

GOVERNING POLARIZED CITIES

Scott A. Bollens
University of California
bollens@uci.edu

Sawyer Seminar
University of Pennsylvania
October 28, 2008

DISCUSSION DRAFT COMMENTS WELCOME

Abstract. This article provides a comparative analysis of different institutional approaches to dealing with antagonistic group identity claims on the city. I discuss Brussels, Johannesburg, Belfast, Sarajevo, Jerusalem, Baghdad, and Kirkuk. These cities are broken down into three categories—(1) cities that have utilized power sharing and forms of transitional democratization effectively enough that stability of the local and national state has occurred, (2) cities that have made some progress but are vulnerable to regression because local political arrangements are not sufficiently stabilizing, and (3) cities where power sharing is itself contested and a potential contributor to further instability. The case studies of local governance of polarized cities reported point to their institutional diversity, frequent fragility, and the evolutionary nature of even the “best case” examples. A difficult predicament is faced by local government reform in cities of inter-group conflict. Shared local governance arrangements need to produce measurable differences on the ground in the short term sufficient to allow institutional legitimacy. Yet, necessary power-sharing limitations on local democracy may make local government less effective in producing these needed tangible changes.

I. DIVIDED NATIONS, DIVIDED CITIES

In a deeply divided society, the configuration of local political power in its major cities can create either solid or faulty foundations for the future stabilization and sustainability of the national state. Cities can be critical spatial, economic, and psychological contributors to national ethnic stability and reconciliation. I have argued elsewhere that urban power sharing and democratic compromises should be considered a necessary supplement to national political agreements (Bollens 2007). This is so because many immediate and existential foundations of inter-group conflict frequently lie in daily urban life and across local ethnic divides and, importantly, that it is at this micro-level that antagonisms are most amenable to power sharing strategies aimed at their amelioration. More than at larger geographic scales where segregation of ethnic communities is more likely due to historic settlement patterns, the economic pull of the city means that urban areas will frequently contain contestable faultlines between

ethnic, religious, and/or linguistic groups. They are significant depositories of material resources and culture vulnerable to penetration or implosion by nationalistic ethnic conflict and violence. Cities are focal points of urban and regional economies dependent on multi-ethnic contacts, social and cultural centers and platforms for political expression, and potential centers of grievance and mobilization. They are suppliers of important religious and cultural symbols, zones of intergroup proximity and intimacy, and arenas where the size and concentration of a subordinate population can present a direct threat to the state.

Cities in unsettled societies are susceptible to intense inter-communal conflict and violence reflecting ethnic or nationalist fractures¹. In these cities and societies, ethnic identity and nationalism combine to create pressures for group rights, autonomy, or even territorial separation. Political control of multinational cities can become contested as nationalists push to create a political system that expresses and protects their distinctive group characteristics. Whereas in most cities there is a belief maintained by all groups that the existing system of governance is properly configured and capable of producing fair outcomes, assuming adequate political participation and representation of minority interests, governance amidst severe and unresolved multicultural differences can be viewed by at least one identifiable group in the city as artificial, imposed, or illegitimate. Polarized cities are where two or more ethnically-conscious groups—divided by religion, language, and/or culture and perceived history—coexist in a situation where neither group is willing to concede supremacy to the other (Hepburn 2004). Characterized by ethnic/nationalist saturation of what are typically mundane urban management issues, the unsettled nature of such cities “reveals the contested and limited nature of the national settlement in its schoolrooms and town halls” (Keith 2005, 3).

This essay provides a comparative overview of different approaches to dealing with antagonistic group identity claims on the city. The urban areas to be discussed are:

Sustainable

Brussels (Belgium)

Johannesburg (South Africa) *

Fragile

Belfast (Northern Ireland)

Sarajevo (Bosnia-Herzegovina) *

¹ Although I focus on its contemporary manifestations, Hepburn (2004) reminds us that contested cities are an historical fact; for example, urban regions such as Trieste and Prague (under the Habsburgs), Helsinki (under Tsarist rule), and Danzig/Gdansk (under Prussian and German rule).

Combustible

Jerusalem (Israel/Palestine)

Baghdad and Kirkuk (Iraq) *

Cities in the first set have utilized power sharing and forms of transitional democratization effectively enough that some amelioration of political conflict and stability of the local and national state has occurred. The second set of cities, in contrast, is more vulnerable to relapse because local political arrangements are not sufficiently stabilizing. The third set of cities is in highly inflammatory settings and power sharing is itself contested and a potential contributor to further instability². The cities identified by an asterisk illuminate the particular challenges of local democratic management during major transitions associated with regime change or post-war reconciliation and reconstruction.

II. THE CITY AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

The fundamental problem in polarized cities, as in conflictual national states, is that it is difficult to reconcile majoritarian concepts of democracy with the reality of large, multi-ethnic cities where group identity is a primary driver. Majoritarian democracy may breed frustration and alienation and intensify conflict and the potential for violence. Beyond majoritarian democracy exists alternatives that either promote the sharing of urban political power across identity groups or moderate the potency of group allegiance in local politics. These non-majoritarian forms of local democracy have two broad aims which can clash: (1) *accommodation*-- treat the city as mosaic of groups living essentially apart and thus provide local ethnic groups autonomy in their own affairs and in representation at municipal level; and (2) *assimilation*--promote the city as a melting pot but creating integrated political coalitions so that democracy and political activity are not based along identity lines (International IDEA 2001). In the accommodative strategy, urban governance would protect group autonomy and minority rights. Mechanisms used would be decentralization of city authority to neighborhoods, minority vetoes on issues of particular importance to group, proportionality requirements in areas such as budgeting and civil service appointments, and the use of power-sharing grand coalitions to govern the city. In the assimilative strategy, urban governance would seek integration, provide incentives for multi-ethnic cooperation, use electoral systems that encourage pre-election pacts across group lines, create a non-ethnic federalism that diffuses points of power, and enact policies that promote political allegiances across group lines.

² Montreal is an additional exemplar of the first category, Mostar (Bosnia) and Nicosia are further examples of the second type, and Mitrovica (Kosovo) is representative of the inflammatory category.

National-level models of conflict management aimed at diffusing or moderating inter-group conflict have important implications for urban governance. These national models have tended to treat smaller scale forms of conflict management prevalent in urban areas—such as discrimination and segregation, demographic policies, or community relations—as subordinate and reflecting the playing out of broader imbalances of power (O'Leary and McGarry 1995). This de-emphasis on city-based dynamics notwithstanding, these models of conflict management inform about urban possibilities.

O'Leary and McGarry (1995) outline four main methods for managing ethnic differences and three methods that seek to eliminate ethnic differences³. With hegemonic control, one group dominates the state apparatus and channels decision-making outcomes toward the favored ethnic group (Lustick 1979; Smooha 1980). In urban settings of partisanship, the proximity and interdependence of urban ethnic populations may necessitate greater cooperation or co-optation between political leaders than would be found at national levels. Third-party intervention relies on there being an arbiter whose claim of neutrality must be broadly accepted by contending ethnic groups. At the urban scale, this perceived joint neutrality can be difficult because historic imbalances and inequalities are highlighted by a relative deprivation effect induced by physical proximity. Cantonization and federalization involve, in the first case, devolution of some government authority to homogeneous ethnonational territories; and, in the second, separate domains of formal authority between levels of government. Urban applications of these concepts include, in the first case, the creation of community or neighborhood-based groups that would advise or decide on local issues. In the second case, there would be the creation of a metropolitan government and subordinate municipal governments. The last model of ethnic management is consociation or power sharing. At the national level, this has been the most closely scrutinized option for deeply divided societies (see Lijphart 1968, 1977; and Nordlinger 1972; Horowitz 1985). Primary characteristics of power-sharing approaches as applicable to municipal settings are inclusive government (municipal legislative councils, and especially leadership positions, mirror the ethnic configuration of society), group self-government (neighborhood self-government concerning particular issues), and proportionality in resource allocation (especially regarding civil service position appointments and budgetary decisions) [Roeder and Rothschild 2005].

Urban settings can also be key terrains upon which strategies of ethnic difference elimination can be applied. Urban ethnic cleansing of entire cities or of specific ethnic neighborhoods illustrates the application at the urban and regional scale of forced population transfers. A second means of

³ Other comparative overviews of ethnic management techniques include M. Smith (1969) [modes of collective accommodation]; Esman (1973) [regime objectives]; and Palley (1979) [constitutional devices].

eliminating ethnic differences, political partitioning of urban space (such as Nicosia, Cold War Berlin, and Jerusalem from 1948 to 1967) can be an important feature of national level agreements regarding territorial separation; yet at the urban level, it tends to introduce a host of practical problems not found at a broader, national scale. Integration or assimilation strategies in many ways have greater salience at the smaller-scale urban level than they do at more dispersed national scales.

The three main alternatives that acknowledge group identity in the urban arena--political (or physical) separation; two-tier federated governance; and consociational city government--run the gamut from least to most inter-ethnic cooperation. In a politically partitioned city, sovereignty is divided and ethnic groups are isolated from one another (sometimes dramatically so if physical walls accompany political separation). Political segmentation of an urban area presents numerous logistical problems, especially if competing ethnic groups, while being segregated from each other, are not concentrated in particular sectors or directions. Either drastic relocation must occur to ethnically sort the urban region, or local boundaries must be drawn in disfigured, non-contiguous ways that dampen ethnic community cohesiveness. The second alternative-- creation of a two-tier system of local government--shares the sovereignty of the urban area between two ethnic-specific local authorities. There is unity or cooperation at the higher level of government (metropolitan or city) but functional and political division at the lower level (city or borough). Again, the creation of ethnic local governments (or boroughs) becomes logistically problematic where urban ethnic geographies are intertwined. The pressure associated with ethnically dividing urban governance is alleviated somewhat in this alternative because there exists an umbrella government for the whole area (either city or metropolitan level) and minority rights and guarantees can be built into these integrative institutions. In the third alternative, a consociational or power-sharing city government, a local conflict-accommodative government is established that utilizes power sharing, ethnic proportionality within the public sector, community autonomy, and minority vetoes. Such a consociational arrangement would likely be part of the higher level of the second alternative (two-tier governance).

POLITICALLY SUSTAINABLE GOVERNANCE

This first set of case study cities is most politically sustainable because power sharing structures and forms of transitional democratization have effectively stabilized the local state sufficiently that most group-based conflicts are channeled into political processes where there is the opportunity for some compromise.

BRUSSELS (BELGIUM)

Complex institutional accommodation

Brussels is at the faultline between Dutch-speaking and Francophone areas , a frontier contested by the strong Francophone majority in the city and historic claims of its Flemish (Dutch-speaking) past. In dealing with the strongly binational nature of the urban region (and country as a whole), there has been for more than 30 years a commitment to representation and autonomy along linguistic and ethnic lines. This is an example of the group building-block approach, seeking to accommodate in the Brussels urban region both the 85 percent Francophone majority and the Dutch-speaking minority. Belgium as a country has a Dutch-speaking majority and this has encouraged a type of power-sharing “tradeoff” where some parity is provided for minority Dutch speakers in Brussels region while parity is provided for minority French speakers in Belgium as country.

An officially bilingual Brussels Capital Region (BCR) was created to provide institutional space between the monolingual Dutch-speaking Flanders region to the north and Francophone Wallonia region to the south. The region has powers related to town planning, environment, housing, employment and economic policy, and other territorial issues. The directly elected regional parliament for Brussels region is chosen from candidates put forth by each of two main linguistic communities and Parliament decisions require a majority in each language group. The political rights of the Dutch linguistic minority group in Brussels are constitutionally protected by affording them equal power sharing in the executive branch of the city-region government. The regional government preserves two of its minister positions and a secretary of state position for a Dutch speaker. Additional institutions in the Brussels Capital region include a bi-communitarian public authority, the “Common Community Commission,” responsible for implementing cultural policies of common interest, and two linguistic community-specific public authorities—the Flemish Community Commission and the French Community Commission--that implement policies of the respective Communities in the Brussels Capital Region, including cultural issues, health and social assistance, education, and the use of language in administrative and workplace relations. In contrast to the three “regions” in Belgium that are territorial, “Communities” are non-territorial and exercise their legislative authority over cultural, educational, and health matters within linguistically determined geographical boundaries, including within Brussels urban region.

Compromises through the years between Flemish and French politicians seeking to increase and maintain their power within the Brussels urban region have created this complex layering of local

governance (Terhorst and van de Ven 1997)⁴. Some have criticized this local governance system as excessively disjointed and disarticulated, describing the urban area as existing within a “provincial and parochial institutional straightjacket” (Swyngedouw and Moyersoen 2006, 172). Nevertheless, the messy institutional structure means that tensions that inevitably occur often become dispersed between these various forms and scales of governance, thus making improbable the establishment of stable urban hegemonic coalitions that might further inflame ethnic passions (Hooghe 1995). Another curious aspect of Brussels governance is that while the urban region experiences constrained capacities due to complex political/linguistic bordering and administrative fragmentation, the Brussels metropolis has been exceptionally successful in international city competition over economic and financial assets (Kesteloot and Saey 2002).

Since Brussels’ official bilingualism is different than the two other monolingual regions, the boundaries of the Brussels district become “language borders.” Dutch speakers worry that if Brussels region expands territorially that the “oil stain” of bilingualism will expand into Flanders. Francophones, meanwhile, criticize “iron collar” constraints on Brussels regional expansion as unfairly stopping the bilingual region from spreading (Hepburn 2004). There are six peripheral boroughs outside Brussels, and spatially in Flanders region, where there is a significant and growing Francophone minority. In these cases, a compromise has been worked out whereby there are permanent guarantees for “language facilities” for French, but these areas are to remain part of Flanders.

JOHANNESBURG (SOUTH AFRICA)

Transitional power sharing, boundary drawing, metropolitan restructuring

Johannesburg and South Africa provide a positive lesson of power sharing used as an effective transitional device on the way to eventual majoritarian democracy⁵. The use of multiple bargaining arenas (state, regional, and local) during the transition from apartheid may have facilitated the development of a new constitutional order (Sisk and Stefes 2005). At the local level, explicit use of boundary drawing and metropolitan government as social justice mechanisms are also of importance.

Transition-period Johannesburg was characterized by a local consociational form of power sharing between officials of the old regime, black political leaders, and nongovernmental organizations.

⁴ Swyngedouw and Moyersoen (2006) describe four different stages of state reform in Belgium—1970 (creation of regions), 1980 (creation of communities), 1989 (creation of Brussels Capital Region), and 1993 (creation of Belgium as federal state).

⁵ Direct transitions from minority (or authoritarian) governments to majoritarian democracy would likely cause major strains and disruptions and could be susceptible to setback. In cases such as Barcelona (Spain), however, such an unfiltered transition occurred without major setbacks.

On-again, off-again multiparty national negotiations from 1991 to 1993 reached agreement on a transitional constitution and executive council, and on the procedures for the country's first democratic elections—for national and provincial legislatures—to be held in 1994. National negotiations were successful in establishing the make-up of a multi-party power-sharing executive cabinet to be configured based on election results, and the process by which the final constitution would be created by the national legislature. With the election April 26-29, 1994, a five-year "government of national unity" headed by Nelson Mandela's African National Congress (ANC) formally replaced the old apartheid regime.

Johannesburg (and other South African cities) emphasized the metropolitan scale as a focal point for local government transition negotiations, and used metropolitanism as a means to integrate and transcend old local authority boundaries that had separated races. With the end of apartheid, it became evident that local governance had to be transformed to overcome the virtual coincidence of race, residential area, and local government in South Africa. The geographic distance between races created by apartheid urban policy worked in parallel with administrative separation and subordination (Beavon 1992). Black townships like Johannesburg's Soweto had been politically and financially detached from white areas, undermining their fiscal base and making self-government fiscally unviable (T. Hart, interview.) While white local authorities of Johannesburg city, Sandton, Randburg and Roodepoort contained substantial commercial and industrial tax bases that enabled good municipal services at moderate tax rates, black local authorities and other nonwhite areas were fiscally depleted owing to restrictions on nonresidential uses and the illegality of homeownership. Meanwhile, open-field informal settlements outside of black townships, meanwhile, faced marginalization and even exclusion from the local governance system entirely.

The national 1993 Local Government Transition Act (LGTA) provided guidance for transition-period restructuring of local and metropolitan governance. In the first phase, local negotiating forums based on joint statutory and "non-statutory" (those excluded under apartheid) representation would nominate members of new transitional forms of local and metropolitan governance. These appointed councilors would then run local government until elections were held. These local elections would occur after national elections and would be based on newly demarcated local and ward boundaries that would politically integrate white and black areas.

In the Johannesburg urban region, the impetus for the early consideration of local government reform was crises brought on by the boycotting of the payment of rent and service charges in Greater

Soweto in the late 1980s. The boycott called attention to the illegitimate form of local governance in Soweto, the racial compartmentalization of local government financing and the resulting inadequate levels of urban services. Negotiations to end the boycott resulted in the Greater Soweto Accord, which sought resolution of the boycott issue, but also put the Johannesburg region on a path of metropolitan governance reform of which it never stepped off. Most pertinent was agreement to establish in 1991 a Central Witwatersrand Metropolitan Chamber (CWMC) that would be a negotiating body to formulate non-racial and democratic structures for local and metropolitan government. This Metropolitan Negotiating Forum contained 50 percent non-statutory and 50 percent statutory representation. This Forum then appointed members to an interim council--named the Transitional Metropolitan Council ("TMC")--which would manage urban affairs until local elections.

Metropolitan negotiators confronted questions such as how to politically redraw municipal borders to integrate what was torn apart under apartheid. Debates involved basic disagreements about the boundaries and roles of new local governments (called Metropolitan Sub-Structures, or MSSs) in post-apartheid Johannesburg. An initial ANC proposal for local government restructuring sought the "stitching of townships to cities" so that they would no longer be marginalized, and the creation of a strong overarching metropolitan authority. Statutory representatives, meanwhile, proposed eight MSSs that would politically carve up Greater Soweto and politically de-link some black areas from white ones. After significant contention, a Special Electoral Court in 1995 approved a 4-MSS model, stating that it most effectively eliminated the racial political geography of old group areas. In each of the four MSSs, there was an existing and functioning administration--Johannesburg, Sandton, Randburg, and Roodepoort. At the same time, each of these administrations would have responsibility for managing black townships within its MSS borders. The enacted 4-MSS configuration sought to balance the richer north and the poorer south by, first, putting the CBD within the poorer southern MSS; and secondly, by integrating parts of Greater Soweto with three different MSSs. It also sought to evenly distribute votes, commercial and industrial activities, and tax bases across the four MSSs. This 4-MSS configuration provided the framework for 1995 local and metropolitan elections. Combined with boundary-drawing that connects rich to marginalized communities, there was the creation of a strong metropolitan government with the ability to redirect budgetary resources across MSS boundaries. This was added assurance to equity advocates who claimed that a strong metropolitan government role in regional budgets was needed to reverse the extreme inequalities of apartheid .

Local elections in the Johannesburg urban region occurred November 1995. Electoral rules specified that 60 percent of the seats in each MSS were to be ward-based; the other 40 percent based on proportionate representation (PR) rules. For the metropolitan council, 60 percent of the councilors are to be appointed by the MSSs while 40 percent are directly elected by PR. In a compromise with white authorities, the national local government law specified that at least one-half of electoral wards had to come from pre-existing white (including Indian and Coloured) authority areas. This basically locked in a 30 percent (one-half of 60 percent) representation in each jurisdiction from nonblack areas.⁶ This was agreed upon by the multi-party negotiators to ensure white minority representation during the transition period (D. Ewing 1995).

III. POLITICALLY FRAGILE GOVERNANCE

This set of cities is more vulnerable to relapse because local political arrangements have not sufficiently developed to a point where they can contribute to stabilization of the local and national state.

BELFAST (NORTHERN IRELAND)

Third party intervention, impotent local government

The Northern Ireland Parliament, the governing body for the province up until 1972 and linked to the formulation of discriminatory and unjust laws, was held to be incapable of fair and capable governance and the British enacted "direct rule" in the midst of sectarian conflict in 1972. From 1972 to 1998, legislative power for Northern Ireland was held by the British House of Commons, of which only 17 members come from Northern Ireland. Executive power for Northern Ireland under direct rule has been possessed by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, who is chosen from the party ruling at Westminster. The thinking behind direct rule was that the removal of policy formulation and implementation from the bitter sectarian conflict would make it more efficient and effective (Loughlin, 1992). Ministers in charge of Northern Ireland governance took their political cues from Westminster, and tended toward an inherently conservative, non-risk taking approach to the province's controversial issues (P. Sweeney, Department of the Environment for Northern Ireland, interview).

Such "direct rule" substantially eroded the authority of local governance in Belfast and elsewhere in Northern Ireland. It was at the local level of government that sectarian bias was most evident, especially in the fields of public employment, service delivery and housing (Loughlin 1992). The

⁶ Due to this guarantee of white minority representation, local and metropolitan councils elected in Johannesburg and elsewhere were still technically *transitional* councils. The interim stage of local government restructuring did not end until local elections occurred pursuant to new constitutional principles, in 1999.

locally elected 51-member Belfast city council has thus had severely constrained policymaking power in planning, urban service delivery, and housing; it is predominantly an advisory body (Hadfield 1992). Instead, most power in these policy areas is located in appointed boards--such as the Northern Ireland Housing Executive--or in central executive agencies--such as the Department of the Environment for Northern Ireland--which are responsible to British ministers rather than to local politicians. This centralized policy-making structure was viewed as capable of depoliticizing local planning issues and holding in abeyance the larger community power struggles (Douglas 1982; Blackman 1991; Cunningham and Byrne 2006). Urban administrators in Belfast viewed themselves as above local conflicts and often took pride in their technocratic approach (Loughlin 1992.)

Nevertheless, one of the greatest obstacles to effective urban policymaking in Belfast under "direct rule" has been local city councilors, whose relative lack of power frees them to be extreme in their interactions with government. They often have little to lose from being scaremongers who emphasize division, conflict and single ethnic identity. Government units became easy targets for local councilors who rant and rave at consultation meetings as a way to show their communities that they care (J. Hendry, interview). Indeed, the confrontational and divisive rhetoric is often key to their being elected. Local politicians increase their "leadership" role most easily by tapping into separate constituencies, not seeking to span them (M. Fitzduff, interview). In their ability to thwart efforts by government to move communities forward, local politicians in Belfast "lead from the back" (D. MacBride, interview.) In the local politics of contested Belfast, urban issues became subordinated to arguments over nationalism, constitutionalism, and symbolism. One interviewee⁷ described the "tragedy of the masquerade" represented by monthly city council meetings that resemble more juveniles on a playground than locally elected officials in a forum.

A significant alteration of Northern Ireland governing institutions and constitutional status was specified in the April 1998 *Agreement Reached in the Multi-Party Negotiations* (i.e. The "Belfast Agreement"). This agreement, approved by over 70 percent of Northern Ireland voters May 1998, transfers day-to-day rule of the province from Britain to a new directly-elected Northern Ireland Assembly, in which Protestants (Unionists/Loyalists) and Catholics (Nationalists/ Republicans) have shared power because decisions require concurrent majorities within both unionist and nationalist camps. After several attempts, this reconstituted Northern Ireland Assembly began to function in early 2007. The Belfast Agreement states that Northern Ireland is to remain within the United Kingdom as

⁷ Identity of interviewee withheld upon request.

long as a majority in the province wants to remain there. In response to nationalist desires, the new Assembly and the Irish Parliament are to form a North-South Council to coordinate and encourage cross-border cooperation. To reassure unionists, a Council of the Isles is to link the governments in Northern Ireland and Ireland with the British government and with new legislative assemblies being set up in Scotland and Wales.

In the future, there is hope that the local government of Belfast be one of shared and genuine authority across sectarian groups; that it would mimic the power-sharing Northern Ireland Assembly. The Belfast Agreement called for a comprehensive review of local governments in Northern Ireland. A "Review of Public Administration", initiated in 2002, called for the existing 26 local councils in Northern Ireland to be reduced to seven in such ways that would reduce fragmentation in local government and equalize populations and tax bases across local bodies (Knox and Carmichael 2006). Critical public functions such as planning, zoning, and transportation would be devolved to these reconstituted local units. One idea, put forth by the Catholic Sinn Fein party, was that there should be three "nationalist" councils and three "unionist" councils across the province, with Belfast constituting a "swing" council due to its mixed population and key anchoring position in the province.

Direct rule utilized an urban policy approach for 25 years primarily aimed at stability, neutrality, and maintenance. This protection of the status-quo defended a rigid and sterile territoriality of significant segregation, and reinforced the physical and psychological correlates of urban civil war. Such an approach will not help Belfast and Northern Ireland advance to a greater level of sectarian co-existence. Devolution of genuine political power to city government will thus likely need to introduce a more proactive and progressive ethnic agenda able to move this urban society forward, one that is responsive to the differential and changing needs of both Catholic and Protestant communities.

SARAJEVO (BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA)

Multicultural city unraveled

Sarajevo demonstrates the difficulty of sustaining the multiculturalism of a city after it has experienced the trauma of massive war aimed at its death. With a pre-war mixed ethnic population in 1991 of 540,000 Bosnian Muslims (40%), Bosnian Serbs (30%), and Bosnian Croats (20%), Sarajevo in the early post-war years became an approximately 80% Muslim city of about 340,000 population. Despite international community acknowledgement of the city's importance as an anchor in rebuilding Bosnia and local power sharing efforts that sought electoral representation of displaced residents and provided

minimum representation to minority groups, the essence of the city as a multicultural entity expired soon after the end of the 1992-1995 Bosnian war.

The war created numerous new municipalities in Bosnia, most along the Inter-Entity Boundary Line that now separates the two autonomous regions of the Bosnian state—the Muslim-Croat Federation and Republika Srpska. In numerous cases, including Sarajevo, there was the split of pre-war municipalities into separate ethnic municipalities. Pursuant to international community requirements, power-sharing requirements for local governments in the Federation and the Serb Republic endeavored to allocate municipal council seats proportionate to 1991 ethnic distribution, yet reconstituting local politics at the urban scale has been even more difficult than at regional and state levels. This was illustrated by the need to postpone municipal elections in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina August 1996, while national elections—although flawed—were carried out the following month. Massive war-caused displacement such as on the scale of Bosnia-Herzegovina's caused substantial impediments to the conduct of municipal elections, tied as they are to specific geographies. Between 40-50 percent of Bosnia population no longer lived where they were registered for the 1991 Census but were nonetheless provided the right to vote in 1997 municipal elections in their place of 1991 residence. The ability of displaced to vote in their former municipality meant that many city councils represented “virtual populations” of ethnic members who voted but had not physically relocated back to their former place of residence (Jokay 2001). Appointments to administrative positions and hiring in public employment were also to mirror the registered 1991 ethnic distribution in the city. Such proportionality in public employment constituted the “wages of peace”, aimed at inter-group stability rather than government effectiveness (Jokay 2001). Given the fundamental lack of trust among ethnic groups and the ethnic fragmentation of the professional class, however, administrative decisions became commonly distorted by ethnic considerations.

In terms of Sarajevo specifically, an initial strategy during early diplomatic efforts to counter possible ethnic claims on the city was to create a special status as a district under United Nations or European Community administration. This “*corpus separatum*” strategy resembled the unsuccessful proposal in 1947 to protect the city of Jerusalem through United Nations oversight, and was premised on Sarajevo being different and special in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The urban region was to be preserved as a multiethnic capital for all the state, and a place where collective rights would be protected (Dragan Ivanovic, interview). The Owen-Stoltenberg proposal of August 1993 proposed that Sarajevo city—inclusive of all ten pre-war municipalities except for Serbian stronghold Pale—would be under United Nations governance. One year later, the UN neutral zone idea still appeared alive in diplomatic discussions; the Contact Group

Plan of July 1994 recommended UN administration of a spatially expansive Sarajevo district. However, by the time of the 1995 Dayton Accord that ended the war, the idea for international governance or oversight of the city had been overtaken by the give-and-take negotiations of ethnic leaders.

When peace finally came to Bosnia, peace-making paradoxically started processes that unraveled Sarajevo as a multicultural space amidst a fracturing state. The Dayton Accord structured and empowered the two entities and the Federation's cantonal governments in order to facilitate ethnic self-rule. On the one hand, distributing power in a post-war state in such a way responds to a compelling logic of how to reconstruct a collapsed state. On the other hand, Dayton's ethnic circumscription of space after the war had detrimental effects on Sarajevo, catalyzing a mass exodus in early 1996 of some 62,000 Sarajevo Serbs from inside what would be the Dayton borders of Sarajevo city and its suburbs and creating today's more mono-ethnic post-war city (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre 1996). To the credit of Dayton negotiators, there was a strategy to "reunify" post-war Sarajevo and not let it become ethnically fragmented. The transfer of the certain Serbian-populated districts and suburbs into post-war Sarajevo city boundaries was an effort to maintain the Bosnian Serb population within the post-war city. Yet, this "reunification" of Sarajevo was a proposition having significant ethnic salience because the Serbs, to be reunified within the city, would also under Dayton be simultaneously incorporated into the Muslim-Croat Federation. This psychological factor spawned the substantial out-movement of Bosnian Serb population from the transferred districts and suburbs to nearby Serb Republic land and to other places in that republic. If, instead, the "reunified" city was a spatially expansive zone that spanned entity boundaries and thus was not fully contained within the Federation, it is probable that more Serbs would have stayed in these neighborhoods. The holding of the Serb (and Croat) population within a functional and de-ethnicized urban space was critical to the multicultural vitality of the city; the fact that such did not come to pass represents a significant lost opportunity.

Even after such out-migration of Serbs, another method of sustaining the city's multiculturalism would be to construct a cross ethnic power-sharing agreement for city governance. For the first several years after Dayton, the city had a joint governance and administrative structure that sought fair representation by minority groups. A mayor and two deputy mayors had been selected in a way that each of the main nationalistic groups—Bosniak (Muslim), Croat, and Serb—had one of these positions. From 1997 to 2000, the allocation of city council seats was also engineered to assure multiethnic representation. In the run-up to the first municipal elections in September 1997, there was the detailed management of ethnic balance for the city by the international community. The Protocol on the

Organization of Sarajevo (Office of the High Representative [OHR] 1996) specified that at least 20 percent of city council seats go to Bosniaks, Croats, and to “other”. In March 1997, the constitution of the city was amended to reflect these ethnic quotas. The intent was that the city would be governed on a shared basis and this would show a way forward for the Bosnian state. With the 2001 Election Law for Bosnia, however, this ethnically engineered electoral system for Sarajevo was replaced by an electoral system where council seats are allocated proportionately to popular votes garnered. As of 2004, without minimum representation quotas, an ethnic party representing Croats or Serbs held only one of the 24 city council seats. The days of ethnically shared governance of Sarajevo city appeared to be over⁸.

The Sarajevo and Bosnian cases also illustrate the problems associated with early elections after war. The Dayton accord, although critically beneficial from a military perspective, may have created a faulty foundation from which to politically re-build Bosnia (Jaume Saura, interview). The IC’s push for early elections meant that they often took place amidst feelings of threat and mistrust; in such a circumstance, extremists and war-profiteers were most likely put into office in the early years (J. Mier, interview). These “forces for separation”, once incorporated into the state’s structures of governance, then sought to obstruct and separate the country. One OHR interviewee suggested that the IC should have come in with greater power and act as a protectorate, rather than accommodate to local ownership and the cooperation of internal leaders⁹ (J. Mier, interview). Under this scenario, after a number of years of social and economic stability amidst stronger international intervention, the electoral process would possibly have had a greater chance of producing a more balanced assortment of local politicians.

IV. POLITICALLY COMBUSTIBLE GOVERNANCE

These cities are the most problematic, existing in highly inflammatory settings and where power sharing is itself contested and a potential contributor to further instability.

JERUSALEM (ISRAEL/PALESTINE)

Hegemonic control

Israel exercises de facto hegemonic control over Jerusalem, dominating the state apparatus and channeling decision-making outcomes in partisan ways toward the privileged Israeli Jewish population. This city of over 600,000 residents is a site of demographic, physical and political competition. The social

⁸ The end of guaranteed representation of Croats and Serbs on the city council has not meant dominance of Sarajevo city politics by the Bosniak nationalist SDA. In 2000 and 2004 city elections, Sarajevo voters opted more for the multiethnic Social Democratic Party and the moderate, Bosniak “soft-nationalist” Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina than they did for the SDA.

⁹ An example of such a protectorate role for the IC is the Brcko district in northeast Bosnia, which was placed by the IC under strong international supervision and declared a unified and neutral District in 1999.

and political geography of Jerusalem has included between 1920 and 1948 a multicultural mosaic under British control and two-sided physical partitioning between 1948 and 1967 into Israeli and Jordanian-controlled components. Since 1967, it has been an Israeli-controlled municipality three times the area of the pre-1967 city (due to unilateral annexation) and encompassing formerly Arab East Jerusalem. The international status of East Jerusalem today remains as 'occupied' territory. Jewish demographic advantage (of approximately 70–30%) within the Israeli-defined city borders translates into Jewish control of the city council and mayor's office. Arabs within the annexed eastern part of Jerusalem are considered by Israel as residents of the city but not citizens of Israel. Although they can vote in municipal elections, they resist participating in municipal elections they deem illegitimate.

Israel has created over the past 30 years an urban landscape of visible and stark inequalities. "From the very first, all major development represented politically and strategically motivated planning", admits Israel Kimhi (interview). Equating demographic dominance with political control, large Jewish communities have been built in strategic locations throughout the annexed and disputed municipal area. Of the approximately 27 square miles unilaterally annexed after the 1967 war, the Israeli government has expropriated approximately 33 percent and neighborhoods built in these areas are homes today to approximately 160,000 Jewish residents. At the same time, Israeli planners have curtailed the growth of Palestinian neighborhoods through land expropriation, restrictive environmentally based "green area zoning", road construction that fragments Arab neighborhoods, "hidden guidelines" within Israeli plans that cap building volume in some areas, and the intentional absence of plans in others. The cumulative impact of Israeli restrictions on Palestinian growth is that only 11% of annexed east Jerusalem in 1995 was vacant land where the Israeli government allowed Palestinian development. Although lacking a physical partition since 1967, Jerusalem is a city functionally and psychologically divided.

An alternative, special arrangement for the governance of Jerusalem was considered at an important historic juncture in the city's trajectory. When the British Mandate period (1917-1948) came to a close, there was a United Nations resolution that the city of Jerusalem be a demilitarized and neutral *corpus separatum* (separate entity) governed by a special international regime and administered by the U.N. This resolution (181 II--the Future Government of Palestine. 29 November 1947) called for the internationalization of Jerusalem within a context of a recommended partitioning of Mandatory Palestine into Jewish and Arab states. The resolution was approved by the national leadership of the Jewish community in Palestine, and rejected by the Arab Higher Committee. Intense warfare between Israeli,

Transjordan (now Jordan) and Egyptian armies, centered on the Holy City, turned Jerusalem instead into a physically divided city for almost twenty years, with Israeli west and Arab east parts separated by concrete barriers and “no-man lands.” It was this physically divided city that was transformed by the beginning of Israeli control and annexation in 1967.

In the early years of contested Jerusalem under Israeli control, a Borough Plan was debated from 1968 to 1977, envisioning a single municipal government under dual sovereignty, the representation of Palestinians in the running of the city, and the creation of separate semi-autonomous borough governments to manage local affairs in different ethnic neighborhoods. The possibility of creating spatially cohesive local ethnic boroughs has become increasingly problematic due to the building of large Israeli neighborhoods in the contested eastern part of the city. Either drastic relocation must occur to ethnically sort the urban region, or local boundaries must be drawn in disfigured, non-contiguous ways that dampen ethnic community cohesiveness.

Through the years, numerous ideas have been put forth about how the conflicting sovereignty claims of Israelis and Palestinians can be addressed, oftentimes by nongovernmental organizations and less frequently in formal negotiations. In the Camp David Summit in 2000, for instance, Ross (2004) reports that key elements of a Jerusalem proposal provided Palestinian sovereignty over specified outer neighborhoods and over the Muslim and Christian quarters of the Old City, meaningful Palestinian self-government (including planning and zoning, security, and dispute resolution responsibility) in inner neighborhoods (although under Israeli sovereignty), and Palestinian custodianship over the Haram al-Sharif. A neighborhood outside the Israeli borders of Jerusalem was seen as a possible site for a Palestinian capital, with the municipal border enlarged to encompass this area, in order to meet Palestinian demands that “Jerusalem” be their capital.

Other ideas floated less officially have included a model of “scattered sovereignty” (Baskin and Twite 1993). Jewish communities (in both west and east Jerusalem) would be under the sovereignty of Israel, while Arab communities in east Jerusalem would be within Palestinian sovereignty. Sovereignty would be “scattered” because of the dispersed and complex mosaic patterns of Arab and Jewish communities. A simpler geographic demarcation of sovereignty would be to use the pre-1967 green line to delineate west from east. This “simple solution”, however, is made difficult by the now Jewish majority in “east” Jerusalem. One response might be to re-establish an Arab majority in east Jerusalem by expanding eastern Jerusalem borders to include Arab communities now just outside the Israeli-drawn border. In this plan, Jewish neighborhoods in eastern Jerusalem would be under Palestinian control, although residents

would remain Israeli citizens. Another idea would enlarge the jurisdictional scale of Jerusalem. A metropolitan expansion of Jerusalem's borders would encompass within the new larger city approximately equal Arab and Jewish populations, thus likely increasing the parity of sovereignty solutions¹⁰. There could then be two ethnically-based municipalities under a joint umbrella metropolitan council. K. Tufakji (interview) states that the chances that Jerusalem can be solved geographically increase with a metropolitan federalism of two sovereignties. Sovereignty issues within today's Jerusalem would remain, however.

BAGHDAD AND KIRKUK (IRAQ)

Baghdad: Capitol city of a federalist Iraq?

The governance and management of Baghdad present two primary challenges—(1) how to locally govern a city that has been segregated, cleansed, and sorted during war? (2) how to govern the city in a way that might hold together a country that likely faces some federalist devolution of national power to ethnic autonomous zones? Can Baghdad constitute a multiethnic capital district or zone that holds together a fragmented or federalized state?

Through November 2007, over 65 percent of Iraqis displaced since the start of sectarian fighting in early 2006 have been in ethnically mixed Baghdad, the site of bitter fighting between Sunni Arab insurgents and Shiite Muslim militias (United Nations OCHA 2007.) The city has extensively segregated with substantial sectarian homogeneity of neighborhoods, with a discernable stronghold of Shiite neighborhoods east of the Tigris River and in two swaths west of the river. Blast walls and physical partitions have been constructed by occupation forces at particular sectarian friction points. A green zone with its perimeter secured by Iraqis, Americans and security contractors provides some greater security but also is a target of mortar blasts. The increased “surge” of American troops beginning early 2007 has had some success in decreasing violence, yet there has been continued “takhalasu” (purging) of formerly mixed neighborhoods. Violence was especially chronic in mixed Shiite-Sunni neighborhoods in western Baghdad.

The stability of Baghdad has consistently been a key plank of American military and political planners. In this view, the protection of the Iraqi population in Baghdad is primary because it would allow breathing space to Iraqi leaders to achieve needed political reconciliation. “Localized security” through agreements at the local level, including with militias and former insurgents, would be a

¹⁰ An Israeli metropolitan planning study found within the functional commuting region of Jerusalem that 54 percent of the 1.14 million population was Arab, 46 percent were Jewish (Mazor and Cohen 1994).

necessary complement and encouragement to national compromises (Gordon 2006). These local arrangements would then be stitched together to establish a broader sense of security on a nationwide basis. The American troop surge of 2007 is a more recent manifestation of this desire to stabilize the city as a key foundation of larger national accords.

In an effort to introduce local democratic institutions, the U.S. has attempted to establish a three-tier system utilizing neighborhood, district, and city council representation. First, there was election of neighborhood councils in the neighborhoods officially designated before the war, elected by neighborhood caucuses. When all 88 neighborhood councils were in place in the City, each neighborhood council then elected representatives from among their members to serve on one of the city's nine district councils. Then, each of these nine district councils elect representatives from their membership to serve on the 37 member Baghdad City Council. There is also a 35 member Baghdad Regional Council representing the City and the other communities in Baghdad Province outside of the City itself. Finally, there is a Baghdad Provincial Council, elected from the lower councils in numbers proportional to the population of the districts they represent.

Significant displacement and sectarian purging has occurred also at the national level. As of late 2007, there was an estimated 2.3 million internally displaced people (IDPs) in Iraq. Since the intensification of sectarian conflict in February 2006 (with the bombing of the Al-Askari shrine in Samara), the majority of IDPs have been displaced from central provinces such as Baghdad. Before then, displacement occurred most frequently in northern and southern regions (United Nations OCHA 2007). With such sectarian sorting of the country comes the opportunity to devolve substantial political powers to ethnic autonomous regions as a way to encourage buy-in to national agreements by the country's Sunnis, Kurds, and Shiites. The 2005 Constitution defines the country for the first time in its history as a "federal" country and its federalism law allows semi-autonomous regions to be created through referenda out of one or more existing provincial governorates. One scenario is that there would be reconstitution of the country's 18 provinces as three self-governing entities and reconstruction of Iraq as a loose confederation of these governments¹¹.

A key centerpiece of any sustainable federalist arrangement for Iraq would be the creation and protection of Baghdad city as a multi-ethnic capital district with special status. Within this special district, power-sharing of local governance and protections afforded minority residents would be

¹¹ The Kurds in the north already have extensive regional government and autonomy in their Kurdistan. Several southern provinces have significant Shiite majorities.

needed to avoid continued fragmentation and dismemberment of Baghdad into sectarian districts of autonomy linked more to regional ethnic geographies than to a citywide political corpus.

Kirkuk: Northern flashpoint

Kirkuk province is an oil rich region of ethnic diversity and competition whose governance is crucial to the sustainability of the Iraqi state and to the allegiance of the Kurdish population to it. Much of the Kirkuk population is Kurds, who consider it their holy place, but there is a significant minority population of Turkmen and Arabs. The provincial capital is the city of Kirkuk, whose population makes up about 90 percent of provincial population. Saddam Hussein displaced thousands of Kurds from Kirkuk and parts of Nineveh and Diyala provinces as part of his "Arabization" plan to control the region's oil. Arab tribes from southern Iraq were enticed to move to the north with government benefits and offers of housing. In addition, there was gerrymandering of the province's borders during this time to lessen its size and detach it from four other traditionally Kurdish districts. Since the end of Hussein rule, Kurds have been empowered through the creation of a semiautonomous Kurdish region. Whether the contested lands of Kirkuk will join this region of Kurdistan or remain with the rest of Iraq positions Kirkuk as a flashpoint of ethnic and sectarian conflict and a key element of national negotiations over the future status of the country. There are three provinces currently fully under authority of the Kurdistan Regional Government; however, the regional government claims in whole or in part four other provinces, including Kirkuk. Kurds have made agreement on a set of national issues contingent on favorable resolution of the Kirkuk issue.

Provincial elections in 2005 produced a Kurdish majority in the province (26 of 41 seats). The intent was that there was then to be "normalization" process to include the re-integration of the four districts detached from Kirkuk province by Hussein. This would then be followed by a referendum (by November 2007) to decide whether the province would become part of the Kurdistan regional government. Efforts have been underway by all sides to create demographic "facts on the ground" in advance of the referendum. Kurdish negotiators have proposed a binding political pact between the leadership of the Shia, Sunni and Kurdish blocs to return the administrative boundaries of Kirkuk to the 1970 map, thereby adding the four Kurdish-majority surrounding districts to Kirkuk and ensuring Kurdish success in any future referendum (Kritz, al-Sassaf, and Their 2007). In July 2008, an Arab-sponsored plan was put forth to delay elections in Kirkuk province and city and impose a quota-based power sharing arrangement that would apportion power in the provincial government equally among Kurds, Arabs, and

Turkmen. This proposal further inflamed the situation and put in jeopardy provincial elections in all of Iraq.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In robustly nationalistic cities where group identity matters substantially, leaders need to accommodate the unique needs of each salient group while building and protecting a citywide public interest. There is little possibility of reliance on the traditional model of ethnic assimilation; there must rather be governance that is accommodative of ethnic difference and focused on co-existent community viability. Further, majoritarian democracy will not work in these polarized cases because cross-group coalition-building is limited, and an aggrieved minority group may boycott the political process because they see it as unfair or illegitimate. Power-sharing elements often employed at the national level-- including multi-tier governance, collective executive bodies, communal legislative bodies, reserved seats or quotas in legislatures, and formal rules mandating proportional resource allocation and public sector hires—must come into play and take local and metropolitan forms.

The structuring of local government and elections can be useful in allowing a minority group with little power at national level to potentially find greater inclusion and different partners in the local arena. Beyond this, local and metropolitan governance arrangements that utilize multiple levels of representation that can be key elements in efforts to divide political power among and within levels of government so as to create “multiple majorities” with possibilities for alignments that cut across group identity. Such a power-dividing approach “begins at the bottom” and creates diverse, numerous, and non-overlapping political bodies able to foster multiple and cross-cutting constituencies (Roeder and Rothchild 2005).

The seven cases presented here involving the local governance of polarized cities points to the frequent fragility of such efforts, the evolutionary nature of even the “best case” examples, and how local governance reform can further national political progress. Even in the sustainable cases—Brussels and Johannesburg—where there has been some amelioration of political conflict and stability of the local and national state, sustainability does not necessarily connote stability of institutions and arrangements. Brussels and Johannesburg have changed and modified governing arrangements to accommodate new needs and circumstances.¹² In these cases, there exists an institutional learning process sufficiently embedded and open to democratic innovation that long-term sustainability is likely. Brussels governance structure has been a work in progress for now over three decades. And, in

¹² Another example here is Montreal which, since 1996, has reorganized metropolitan-level government, amalgamated local governments in the urban core, and decentralized some political power to boroughs (Collin and Robertson 2005).

Johannesburg, the establishment of a sustainable system of governance did not happen overnight, but was created over a five year period out of numerous and multi-layered transitional forms of governing institutions.

In the fragile cases of Belfast and Sarajevo, local governance arrangements are not sufficiently stable and are subject to relapse. Local governance is emergent and untested in Belfast and Sarajevo.¹³ These cases will likely need to undergo significant restructuring and experimentation regarding how local governance structures can effectively address local problems and obstacles. Fragile local democratic institutions must be able to create visible on-the-ground outcomes (in terms of job opportunities, better services, safer neighborhoods) that can reinforce and gain public acceptance of shared local governance. Only then can we be assured that these precarious city institutions survive and become key agents of inter-group coexistence and local anchors to national stability over the longer term future. Yet, there exists a difficult predicament—that in the short term the constraints on local democracy which are necessary for shared power may make local government less effective in producing such tangible change in the city.

Jerusalem and the Iraqi cities are cases of unformed shared governance where the question of how the city is to be governed is itself part of larger political negotiations. These cities can be major roadblocks and obstacles to larger national peace agreements and constitutional arrangements. More optimistically, shared urban policies and institutions negotiated during and in the early years of post-war transition can set important precedents that positively shape long-term urban and political development and can articulate how relationships will be structured between numerous and competing interests. If cities are left unprotected and unplanned during transitional periods, however, ethnic antagonists who recognize the power of the city will likely submerge and fragment the peace-constitutive potential of the city in pursuit of their own group aspirations. The future of Baghdad and Kirkuk is one of debilitating sectarian fragmentation unless strong and effective integrative institutions are put in place.¹⁴ For Jerusalem, any sustainable peace agreement between Israelis and Palestinians will need to directly confront the mechanisms and outcomes of over thirty years of partisan governance in the Holy City.

¹³ In other examples of fragility, local public authority has faced severe obstructions by nationalist leaders in Mostar, has been hamstrung by rigid power sharing formulas in Beirut, and has been divided in Nicosia (Bollens 2007, Salamey 2007).

¹⁴ Similarly situated is the divided Serb-Albanian city of Mitrovica, which presents a critical challenge to the sustainability of the disputed newly independent country of Kosovo. UN recognition of Serb group aspirations in this city that is intended to ameliorate conflict may at the same time lay a foundation for a damaging institutional separation of Serbian parts of Kosovo (Spahiu 2002).

Four of the case study cities also allowed for the analysis of local democratic management during major transitions associated with regime change or post-war reconstitution—Johannesburg, Sarajevo, and the two Iraqi cities. Two additional lessons emerge. First, from Sarajevo, international agreements that stop war must be cognizant of the new ethnic geographies of local and substate governments that they create so that local governments are not unintentionally stunted in their inherent ability to bring people together, over time. Second, from Johannesburg, two-tier governance utilizing metropolitan and local levels can be particularly useful during political transitions. By creating a metropolitan level of governance during a period of political transition, new distributions of power can be created that can transcend older, more ossified ethnic power structures. It can open up opportunity spaces for conflict management by dividing power between levels of government and by enabling new alignments of constituencies not necessarily ethnic group based. Metropolitanism can be an effective mechanism not only during times of major political transitions, but also in more stable arrangements, such as Brussels, that have used multi-tier governance (often in complex and evolutionary ways) to assure the territorial and political expression of identity groups.

Local political arrangements that allocate power to identity groups in some shared and engineered way are likely required for resolution of urban tensions amidst contested sovereignty. By building ethnic group power into local institutions, however, these systems can ethnicize many policy issues, dampen cross-cutting cleavages, and concentrate institutional power in the hands of ethnic politicians who then have the means to escalate demands (Roeder 2005). Thus, these structural solutions may provide autonomy and sovereignty at the expense of ethnic separation and isolation and, ultimately, urban and regional dysfunctionality. Something more is needed.

Political and even physical separation tears at the heart and soul of the urban region, hermetically sealing antagonistic sides within their respective political chambers or behind physical walls of hatred. Two-tier structuring of local government that establishes both integrated and separate institutions is more moderate; yet, it also can lead to a functionally disconnected and economically stagnant urban area for one or both groups. Even joint, power-sharing political control of the city can disintegrate into a condition of urban paralysis amidst policy vetoes. Essential in these circumstances are on-the-ground urban policies and strategies that facilitate mutual tolerance and co-existence. Any local political arrangement, no matter how constituted, must have the capacity and means to implement programs and produce outcomes that make a meaningful difference to all groups in the divided society.

Under either shared local rule or international management, some effective city policy-making must occur that moves urban life toward mutual accommodation and away from rigidity and the status-quo. Seen in this light, political negotiations that restructure local political power represent a first, but by no means sufficient, step toward normalizing polarized cities.

REFERENCES

- Baskin, Gershon and Robin Twite (eds.) 1993. *The Future of Jerusalem. Proceedings of the First Israeli-Palestinian International Academic Seminar on the Future of Jerusalem*. Jerusalem: Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information.
- Beavon, K. S. 1992. "The Post-Apartheid City: Hopes, Possibilities, and Harsh Realities." In Smith, David M. (ed.) 1992. *The Apartheid City and Beyond: Urbanization and Social Change in South Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Blackman, Tim. 1991. *Planning Belfast: A Case Study of Public Policy and Community Action*. Aldershot, U.K.: Avebury.
- Bollens, Scott A. 2007. *Cities, Nationalism, and Democratization*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Collin, Jean-Pierre, and Melanie Robertson. 2005. "The Borough System of Consolidated Montreal: Revisiting Urban Governance in a Composite Metropolis". *Journal of Urban Affairs* 27, 3: 307-330.
- Cunningham, Chris and Sean Byrne. 2006. "Peacebuilding in Belfast: Urban Governance in Polarized Societies." *International Journal on World Peace* 23, 1: 41-73.
- Douglas, J. Neville. 1982. "Northern Ireland: Spatial Frameworks and Community Relations." Pp. 105-135 in Boal, Frederick W. and J. Neville Douglas (eds.). *Integration and Division: Geographical Perspectives on the Northern Ireland Problem*. London: Academic Press.
- Esman, M.J. 1973. "The Management of Communal Conflict." *Public Policy* 21, 1: 49-78.
- Ewing, Deborah. 1995. *Guide to Local Government Elections*. Durban, South Africa: Y Press.
- Fitzduff, Mari. 1995. Interview with author. Director, Northern Ireland Community Relations Council. January 13.
- Gordon, Michael. 2006. "U.S. Seen in Iraq Until at Least 2009" *New York Times*. July 24. Pp. A1, A10.
- Hadfield, Brigid. 1992. "The Northern Ireland Constitution." Pp. 1-12 in Hadfield, Brigid (ed.). *Northern Ireland: Politics and Constitution*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Hart, Tim. 1995. Interview with author. Urban geographer, SRK Engineers, Johannesburg. August 10.
- Hendry, John. 1995. Interview with author. Professor of Town and Regional Planning, Department of Environmental Planning, Queen's University of Belfast. January 18.
- Hepburn, A.C. 2004. *Contested Cities in the Modern West*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hooghe, L. 1995. "Belgian Federalism and the European Community." Pp. 134-65 in Jones, J.B. and M. Keating (eds.) *The European Union and the Region*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. 1996. "More Population Displacement in 1996." Oslo: Norwegian Refugee Council.
- International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance). 2001. *Democracy at the Local Level: The International IDEA Handbook on Participation, Representation, Conflict Management, and Governance*. Stockholm: Author.
- Ivanovic, Dragan. 2003. Interview with author. Deputy Speaker, Sarajevo Canton Assembly; Member, Federation Parliament (Chamber of Peoples); Director, Center for Policy Research and Development. November 24.
- Jokay, Charles. 2001. "Local Government in Bosnia and Herzegovina." Pp. 91-140 in Kandeve, Emilia (ed.) *Stabilization of Local Governments*. Budapest, Hungary: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative.
- Keith, Michael. 2005. *After the Cosmopolitan? Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Kesteloot, Christian and Pieter Saey. 2002. "Brussels, A Truncated Metropolis" *GeoJournal* 58: 53-63.
- Kimhi, Israel. 1994. Interview with author. Jerusalem Institute of Israel Studies. City planner-Municipality of Jerusalem (1963-1986). October 20.
- Khuri, I. Fuad. 1975. *From Village to Suburb: Order and Change in Greater Beirut*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Know, C. and P. Carmichael. 2006. "Bureau Shuffling? The Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland." *Public Administration* 84, 4: 941-965.
- Kritz, Neil J., Sermid al-Sarraf, and J. Alexander Their. 2007. "Constitutional Reform in Iraq: Improving Prospects, Political Decisions Needed" *USIPeace Briefing*. September.

- Lijphart, Arend. 1968. *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Loughlin, John. 1992. "Administering Policy in Northern Ireland." Pp. 60-75 in Hadfield, Brigid (ed.). *Northern Ireland: Politics and Constitution*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lustick, I. 1979. "Stability in Deeply Divided Societies: Consociationalisation vs. Control." *World Politics* 31: 325-344.
- MacBride, Deirdre. 1995. Interview with author. Housing and Projects Officer, Community Development Centre, North Belfast. January 30.
- Mazor, Adam and Shermiyahu Cohen. 1994. *Metropolitan Jerusalem: Master Plan and Development Plan. Summary Document*. June.
- Mier, Javier. 2003. Interview with author. Criminal Institutions and Prosecutorial Reform Unit, Office of the High Representative, Sarajevo. November 21.
- Merrifield, Andy and Erik Swyngedouw (eds.) 1997. *The Urbanization of Injustice*. New York: New York University Press.
- Nordlinger, Eric A. 1972. *Conflict Regulation in Divided Societies*. Boston: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
- Office of the High Representative. 1996. *Protocol on the Organization of Sarajevo*. Federation Forum Meeting. October 25th. Sarajevo: author.
- O'Leary, Brendan and John McGarry. 1995. "Regulating Nations and Ethnic Communities." Pp. 245-289 in Breton, A., G. Galeotti, P. Salmon and R. Wintrobe (eds.) *Nationalism and Rationality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olver, Crispian. 1995. Interview with author. Director, RDP Development Planning, Ministry in the Office of the President, Pretoria. August 25.
- Palley, Claire. 1979. *Constitutional Law and Minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Reid, Graeme. 1995. Interview with author. General Manager/ Lawyer, Planact. July 28.
- Roeder, Philip G. and Donald Rothchild (eds.) 2005. *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy After Civil Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ross, Dennis. 2004. *The Missing Peace: The Inside Story of the Fight for Middle East Peace*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Salamey, Imad. 2007. "The Crisis of Consociational Democracy in Beirut: Conflict Transformation and Sustainability thought Electoral Reform." Unpublished manuscript. 31 pages.
- Saura, Jaume. 2004. Interview with author. Member, Elections Monitoring Team, Bosnia; and Professor of International Law, University of Barcelona. May 20.
- Sisk, Timothy D. and Christoph Stefes. 2005. "Power Sharing as an Interim Step in Peace Building: Lessons from South Africa." Pp. 293-317 in Roeder, Philip G. and Donald Rothchild (eds.) *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy After Civil Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, M. G. 1969. "Some Developments in the Analytic Framework of Pluralism." In Kuper, Leo and M. G. Smith (eds.) *Pluralism in Africa*. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Smooha, Sammy. 1980. "Control of Minorities in Israel and Northern Ireland." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 22 (2): 256-280.
- Spahiu, Nexhmedin. 2002. "'Legalized' Division of Mitrovica." *Balkan Crisis Report*. Report No. 393. Institute for War and Peace Reporting. December 23.
- Suara, Jaume. 2004. Interview with author. Member, Elections Monitoring Team, Mostar June 1996; Professor of International Law, University of Barcelona. May 20.
- Sweeney, Paul. 1995. Interview with author. Advisor, Department of the Environment for Northern Ireland. February 2.
- Swyngedouw, Erik and Johan Moyerson. 2006. "Reluctant Globalizers: The Paradoxes of "Glocal" Development in Brussels." Pp. 155-177 in Amen, M. Mark, Kevin Archer, and M. Martin Bosman (eds.). *Relocating Global Cities: From the Center to the Margins*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Terhorst, P.J.F., and van de Ven, J.C.L. 1997. "Fragmented Brussels and Consolidated Amsterdam, A Comparative Study of the Spatial Organization of Property Rights." *Netherlands Geographical Studies* 223.
- Tufakji, Khalil. 1994. Interview with author. Geographer. Arab Studies Society. Member. Palestinian-Israeli Security Committee. December 10.
- United Nations. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). 2007. "Humanitarian Crisis in Iraq: Facts and Figures." Amman. November 13, 5 pages.