective through the essay and the final examination.
- Discuss different views on the “best” way to manage a diverse society or to measure “success” in management of diversity. You will demonstrate fulfilment of this objective through the essay and the final examination.

Graduate Attributes

As with all POLS and INTP courses, learning objectives of this course contribute to the attainment of specific attributes in the areas of critical thinking, creative thinking, communication and leadership.

Please consult the Programme Prospectus 2009, p. 10, for more details or on our website

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/pols/>

Expected workload

In accordance with Faculty Guidelines, this course has been constructed on the assumption that students will devote 15 hours per week to POLS/INTP 211. This includes 2 hours of lectures plus one tutorial per week.

Essential texts:

The prescribed textbook for the course is: S. Bose (2002) *Bosnia after Dayton* (London: Hurst & Co). You must also buy the *POLS/INTP 211 Course book 2009*. A detailed list of each week’s required and recommended readings is listed at the end of this Course Outline.

For the first two weeks of trimester all undergraduate textbooks and student notes will be sold from the Memorial Theatre foyer, while postgraduate textbooks and student notes will be available from the top floor of VicBooks in the Student Union Building, Kelburn Campus. After week two all undergraduate textbooks will be sold from VicBooks and student notes from the Student Notes Distribution Centre on the ground floor of the Student Union Building.

Customers can order textbooks and student notes online at www.vicbooks.co.nz or can email an order or enquiry to enquiries@vicbooks.co.nz. Books can be couriered to customers or they can be picked up from the shop. Customers will be contacted when they are available.

Opening hours are 8.00 am – 6.00 pm, Monday – Friday during term time (closing at 5.00 pm in the holidays). Phone: 463 5515.

Assessment requirements

In-class test	worth 20% of your total course mark; held <u>Wednesday 12 August</u>
Essay (2,000- 2,500 words)	worth 40% of your total course mark; due <u>Monday 21 September</u>
Final Exam	worth 40% of your total course mark

Assessment for this course comprises three elements. The **in-class test** part-way through the trimester is designed to ensure that you have learned what it means to be a divided society and understood some of the key concepts related to identities and to ethnic and national difference. This material is an important foundation for the second half of the course.

In the **essay** you will be required to show an understanding of one or more of the different strategies that political leaders use to manage divided societies, applying this to one or more cases that we cover in the course or of your own choosing. You must submit the essay in written form AND upload it in electronic form to Blackboard.

The **final exam** will test your understanding of material covered throughout the course, with a focus on the range of strategies and cases addressed in the second half of the course. The date, time and venue of the final three hour exam will be determined when the University completes its timetable during the second half of the trimester. The examination period runs from 27th October to 15th November 2009.

Return of assignments

In-class tests and essays will be returned in lecture and are also available for pick-up in tutorial time of the same week. After this time, students may pick-up the marked assignment during my office hours.

Penalties

Students will be penalised for late submission of essays—a deduction of 5% for the first day late, and 2% per day thereafter, up to a maximum of 8 days. Work that is more than 8 days late can be accepted for mandatory course requirements but will not be marked. However, penalties may be waived if there are valid grounds, e.g., illness (presentation of a medical certificate will be necessary) or similar other contingencies. In such cases prior information will be necessary.

Mandatory Course Requirements

To gain a pass in this course each student must:

- a) Submit the written work specified for this course, on or by the specified dates (subject to such provisions as are stated for late submission of work)
- b) Sit the final exam at the end of the course.

Turn-It-In:

Student work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine <http://www.turnitin.com>. Turnitin is an online plagiarism prevention tool which compares submitted work with a very large database of existing material. At the discretion of the Head of School, handwritten work may be copy-typed by the School and subject to checking by Turnitin. Turnitin will retain a copy of submitted material on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions is not made available to any other party.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND PLAGIARISM

Academic integrity means that university staff and students, in their teaching and learning are expected to treat others honestly, fairly and with respect at all times. It is not acceptable to mistreat academic, intellectual or creative work that has been done by other people by representing it as your own original work.

Academic integrity is important because it is the core value on which the University's learning, teaching and research activities are based. Victoria University's reputation for academic integrity adds value to your qualification.

The University defines plagiarism as presenting someone else's work as if it were your own, whether you mean to or not. 'Someone else's work' means anything that is not your own idea. Even if it is presented in your own style, you must acknowledge your sources fully and appropriately. This includes:

- Material from books, journals or any other printed source
- The work of other students or staff
- Information from the internet
- Software programs and other electronic material
- Designs and ideas
- The organisation or structuring of any such material

Find out more about plagiarism, how to avoid it and penalties, on the University's website: <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/study/plagiarism.aspx>

GENERAL UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENTS

Students should familiarise themselves with the University's policies and statutes, particularly the Assessment Statute, the Personal Courses of Study Statute, the Statute on Student Conduct and any statutes relating to the particular qualifications being studied; see the *Victoria University Calendar* or go to the Academic Policy and Student Policy sections on:

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy>

The AVC(Academic) website also provides information for students in a number of areas including Academic Grievances, Student and Staff conduct, Meeting the needs of students with impairments, and student support/VUWSA student advocates. This website can be accessed at:

<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/avcacademic/Publications.aspx>

Outline of lectures and readings

PART I	INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTS
Week 1 July 13, 15	Introduction to the Course Ethnicity, Nation and Identity
Week 2 Jul 20, 22	Diversity in Empires & Colonial States Contemporary Choices for Managing Diversity
PART II	POLITICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO DIVERSITY
Week 3 Jul 27, 29	The Integrationist Approach – Turkey, France

Week 4 Aug 3, 5	Executive & Legislative Power Sharing –Lebanon, Northern Ireland
Week 5 Aug 10, 12	Executive & Legislative Power Sharing –Lebanon, Northern Ireland <i>In-class test August 12</i>
Week 6 Aug 17, 19	Electoral System Design – Fiji
	<i>MID-SEMESTER BREAK: Monday 24 August to Friday 4 September</i>
Week 7 Sep 7, 9	Political Decentralization – Canada, United Kingdom
Week 8 Sep 14, 16	Legislative Measures and Public Policies
Week 9 Sep 21, 23	**Essay Due Monday, 21 September** Partition & Secession – Cyprus, Bosnia
Part III	BRINGING IT TOGETHER: BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA
Week 10 Sep 28, 30	Bosnia-Herzegovina
Week 11 Oct 5, 7	Bosnia-Herzegovina
Week 12 Oct 12, 14	Conclusions

Reading List and Questions:

Part I INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTS

Week 1: July 13 (Mon) Introduction to the Course

Questions – What is a *divided* society? What is a multinational state? What kinds of conflicts can occur in divided societies, and why?

Required reading:

Gurr, T.R. (2000) *Peoples versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington DC: US Institute of Peace.

NB. This reading is not in the Coursepack. The book has been placed on Closed Reserve in the library. Please read 2-3 case studies of minorities around the world that interest you.

Further reading:

Brown, M. (1993) "Causes and implications of ethnic conflict", in Brown (ed.) *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 3-26.

Kymlicka, W. (1996) *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: OUP. [pp. 10-25]

Keating, M. "So many nations, so few states: territory and nationalism in the global era", in A-G. Gagnon & J. Tully (eds.) *Multinational Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39-64.

Horowitz, D. (2000) *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: UC Press. [Chaps. 3-5]

July 15 (Fri) Ethnicity, Nation and Identity

Questions – What is meant by the terms *identity*, *nation* and *ethnicity*? Are identities in divided societies fluid or fixed, real or constructed identities? Can states shape identities?

Required reading:

Waters, M. (1999) *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 44-49.

Hutchinson, J. and A. Smith (1996) "Introduction", in Hutchinson & Smith (eds.) *Ethnicity*. Oxford: OUP, 3-14.

Maaalouf, Amin (2000) *On Identity*. London: The Harvill Press, pp. 3-25.

Johann Gottfried von Herder (1784) *Materials for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*.

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1784herder-mankind.html>

Further reading:

Connor, W. (1978) "A nation is a nation, a state is a state, an ethnic group is a ...", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 1: 4, 379-388.

Trevor-Roper, H. (1983) "The invention of tradition: the Highland tradition of Scotland", in E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds.) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: CUP, 15-42.

Week 2: July 20 (Mon) Diversity in Empires & Colonial States

Questions – What are some historical examples of how states managed difference? We consider the institutional practices of the Ottoman Empire and of colonial powers in Africa in the face of highly diverse populations. Would these types of choices be logistically and morally possible today?

Required reading:

Grillo, Ralph (1998) *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference: State, culture and ethnicity in comparative perspective*. New York: OUP. [Chap. 4, pp. 75-96]

Bunche, Ralphe (1968) *A World View of Race*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, pp. 46-62.

Further reading:

Laitin, D. (1985) "Hegemony and religious conflict: British imperial control and political cleavages in Yorubaland", in Evans, P., D. Rueschemeyer and T. Skocpol (eds.), *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: CUP, 285-316.

Weber, Eugen (1976) *Peasants into Frenchmen: the Modernization of Rural France*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [pp. 3-11, 95-99, 241-276, 485-496]

July 22 (Fri) Contemporary Choices for Managing Diversity

Questions – What strategies can political leaders of divided societies use? Must difference always be accommodated, or can it be ignored or even eliminated? Which strategies are acceptable in democratic societies?

Required reading:

McGarry, J. and B. O’Leary (2007) “Framing the debate: integration versus accommodation”, in R. Panossian, B. Berman & A. Linscott (eds.), *Governing Diversity: Democratic Solutions in Multicultural Societies*, Montreal: International Center for Human Rights and Development, 19-29. [Online at: http://www.dd-rd.ca/site/_PDF/publications/R&D-Governing-Diversity-ENG-low.pdf]

Further reading:

O’Leary (2001) “The Elements of Right-Sizing and Right-Peopling the State”, in O’Leary, Brendan, Ian S. Lustick, and Thomas Callaghy. *Right-sizing the State - The Politics of Moving Borders*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 28-62.

Part II POLITICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO DIVERSITY

Week 3: July 27 (Mon) & July 29 (Wed) Strong Integrationist Approaches

Questions – Drawing on evidence from two determined integrationist countries, Turkey and France, we ask why some countries choose to diminish or ignore differences within the population? Which types of institutions and policies can be called integrationist and which assimilationist? What are the main arguments about whether or not integrationist policies are successful?

Required reading:

Brubaker, R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: pp. 1-17.
 Joppke, C. (2009) *Veil: Mirror of Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 27-52.
 Altunisik, M. & Ö. Tür (2005) *Turkey: Challenges of Continuity and Change*. Routledge, pp. 1-23; 52-54.

Further reading:

Grillo, R. (1998) *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 119-140. [This chapter uses the case of the place of the Jewish “nation” in the French “nation” to highlight some tensions within the Republican myth.]

Joppke, C. (2009) *Veil: Mirror of Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [NB. So as to get a broader view of the question of religious accommodation, I highly recommend that you read other chapters in this book. Multiple copies of the book are available on 3-Day loan.]

Tavuz, H. (2009) *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*. Cambridge: CUP.

Weeks 4-5: Aug 3 (Mon), Aug 5 (Wed), Aug 10 (Mon) Executive & legislative power sharing

Questions – What are the different ways in which power can be shared in parliament and government? Consociationalism is a common recommendation for deeply divided societies. What are its key elements? What are the advantages and drawbacks of this manner of managing difference? Does sharing power among groups in society outweigh the danger that differences will become permanently entrenched? Comparing the cases of Lebanon and Northern Ireland, we consider why consociationalism emerges and how it functions, as well as asking what the political and social consequences of consociational institutions are.

Required reading:

August 3

Lijphart, A. (1977) *Democracy in Plural Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 25-52.

August 5

Kerr, M. (2006) *Imposing Power Sharing*. Irish Academic Press, pp. 112-140. [Chapter 5]

August 10

McGarry, J. and B. O'Leary (2006) Consociational Theory, Northern Ireland's Conflict, and its Agreement: Part 1. What consociationalists can learn from Northern Ireland", *Government and Opposition* 41: 1, 43-63.

Further reading:

McRae, K. (ed.) (1974) *Consociational Democracy: Political accommodation in Segmented Societies*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart. [Read the Introduction by McRae]

Lijphart, A. (1999) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press. [Skim Chaps 6-7]

O'Leary, B. (2005) "Debating consociational politics: normative and explanatory arguments", in S. Noel (ed.) *From Power Sharing to Democracy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 3-43.

Text of the Good Friday Agreement: <http://www.nio.gov.uk/agreement.pdf>

Information on the Northern Ireland conflict and background to the Good Friday agreement: http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/northern_ireland/understanding/events/good_Friday.stm

BBC News Website Lebanon Country Profile:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/country_profiles/791071.stm

McGarry, J. and B. O'Leary (2006) Consociational Theory, Northern Ireland's Conflict, and its Agreement: 2. What critics of consociation can learn from Northern Ireland", *Government and Opposition* 41: 2, 249-277

Lijphart, A. (1996) "The puzzle of Indian democracy: a consociational interpretation", *American Political Science Review*, 90: 2, 258-268.

August 12 (Wed) In-Class Test – No reading.**Week 6: Aug 17 (Mon) & August 19 (Wed) Electoral System Design**

Questions –What kinds of incentives can electoral systems offer to induce voters and political parties to act in ways that minimize inter-group conflict? What is the logic and expected outcome behind different types of electoral system? What are the implications for political parties and representation of different types of electoral system design? After discussing theories of electoral system design in divided societies, we focus on the experiences of Fiji in this area.

NB. In tutorials this week we will also consider the cases of the Northern Irish and Lebanese electoral systems, so I recommend that you review the readings on institutional design in these societies.

Required reading:

Reilly, B. (2002) "Electoral systems for divided societies", *Journal of Democracy*, 13: 2, 156-170.

Horowitz, D. (1991) *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society*, Berkeley: University of California Press [Chap. 5, 163-203].

Further reading:

Ghai, Y. & J. Cottrell (2007) "A tale of three constitutions: ethnicity and politics in Fiji", *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 5: 4, 639-669.

Lal, B. (2002) "Constitutional engineering in post-coup Fiji", in Reynolds, A. (ed.) *The Architecture of Democracy*. Oxford University Press, 267-292.

Reilly, B. (2006) "Political engineering and party politics in conflict-prone societies", *Democratization* 13: 5, 811-827.

Reilly, B. (2001) *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*, New York: Cambridge University Press. [On Northern Ireland – Chapter 6, pp. 129-148]

Lijphart, A. (1999) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press. [Chaps. 8, 11, 12]

MID-TRIMESTER BREAK: Monday 24 August to Friday 4 September – ENJOY!

Week 7: Sept 7 (Mon) & Sep 9 (Wed) Political Decentralisation

Questions – We discuss the different forms of political decentralization, such as federalism, devolution and other types of territorial autonomy. How does federalism contrast with unitary systems? Is decentralisation more of an accommodationist or more of an integrationist strategy? Based on the evidence, does political decentralisation seem more likely to contain ethnic conflict and hold a country together or to increase the likelihood that it will break up? We discuss these questions in the cases of Quebec (Canada) and Scotland (United Kingdom).

Required reading:

Watt, R. (1999) *Comparing Federal Systems*. Kingston, ONT: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 1-18.

McGarry, J. and B. O'Leary (2005) "Federation as a method of ethnic conflict resolution", in Sid Noel (ed.), *From Power Sharing to Democracy: Post Conflict Institutions in Ethnically Divided Societies*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 263-296.

Keating, M. (2001) *Nations Against the State*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 199-229; 254-262.

Further reading:

Swenden, W. (2006) *Federalism and Regionalism in Western Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-22.

Watt, R. (1999) *Comparing Federal Systems*. Kingston, ONT: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 21-31.

Hechter, M. (2000) *Containing Nationalism*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 134-159. [Chap. 8: "Containing nationalism"]

Karmis, D. and A-G. Gagnon (2001) "Federalism, federation and collective identities in Canada and Belgium: different routes, similar fragmentation", in Gagnon, A-G. and J. Tully (eds.) *Multinational Democracies*. Cambridge: CUP, 137-175.

Swenden, W. (2006) *Federalism and Regionalism in Western Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 244-290.

Burgess, M. (2006) *Comparative Federalism: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 114-131.

Week 8: Sep 14 (Mon) & Sep 16 (Wed) Secession and Partition

Questions – When do states (or the international community) consider that a country cannot be held together? What are the differences between secession and partition, and what have been the political and social consequences of pursuing or resisting each in cases like Cyprus or Czechoslovakia?

Required reading:

O'Leary, B., I. Lustick and T. Callaghy (ed.) (2001) *Rightsizing the State: the Politics of Moving Borders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 47-62.

Kumar, R. (1997) "The troubled history of partition", *Foreign Affairs* 76: 1, 22-34. ****This reading also introduces the case of Bosnia a little. We discuss the question of partition in Bosnia further in Week 11.****

Further reading:

Moore, M. (ed.) (1998) *National Self-Determination and Secession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 The chapters in this edited book offer different moral arguments for and against secession.

Week 9: Sept 21 (Mon) & Sept 23 (Wed) Legislative measures & public policies

Questions – Measures can also be taken below the level of formal institutions to manage division in a society. Do quotas in the police, bureaucracy and education system appear to be effective in engineering group outcomes and inter-group relations?

Required reading:

Gagnon, A-G, L. Turgeon and O. De Champlain “Representative bureaucracy in multinational states: Turkey, Nigeria and Canada”, in R. Panossian, B. Berman & A. Linscott (eds.), *Governing Diversity: Democratic Solutions in Multicultural Societies*, Montreal: International Center for Human Rights and Development, 71-78.

[Online: http://www.dd-rd.ca/site/_PDF/publications/R&D-Governing-Diversity-ENG-low.pdf]

Horowitz, D. (2000) *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: UC Press, pp. 653-680.

Further reading:

Stuligross, D. & A. Varshney (2002) “Ethnic diversities, constitutional design, and public policies in India”, in A. Reynolds (ed.) *The Architecture of Democracy*. Oxford: OUP, 429-458.

PART III BRINGING IT TOGETHER: BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA**Weeks 10-11**

Bosnia-Herzegovina, part of the former Yugoslavia, is one of the most complex recent instances of attempts to design democratic institutions to manage a divided society. We discuss the kinds of institutional strategies adopted in Bosnia and consider other important elements, such as post-conflict institution building, democratization, and the involvement of the international community.

Sept 28 (Mon), Sept 30 (Wed); Oct 5 (Mon)

Questions – Yugoslavia under Tito was sometimes held up as a model of the management of a multi-ethnic society. Which institutional arrangements existed in Yugoslavia to manage difference? In the early 1990s, what situation did institution builders in Bosnia face? Which institutional arrangements did the Dayton Agreement propose? What are the arguments for and against partition in Bosnia?

Required reading:

Bose, Sumantra (2002) *Bosnia after Dayton*. London: Hurst & Company. [Chaps 1, 2, 4, 5]

Further reading:

Constitution of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

http://www.ohr.int/const/bih-fed/default.asp?content_id=5907#21

Bieber, F. (2005) "Power Sharing after Yugoslavia: Functionality and Dysfunctionality of Power-sharing Institutions in Post-War Bosnia, Macedonia, and Kosovo" in Noel, S. (ed.) *From Power Sharing to Democracy: Post-Conflict Institutions*.

Malcolm, N. 1994. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: Macmillan.

Oct 7 (Wed) International involvement in Bosnia

Questions – Reflecting further on the case of Bosnia, we ask whether divided societies are managed differently when the international community, rather than a sovereign state, controls institutional and

policy design? What role did the international community and neighbouring states play in designing the Bosnian state, and what were their preferences about which institutions should be chosen? How does involvement of international actors in Bosnia compare with other cases we have studied, notably Northern Ireland and Lebanon?

Required reading:

Bose, S. (2002) *Bosnia after Dayton*. London: Hurst & Company. [Chap. 6]

Further reading:

Weller, M. and S. Wolff. 2006. "Bosnia and Herzegovina Ten Years After Dayton: Lessons for Internationalized State-Building", *Ethnopolitics* 5 (1 (March)):1-14.

McGarry, J. (1998) "Political settlements in Northern Ireland and South Africa", *Political Studies* 46: 853-870.

O'Flynn, I. and D. Russell (eds.) (2005) *Power-Sharing: Institutional and Social Reform in Divided Societies*. London: Pluto Press [Chap. 8 on Bosnia].

Week 12: Oct 12 (Mon) & Oct 14 (Wed) Conclusions

Questions –In managing difference, should states place more emphasis on *justice* or on *stability*? Do institutions and policies such as consociationalism, federalism and multiculturalism place more value on individual or group rights? In the cases we have examined, which have been the main intended and unintended consequences of institutional design? On balance, can we say that certain institutional and political models for managing difference are more successful than others?

Required reading:

McGarry, J., B. O'Leary & R. Simeon (2008) "Integration or accommodation? The enduring debate in conflict regulation", in S. Choudhry (ed.) *Constitutional Design for Divided Societies. Integration or Accommodation?*. Oxford: OUP, 41-89.

Further reading:

Norman, W. (2001) "Justice and Stability", in Gagnon, A-G. and J. Tully (eds.) *Multinational Democracies*. Cambridge: CUP, 90-109.

Kymlicka, W. (1995) "Introduction", in Kymlicka, W. (ed.) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: OUP, 1-27.

Kymlicka, W. (2007) *Multicultural Odysseys*. Oxford: OUP. [From chapter 6 "The European Experiment", read pp. 173-204, 231-246]