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PART I: Plurinational States and Multinational Federalism

1. Sujit Choudhry: Plurinational Polities and Constitutional Design

Since the early 1990’s, the study of multinational or plurinational polities has been a central preoccupation of political theory (e.g. Will Kymlicka), and a closely related sub-field in comparative politics devoted to the study of nationalism (e.g. Michael Keating). In parallel to this literature, there is has been a vigorous debate over constitutional design in ethnically divided societies, in which the leading figures have been Don Horowitz and Arend Lijphart. In this paper, I will explore the connection between these two lines of scholarly inquiry. What is striking is how these literatures have developed in isolation, with minimal contact. In this paper, I want to explore the sources of this gap. As well, I would like to explain what insights each body of work can offer the other.


The issue of autonomy (as a category distinct from both federalism and decentralization) in highly differentiated societies raises major issues related to trust and boundaries (social as well as territorial). For example, liberal nationalists have largely assumed that trust builds on a shared national identity and allegiance which sustain social solidarity and redistribution between conationals, hence constraining the scope of solidarity outside those ‘boundaries’ (though not excluding it). In this paper I will propose preliminary remarks on 1) how one may challenge such a thesis from the point of view of processes of democratization 2) the relationship of those processes to trust as an institutional or public (rather than purely personal) matter, and the issues raised 3) the function of the notion of sovereignty in those conditions.

3. Alain-G. Gagnon: Autonomy: Reconciling Autonomy, Community and Empowerment

Different models have been proposed to manage diversity. Among the most prominent of those models we find federalism, consociational democracy and territorial autonomy. Building on his earlier work, especially on The Case for Multinational Federalism (Routledge, 2009), the author challenges the dominant monist model of an all-encompassing nation-state and advances an alternative model founded on deep-diversity and trust.

Multinational federalism is introduced as a powerful element that can contribute to advance trust among national communities on a given territory. The author challenges prevailing models of “integration” and “accommodation” which he sees as two faces of a same medal. He proposes instead to advance a model of recognition based on a politics of recognition of national minorities through new forms of partnership. The notion of political nationality is used to describe trust at the federal level.

Limits of national sovereignty are also discussed while it is established that, far from escaping “the world of nations-states”, nation-state will remain for a foreseeable future the most potent political expression and constitute fundamental provider of meaning to citizens’ life experience. The author documents the extent to which international organisations have, a few years after the collapse of communism and the Soviet Empire, opposed more and more firmly the
emergence of new nations-states. In the meantime, international organisations have been more sensitive to the need of aboriginal communities and have been willing to recognize additional rights for them. This, in turn, led minority nations to identify themselves as indigenous peoples in order to see their claims being met. Rather than imagining the world based on a politics of recognition – though this remains an essential part of the equation - that would reproduce a world based on a hierarchical model, one needs to elaborate an authentic politics of empowerment that would give societal meaning to political communities. The intention is not so much to favour the emergence of new nation-states but instead to encourage nations, in an agonistic manner, to come to terms with each other and to engage the field of federal multinationalism as an empowering tool for nations.


Canada, it is generally acknowledged, is one of the most decentralized federations in the world, with provinces endowed with constitutional and fiscal powers that make them crucial political actors – either solely or in concert with the federal government – in most fields of Canadian public policy. That Canadian provinces exercise a large degree of regional autonomy is therefore a given for those who study Canada in a comparative context, often making the concessions to autonomous regions in other national contexts seem rather meager in comparison. But this does not tell the whole story about regional autonomy within Canada, in that it tends to be both reductionist in its collapse of regions into provinces, and neglectful of the ways in which powerful and entrenched federal institutions can frustrate, inhibit or co-opt, but also occasionally trigger and nurture new territorial autonomies.

There have been a number of different catalysts and rationales at work in attempts to diversify and rescale regional governance in Canada. Some of these can be linked to shifts in the national and global political economy that have altered the conditions and strategies for regional development; strong minority group identities and territorial affinities have been primary in other initiatives; fiscal and political crises have been catalysts, especially when interpreted through the lens of neoliberal ideology and the efficiency and accountability promises of new public management philosophy; and looming energy and environmental crises seem poised to re-localize economic activity, with implications for the construction of new regional autonomies.

At least three different strategies or approaches are evident in past efforts to accommodate diversity by constructing new regional autonomies within Canada’s federal system: through the creation of new nodes and patterns of governance; through the renovation of existing institutional arrangements; and government-initiated rescaling of regions without constitutional or institutional reform. A number of Canadian experiences with constructing new autonomies – with varying degrees of success – will be examined, yielding insights into the general processes at work, especially as they may apply in well-established federal systems. These cases involve the construction of autonomies at a number of different spatial scales (above and below the provincial level) and pursued by a range of cultural and territorial identity groups, in addition to state actors seeking to solve policy problems or implement conflict management strategies.
PART II: AUTONOMY WITHIN THE STATE

1. Markku Suksi: Sub-state Governance through Territorial Autonomy


Territorial autonomy has often been recommended as a way of managing diversity. It has been criticized on several grounds: that it freezes national-territorial identities; that it is centrifugal and encourages further demands; that territories and national identity groups rarely coincide perfectly, so that territorial autonomy merely creates more discontented minorities. These problems can be addressed by rethinking the meaning both of national groups and of territory. Nationality is not to be seen as a monopolistic identity but can rather take multiple forms within population groups and within individuals. These identities are not necessarily even nested but can overlap in complex ways. Territorial autonomy can allow the expression of these multiple identities within overarching federal or supranational systems.

Territory has also been reconceptualized. Previous understandings were dominated by the model of the unitary nation-state, within whose boundaries a range of political, cultural, social and economic systems coincided. Recent decades have seen an erosion of territorial boundaries in this restricted sense but it is wrong to conceptualize this as an end of territory. Rather we are seeing a process of rescaling in which the relationships between territory, identity and functional systems are transformed. New territories are emerging and old ones re-emerging as loosely-bounded systems, with different geographical reaches and often fuzzy boundaries. This permits an unpacking of territory as the basis for political authority and public policies, and its expression at multiple scales.

Territories differ in their degree of integration and national homogeneity, so that asymmetrical arrangements are appropriate in complex polities.

Territory is also important in historic claims, which also underpin many nationality demands. Such historic claims are best handled not as rival ethno-histories or as competing accounts of who arrived first or to the ownership of territory but rather as matters of constitutional history and practice. This does not yield definitive solutions as the appropriate form of government, but does permit discussion and constitutional interpretation and re-interpretation as means of negotiating over authority claims. In order to engage in such negotiation and debate, we need to overcome the legacy of the nation-state with its monopolistic and absolute claims to sovereignty and to territory.

3. Rémi Léger: Autonomy Beyond National Minorities

The literature on multiculturalism typically distinguishes between minorities that seek autonomy and those that seek integration. The assumption is that national minorities and indigenous peoples claim autonomy, whereas immigrant groups wish to integrate into the mainstream society. As a result, discussions of existing models of autonomy have for the most part centered on the “big 3”: Catalonia, Québec and Scotland. A less substantial literature has looked at Indigenous peoples in Canada, and to a lesser extent South America. My most basic
objective in this paper is to uncover the alternative model of autonomy that has resulted from the interactions between the Canadian government and Francophone minority communities since the adoption of the Official Languages Act in 1969. Precisely, through an analysis of position documents published by representative associations from these communities as well as government responses to their demands, the paper fleshes out an alternative conception of autonomy that combines self-rule with shared-rule; these communities seek the exclusive control of matters relating to education, whereas they desire shared governance with governments (“mechanisms of multilateral governance”) notably in the areas of health and immigration. The paper concludes by asking whether this softer model of autonomy is of use to appreciate and/or theorize other state-minority relations. In essence, my sense is that this paper contributes to understand how autonomy is currently played out in liberal democracies.

PART III: EUROPE: EXPLORING THE MANAGEMENT OF DIVERSITY WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION

1. Francesco Palermo: Why is Territorial Autonomy Anathema in Central and Eastern Europe?

Territorial (sub-national) autonomy in the former communist countries is generally considered with great suspicion. This is mainly due to political legacies of the past and fears for territorial integrity in mostly new and weak nation states. While the international community has been extremely active and overall effective in promoting human and minority rights and good governance, it has played very little role with regard to the territorial organization of power. The situation today, however, is no longer comparable to the early 1990ies. Good governance is essential for the development of these countries, and this might imply territorial decentralization in some areas. In any event, it is argued that an emotional and negative attitude towards territorial autonomy is counter-productive for the very progress of these countries.

The paper will analyze the few cases where regionalization is formally in place (such as Gagauzia, Crimea, Vojvodina, to some extent Poland), where it is invoked by some (usually minority) groups (such as Transilvania or Southern Slovakia) or where some attempts are made mostly as a consequence of conditionality (the most recent example being the newly adopted law on regionalization in Serbia).

It is argued that, particularly since the “territorial integrity emergence” is largely over, the persistent negative attitude towards territorial autonomy in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe has negative repercussions on the overall governance in the region. It is maintained that territorial autonomy should be divorced from ethno-cultural diversity: while these two elements can mutually benefit from one another, they are conceptually very different and so are the legal instruments to deal with them. The overlap between the two (both in the minds of political actors and also in some successful examples in Western countries) are one of the reasons for the misunderstandings that prevent regionalism/decentralization to spread out in Central and Eastern Europe. It is argued that states, minority groups and the international community adopt a view of territorial autonomy that goes back to its origins and stresses the good governance element more
than that of self-governance. This might help all involved actors to make a better use of the potential of autonomy.

2. Luis Moreno: Autonomy, Multi-Level Europeans and the Advancement of Social Citizenship

Europeanization implies that policies are to be shaped by considerations which go beyond the formal sovereignty of EU’s member states

Claims for autonomy within the EU have been put forward not only by ‘stateless’ nations within plural and compound states, but also by regions demanding self-governance. More often than not, meso-governments do not need par force the rationalising intervention of state central bureaucracies and elites. Autonomous regions enjoy additional economic and political security offered by the European Union and are gradually accommodated in a post-sovereignty era of progressive trans-nationalization.

The paper elaborates on the idea of multi-level citizenship as a ‘civility compound’ of collective attachments which favours regional territorial autonomy. Multiple identities expressed by Europeans are inserted in a variable continuum of territorial belongings and affinities grounded in values of human rights and solidarity. Both civil and political rights are being increasingly accomplished at the regional level of EU’s member states. As it could no be otherwise the exercise of civil and political rights has ‘spilt over’ into social citizenship.

Attention is paid to the aspirations of regions and sub-state layers of governance to carry out welfare expansion based upon arguments of optimality, accountability, legitimacy, partnership and recalibration. As a consequence of the emergence of ‘new social risks’ (NSR), vulnerable groups are likely to experience new needs in three broad areas: (i) balancing paid work and family responsibilities (especially child-care), (ii) being called on for care for a frail elderly relative, or becoming frail and lacking family support; (iii) lacking the skills necessary to gain access to an adequately paid and secure job, or having skills and training that become obsolete and being unable to upgrade them through life-long learning; and (iv) using private provision that supplies an insecure or inadequate pension or unsatisfactory services. NSR are seen as providing autonomous political communities with opportunities for welfare development, concerning labour activation, social assistance, care services and policy closure of ‘safety nets’. Some regions in EU’s member states have been active in policy innovation concerning NSR (e.g. Basque Country’s Regional Plan Against Poverty or Scotland’s Free Care for the Elderly).

Due to the very nature of multi-level governance in the EU, there is little impediment for autonomous political communities to develop programmes which may advance social citizenship based upon two premises: (a) EU’s post-regulatory ‘soft regulation’; and (b) Practices of emulation and policy learning such as ‘benchmarking’ and ‘best practices’.

3. Dejan Stjepanovic: Regions and Territorial Autonomy in Southeastern Europe

Regionalism and sub-state territorial politics in the Balkans have not received significant attention so far. Those who do engage in the debate have often argued that territorial restructuring in Southeastern Europe was a result of European Union conditionality and absorption of the EU
structural funds. Accordingly, what characterises South East European countries is a top-down process creating administrative and/or functional regions. The related concept of new regionalism promoting cultural identity, economic development and claims for political autonomy is considered as an uniquely Western European phenomenon. This paper casts doubt on both of these assumptions.

While referring to various instances of sub-state territorial politics in SEE, the paper deals in more detail with the cases of Vojvodina in Serbia and Istria in Croatia. In both of these cases there are strong elements of new regionalism but with different outcomes regarding institutional build-up in terms of power sharing.

The paper concludes that although central state political elites in SEE often feel apprehensive about minority ethnonational territorial autonomy demands fearing possible secession, plurinational/multiethnic and historically constituted regional projects might be more successful in achieving autonomous competences.

4. Laurent-Mehdi Chokri: Toward a comparative account of the long-term effect of systems of pluralism: from the collective religious-based autonomies in the Ottoman Empire to fragmented nationalisms.

As Ernest Gellner understood it, nationalism is the contemporary form of societies’ social link. In this perspective, the concept of nation is a synthetic representation of these societies. This synthetic representation tends to be reinforced by institutions, mainly the State, but also others like corporations or associations. Standing on Pierre Bourdieu’s work, Brubaker and Cooper proposed a theoretical description of the concept of nation who stressed its political nature. According to these views, the historical constructions of the concepts of nation has something to do both with their political efficiencies and the institutional contexts of their construction.

In this presentation, I shall focus on one of this institutional context, namely the form of institutionalized pluralism, in order to stress its effect on the mainstream representations of nation. More precisely, by comparing it with the well-known cases of France and Great Britain, I intend to stress that the millets system of the Ottoman empire has profoundly shaped the way nation are, and can be, conceptualized in the region who used to be under the Ottoman rule.
PART IV: AUTONOMY, SOVEREIGNTY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN SPAIN

1. José Maria Sauca: Cultural Rights and membership

The category of Human Rights has been traditionally constructed as a marginal category within the general theory of Human Rights and the number of those which have been included in it is limited. This was caused by two main reasons: On one hand, the traditional liberal theory had focused on the cultural dimensions of justice through proceedings based in the territorial distribution of institutional guaranties. On the other hand, the strategy of the Rights regarding the cultural phenomenon entailed to assure the public coexistence of the private spaces. Both reasons went into a crisis and the discourse justifying cultural rights has increased its complexity. Within this frame I would like to tackle the study of this category of Rights regarding the assumptions by which their implementation will help to define the membership of the individual into an identitary group within plural contexts.


My basic purpose is to contribute to the main topic of the workshop from a conceptual, institutional and normative point of view. Conceptually, I would like to discuss the concept of autonomy applied at the territorial and community level in Spain, and interpreting its meaning as a certain way of interaction between identity and political/legal competence. Here my argument will be that ‘autonomy’ is a theoretical concept that in practice it is very policy-related, in the sense that it has different meanings for different kind of policies. Taking the immigration policy as a case example and understanding it not only under its diversity management dimension, but also under its border management dimension, I will develop the institutional and normative point of view.

At this point I will be interested in analysing how autonomy is being constructed under the immigration policy in Catalonia. I will analyse institutionally, and with an historical overview, how Catalonia is combining identity and competencies in immigration policy though a serie of institutional actions, especially in the context of the development of the new Autonomous Statut (programmes, National Agreement on immigration, reception Law), and by this way how Catalonia is conducting its autonomy-building process in a policy that were not a matter of discussion during the democratic transition. Immigration policy is one of the first policies, whose analysis allows us to understand this autonomy building process from the beginning in a a very different context than the democratic transition. In this sense Spain and Catalonia is a very interesting laboratory for the international debate.

Normatively, I will be interested in dealing with the questions of limits. I will try to identify a list of topics that still need to be discussed in order to reach the level of “full autonomy” in immigration policy. That is, the level where Catalonia will have all the legal/policy instruments to deal with immigration following its own national identity. At the end of my discussion I will try to summarise and orientated my main findings under a broad theoretical reflection on immigration into multinational states, organised under a federal system.
3. **Jaime Lluch: Towards a Theory of Autonomism**

In many multinational democracies, models of federation are the preferred institutional configuration to address the complexities of multinationalism, and much of the scholarly literature echoes this preference for federation. Yet, we find many examples of sub-state national societies with autonomist nationalist parties that reject a model of federation as an appropriate institutional design to address their needs. Instead, many stateless nationalists advocate autonomism. How can we conceptualize autonomism? How does autonomism differ from related concepts including federalism, federation, devolution, self-rule, asymmetric federalism, sovereignty-association, decentralization, and self-government? I seek to sketch the general contours of a theory of autonomism as an ideology of territorial order and institutional design. I will do so on the basis of empirical research into the attitudes, discourse, and opinions of the autonomists themselves. I examine the discourse of leaders and militants of the autonomist parties of Puerto Rico, Quebec, and Catalonia. My analysis is centered on five aspects of the autonomists’ credo: the parameters of national and ethnic identity that encompass the autonomist political universe, autonomism’s relation with federation, independence, and sovereignty, and how autonomists order their political preferences. I will then synthesize the empirical data I have gathered and distill from it a political theory of autonomism. Lastly, I will use this empirically-based theory of autonomism to see how it overlaps with -- or can be distinguished from -- the related concepts of federation, decentralization, and asymmetric federation, in order to interrogate the category of “autonomism,” and to understand its contribution to our existing theories of federalism.

4. **Xabier Ezeizabarrena: Scottish Devolution and Basque Historical Titles: Two Legal Scopes for co-Sovereignty?**

The legal and political process opened with Devolution within the UK-Scottish relations contains similarities and potentials of remarkable real and comparative interest with the constitutional clauses of recognition of Basque Historical rights within the Spanish Constitution. Nowadays the EU framework is suitable in both cases to ease and foster this interest within a context of progressive co-sovereignty at the EU level.

This paper will compile the main legal and political comparative sources regarding Scottish Devolution and Basque Historical rights within both “constitutional” cases, in order to establish a comparative approach in the two territories. It will underline the potentials of these frameworks to develop the concept of co-sovereignty through mutual “constitutional” recognition with the UK and Spain.

In addition to the legal approach within the paper, there is indeed a different political consideration on both situations right now with extremely interesting consequences. A nationalist party ruling Scotland within the devolution process and after a long time out of the government, while Basque nationalism, even though winning clearly the March 2009 elections, is for the first time in democracy out of the Basque central government through a formal agreement between the main Spanish parties: the Socialist party and the Popular party. Would this imply a different vision of Basque Historical Rights from the new Basque Government and the possible
path towards co-sovereignty?? In the meantime, the Spanish Constitutional Court is close to rule a key judgment concerning the new Statute of Autonomy for Catalonia. Will it foster the idea of co-sovereignty or will it avoid any step forward?

PART V: AUTONOMY AND SOVEREIGNTY IN THE PHILIPPINES

1. Jacques Bertrand: Autonomy and nationalist demands in Southeast Asia

Autonomy has only recently been used in Southeast Asia to address territorially concentrated nationalist groups’ long lasting demands for accommodation. Two cases offer a particularly interesting contrast: the Moros in the Southern Philippines and the Acehnese in Indonesia. Several parallels can be made between the two groups and their respective struggles. Both Moros and Acehnese developed their own nationalist orientation as a result of histories of resistance to colonial rule, as well as struggles against centralizing and integrationist states. Armed guerrilla movements were formed in both groups as they faced states intent on repressing rather than accommodating their grievances. In this respect, both the Philippine and Indonesian states preferred strongly integrationist, assimilationist, and centralizing policies. Yet, in the last decade, they have taken divergent paths. In spite of being generally less centralizing and integrationist than its Indonesian neighbour, the Philippine state has been unwilling to agree to significant autonomy for the Moros. Even though some form of autonomy has been implemented since a 1996 peace agreement with the Moro National Liberation Front, this autonomy has never been properly implemented in part because of continued armed struggle against the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF). Negotiations with the MILF on territorial recognition and genuine autonomy have repeatedly failed. Conversely, in Indonesia, where the state has historically been much more strongly integrationist and centralizing, wide-ranging autonomy has been granted and is being implemented in Aceh. Why have such divergent outcomes occurred? The paper argues that two factors were particularly important: first, the electoral interests of ruling parties in Indonesia required that a solution be reached in Aceh whereas ruling parties are relatively insulated from political damages over the Moro conflict in the Philippines; second, business interests in Mindanao have been much more reluctant to relinquish control over local resources than similar interests in Aceh, partly because of the depletion of oil and gas resources in the region. Furthermore, business interests in both regions have different structural bases and ties to ruling parties, with important consequences on autonomy. The paper discusses these issues and draws general conclusions on conditions favourable to autonomy solutions to accommodate nationalist demands in these types of settings.

2. Manuel Litalien: Indonesia and The Philippines: Relevant Models of Autonomy for Thailand?

The question of autonomy is often related to conflict resolution or conflict escalation (Gurr, 1994; Cornell, 2002). In this aspect, various Southeast Asian countries have opted for different policies to contain the demands of minority groups seeking territorial sovereignty (Brown, 1988; He, Galligan & Inogushi, 2007). The presentation assesses how different Southeast Asian countries have addressed separatist claims by granting certain groups some level of governing
autonomy. Two cases where various autonomy arrangements have been adopted will be considered here to evaluate possible conflict management for a third case. The first case examines the Muslim minorities in the Philippines and the second looks at the special autonomy given to the province of Aceh by the Indonesian government. These two models of autonomy will be studied in order to evaluate their limits and potential in dealing with the Muslim insurgents of Thailand’s three southern border provinces, Pattani, Yala and Narathiwat. By exploring two models of autonomy, the presentation provides some reflections as to why Thailand has adopted a policy of increased decentralization, rather than autonomy with its three concentrated Muslim provinces. In light of the Indonesian and the Philippines model, I will addresses the potential these models hold in solving the failures of the Thai States in dealing with its anti-state militant movement. The argument is structured around a historical overview of the model of autonomy in each country, a focus on structural and functional constraint presented by the political regime for autonomy, and an analysis of the impact of the economic environment over the state’s capacity in responding to self-governing demands.

PART VI: Autonomy and Sovereignty in Insular Settings

1. André Fazi: Insularité et autonomie : une équation des plus trompeuses

Les îles ont été classiquement représentées comme des territoires de l’exceptionnel. Les îles visitées par Ulysse et ses compagnons, Utopia, la Nouvelle Atlantide, etc., sont toutes des mondes à part. D’autres voulurent en faire plus ou moins concrètement des laboratoires politiques ; le projet de Constitution pour la Corse de Jean-Jacques Rousseau en est peut-être l’exemple le plus connu. Aucune de ces volontés n’aboutit, mais la singularité insulaire n’en demeure pas moins conçue comme une évidence. La rupture géographique serait un obstacle majeur au processus d’intégration politique, économique et culturelle, caractéristique du nation-state building. Une telle représentation est extrêmement simplificatrice. En se concentrant particulièrement sur les collectivités de type régional, les territoires insulaires ressortissant aux États européens renvoient à trois types de logiques politiques très distinctes, lesquelles fondent trois grands groupes de territoires. La première est une pure logique d’assimilation, qui implique l’application du droit commun (catégorie A). La deuxième est une logique d’adaptation, pouvant elle-même revêtir des formes très diverses (catégorie B). Toutefois, le niveau d’intégration aux systèmes politique et juridique nationaux est toujours très élevé, y compris lorsqu’il s’agit de régions dotées d’un pouvoir législatif. La troisième est une logique d’exception, suivant laquelle les territoires considérés – dont la majorité sont extra-européens – ne partagent rien ou si peu avec les collectivités continentales de même niveau (catégorie C).

Alors que les évolutions statutaires sont relativement nombreuses au sein même des catégories B et C, le changement de catégorie est en revanche assez exceptionnel. C’est cette stabilité que nous voudrions interroger, notamment à l’aune des classes politiques régionales relevant de la catégorie B. Dans leur très grande majorité, celles-ci excluent catégoriquement d’envisager des formes d’autonomie beaucoup plus larges, parfois pratiquées dans le même État. Plus qu’une volonté immédiate de conquérir de nouveaux pouvoirs, c’est une grande dépendance politique et normative qui caractérise ces régions.
2. Eve Hepburn: *Autonomy: Recrafting Sovereignty: Lessons from Small Island Autonomies*

Islands have developed some of the most innovative forms of sovereignty in the world. Being typically small and insular, islands have repeatedly rejected outright independence in favour of developing unique status arrangements with larger state or supranational bodies. Islands such as Åland, Aruba, the Canary Islands, Corsica, the Isle of Man, Puerto Rico, and dozens of other island territories have agreed to share their sovereignty with larger political structures rather than seek independence. However, rather than representing an oddity in the world political order, islands are in fact illustrative of the creative governance arrangements that many states have adopted in order to accommodate diversity. In light of the trend towards decentralisation across OECD countries, scholars have begun to examine the implications of ‘variegated’ or shared sovereignty (Keating 1998, 2005; MacCormick 1999; Walker 2002). This is part of the shift away from conventional understandings of sovereignty focused on the nation-state.

The experience of small islands offers important lessons in ‘asymmetry’ for states such as the United Kingdom, Spain, and Italy, which are all undergoing processes of ‘asymmetrical’ spatial rescaling. This paper will explore the self-rule and shared-rule aspects of island autonomy arrangements, in order to draw lessons for other states that are granting special status and special forms of autonomy to some parts of their territory. The paper will develop an analytical framework for the analysis of island autonomy and provide empirical exemplification with two case studies (Åland Islands in Finland and Sardinia in Italy). The main research question is: How do island regions negotiate and exercise their autonomy within larger political structures? And what lessons can we draw from their experience? Understanding how islands are governed helps us understand better the pluralism and creativity of new forms of political order around the world.

PART VII: SOVEREIGNTY, AUTONOMY AND DIVERSITY IN CHINA

1. Isabelle Côté: *Instituting Troubles. Impact of Autonomous Arrangements on Ethnic Conflicts in China*

Territorial autonomy is often prescribed for national minorities as it tends to accommodate minorities' linguistic and cultural demands while granting them more economic and political power. But several scholars have pointed out that the effects of territorial autonomy on ethnic conflicts may have been painted in an overly positive light, overestimating its taming capacities and underestimating its strains. Why has autonomy worked to reduce ethnic conflicts in some contexts, but not in others? Cornell (2002) has blamed the lack of a clear delineation of power between the center and the autonomous units, which has led to some discrepancies between 'expected' autonomy and the actual amount of power held by the national minorities in these areas. Others, such as Bertrand (2004) have claimed that flexible ‘national models’ that properly integrate national minorities are important elements of the success of territorial autonomy. Yet, these two approaches are not applicable in the case of a single country that applied the same (arguably unclear) distribution of power between the center and all five of its autonomous regions, or that attempted to encompass all five of the national minorities to which it granted territorial autonomy into one national model.
As the numerous instances of Tibetan and Uyghur uprisings indicate, ethnic tension has recently been on the rise in several localities in northwest China’s autonomous regions despite the granting of 'more' regional autonomy to those regions in the 1990s. Whereas the economic causes of such conflicts have extensively been reviewed elsewhere, two socio-political factors have largely been ignored: the nature of autonomy in China and the increased heterogeneity of the population in those autonomous regions. In China, autonomy is traditionally attributed at the provincial, prefectural or county level, and it is often overlapping. The Uyghurs, for instance, are the titular groups at the provincial level in Xinjiang, yet many other ethnic groups possess autonomous arrangements at lower levels. These multiple “autonomies” make it difficult to delineate the realm of power that is devolved to each group. Conversely, the ever-increasing Han population seeking work has also complicated this thorny situation by significantly shifting the demographic balance of those regions. These two conundrums thus fall into two different scholarly literatures that, in the case of China, have not been previously studied conjointly: the literature highlighting the conditions under which autonomy successfully reducing ethnic conflicts, and that highlighting the impacts of internal migration and heterogeneity on ethnic conflicts.

My research dwells upon the role of autonomous arrangements and Han migration on ethnic conflicts in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and in the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region. It will look at the conditions under which territorial autonomy reduces ethnic conflicts in some Chinese autonomous regions, while it increases conflicts in others. More specifically, it will attempt to explain why the granting of 'more' regional autonomy in Xinjiang in the 1990s has led to more ethnic conflicts in the region, whereas next-door Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region has seen an overall decrease in ethnic conflicts at the same period. Besides looking at state-autonomous units relations and at the titular ethnic group itself (eg: its territorial concentration, the strength of its national identity, etc), I will argue that one should also give due respect to inter-groups factors. In particular, it will evaluate whether the presence of substantial internal minorities within the autonomous unit, the granting of sub-autonomous arrangements to those minorities, the existence of state-sponsored migration schemes to the autonomous regions, and the increasing number of economic (Han) migrants moving to autonomous areas may make territorial autonomy more likely to lead to ethnic conflicts.

2. Tashi Rabgey: Autonomy: Imagining Democratic Alternatives in Complex Settings

In the aftermath of the unrest in Tibet and Xinjiang since 2008, new currents of thought on ethnicity, nationality and the state have begun to emerge in Chinese political discourse. Driven by the specter of growing ethnic tensions across the PRC's western frontier, the new discourse seeks to reframe China's orthodox political theory of nationality, shifting from a paradigm of 'multinationalism' to that of 'multiculturalism.’ This paper discusses the development of this recent reframing of the theory and practice of Beijing's nationality—or minzu—policy and explores the consequences of the liberal logic at work in advancing the new critique. In particular, the paper examines the role and significance of autonomy in the recent critique. How is the concept of autonomy conceptualized within this new framework? In what ways is the concept expected to operate and function within the revised minzu theory? To what extent does this reflect a departure from the role of autonomy in the prevailing Chinese political discourse? The paper will focus on the reframing of Chinese nationality theory in the context of the case of
Tibet. Constituting one-fourth of PRC territory, the restive Tibetan region has posed both a political and theoretical dilemma for the Chinese state since its annexation in 1951. The region, which is currently divided into five provincial units, remains predominantly rural and nomadic despite three decades of the state’s policy of rapid economic development. That is, the region remains predominantly Tibetan. The paper will assess the significance of the shifting political discourse on nationality for the discussion of autonomy in Tibet.

3. Lobsang Sangay: *Paradox of Autonomy and Unity in Tibet*