



Federalism as a Power-Sharing Method in Multicultural Societies

Makbule Evin Öztaşdönderen

Dissertação para obtenção do Grau de Mestre em
Ciência Política
(2º ciclo de estudos)

Orientador: Prof. Doutor Luís Filipe da Silva Madeira

setembro de 2020

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to show my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr Luís Filipe da Silva Madeira for his guidance, and immense contribution to this work. He contributed greatly to the existence of this work with his open-mindedness, knowledge and experience. I feel very lucky to have had the opportunity to look at my research from different perspectives with the help of his piercing criticism.

I am also indebted to Prof. Ângela Prestes for her kindness, patience, and time for reviewing this work. She gave a great contribution to the completion of this work.

I would like to thank my uncle (Apo), Ahmet, who contributed greatly to my education in every sense, and to whom I owe a lot. He has always opened different doors in my mind with his realistic, and creative approaches.

I would also like to thank my mother, for her great endeavour on me and my siblings, to insist on our education despite all the compelling conditions. I especially thank her for instilling the sense of being a woman able to stand on my own feet, and I will always try to pursue the beautiful seeds that she laid in me. I figure her out better, and appreciate her more every passing day.

I also owe a lot to my sister, Yeliz, for what she has contributed to my development as a human being since I was a child. I must mention that I gained reading habits with her very regularly storybook gifts. Also, I would like to thank my brother, Aydın, for having always supported me.

I would also like to thank Emin Apo for his heartening support and positivity he has shown towards me since we first met. It means a lot to me.

Finally, I would like to thank my beloved nephews, Ahmet, and Ali for the pure and beautiful love they brought into my life.

Resumo

Quando a partilha do poder não pode ser exercida de forma equitativa e justa entre as comunidades que vivem em conjunto, há sempre uma nação que toma a dianteira e se coloca em posição dominante, deixando as outras comunidades confrontadas com situações desvantajosas. Assim, e de forma a prevenir a ocorrência de tais situações, a partilha de poderes é fundamental para as comunidades que se propõem viver em conjunto. O federalismo é apontado como um método eficaz de proceder à partilha de poder em sociedades multiculturais, uma vez que proporciona autonomia regional bem como distribuição do exercício do poder entre os vários elementos constitutivos dessa mesma sociedade. Assim, neste estudo, o federalismo foi abordado como sendo um método efectivo de repartição do poder em sociedades multiculturais, à luz da Teoria de Partilha de Poder, desenvolvida por Arend Lijphart. Foi, ainda, utilizado o método qualitativo a fim de que o tratamento de dados fosse feito do ponto de vista conceptual, historico e comparativo. Neste estudo, a Suíça foi considerada como um caso de federação multi-cultural bem-sucedida, devido, entre outros factores, à ausência de movimentos separatistas. Os elementos que fazem desta federação uma federação de sucesso foram analisados, metodologicamente, de forma a determinar os componentes constitutivos de uma federação próspera e bem-sucedida. Também, e de acordo com este propósito, foram analisados casos de federações mal-sucedidas e os elementos que contribuíram para essa falta de sucesso, ao mesmo tempo que foram igualmente abordados os componentes necessários para o sucesso de uma federação. Concluiu-se que o êxito, no que respeita a concretização do estado federal, se deve, fundamentalmente, ao desenvolvimento harmonioso do processo de construção da federação bem como à vontade e consentimento dos actores de partilhar a vida numa mesma comunidade.

Palavras-chave

Federalismo;partilha de poder;multiculturalismo;sistema federal Suisso

Abstract

When power-sharing cannot be exerted equally and fairly among the communities who live together, a nation comes to the forefront as dominant causing the remaining communities to be confronted with disadvantageous situations. Therefore, in order to prevent these disadvantageous situations, power-sharing is needed for the communities who intend to live together. Federalism is shown as a good power-sharing method for multicultural societies since it provides regional autonomy and power distribution among the various constitutive levels. Therefore, in this study, federalism was examined as a power-sharing method in multicultural societies, in the light of Arend Lijphart's Power-Sharing Theory. Besides, the qualitative method has been used to handle data conceptually, historically, and comparatively. Switzerland was considered here as a successful multicultural federation due to, among other factors, the absence of separatist movements. The points that make this federation successful were handled historically and methodologically in order to determine the constitutive components of a multicultural and effective federation. Also, in line with this purpose, several failed multicultural federations were examined along with their failure reasons, and the fundamental elements for a sustainable and successful federation were also considered. Accordingly, the success of a multicultural federation lies in the process of its construction, where the willingness and consent of the parties to live together emerge as the most crucial basis among them.

Keywords

Federalism, power-sharing, multiculturalism, Swiss federal system.

Index

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Scope of the Study	2
1.2	Objectives of the Study.....	2
1.3	Research Questions	2
1.4	Literature Review	3
1.5	Limitations.....	4
1.6	Theoretical Framework.....	4
1.6.1	Power-Sharing Theory	4
1.7	Research Methodology.....	5
2	Multiculturalism	8
2.1	Concepts of Ethnicity, Ethnic Minorities and Nation.....	8
2.1.1	Ethnicity.....	8
2.1.1.1	Ethnic Revivals in the 1950s	11
2.1.2	Minority and Ethnic Minorities	13
2.1.3	Nation.....	14
2.2	Final Considerations	15
3	Federalism as a Power-Sharing Method in Multicultural Societies.....	16
3.1	Evolution of Federal Thought	17
3.2	Definitions of Federalism, Federation and Federal Systems.....	19
3.2.1	Types of Federal States based on Ethnic Issues.....	20
3.2.2	Constitution of the Federations	22
3.3	Why have Federations Failed?	23
3.4	Final Considerations	26
4	The Case of Switzerland.....	27
4.1	A Brief History of Switzerland: Transition from Confederation to Federal State...27	
4.2	Swiss Federal System.....	31
4.2.1	General View	31
4.2.2	Power-Sharing among the Federation, Cantons and Communes	32
4.2.2.1	Responsibilities of the Levels	32
4.3.2.2	The Swiss Parliament.....	33
4.2.3	Direct Democracy in Switzerland: Referenda	34
4.2.4	Swiss Neutrality	35
4.3	Why was Switzerland not Invaded During the First and Second World Wars? .36	

4.4 Final Considerations.....	37
5 Conclusion.....	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	43

List of Acronyms

NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
PKK	Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan (Kurdistan Workers' Party)
UN	United Nations
US	United States
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

1 Introduction

It is an undeniable fact that there are, and there have always been, around the world, many ethnic communities coexisting together. Sometimes, life in these communities is harmonious and sometimes less harmonious. When multicultural societies exist, some mechanisms, that may help these communities to live together should be created, and implemented, so that harmony becomes a reality amongst them. In our point of view, homogenization is surely not the best solution.

Furthermore, the factors that enable a multicultural federalism to be successful will be scrutinised throughout our work. For our research, we chose Switzerland, first of all because it has been a successful federation in progress for many years, and possesses a multicultural social structure.

The fact that a nation, which is dominant in multicultural societies, comes to the forefront and creates a nation-state by homogenizing the remaining communities may give rise to specific problems. Assimilation, ignoring or even destroying the communities in existence are but some of those problems, and lays bare the importance of power-sharing among the communities. Homogenizing creates social unrest and, in the ultimate analysis, prevents peaceful coexistence among the constitutive communities. At this point, it is important to highlight the issues for the formation of a federation, which brings together the various communities in question, and their wish or willingness for coexistence.

When coexistence emerges, and the parties have the willingness to pursue a specific goal, or goals, it is necessary to find effective ways of power-sharing among the communities and nations that form the core of the federation to be in the world today.

With the establishment of the modern states, the majority of ethnic communities and nations were unable to establish their own states, and this fact led certain communities to be forced to live together, not rarely, against their will, which, obviously, gave rise to disputes. When power cannot be equally distributed among the communities living together, or when the state is designed around a single nation, unfair and disadvantageous situations may occur for the remaining communities. At this point, for the strongest community that holds the power, it is a matter of melting other communities in a pot by means of homogenization policies, and therefore ignoring diversity. Hence, in order to reach fair and democratic criteria, power-sharing is important among the communities that live together, which, in contrast to homogenization, is bound to appease social tensions, and therefore plough the path for a future and fruitful understanding among them.

1.1 Scope of the Study

This study aims to examine the reasons why power-sharing should be equally implemented among the communities in a determined geographical space.

Federalism will be considered as an effective method towards granting power-sharing among the communities. Due to the division of power at the various level, and regional autonomy provided by federalism, it seems to us an efficient power-sharing method that can be applied as long as it complies with the principles of the constitutive components, i.e. communities. Thus, at this point, the constitutive components of the federal system are of great importance, and should be carefully analysed since we aim to contribute to the literature on power-sharing in multicultural societies by determining those constitutive components of federalism, and providing comparative examples, presenting Switzerland as a successful and, sustainable case of what a federal state can be along with failed attempts to the formation of federations.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to examine federalism as an efficacious power-sharing method in multicultural societies, and the factors that enabled the Swiss federal system to become successful as we know it today. Furthermore, the specific objectives to be achieved are the following: to examine the constitutive principles of federalism, to examine how federalism prevents homogenization, to examine how federalism should be implemented as a power-sharing method in multicultural societies, and, finally, to examine how power-sharing is managed in the Swiss example.

1.3 Research Questions

Although federalism is shown as a good power-sharing method due to the fact that it provides regional autonomy as well as division of power at the various existing levels, i.e. administrative divisions, for the multicultural societies, when the multicultural federations that have failed are considered, the questions related to how federalism is applied methodically, and what conditions make federalism applicable, come to the forefront. For this reason, in this study, federalism will be considered as a method of power-sharing, and the question of why federations occur in multicultural societies will be researched.

Furthermore, Switzerland, which will be considered as an example of a successful multicultural federation, and several failed federations will be examined with their reasons for occurrence and separation in order to find out the question of the reasons for the failure of the multicultural federations.

The Swiss federal structure, which will be examined in detail on its own, with both its historical and current political system, together with the reasons why this federation came to be successful, will be determined.

At the end of this study, on the other hand, and in light of the cases that will be examined throughout it, and the constitutive components of federalism, we aim to be able answer the question related to under which conditions a multicultural federation should be established.

1.4 Literature Review

Generally, the subject of power-sharing has been discussed concerning societies consisting of various layers. Referring to those societies has commonly been related to their own structure. In order to express multi-layered societies, other expressions have also been used, such as: "plural societies" by Arend Lijphart (1977), "multicultural societies," by Will Kymlicka (2001), and "deeply divided societies" by Joanne McEvoy and Brendan O'Leary (2013).

Based on the characteristics of a determined society, its layers may vary according to diverse elements such as: ethnic groups, ethnic minorities, nation, and others. In the literature on ethnicity, the studies of Fredrik Barth (1969), Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan (1975), John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (1996), Thomas H. Eriksen (2010) come into prominence. In these scholars' studies, the concept of ethnicity has been handled considering its basic principles, and classified in itself. When looking at the studies on the concept of nation, despite the fact of being a very broad and controversial concept, this issue will be discussed by emphasizing what seems to be the differences between nation and ethnicity, since many similarities between these two concepts can be found. For this reason, the studies of Anthony D. Smith (1995) and Michel Seymour (1999), which emphasize these points in the literature, will also be addressed.

When considering the studies on power-sharing in literature, we come across names such as Arend Lijphart (2007), Joanne McEvoy and Brendan O'Leary (2013), and Brigid Brooks Kelly (2019) who have significantly contributed to the clarification of these two concepts. Generally, in these scholars' studies, the subjects related to the implementation of power-sharing, and where it originated, have been abundantly worked upon. Arend Lijphart, especially, laid an important foundation for the sharing of power understanding by identifying its elements.

On federalism, which is shown as one of the power-sharing methods, studies of Kenneth Wheare (1964), Thomas Franck (1968), Ronald Watts (1977), Preston King (1982), Daniel

Elazar (1991), Michael Burgess (1993), Soren Dosenrode (2007) come to the forefront. These scholars' studies focused mainly on the constitutional design of federalism.

George Sauser-Hall (1946), Clive H.Church (2004), and Wolf Linder (2015) fundamentally examined the Swiss federal system in the light of historical and constitutional factors. Their works occupy an important place in the literature on the subject. Hence, in this study, we chose to use their work as a guide to help us find, and possibly rethink, a fair, reliable and achievable method. Federalism appears, in our view, as an effective method of power-sharing.

1.5 Limitations

There are some conceptual limitations in this study. Some different approaches are involved in the definitions and distinctions between the concepts of ethnicity and nation, which will be emphasized as the main subjects of multicultural societies, and discussed in chapter 2 of this study. Therefore, these concepts will be discussed within the scope of different viewpoints. Moreover, it is unclear, in general, why some federations, which will be examined in chapter 3, have failed; in other words, what the failure criteria are when applied to federations. For this reason, federations that disintegrate, or federations that were unable to fulfil their purpose, or where separatist movements are present, will also be considered as unsuccessful.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

Since federalism is suggested as one of the power-sharing methods for geographically divided societies (Lijphart, 2008, p. 83), the theoretical basis of this study will thus be the Power-Sharing Theory. By referring to the power-sharing theory, the goal is that of answering the questions why power-sharing is needed in the case of federations that evolve around ethnic issues, and how the constitutional foundations are laid.

1.6.1 Power-Sharing Theory

Arend Lijphart started to use the expression "power-sharing" as far back as 1969. Lijphart used the term "power-sharing" to substitute "consociational", which he considered as an obstacle due to its pronunciation in his talks with politicians (Ibid., p. 6). That is to say, Lijphart used the expressions consociational and power-sharing interchangeably. However, McCrudden and O'leary distinguished consociation and power-sharing from each other. Moreover, they implied "consociation" as being just one type of power-sharing (McCrudden & O'leary, 2013, p. 6).

Power-sharing is used in various constitutional arrangements in order to share power between parties consisting of different groups (Irwin, 2013, p. 295). Peaceful coexistence is possible, provided that equal representation and distribution of power among the different layers of the society are met, which complies with the power-sharing theory (Kelly, 2019, p. 19). Thus, in multi-layered societies, the power-sharing theory, while supplying each of the layers with an equal representation, appears in opposition to the theory of homogenization around a single-nation.

Lijphart has addressed the power-sharing elements under four main pillars: "coalition, cultural autonomy, proportionality, and minority veto." Furthermore, coalition and autonomy, have been referred to as primary degrees, while proportionality and minority veto as secondary degrees. The primary degree is crucial, and the secondary is, on the other hand, considered as of lower position importance (Lijphart, 2008, p. 4). The coalition, which is the primary degree, consists of politicians from each of the layers in society. With autonomy, each of the layers in society governance deals with its internal affairs. Proportionality provides an inter-layer proportion in society in terms of political representation, government services, and distribution of public funds. The minority veto aims to prevent the majority from deciding without a prior minimum consensus. In this way, while minorities use their veto powers, they also have the right to make decisions about vital interests for them. In short, this is a way to guarantee the rights of minorities (Lijphart, 1977, p. 25). Unlike Lijphart, McCrudden and O'leary differentiate between consociation and power-sharing, as stated above. The power-sharing elements, which comprise collective presidencies, multi-party governments, proportional electoral systems, allocation rules, and co-decision in the making of rules, and in spite of the fact that Lijphart does not embark in such differentiation, one may consider those consociational elements as being parallel to the elements determined by him (McCrudden & O'leary, 2013, p. 6).

1.7 Research Methodology

This study will be conducted based on the qualitative method. It is aimed to analyze the phenomena that will be obtained in the light of the qualitative method in a detailed descriptive manner, in order to understand the relevance of the variables in question by establishing a cause-effect relationship.

In line with this method, the relevance of social identities such as ethnicity and nation, the conditions of communities to live together, the need for power-sharing caused by these conditions, and federalism as a power-sharing method will be scrutinized in the second chapter.

Chapter 3 will be dedicated to the failed federations, the reasons for their failure, and the presentation of some examples, under the title "Why have Federations Failed". Chapter 4 will deal with the Swiss federal system as a case of success. In light of the power-sharing theory, the constitution of the Swiss Federal system, and implementation of power-sharing, will be researched and analyzed as far as historical and present conditions are concerned.

The collection of data in this study was obtained from secondary sources such as published books, journals, newspapers, reports and official internet sources.

This study consists of three chapters apart from the introduction and conclusion. In each chapter, the topics were analyzed based on a conceptual, historical, and theoretical framework.

In the second chapter, multiculturalism, which is related to the empowerment, in the public sphere, of individuals or groups, who have different identities such as ethnic, racial, or gender, was addressed in line with the problems that arise in consequence of homogenization. The focus of this chapter is laid upon what multiculturalism is, and where it originates.

Since ethnocultural communities are generally included as actors in multiculturalism, accordingly, they were mentioned as part of multiculturalism, in this study. Ethnocultural identities are named as ethnicity, nation, minority, and ethnic minorities, depending on the structure of the society. Those ethnocultural identities are often used interchangeably, and this situation has given rise to a certain ambiguity. Therefore, in chapter 2, those ethnocultural identities were examined, conceptually, by highlighting the similarities and differences between them within the framework of multiculturalism.

In chapter 3, we tried to clarify the distinction between ethnocultural communities, divided societies, power-sharing, and federalism. The problems that may arise when the sharing of power cannot be achieved politically, economically and socially among the communities that live together were tackled, and we tried to demonstrate how power-sharing would be made successfully possible through federalism in societies where such diversity is to be found. Federalism was thus addressed conceptually as well as historically and constitutionally, and classified based on ethnic issues. The concepts of federalism, federal system, and federation were discussed separately, and their use emphasized. At this point, the failed multicultural federations were classified and analyzed according to the reasons for their failure, and some examples were provided.

In chapter 4, besides the federal system in itself, which was examined as a power-sharing method, the Swiss federal system, in particular, with its multicultural social structure, was also examined as a case of prosperous outcome. Switzerland is thus a federation that has,

for many years, cherished and maintained a successful power-sharing. We tried, therefore, to highlight the points that made this federal system successful, namely how the Swiss federal system evolved from a confederation to a federal state, and how power-sharing was implemented, and the policies put in place in order to strengthen it.

In the conclusion, on the other hand, we expatiate on under which conditions a federation can constitute a multicultural society. Also, the success of multicultural federations was thus analyzed based on the constitutive components of federalism.

2 Multiculturalism

The concept of multiculturalism emerged towards the end of the 1980s. This concept, appeared as a new form of cultural pluralism, aims to empower, in the public sphere, individuals or groups, who have different identities such as ethnic, racial, or gender. Towards the 1990s, the concept was further developed against unjust exclusion. Namely, multiculturalism has opposed to the marginalisation of a group or groups of individuals based upon their identities (Inouye, 1994, p. 1179).

The demands for recognition of excluded subaltern groups generate multiculturalism, which has to do with the strengthening of cultural pluralism in public. Therefore, the understanding of multiculturalism also corresponds to the demand for recognition of different identities. The non-fulfilment of this demand may give rise to unfair situations, such as misrecognition, distortion, or suppression of the subaltern group in question (Taylor, 1994, p. 25).

In the process of construction of a modern nation-state, not rarely have we all witnessed that the sovereign powers have forced the citizens to conversion by imposing a common language and common institutions, such as national media, education, military service among others. In line with this, homogeneous societies seem to be the goal to be attained. Accordingly, from past to present, the ethnocultural minorities have been subjected to a transformation, whether voluntarily or not (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 1). At this point, it is important to highlight what are the ethnocultural minorities which have been subjected to homogenisation in the form of a nation-state, or what the concepts of ethnicity, nation, and minority in themselves are. These concepts, which will be used frequently in the following part of this study, are also frequently used interchangeably in daily language being thus a cause for ambiguity. Therefore, it is important to clarify these concepts so as to enable the understanding of the following parts of the subject.

2.1 Concepts of Ethnicity, Ethnic Minorities and Nation

2.1.1 Ethnicity

The concept of ethnicity dates back to ancient times. It arose by deriving from many words over time. In the English language, the roots of the concept of ethnicity can be traced to medieval times. It derived from the word "ethnic," which was used mostly as an adjective. Also, the adjective "ethnic" comes from the word "*ethnos*", in ancient Greek. The

word "*ethnos*" referred to the gentile, which was applied to non-Christians and non-Jewish pagans according to the New Testament in Greek (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996, p. 4).

The word "ethnic" was used in the English language since the middle of the 14th century. It was applied to the pagan, gentile, and heathen. In the 19th century, its meaning started to refer to racial features. In 1961, the word "ethnic" was used as a political term in the US, when addressing Jews, Italians, and other communities. In the middle of the 20th century, the word "ethnic" was used as a very close meaning to the word "folk". Presumably, it was influenced by the 19th-century American usage (Williams, 1983, pp. 119-120).

If we delve into the first usage of "ethnic" in the English language, the word "ethnic" does not appear in the 1933 publication of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. But, in its 1972 edition, it was defined as "the character or quality of an ethnic group" by getting hold of David Riesman's definition of 1953. At this point, it seems pertinent to clarify the characteristics of an ethnic group in order to understand the concept of ethnicity (Glazer & Moynihan, 1975, p. 1).

Nowadays, we acknowledge the existence of various ethnic groups, defined in accordance with different elements by many different scholars. For this reason, it is quite difficult to give a single and clear answer to what an ethnic group really is. Max Weber described the ethnic group as communities, possessing a common language, history, tradition, or similar physical characteristics, and awareness of their own partnerships. In Max Weber's definition ethnic group, kinship is also taken into consideration. However, according to him, this is not an essential condition. The lack of kinship ties does not pose an obstacle to the occurrence of ethnic groups as long as the existence of common similarities and awareness are met. Moreover, ethnic groups may emerge by virtue of a political union and may continue to exist even if this very political union disappears (Weber, Roth, & Wittich, 1978, p. 389).

Eriksen, on the other hand, states the fundamental elements of the ethnic group as being in contact with each other even if just for a short while and having the consciousness of being culturally different from one another (2010, p. 16). In this sense, being part of an ethnic group may be the start or the disappearance of communication. Likewise, this applies to the consciousness of being different from others.

Anthony Smith describes the characteristics of the ethnic groups as a human population, living together in a particular region, possessing a sense of solidarity and unity, in line with a common culture, history myth, and so on (1997, p. 27).

Ethnic groups are often characterized on the basis of their similarities. However, Eriksen claims that the ethnic groups also may be described according to their differences as well as similarities. In other words, the characteristics of some ethnic groups may differ from other

ethnic groups, depending on the society in which they are inserted. Therefore, Eriksen classified the ethnic groups, according to this principle, as follows: "1. Modern migrants (non-European immigrants in European cities and Hispanics in the United States), 2. Indigenous peoples, 3. Proto-nations (nations without a state), 4. Ethnic groups in plural societies and 5. Post-slavery minorities (the descendants of slaves, their ancestors were transformed from being members of distinctive, African ethnic groups to simply)" (2010, pp. 18-19). Additionally, when it comes to ethnic group definitions, there are two opposite approaches that must be referred to - primordialism, and instrumentalism (Kataria, 2018, p. 130). The primordialist perspective considers that the ethnic groups' characteristics are given by birth. It is addressed as an identity. However, the spatial movements of such groups as well as time are bound to change the "given" roots. Thus, the primordialists were criticised by the instrumentalists for neglecting the variability factor (Ibid., p. 133). In the Instrumentalist perspective, ethnic groups are addressed based on the social, economic, and political interests of a particular community (White, 2002, p. 155).

Geertz, one of the primordialist theorists, claims that the ethnic groups consist of "given roots". These "given roots" he refers to have nonetheless a basis of social existence since he considers the direct contact, belief, kinship, language, or dialect to be elements to be taken into account (Geertz, 1973, p. 259).

Harold Isaacs, also a primordialist theorist, on the other hand, has a slightly different approach. He associated ethnic groups to factors like identity and belonging. The identity that he called "primordial affinities and attachments" is given to the person by birth (Isaacs, 1975, p. 30). However, instrumentalist theorist Barth is critical of this point of view, and claims that definitions, whose explanation was based on culture, prevent us from understanding the place ethnic groups occupy in society. Moreover, the place of the ethnic groups in society might be neglected because of the pre-accepted factors, such as the genesis, structure, and function (Barth, 1969, p. 11). Cultural factors may also be included in the characteristics of the ethnic groups. Nonetheless, identifying those groups according to their cultural similarities and differences, taking into account one-to-one ethnicity, seems to be a difficult task. For this reason, Barth explained that the ethnic groups encompass what he called an "ethnic boundary" rather than cultural factors. Furthermore, these boundaries are beyond territories, they rather refer to social boundaries, relationships, and human behaviours (Ibid., p. 15).

In the modern world states, subsystems and subsections, which are different if a certain part of the population is to be considered, may come in sight. Primordialist theorist Schermerhorn uses the expression "ethnic group" for this subsection population. He claims that one or more characteristics of the ethnic group refer to the community, which he

defines as peoplehood – the condition of being or belonging to a people. These characteristics can be broadly based on a common culture, history, and origin. It may also include kinship, physical similarities, belief, language or dialect, nationality, and so on (Schermerhorn, 1996, p. 17). Barth has criticised this view since it does not contemplate the interaction between people (1969, p. 10).

Theorists Gurr and Harff assert that the primordialist and instrumentalist approaches are not poles apart, and that a combination of both approaches can also form an ethnic group. Namely, an ethnic group is already in possession of an identity, as emphasised by the primordialist approach. When this ethnic group shows little interest for economic or political issues, it may bend to either side or to a combination of both. Accordingly, an ethnic group may carry both approaches in a situation (Gurr & Harff, 1994, p. 79).

In the light of all the definitions and criticisms mentioned above, ethnic groups will be addressed in line with Max Weber's ethnic group definition as well as with Eriksen's ethnic group classification. The expression "ethnic minority", to which we shall come later in this work, will be used for the ethnic groups, who show a lack of political and economic interests.

2.1.1.1 Ethnic Revivals in the 1950s

Towards the end of the 1950s, ethnic movements have risen across the world. Hence, researchers have begun to focus on the concept of ethnicity and the causes behind the ethnic revivals. When taking into consideration that the word "ethnicity" was conceptually used in the English language for the first time in 1953 (Glazer & Moynihan, 1975, p. 1), it constituted thus a new term in the social sciences in this period. Nevertheless, empirically, ethnic movements before the 1950s were already in existence and likely to be recognised.

In the 1950s, the movements of ethnic groups, especially, Breton, Basque, Catalan, and Quebecois, became prominent, and those movements were massively spread all over the world. Therefore, the revival of ethnic groups is often considered as having taken place towards the end of the 1950s (Smith, 1981, p. 20).

Since the ethnic revival was attributed to the movements of ethnic groups, to focus on the justifications which gave rise to movements may reveal the causes for ethnic revival. Although each movement may have had its own and different reasons for exposure, such as language, belief, physical characteristics, and so on, it is nonetheless possible to reach some general justifications based on the specific cases. Novak explains the ethnic movements in America as an awakening of the ethnic groups. The ethnic groups turned back to their own roots due mostly to racism and superpatriotic policies (Novak, 1972, p. 80), which were then triggered and implemented.

In the case of France, the government followed regional policies, in conjunction with the participation of the country in the world economic system. Those regional policies led to the development of ethnic regionalism. With the influence of the May 1968 revolution and the ethnic movements worldwide, the process of decolonisation started (Beer, 1980, p. 34).

Ethnicity has become an important phenomenon, along with many colonies in Africa gaining independence in the 1960s (Guibernau & Rex, 1997, pp. 1-2). In Africa, the Nigerian movements occurred around three factors - political, economic, and cultural, during the period of colonisation and post-independence. Based on those three factors, the movements intertwined with each other hoping to achieve their set goals. Nonetheless, in general, those movements manifested themselves against the white supremacy and imperialism. The white supremacy imposed by the colonizers, by claiming the inability of the African peoples to self-governance. This position started then to be criticised by some African historians. Hence, researches began to focus on white supremacy. Thereupon, various publications and institutions have been created to provide services in the local languages related to the imposed white supremacy (Falola & Aderinto, 2010, pp. 49-50).

In the case of Turkey, the various Kurdish movements occurred after the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. However, those movements were suppressed through various policies such as exiling, killing and displacing. As a way to deny the Kurds their identity, the Turkish state has its ways as, for example, to call them “mountain Turks”, which is humiliating, while implying the ignorance of people from the mountains, and reject their identity by calling them Turks (Romano, 2006, p. 38).

As a result of systematic oppression, which continued especially during the 1980 military coup d'état period, a stronger cultural Kurdish identity has emerged. After the military coup d'état, many Kurds were forced to flee the country, and seek exile in western Europe. The Kurdish diaspora, especially in Europe, has created various Kurdish movements, which, from an intellectual and cultural view, intensified the sense of belonging to their own identity. Besides, the armed Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) emerged as the most influential movement in Turkey (Bruinessen, 1996, para. 13).

Although each ethnic group movement carries different reasons in itself, the movements that started to loom worldwide from 1950 to the recent past, in line with the examples mentioned above, have emerged as resistance against oppression, imposition, and exploitation.

2.1.2 Minority and Ethnic Minorities

Although ethnicity has been explained through various approaches, based on political and sociological grounds, an ethnic group may exist by itself, whether holding a political status

or not (Weber et al., 1978, p. 389). Thus, in this study, the expression "ethnic minority" will be used whenever ethnic groups who hold a political status is referred to. At this point, it seems pertinent to clarify the concept of minority.

A minority is by definition a non-dominant group, therefore a group who is in a disadvantageous situation. Schaefer's explanation of the concept of minority is based upon power inequality, which comprises social, political, and economic disadvantages (Preece, 2008, p. 905).

Dunn, on the other hand, explicitly states that minorities are groups that have less access to power and are exposed to adverse treatments. Moreover, minorities are diverse and classified according to their status: "racial/ethnic, sex/gender, age, religious, and disabled minorities as well as economic and educational minorities" (Dunn, 2012, p. 3).

Based on the diversity of minorities, whether ethnic groups are political or not, this study will focus on ethnic minorities who find themselves in a disadvantageous situation in the political, economic, and cultural fields.

Although there is no common definition of what a minority really is, or a declaration of minority rights accepted by all states, the minority definition of the United Nations is, nowadays, usually taken as the basis. Francesco Capotorti, who is Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, suggested, in 1977, the definition of minority as follows:

"A group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a State, in a non-dominant position, whose members—being nationals of the State—possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language" (Capotorti, 1991, para 568, p. 96).

In minority definitions, usually, minorities are expressed as part of the rest of the population of a given state, which means numerical expression. However, in some cases, disadvantaged ethnic groups may have a larger population than the dominant ethnic group. For example, in Africa, the white population in countries that came into existence, or acquired independence, after the European colonisation, continue to enjoy advantageous situations in terms of welfare and political rights vis-à-vis the black populations, despite the fact of being a minority. O'Brien and Healey, who emphasise the insignificance of the number in the definition of minority, describe the concept of minority as a certain identity, systematically in disadvantaged situations, and possessing self-consciousness (Healey & O'Brien, 2015, p. 71).

Regardless of the numerical factor, minorities are subordinate, and as a result of this subordination, minorities remain in the background and dwell into insignificance. The insignificance of the minority may originate in the fact of being patronised, either physically or culturally. Not to mention that subordination, insignificance and patronising are constraints the minorities are forced to face. Thus, a self-consciousness arises amidst minorities because of being marginalised (Wagley & Harris, 1958, p. 10).

2.1.3 Nation

The concept of nation has been defined and used in different ways when dealing with political issues. Although it is often intermingled with ethnicity and used interchangeably, there are points where it differs from ethnicity within the framework of its various definitions. Likewise, the concept of nation has some common points with ethnicity, and those common points allowed the two terms to be used interchangeably. At this stage, it seems pertinent to clarify the common and distinct points of both concepts so that misleading readings and interpretations are avoided.

Anthony Smith correlates the nations with previous ethnic ties. In this direction, ethnic groups are pre-modern, and nations are modern era phenomena. In other words, communities that are formed by ethnic groups may become a nation, or nations, over time. Historically, there are ethnic communities that were not able to become a nation, such as the Phoenicians, Wends, and Burgundians, who have disappeared, intimidated by "others", or divided into different communities. Nevertheless, there are still communities, composed of a certain population, which were, in the pre-modern period, an ethnic group and became a nation or formed a national movement. We are here referring to such communities as the Breton, Catalan, Croat, and Serb, in the modern period (Smith, 1995, p. 57). At this point, a question comes to the forefront – when did the communities become a nation and ceased to be just an ethnic group? In other words, on what basis does the transition between the pre-modern and modern periods occur in terms of communities?

The phenomenon of the nation is related to a common language, history, culture, origin shared by a certain human community (Seymour, 1999, p. 412). In this sense, it is about sharing similarities with the ethnic groups. However, unlike ethnic groups, the nation has emerged from political structures in the modern world system (Wallerstein, 1991, p. 80). Thus, it has a political as well as a cultural structure. Ethnic groups also may have a political character; nonetheless, it does not apply to all ethnic groups. Although ethnic groups, generally, do not have a political character, yet an ethnic group still may turn into a national movement with political demands (Eriksen, 2010, p. 10). Thus far, the concept of nation was defined by its similarities and differences vis-à-vis the ethnic groups. Furthermore, Benedict Anderson defined nations as "imagined communities". Members of these

imagined communities share feelings with each other without seeing or meeting, even though they may be a very small community (Anderson, 2006, p. 6).

2.2 Final Considerations

It has been witnessed, from past to present, that when power-sharing cannot be divided equally among the communities living together, the ethnocultural societies are, inevitably, subjected to disadvantaged situations, and, therefore, homogenization in terms of language, culture, belief, and so on, becomes the rule. Ethnocultural societies, in general, are named as an ethnic groups, nations, or minorities depending on the structure of the society. Clarifying those concepts has been important since those concepts are the pillars of power-sharing in multicultural societies. Therefore, in this chapter, the definitions of ethnic group, nation, and minority, were made clear by addressing their differences within the context of multiculturalism. The reasons why we have witnessed a revival of the ethnic groups, especially from the 1950s onwards, and, why do ethnic groups have political demands have also been under scrutiny.

As a result, the ethnic groups and nations have been associated historically. Although ethnic groups and nations may have common features such as language, culture, belief, or others, they may, however, have differences in a political sense. It is seen that ethnic groups become a nation in the historical process when they gain political structuring. Nonetheless, not every ethnic group may be liable to provide this situation. Also, it was concluded that when ethnic groups are politically, socially, or economically in disadvantaged situations, they acquire an ethnic minority status. Moreover, in the light of the examined examples, it has been seen that the revival of ethnic groups and their demands of a political character comes as a consequence of the policies of homogenization or superiority that triggered them, and forced them to be subjected to.

3 Federalism as a Power-Sharing Method in Multicultural Societies

Nowadays, there are numerous communities coexisting in the world. This fact obviously involves different sorts of languages, religions, cultures, or origins. When political, economic, and social power cannot be equally shared among these coexisting communities, divisions may occur in the society as a result. These divisions may be of an ethnical, national, or territorial nature. Analysts use various different terms such as multicultural, plural society, multiple societies, cultural diversity, multi-ethnic, multi-national, and so forth, to imply coexisting societies. Since, generally, the term multicultural appears as a comprehensive one, it will be used in this study when referring to the coexisting societies. However, its usage will change according to the social structure.

Until recently, it has been observed that after the states or communities, which did not have a homogeneous structure, were transformed into the nation-state form, the dominant national groups achieved dominance over minorities precisely through the very notion of nation-state as an instrument of dominance. This dominance may include identity, language, history, culture, literature, belief, economics, politics, education, various services, and so on. Also, in many cases, we witnessed minorities being exposed to assimilations or exclusions by the majorities. For all that has been said, multicultural societies are in contradiction with the homogeneous nation-state (Kymlicka, 2007, p. 17). Accordingly, the coexistence of different sorts of communities, in terms of ethnic, national, religious, or other grounds, requires an equally power-sharing practice, which obviously implies the division of political power and political assignments.

The division of political power is a crucial point for preventing despotism, and provides to preclude the owners of power from abusive actions (O'leary, 2013, p. 10). Also, the power-sharing method acts as a regulatory tool in such issues as the legislative, executive, judiciary, bureaucracy, military, administrative, cultural power, and avoids monopolism. Thus, the power-sharing method, presents itself as basically favourable regarding the policies and practices that protect cultural pluralism. Besides, it may play an important role to ward off assimilations or exclusions if each member of society achieves representation. This is a way of expressing the rejection of monopolism (Ibid., p. 4).

Instead of a single dominant community in a multicultural society, multiple majorities may be created, or the concept of the majority may even disappear if a well-structured power-sharing method is put into practice (Ibid., p. 9).

Arend Lijphart suggests that the federal system is an opportunity for providing autonomy for divided societies while each of the constitutive elements maintain a specific relation to its own territory. With details that vary from country to country, the federal system is suitable for the formation of relatively homogeneous structures through units (provinces, member states, cantons, etc.) These homogeneous structures are obtained by way of the distribution of tasks between units. These homogeneous structures may be created based on ethnic, religious, national, or other grounds. While regional autonomy matches with the territorially divided societies, the situation is different for the non-territorial divided societies. For example, different religious communities may demand the creation of schools based on their principles. Today, communities with different beliefs have this right in countries such as India, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Besides having an autonomous education system, these countries also have the essential education services provided by the state (Lijphart, 2008, pp. 83-84).

3.1 Evolution of Federal Thought

Nowadays, federalism is considered within the political systems. However, the concept of "federalism" is older than the political systems we know today.

Some scholars imply that the origin of federalism arises from religious sources. Daniel Elazar states that the concept of federalism originates from the Bible. The concept derives from the Latin word "*foedus*", which means agreement. Also, the word "*foedus*" corresponds to "*brit*" in Hebrew, which means contract. Since the origin of the word defines the relationship between God and man in religious sources, it refers to an agreement. Thus, the first usage of the concept is theological (Elazar, 1991, p. 5).

Rufus Davis, on the other hand, moved the federal concept beyond the "*foedus*", and associated it with the "*fides*", which is a Latin word as well. He claims that the word "*fides*" has great importance to reach the origin of federalism. Because the word carries in itself the meaning of "faith" and "trust" (Davis, 1978, p. 3).

In the evolution of the concept of federalism, which followed a long historical process, it appeared as agreements in the Middle Ages, besides the religious sources. In the Middle Ages feudalism, we witness the marks of federalism as an agreement once again, namely, the parties of feudalism agreed, in order to guarantee safety and protection. Still in the Middle Ages, the agreement occurred among the commercial cities of Central Europe as well. Furthermore, formations emerged under the multiple monarchy systems in Spain and Italy in the following periods, which were close to today's federal systems. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, researchers, who made revisions and corrections on the Bible, in other words, biblical scholars, began to implement the federalist intellectual path in state-

building. For example, at the end of the sixteenth century, a basic organisational structure of the United Provinces was built in the Netherlands. At the same time, an unclear confederation of cantons was created in Switzerland (Harman, 2003, p. 336).

If we look over the general framework, the federal concept originates from theology as a result of contract and faith notions, and it has experienced a breaking point in terms of intellectual and application fields over time, especially with the effect of reforms in Europe. The Swiss theologian-philosopher Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), and the German Calvinist intellectual and administrative lawyer Johannes Althusius (1557-1638) played a major role on breaking points concerning the evolution of the federal thought. Bullinger, along with his publication "*A Brief Exposition of the One and Eternal Testament or Covenant of God*", in 1534, points to the intellectual foundations of the developing federal currents both in continental Europe and in the Anglo-American world. Therefore, he is regarded as a pioneer of modern federalism in some sources (Arısoy, 2010, pp. 1200-1201). Moreover, American theologians Charles McCoy and J. Wayne Baker produced a revisionist monography titled "*Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition*." This work reveals Heinrich Bullinger's federalist thought that includes particular importance to "covenant" (McCoy & Baker, 1991, pp. 11-14).

Consequently, there is a relation between the "covenant" and federalism, since federalism includes the principle of "reciprocal commitment" (Arısoy, 2010, p. 1201).

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, political theory has markedly separated from theology (Skirbekk, Gilje, & Worley, 2001, p. 78). Johannes Althusius is shown as one of the most important names of the federalist thought in Europe for this period (Carney, 1964, para. 1). He put forward the contract theory in his work "*Politica Methodice Digesta*", which was published in 1603 (Burgess, 2000, p. 7). In this work, he brought into the open the first developed and systematic foundations of modern federal political philosophy to a point, where theological federalism evolved into political federalism. According to Althusius, there are various groups in the society, such as family, community, nation, institutions, and so on. All of these groups have different covenants in their own right. Althusius says that sovereignty comes from the people, and the people delegate this power of sovereignty to the king or the civil servants, around a covenant. Unlike the belief dimension, this system processes within "consent" and "contract." In short, this contract theory was designed for social groups as distinguished from theology (Skirbekk et al., 2001, pp. 178-179). Also, Althusius considered federalism as a tool to reach national unity when analysing the Dutch and Swiss constitutions. Moreover, he distinguished federalism from the multiple monarchies, leagues, and confederations by associating to sovereignty (Harman, 2002, pp. 340-341).

The tendency to create larger political entities is shown as the beginning of modern federalism. The Dutch and Swiss political theorists, such as Johannes Althusius and Hugo Grotius, made a great begin towards modern federalism without including traditional policies (Elazar, 1991, p. 109).

The federalist revolution originates from three fundamental causes of modern political life. The first cause is the establishment of modern nation-states, which involves a large population/territories and different types of communities. This caused problems in the distribution of internal power. Secondly, modernism caused the dissolution of the pre-modern community. Thus, the local units and self-government models were revealed as necessities, in order to give place to the former pre-modern communities. The third cause is that modernism brought new commitments based on equality, and those new commitments demand more democratic political and social orders instead of the old aristocratic principles (Ibid., p. 110).

3.2 Definitions of Federalism, Federation and Federal Systems

The concepts of federalism, federal systems, and federation are frequently used interchangeably in daily language. However, each of the concepts represents a different meaning. In order to reach the correct usage of these concepts, we need to define each of them individually, which will also facilitate understanding of the further parts of the subject.

As we have mentioned above, intellectually, the concept of federalism has always been taken into consideration since it arose. In addition to intellectuality, the concept also has an ideological and empirical meaning. The ideological meaning comes from being a guide once it consists of rules, and as it made judgments about ideal structures on human relations and management, it also has an intellectual bending, which is concomitantly philosophical. Empirically, on the other hand, it is the recognition of diversity in social, economic, cultural, and political issues (Burgess, 1993, p. 8).

“Federal political systems” is a concept that implies the form of political design, which consists of the principle of shared-rule and self-rule (Watts, 1998, p. 120). Functionally, it provides the distribution of power, which originated from the idea of federalism by way of negotiations among the constituent units (Elazar, 1991, p. 6). In short, the “federal political systems” is a tool that fulfils the ideas of federalism.

Federal political systems are diverse and comprehensive. However, in this study, we chose to deal with the most known federal political system - the federation. Although some of the countries had adopted a unitary government form, they have also applied some principles of the federal political systems. Therefore, the federal political systems do not only consist of the federation (O’leary, n.d., para. 1). For example, in the United Kingdom and the

Kingdom of Spain, some regions are ruled through autonomy, which is a principle of the federal political systems (McGarry & O'leary, 2004, p. 21). However, institutions, such as "regional, municipal, local, etc.", where the distribution of power is strengthened in any document, were considered as federal structures by Breton and Scott in the book *"The Design of Federations."* Accordingly, countries, such as France, and the United Kingdom were considered as federations by them (Breton & Scott, 1980, pp. 6-7). In this direction, taking into account the process of the constitution of federations, which will be mentioned later in this study, the countries' regime, in question, will be considered as it declares itself to be. Countries, such as the UK, Spain, and France will be considered as implementers of some federal political systems, rather than being called federations.

Burgess describes the federation as a pluralist system that involves the construction of authority and decision making in line with the principle of subsidiarity from bottom to top (2000, p. 8). Preston King, on the other hand, described federation as "an institutional arrangement, taking the form of a sovereign state, and distinguished from other such states solely by the fact that its central government incorporates regional units into its decision procedure on some constitutionally entrenched basis" (1982, p. 77). The concept of federation refers to a state in King's definition. Unlike the unitary states, the federation state implies the inclusion of the constituent units in the decision-making processes by the central government, in the direction of the constitutionally strengthened principles.

In a federation state, power distribution evolves around the "central/general/federal" and "constituent/federate/state" governments. While the constituent units have the authority over their own regions, the central government, on the other hand, has the authority over the entire state. In general, central governments exercise their authority in the realms of defence, currency, and foreign affairs, and the constituent units are represented by the central government in those subjects (Babalola, 2019, p. 12).

Federations may resolve ethnic conflicts under specific conditions at certain times. Nonetheless, federations may not provide a solution to every conflict, or every federation may not be built based on anti-conflicts justifications. In other words, the federation is conditional and changes depending on the situation (Burgess, 2006, p. 3). At this point, a question arises, which is why do federations occur? In the broadest sense, economic, and political conditions are the causes of the occurrence of the federations (Filippov, Ordeshook, & Shvetsova, 2004, p. 1). However, the federations will be classified based upon ethnic issues along with some cases in the further part of this study.

3.2.1 Types of Federal States based on Ethnic Issues

Federal states can be divided into three groups based on ethnic issues. The first is mono-national federations. These types of federations do not have to be ethnically homogeneous,

and they may also include ethnic diversity. Notwithstanding the fact that ethnic factors are not taken into account when member states are arranged into regions or units, whether including ethnic diversity or not. In such countries, federalism has only been used historically as a unification tool between states. This unification is achieved to aim at reducing power in the centre, democratisation, and providing a balance between regions. The population unites at the point of common policy and national consciousness (Juhász, 2005, p. 246). For example, although the United States and Australia have ethnic diversity, those states have been constructed based on the mono-national federation. There are also mono-national federations with a homogeneous community structure, such as Germany and Austria (O'leary, 2001, p. 281).

The second type of federation is, on the other hand, the multi-ethnic federation based on ethnic issues. However, occasionally, it is seen that multi-ethnic and multi-national federations are used interchangeably. This situation is also encountered in places where the difference between nation and ethnicity cannot be clearly stated. The difference between the multi-ethnic and multi-national federations originates from the difference between nation and ethnicity. Therefore, in this study, multi-ethnic and multi-national federations will be discussed as different types of federations along with case examples.

In multi-ethnic federations, the individual member state first identifies itself with the identity of the dominant state (federation), and that member state's own identity comes as secondary. Today Switzerland is a set example of a multi-ethnic federation. In Switzerland, people first define themselves as "Swiss," and the ethnicities express their own identity as secondary within cantons (member states) (Juhász, 2005, p. 247). However, the difference between multi-ethnic and multi-national federations is not clearly stated in some sources, and the same situation occurs when referring to the Switzerland federation as well. That is to say, Switzerland is stated as a multi-national federation in some sources (see O'leary, 2001, p. 290). Another example is that of Serbia, which has two different autonomous provinces, Vojvodina in the north and Kosovo-Metohija in the south. Although it is a unitary state today, Vojvodina province has an autonomous multi-ethnic administration (Stjepanovic, 2012, pp. 193-194). It also consists of 26 different ethnic groups (Territorial organization, n.d., para. 8). Kosovo, on the other hand, which declared its independence by leaving Serbia in 2008, and still not recognised by Serbia as an independent state, constituting, therefore, an issue apart in itself (Ibid., pp. 193-194).

The third type of federation is the multi-national federation, based on ethnic issues. In multi-national federations, each member state has its own national identity. Also, each member state primarily expresses itself on the grounds of its national identity. The state (federation) comes as a secondary identity. Former USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics) and today's Bosnia-Herzegovina are examples of such federations. The unification of nations under a federation usually arises from long-term common political goals (Juhász, 2005, pp. 246-247). These goals can have different causes and vary from federation to federation.

According to multi-national federalists, the combination of federalism and nationalism may have a significant impact on the regulation of national and ethnic conflicts. Multi-national federations may positively play a role as regulatory on conflicts, by way of making an ethnically heterogeneous political society more homogeneous by creating sub-units (O'leary, 2001, p. 281).

Besides, although some countries are not officially federations, such as the UK and Spain, they supply sub-state nationalism in a sense, by way of using federalism's principles like autonomy, devolution, and consociationalism (Burgess, 2006, p. 131).

3.2.2 Constitution of the Federations

The occurrence of federations may have its origins in reasons of historical, intellectual, cultural-ideological, socio-economic or territorial and non-territorial, philosophical grounds (Ibid., p. 102). In the broadest sense, federations are constituted on two paradigms, which are "coming together" and "holding together." The paradigm of "coming together" means merging territories through the federal constitution in order to build a new state. The paradigm of "holding together," on the other hand, is the goal of trying to hold a state together with a new federal constitution (Tierney, 2018, p. 59). Also, political and sociological justifications are diverse for federalism, such as minorities, ethnicities, religious, linguistic, and so on (Filippov et al., 2004, p. 2). The reason for the constitution of a federation may aim to counter any threat to the military, economic, social, regionally. Thus, the existence of a region or state will supply protection. In a sense, a federation may be constituted for security reasons. Besides, the emergence of a federation may be based on the desire to realise an ideology or vision. The federation can also be used as a tool that reduces power in the centre. Since federations have autonomous institutions that provide power-sharing, the centre power is, therefore, automatically reduced, and a balance is thus provided between the units (Dosenrode, 2007, p. 30).

In the process of constructing a federation, there must be a sense of "partnership" between the parties, and this partnership must occur around a "federal compact." A negotiated cooperation is created on issues within the scope of this federal compact. However, the issues must always be bound to be bargained among parties, based on a "commitment" (Elazar, 1991, p. 67).

In order for a federation to be formed, communities or states, first of all, must have a desire to come together for determined purposes within a single independent state. They should have intended to be united, rather than unitary. In other words, instead of gathering the power in a single-centre, it should be possible for the units to fulfil their causality of coming together within their representation. However, if the parties have no desire to unite under an independent state, but if they still want to have control over the general situation, in this case, a federation cannot be established. In such a case, a confederation, or an alliance, can be formed instead of a federation. For example, the islands of the West Indies, which had a federal system between 1957 and 1962, disintegrated in a short while because of some constitutive states demanded independence after political conflicts (Wheare, 1964, pp. 35-36).

In the place where territorial pluralism exists, the recognition and protection of territorial specificity is one of the constitutional imperatives, for the state that has adopted the federal government model. It should also include that the units, which have territorial specificity, and the state (federation) can work together and develop the system through a set of constitutional commitments. However, in order for these to come true, the constitutional demarcation of the authorities between polity's constituent territories should be done (Tierney, 2018, p. 62). At this point, while demarcation of the authority prevents a potential despotism, it also creates a balance of power between the units. Besides, since the public power has been distributed among the units in federal states, thus the government power minimises as opposed to the unitary states.

3.3 Why have Federations Failed?

Although federalism appears as an ideal form of polity in the light of successful cases, there are failed and disintegrated federations as well. Every state is distinctive in the matters of social structure, history, geography, and methods of applying federalism. Therefore, each failed federation case is a matter of study in itself (Elazar, 1991, p. 240). However, it is possible to specify the causes of failed federations through successful federations and determined constitution principles of federalism. Currently, it is crucial to detect the reasons for failure of the states which adopted federalism, because this also indicates the requirements of a successful federation.

In order to understand the reasons for failure in federations, first of all, we must define what success and failure are. The failure of a federation is, in the general sense, that the necessary conditions for its survival, which were designed during the construction process, could not be achieved (Franck, 1968, p. 169). Therefore, while looking at whether a federation is successful or not, some issues become prominent in the construction process of the federation. Accordingly, the failure of federations may be defined as the end of

negotiations, which constructed constitutional regulations among the units of the union. In other words, termination of constitutional unity between parties (Ibid., p. 170).

Ronald Watts analyses the causes of federations' failure under four main pillars, based on collapsed and ongoing federations. The first has to do with the differences in political demands among the regions. Even if these differences were the reason why they initially adopted federalism as a solution, the differences also might be the reason of internal disturbances or secession. Communities exposed to discrimination preserve their identities through regional autonomy. When this autonomy is threatened, communities may tend to the secession as a way to deal with assimilation, for example, the separation of the Southern United States, due to anti-slavery movements. Another example is the separation of Singapore Chinese from Malaysia in 1965, because the Singapore Chinese had second-class status in Malaysia (Watts, 1977, pp. 43-44).

Besides the regional autonomy, also continual negotiations, consultations, and dispute resolutions are the crucial processes to acquire guaranteed and balanced power distribution among the different communities, who are living together in a country. These processes, which are the constitution of the federal state, can improve political and socio-economic integrations with negotiated issues as well as eliminate the causes of short-circuit separations. Therefore, guaranteeing different communities' rights during the constitutional arrangement, in a federation that was designed based on multiculturalism, reduces the federation's failure rate; otherwise, reasons for separation become stronger. Today, the different communities, which include, among others, ethnic, religious, cultural, linguistic, and racial issues, have been able to find a place for themselves in Belgium, Canada, India, Nigeria, Russia, and Switzerland come as good examples of what has been explained (Kincaid, 2005, p. 414).

The second reason for federations' failure is the lack of communication among the units (Watts, 1977, p. 43). Lack of communication may create difficulty in holding together, especially federations with long-distance units. Long and hard communication ways in extraordinary and urgent matters can lead to misunderstandings and suspicions among the parties. This situation is more common in overseas federations. For example, this problem was seen between Western Australia and its colonies, or between Jamaica and Eastern islands (Hicks, 1978, p. 13). West Indies lived in poverty of communication since travelling from island to island was quite expensive. Thus, the units of the West Indies Federation were not able to stay in solidarity, on the contrary, alienation, and misunderstandings arose between the units (Adams, 1957, p. 32).

The third reason for federations' failure is that the common interests, which led the regions to unite in the beginning, lose significance. Even though the common interests could bring

the communities or states together under the same roof, the secessions may occur when the necessities leading to common interests change or disappear in federations. For example, India, Pakistan, and Malaysia, which came together in anti-imperial nationalism, lost in time this unifying cause after gaining independence (Watts, 1977, p. 48). Besides, while established federations, the lack of sufficient common interests may also create secessions, for example, Bangladesh separated from Pakistan and Singapore separated from Malaysia (Elazar, 1991, p. 243).

The fourth cause for federations' failure, on the other hand, has to do with external influences (Watts, 1977, p. 43). External influences might have positive or negative effects on the federations. In a positive sense, while a foreign country may play a role as a peace-maker among the parties, in a negative sense, the foreign country may tend to impose its own interests.

When a foreign country and unit/units of the federation have common or national interests, the foreign country may lead to a disintegration of the federation by way of encouraging the units to be separated. During President Charles de Gaulle's period, France emboldened the separatist movements in Quebec, Eastern Nigeria, and the Jura region of Bern, in Switzerland. Therefore, Switzerland pursued a neutrality policy as a fundamental principle in external relations (Ibid., p. 49).

The parties must hold the desire for unity when a federation is constituted. In case of either party manifests unwillingness during the constitution of the federation, the separation movements may reveal later. This situation is common in proposed federations where the parties do not have the desire for unity. Federations, which were imposed and created in a short time along with certain goals, may fail when constitutional requirements could not be fulfilled. For example, the British government proposed the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, where parties were not willing to unite, and the federation eventually disintegrated (Hicks, 1978, p. 11).

The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is another case of proposed federations. After a large-scale military intervention of the NATO allies, especially the US, a ceasefire among the parties of the Bosnian war was declared, around Dayton Peace Accords, in 1995, in order to prevent the Bosnian war to turn into a Balkan war. The construction process of a multi-ethnic federation started then in Bosnia. Since the parties initially did not want to enter into an agreement, the agreement included peacekeeping troops and international participation commitments in the construction process of the newly established multi-national federation.

International actors were assigned to supervise the constitution and democratisation of the federation. Also, the interventionists guaranteed to hand over political control. However,

the hand over of the political control took a long time. Therefore, this polity was criticised by some Bosnian parties for being anti-democratic. The unwillingness of the main actors to unite triggered separations in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bahcheli & Noel, 2005, p. 21).

3.4 Final Considerations

Federalism has been referred to as a good power-sharing method for multicultural societies. Nowadays, however, besides the successful multicultural federations, there have also been several multicultural federations that failed, disintegrated, or were subjected to separatist movements claims. Therefore, the questions of which conditions should be met for a multicultural federation to be successful, or why did communities/states turn into a multicultural federation, have been examined. Thus, in this part of the study, federalism has been handled with its conceptual and historical aspects, and the federations have been classified based on ethnic issues, and, finally, failed federations were examined according to their causes for failure.

As a result, federalism, which originated from the word agreement, points to the consciousness of partnership of the parties. Therefore, the sustainability of the federation needs the consent of the parties around an agreement to share power. In the light of the examined examples, when looking at the failed federations, it has been observed that, in many cases, the federations to be have triggered conflicts of various sorts, and given rise to separatist movements. At this point, the reasons for the occurrence the multicultural federations come into being as an important issue.

4 The Case of Switzerland

Switzerland is one of the oldest federations in the world. Since four different languages are spoken, and two different religious groups live together in peace, it appears as an example of a successful federation (Erk, 2008, p. 73). That is to say, Switzerland is a country where diversity is the rule. The people who live in the cantons speak German, French, Italian, and Romansh languages. Besides, those languages were accepted and recognised as national languages, in 1937 (Sauser-Hall & Felkin, 1946, p. 12).

Switzerland has a high welfare level and progress in a stable political line, notwithstanding the fact that it has a plural society structure. While plural society structures may encounter problems and conflicts in general, Switzerland has been able to avoid conflicts and problems by way of holding principles of federalism, direct democracy, and limited state (Church, 2004, p. 11).

As the Swiss Confederation contains the elements of federalism and multi-ethnicity, and has a more democratic system and a high welfare level when compared to the existing countries, the rest of this study will be briefly focused on the Swiss history and the Swiss Federal system. Understanding and analysing this system within its historical background will significantly help in terms of answering the questions of how a multicultural society has reached a democratic level, how it has implemented federalism, and eliminated conflicts. For all these reasons, Switzerland was chosen as a good and successful example to be under scrutiny, in this work, for a better understanding of the theme of federalism.

4.1 A Brief History of Switzerland: Transition from Confederation to Federal State

It seems pertinent, at this stage, to analyse the historical background of Switzerland in order to understand the political environment the country has reached today. Therefore, we shall be dealing with matters how Switzerland come into existence, the form of confederation, and the transition process to the federal state.

Officially the Swiss Confederation is governed by the federal system. Since the roots of this federal system, historically, come from the confederation, in daily language, the polity of the Swiss Confederation may create some sort of confusion between the concepts of confederation and federation. Hence, if, comparatively, one refers to the terms confederation and federation, one assumes a confederation as being a union formed by independent states gathering around an agreement, and a federation, on the other hand, as

being a system of power-sharing between the central state and its member states. For this reason, the Swiss polity will be called confederation for the period 1815-1848, and federation for the following period (Linder, 1994, pp. 5-6).

The origins of the Swiss Federation date back to the thirteenth century. Three alpine communities, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden, separated from the Holy Roman Empire, in 1273, and declared their independence. These three communities signed a written agreement, that was called "*Eidgenossenschaft*", in 1291, on behalf of cooperation. This written agreement also became the name of the confederation which they established (Erk, 2008, pp. 73-74). This point has great importance because it began with an agreement, and today's scholars accept the agreement as one of the first marks of federalism (see chapter 3).

Over time, this confederation has changed its features. It was enlarged to thirteen cantons, including two religions and four languages, during the French revolution period. However, this confederation, which was initially a product of rebellion, gradually developed into a feudalist regime because of the exploitation of the resources and people of the newly acquired cantons (Linder, 1994, p. 5). Besides, the confederation continued its existence, in spite of the Thirty Years' War between Protestants and Catholics, and its divided population (Erk, 2008, p. 74).

Napoleon Bonaparte's soldiers invaded Switzerland in 1798, and the Helvetic Republic was established. Contrary to the former confederation, this new system did emerge as a single and indivisible state with the identity of "national citizenship," where power was centralised. The new state, created with the emphasis on national citizenship, could not prevent the tension between conservative Catholics and the ruling class. Also, this tension resulted in various situations of conflict. Upon these problems, Napoleon rehabilitated some of the cantons in 1803, with an "Act of Mediation" (Ibid., pp. 73-74).

After the defeat of Napoleon in 1814, the old aristocratic order was rebuilt. In other words, the Swiss Confederation was re-established in 1815. Besides, the 1830 July Revolution, which occurred in France, influenced Swiss cantons regarding the achievement of a democratic system (Schelbert, 2007, p.140).

In the new confederation, the number of cantons was higher than in the past, it had further national structures, and the official status of impartiality was recognised. On the other hand, although the system was restructured, privileged groups still existed. Therefore, the opposition continued against these groups. Furthermore, after the uprisings, in the 1830s, under the influence of the industrial revolution, the masses, especially those who were living in the Protestant cantons, demanded a more unified Swiss identity (Church, 2004, p. 17).

The cantons of Lucerne, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Friborg, and Valais, which were predominantly conservative Catholics, established a war council in 1845, after the cantons of Zurich, Bern and Vaud, with their radical Protestant supporters, seized authority. This council, which was formed as a result of the cooperation of the mentioned cantons, was called "Sonderbund", and was also supported by the governments of France, Sardinia, and Austria. As a result of the votes in the parliament, which favoured the government, the "Sonderbund" partnership was declared illegal, in 1847. Subsequently, all negotiations produced an unexpected and undesired result regardless of mediation, and a war began. The clashes that started in November 1847 lasted for 26 days. As a result of this war, the government troops defeated "Sonderbund" (Schelbert, 2007, p. 23).

The new state aimed to maintain order within Switzerland and to protect its interests abroad. The building blocks of this federal-state were formed through a federal parliament, a federal council, and a court. In other words, legislative, executive, and judicial bodies were established. Besides, the public service budget was constituted by way of customs duties, specific taxes, and incomes from its many sources. Moreover, all Swiss citizens were legally and politically guaranteed to be equal. Thus, twenty-two cantons were to form a nation. On the other hand, the constitution was adopted on 12 September 1848 without any external intervention, by 169,743 votes to 17,897. The constitution was based on the old historical states, cantons, the new judicial system, and the federal state. The old institutions played a significant role in the formation of the new institutions (Sausser-Hall, 1946, pp. 38-39). Furthermore, with the new constitution, the secularisation of education was an essential step towards democratisation (Schelbert, 2007, p. 215).

There had been some difficulties in the transition from the confederation to the federation. Generally, the conservatives and the reformers were confronted because the conservatives were not willing to surrender their cantons' sovereign rights. Likewise, differences such as language, religion, and culture between the cantons, caused some difficulties in the new system. Since the greatest majority spoke the German language, Italian and French-speaking cantons felt uneasy about their futures. Also, the fact that the economic structure was different amongst the cantons, the creation of different trade arrangements with the cantons became a reality. Even though people were called "The Swiss," people's faithfulness was over cities such as Zurich, Uri, Geneva, or the region of Tessin. So much so that the different demands and disaccords between cantons caused intense internal conflicts. For example, since the city of Basel did not want to give up political control, the canton was divided into a semi-canton between Basel city and Basel county (Linder, 1994, pp. 8-13).

Considering all conflicts and discrepancies, some pertinent questions come to the fore - why did reformers insist on a federal-state? Or has the federal-state system reached a

compromise? If so, under what conditions was it provided? To answer these questions, it will be easier to focus on the beginning of the conflicts, the actors and their demands.

Since the establishment of the Helvetic Republic, "Catholic Conservatives," and "Liberal Protestants", who were respectively called reformers or radicals, confronted. While Conservatives desired to maintain the old system, Liberals were requesting innovations on the system. Because of disagreements, various conflicts occurred between these two opposing views. Moreover, the constitutional amendments were made throughout the conflicts. However, a permanent compromise could not be achieved. Especially after the defeat of Napoleon, the transition to the old system and the restoration of the 1815's constitution did not meet the demands of the Liberals, and then divisions began. According to the liberals, with the lack of public services, there was no guarantee of national protection against external powers. Furthermore, in the 1830s, with the adoption of liberal constitutions by several cantons, the liberals' gained strength. The liberals aimed to build a unified national state. They were planning to build a federal state, which involved an equal financial system supported by internal trade, as well as an army, in order to protect national security. In addition to voting rights, the abolition of privileges, and proportional representation, the Liberals made various proposals to cantons where they were not supported, such as freedom of worship and press, and right of association (Bonjour, Potter & Offler, 1952, pp. 257-258).

Switzerland, which converted from the confederation into the federal state structure, had become centralised comparing with the confederation period because of the existence of independent states in the confederation system. While these independent states surrendered their sovereignty to the central state, as a consequence, they became part of the federal state.

Also, various reforms were made to strike a balance on the cantons' demands, in terms of political, social, and economic rights. The system created by these consecutive reforms played an essential role in the formation of the infrastructure of today's prosperous modern federal state.

By the 1860s, although the new federal state was weak and unsteady, the movements for democratisation began in the cantons. These movements made segregation even more pronounced in an environment, where progressivism and conservative views were already looming. Following an unsuccessful attempt in 1872, the constitution was revised through centrally in order to establish balance in relation segregation and disputes in 1874 (Church, 2004, p. 17).

The 1848 constitution, which was revised in 1874, contained much of today's policy in terms of institutions. For example, the Swiss Confederation had three administrative structures:

federation, canton, and commune, had separately legislative, executive, and judicial powers at each level (Linder, 1994, p. 8). The problems between the cantons and the Swiss Confederation subsisted until the nineteenth century, but the process of democratisation nevertheless continued. By the 20th century, innovations, such as the direct election of executive members, and proportional representation were introduced and led to important developments (Schelbert, 2007, p. 215).

When we look at the main factors that generate the successful federal-state model in Switzerland, the fact that it is a multicultural nation-state appears in the forefront. Switzerland had never resorted to restrictive policies, such as a single language, a single religion, or an ethnic origin. Besides, the binding point has been the principle of citizenship in the country. Despite the conflicts, the system progressed by means of constitutional amendments. Thus, it enabled demands to be fulfilled. While the central government had military, economic, and foreign relations competences, at the same time, the cantons had an autonomous status and had their own constitution. In other words, this was another product of reconciliation because a balance between the central state and cantons was made possible. Even today, the central state cannot gain other duties or competences without the consent of the cantons; this is one of the fundamental guarantees that ensure the rights of the cantons. At this point, federalism emerges as a power-sharing tool because all cantons become decision-making actors even in the slightest amendments to be made in the federal constitution. Also, laws are enacted through bicameralism, i.e. consisting of the two chambers. The cantons have the right of representation in the "Council of the states," which has its seat in the second chamber of the Swiss Parliament. The cantons' representation in the parliament indicates that they play an active role in the decision-making process. This representation does not take place only in the parliament; besides, it works as well in all institutions throughout the country, representing the cantonal peoples. In this way, Switzerland is thus endowed with a proportional representational system (Linder, 2015, p. 4).

4.2 Swiss Federal System

4.2.1 General View

The Swiss Confederation is built on diversity. German, French, Italian, and Romansh languages are accepted as national languages by the Swiss Constitution (Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, 1999, Art. 4). 17 cantons speak German, 4 cantons

speak French, 1 canton speaks Italian, 3 cantons speak both German and French, and 1 canton speaks German, Romansh and Italian (Fleiner, 2002, p. 97).

The Swiss Confederation is a federal state, and the Swiss federal system consists of three levels - communal, cantonal, and federal. There is power-sharing among those three mechanisms. Thus, each of the levels has its own role. Furthermore, each of the levels has its own legislative executive and judicial bodies (Democracy: The Swiss political system, n.d., para. 1).

Modern Switzerland consisted of 25 cantons according to the 1848 federal constitution. However, in the late 1970s, the number of cantons reached 26, after the separation of Jura from the canton of Bern (Fleiner, 2002, p. 97).

According to the Swiss Constitution article 3, the cantons have sovereignty apart from the limitations, which are specified in the Federal Constitution (1999, Art. 3). Based on this, the cantons in Switzerland have their own statehood, constitution, and political autonomies. Also, they play an active role in the decision-making process in the federation (Linder & Vatter, 2001, p. 95).

The commune, on the other hand, is the smallest representative unit in the Swiss Federal system. It has a certain population and territory. It is a self-governing structure. A commune is governed by the authorities elected by its own population, and has its own laws, called statutes. Although they set their own laws and elect their authorities just like a state, communes do not have sovereignty, unlike the state (Sauser-Hall, 1946, p. 159).

In the Swiss federal system, another prominent method is the referendum. The frequency of these referenda makes the Swiss federal system different from others. Since the referenda are referred to as a ring of direct democracy, the Swiss model also becomes important on the subject of direct democracy (Church, 2004, p. 143). Thus, the Swiss public takes part in the decision-making process through referenda (Sciarini & Nicolet, 2005, p. 224).

4.2.2 Power-Sharing among the Federation, Cantons and Communes

4.2.2.1 Responsibilities of the Levels

In Switzerland, the power-sharing is exercised at all levels - federation, cantons, and communes. This power-sharing is guaranteed by the constitution. Federal rules regulate the relationship between the federation and the cantons, while cantonal norms regulate the relationship between cantons and communes. These constitutional rules imply that all three levels are subjected to certain restrictions. Thus, levels cannot oppose each other's

autonomy and prerogatives, and those laws also provide the basis for levels to work together in harmony. Moreover, due to the course of law, the actions of the cantons are inspected at the judicial level by the Federal Tribunal. However, federal actions can only be challenged by way of referenda (Dardanelli & Church, 2005, pp. 173-174).

In the Swiss Federal System, the federal level is entitled to make laws in the fields of "foreign relations, national defence, tariff law, currency and monetary system, postal services, telecommunications, mass media, railways, aviation, nuclear energy, civil and criminal law, social security insurances, protection of the environment." The laws of social security insurances and protection of the environment are implemented by the cantons. The cantons exercise their authority to make laws regarding Police and Churches. Also, cantonal and federal levels, together, have common duties concerning the making of laws, such as "utilisation of water power, roads, trade, industry, labour legislation, agriculture, public schools, education, and taxes" (Linder, 2010, p. 46).

The Swiss Federal System is constituted around the federal, cantonal, and communal levels. Commune is the lowest level, as previously mentioned, in this sphere. Besides, there are nearly 2300 communes. Around a fifth of communes have their own parliaments. In these parliaments, communes can make their own decisions without the need for a representative when making them, and a communal executive is elected to implement the decisions taken (Democracy: The Swiss political system, n.d., paras. 11-12-13).

Since the communes work to enhance their living space, thus the inhabitants of the communes are interested in the participation regarding administrative issues. Moreover, this system contributes to the federation in terms of welfare and development because of bottom-up participation and development (Sauser-Hall, 1946, pp. 159-160).

The freedoms of the communes have no clarity, and for this reason, cantons carry authority to control the communes. This supervision has been done in order to prevent abuse concerning whether the communes exceed their power or take a disproportionate financial burden on their resources (Ibid., pp. 159-160). Accordingly, the duties of the communes are "building and surveillance of local roads, local public transport systems, gas, electricity and water supply, removal services, local land use planning, the election of teachers/building of schools, budget responsibility, the imposition of taxes and public welfare" (Linder, 2010, p. 46).

4.3.2.2 The Swiss Parliament

The Swiss parliament is called "Federal Assembly." The Federal Assembly consists of 246 members, who are elected every four years by the Swiss people. The Federal Assembly is

bicameral (The Federal Assembly, n.d., para. 1), as said before, two separate chambers exist in the parliament (Tsebelis & Money, 1997, p. 1).

The National Council (lower chamber) is the first chamber of the parliament and consists of 200 members, and the second is the Council of State (upper chamber), which consists of 46 members. The National Council represents the Swiss people, and the presence of at least one member from each canton is guaranteed. The Council of States, on the other hand, represents the cantons, and two deputies are sent by each of the cantons through an election. However, the number of deputies may vary depending on the population of the cantons for both chambers (The Federal Assembly, n.d.). The members of the Council of States must not be involved in any kind of affair with their own cantonal parliament or government. Such practice is forbidden by the Federal Constitution, so that the deputies perform their duties independently without being influenced by the cantonal government (Lanz, 2002, p. 215).

The cantons collectively possess the right of veto regarding the amendments at the federal level, which means that the laws cannot come into effect, under any circumstances, without the approval of the majority of the cantons. At this point, the cantons play an active and decisive role in the process of decision-making at the federal level (Dardanelli & Church, 2005, p. 174).

Moreover, its president, or, as it is called, the President of the Confederation, is elected by the Federal Assembly among the six members of Federal Council, on a rotative basis, in order of seniority, for a year term. The whole of the entire Federal Council is considered as being the head of the State, and not its president alone (Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation, 1999, Art. 176).

4.2.3 Direct Democracy in Switzerland: Referenda

In British usage, the referendum is implemented as a decision-making tool on crucial issues all across the country. In Switzerland, beyond the crucial decisions, referenda are frequently implemented as a special type of direct democracy (Church, 2004, p. 144). Since the meaning of referendum remains narrow and limited for the Swiss usage, when we consider the frequency of the votings, the terms "Votation (French) / Votazione (Italian) / Abstimmung (German)" are used to meet the common votings in Switzerland (Ibid., p. 263). Therefore, in this study, the term referendum will be used for the Swiss votings by taking into consideration the effectiveness of the people on the decision-making process (Linder, 2010, p. 93) and frequency of the votings.

The tradition of the referendum in Switzerland dates back to the 1820s. Within this period, the Liberals, who were impressed by the French Revolution, pioneered bringing the

referendum at the cantonal level, which covered law-making, veto, and constitutional issues. At the national level, a referendum was held for the first time in 1848, in order to obtain approval of the new constitution. By 1874, with the influence of the democratic movements, legislation issues were also introduced at the national level (Church, 2004, p. 144). In 1921, as a result of the constitutional amendment, a decision was made to give the citizens the right of approval or rejection of international treaties by way of a referendum. In 1977, this provision was extended and included the approval of the majority of the cantons on certain issues. However, before 1977, a referendum was held that obtained approval of the majority of both citizens and cantons, for the bilateral trade agreement, in 1972, with the European Union (at that time still the European Economic Community) (Ziegler, 2020, p. 194).

There are two types of referenda in Switzerland: obligatory and optional. The obligatory referenda are held on the constitutional amendments and international treaties, the optional referenda, on the other hand, are related to the parliamentary act and regulations. A parliamentary decision can be changed through an optional referendum, and this referendum is held by holding the demand of popular vote with the signatures of 50,000 citizens, within 100 days. If signatures are collected within a specified time, a referendum must be held (Linder, 2010, p. 93). While the obligatory referendum is held on the constitution, security, and international issues, 100,000 signatures need to be collected within 18 months. Also, a majority of the votes as well as a majority of the cantons are determinative for the referendum (Ladner, 2019, p. 15).

4.2.4 Swiss Neutrality

Direct democracy, federalism, and neutrality are the building blocks of the Swiss identity (Devore & Stähli, 2011, p. 1), and those policies complement each other. Therefore, the neutrality policy has an important place in the Swiss federal system.

According to international law, the term "neutrality" is a legal status of a state. A state, as long as it carries this neutrality status, does not participate in war when other states are at war. However, this neutrality status ends when the state participates in the war. The laws of neutrality were codified to some extent, in the Paris declaration of 1856. Moreover, in The Hague Convention, in 1907, the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons were determined. The laws of neutrality determine the extent of the relationship between the warring states and the neutral state (Bindschedler, 1982, pp. 9-10).

The laws of neutrality and policy of neutrality are different from each other. While the laws of neutrality are the legal regulation on neutrality, the policy of neutrality maintains its neutrality status (Ibid., p. 10). Switzerland has been maintaining its neutrality both legally

and politically. Furthermore, in Swiss policy, the maintenance of neutrality is considered as a guarantee of the legal status (Gabriel, 2003, p. 7). Namely, this is a permanent neutrality. Also, according to the UN Charter, if a permanently neutral state is directly attacked, the neutral state has the right to "self-defence" collectively, in response to a call for sanctions by the United Nations Security Council (Bindschedler, 1982, p. 13).

Neutrality policy is a quite old tradition in Swiss political history. Firstly, in 1516, the Swiss Confederation adopted neutrality temporarily through an agreement with France. In 1638, with the thirty years wars, the Swiss Confederation declared its neutrality again (Devore & Stähli, 2011, p. 3). In 1815, the neutrality of Switzerland was permanently ratified in the Congress of Vienna, by the international system (Dreyer & Jesse, 2014, p. 63).

Even though most of the states that adopted the neutrality policy have failed, Switzerland has successfully maintained this policy as it has decisive factors such as historical, cultural, and international recognition. In brief, some essential factors, such as the inclusion of armed deterrence in the national culture, the adoption of neutrality as a collective good, recognition in international law, and its transformation into a 200-year-old tradition, have played an important role in the success of the neutrality policy (Ibid., p. 61).

4.3 Why was Switzerland not Invaded During the First and Second World Wars?

The First and Second World Wars were the crucial periods that challenged the Swiss neutrality. Although each linguistic group in Switzerland had sympathy for their foreign compatriots during the First World War, the armed neutrality and power-sharing methods worked as a significant deterrence on these groups (Langendorf & Streit, 2007, as cited in Devore & Stähli, 2011, p. 4).

Switzerland was in the midst of the great wars, geographically and politically, since the belligerents, such as Germany and Italy, had the same origin as the Swiss people from place to place and tended to expansionist policies during the First and Second World Wars. When we consider that Switzerland did not disintegrate in the risky periods, even managed to maintain its stability, some questions come into prominence – why did the belligerents not invade Switzerland? Or, how did Switzerland manage to maintain its stability during the risky times? The role and preparation of Switzerland to these wars, as mentioned above, is, substantially, related to the power-sharing and neutrality that it had. In order to answer why Switzerland was not invaded during the great wars, in other words, why it did not disintegrate, considering its neutrality and power-sharing methods, we need to look into the attitudes of Switzerland regarding the great wars.

At the beginning of the First World War, the Swiss Federal Council declared a mobilisation with the emphasis on military and economy, against a possible occupation (Bonjour et al., 1952, p. 343). In line with the mobilisation, military units that consisted of 250,000 people placed on the borders of the country. In particular, the security of the north-western part of the country was maximised, and this continued throughout the war (Ibid., p. 347). At this point, it is necessary to lay emphasis on the fact that Switzerland was prepared in accordance with international law, against a possible attack, besides being neutral during the First World War.

The Second World War, on the other hand, is another critical period for Swiss neutrality and stability. Although Germany tended to expansionist policies during the Second World War, Switzerland was not invaded by Germany. One of the most important reasons why Switzerland was not invaded in this war was its preparation for the war with large troops, notwithstanding the fact that it was neutral. These large troops were a quiet deterrent factor. In the circumstances, when the Second World War broke out, Switzerland launched a more comprehensive mobilisation than in the First World War. Initially, 400,000 troops were gathered, plus, the number of troops reached 850,000 with auxiliary services and home guards. This number is described as an unprecedented mobilisation when compared to a country with a population of 4 million (Ibid., p. 367).

Beyond military readiness, changes in trade relations also had a significant influence. The US involvement in the war after Japan's Pearl Harbor attack, in 1941, turned the tide of the war, and, accordingly, the impact of the war on Switzerland also changed. Although Switzerland was neutral during the war, still, it had trade relations with the belligerents. Therefore, in 1943, the US started trading with Switzerland, in order to buy some products such as machine tools, ball-bearing and jewel bearings, and so decreasing trade between Germany and Switzerland. Thus, while meeting the needs of the Allied Powers, the Swiss economy did also strengthen and did not need to trade with Germany (Halbrook, 1998, p. 171). However, by 1944, these trade relations were halted by the Federal Council, with the decision that Switzerland was not to trade any military support products and, besides this decision, declared that Nazi leaders could not seek asylum in Switzerland (Ibid., p. 214).

4.4 Final Considerations

Today, the Swiss Confederation is a democratic multi-ethnic federal country, and considered one of the states in the world where its population enjoy the highest welfare standards. Despite being a multi-ethnic society, it is a country where there have been no separatist movements in recent periods, which made it easy the carrying out of power-sharing policies at all levels, thus enabling an outstanding and successful federation to come

into being. This way, the Swiss Confederation has been handled as a case in this study, in order to determine the components that make a multicultural federation feasible and prosperous. The Swiss confederation has been examined here historically, with the successive developments and political processes, since its establishment up to the present days.

The Swiss Confederation is based on diversity and has a self-governing political structure where these diversities are autonomous. The power-sharing is exercised, in Switzerland, among the federation, cantons, and communes. Accordingly, each level has its own tasks. While communes and cantons are administered autonomously, they are also included in the decision-making processes within the federation.

In short, Switzerland is a pluralist, limited state where the citizens are included in the decision-making processes, and have the right of representation both individually and cantonally.

Swiss political structuring has been strengthened by its policies, by frequent referenda, as well as by federalism; and the fact that the country carries out a policy of neutrality keeps it immune against external problems or conflicts. At this point, one can conclude that all these factors together contribute to prevent separatist movements and ethnic conflicts from emerging.

The First and Second World Wars appeared as great threats for Switzerland's unity, since some of constitutive ethnic groups shared the same origins with the belligerents. However, due to strong power-sharing, the ethnic groups were part of the Swiss identity, and this prevented separatist movements significantly.

As a result, the success of the Swiss federal system resides on the strength of the power-sharing policies, direct democracy procedures, and on the policy of neutrality, besides, obviously, the principles of federalism.

It was also of great importance to look into the Swiss Confederation historically, to examine the purpose that presided over their willingness to remain together, and under which conditions the parties managed to create this federal system. All these factors helped to reveal the constituent components of the Swiss federal system, which ultimately led to the success of a multicultural federation. In this direction, the Swiss union, first as a confederation, was later to become a federal system, respecting all the principles due to the formation of such a regime. Notwithstanding the fact that there had been two opposing sides - conservatives, and reformers. While the conservatives demanded the stay in the confederation system, reformers demanded the federal system in order to create a more centralized system for security reasons, after the defeat of Napoleon. With the defeat of the

conservatives after a 26-day war among the parties, the reformers started the process of building a federal structure. However, the significant point here is that, after the war, liberals included conservatives in all decision-making processes. They carried out the federal structuring process together with the continuously constitutional changes, especially on freedom of worship and press, right of association, voting rights, the abolition of privileges.

As a result, since its establishment, the Swiss Confederation has had a self-renewing federal political structure where power-sharing is carried out in a partnership based on consent/willingness, in which the parties are constitutionally guaranteed within negotiations and bargaining.

5 Conclusion

Not all nations and ethnic communities were able to set up their own states with the establishment of modern nation-states. Accordingly, a homogenization arises within the remaining ethnic communities or nations, with the political, economic, and social structures, which were shaped based upon the dominant nation. Today, different methods have been carried out vis-à-vis the ethnic communities and nations that are subjected to this homogenization, in order to prevent unfair and undemocratic treatments.

In this study, the power-sharing theory has been referred to as a theoretical framework for the problems arising from homogenization. Unlike homogenization on multicultural societies, the emphasis has been placed on the fact that each of the communities has its own representation right. Thus, federalism, which is referred to as one of the power-sharing methods, in multicultural societies, has been examined. Moreover, some points on under what conditions and principles of federalism can be implemented in multicultural societies have been approached, by examining failed and successful federations. However, the subject of the success and failure of federations is controversial. Therefore, in this study, the success as well as the sustainability of a federation were considered in line with its constitutive components.

Federalism has been considered as a power-sharing method against homogenization, in consequence of the examination of successful and unsuccessful examples, we concluded that the most important factors that led federations to failure or success, essentially, lie in the construction of the federation itself, i.e. in the way the actors choose to act out in relation to the delegation in certain fields in favour of the federal power.

The constitutional adjustments of the federation indicate thus the important points of success or failure of their establishment. For this reason, the success or failure attained in multicultural societies was addressed by means of the analysis of the constitutive components of the federations.

In the light of the data collected, which was analyzed through conceptual and historically, plus the examples presented, the most important factor that leads to the failure or success of multicultural federations, has to do, as broached above, with the delegation of sovereignty in certain fields in favour of the federal control, namely the parties' consent and willingness, or the lack of it. In the places where parties do not have a desire to be part of the federation, it has been observed that separatist movements occur over time, such as in the examples as Bosnia and Herzegovina or Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which have never been able to carry

out a successful union that led them to constitute a federation. It seems their wish to live together was not strong enough to materialize their initial attempt, hence their failure.

Federalism is, from the start, as noted above, associated with the principles of "partnership" and "agreement," within its historical, conceptual, and theoretical framework. So, during the construction of multicultural federations, the consent of the parties must be achieved, in line with the laid down principles of partnership and agreement. It is exactly at this point that the consent and willingness of the parties appear to be fundamental, for the sake of common purposes, such as economic, political, military, or security. In line with those purposes, federations may be successfully sustained, however, the separations may still occur when the reasons for coming together or holding together disappear, or fail to fulfil their constitutive reasons over time.

Looking at the factors that made the Swiss federation successful, we observed that, while respecting the federal principles, a strongly structured power-sharing at all levels, also underpinned by other policies, was attained. At this point, the bicameral parliament in the Swiss federation, the frequency of referenda, and the neutrality policy of Switzerland against external problems have been important factors that led this federation to achieve success. With the double-chambered parliament, citizens are represented at both national and cantonal level. The frequency of referenda is important since referenda reflect the decisions of citizens and cantons on crucial issues, and, in a way, indicate the manner policies on those very issues should be implemented. The neutrality policy of Switzerland vis-à-vis foreign topics is also an important factor for the successful maintenance of the federation. In the third part of the study, under the title of "Why have federations failed", one of the reasons for the failure of federations has been addressed as external influences. Accordingly, Switzerland, by following a neutrality policy into foreign issues, neutralized the external influences.

As a result, federalism as a power-sharing method in a multicultural society can only be formed around certain constitutive components. Those constitutive components, in the general sense, are willingness, partnership, agreement, negotiations, bargaining, and commitment.

It also has been concluded, in line with the examined examples, that federalism may also trigger separatist movements in the proposed federations, which are built on ethnic conflicts as a method of peace. In this direction, it is seen that federations can only achieve success when they can be formed within the consent or willingness of the states or communities, compatible with common goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, S. G. (1957). The West Indian Experience and Hopes: B. Sir Grantley Adams. In P. A. Lockwood (Ed.), *Canada and the West Indies; speeches by Sir Grantley Adams, Professor Alexander Brady and others* (pp. 30–36). essay, Mount Allison University Publication No: 2.
- Anderson, B. R. O. (2006). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
- Arısoy, A. (2010). Avrupa’da Federalizm Geleneği ve Avrupa Bütünleşmesinde Federalist Akımlar [European Tradition of Federalism and Federalist Movements in European Integration]. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 10(4), 1195–1206.
<https://arastirmax.com/en/publication/ege-akademik-bakis-dergisi/10/4/avrupada-federalizm-gelenegi-avrupa-butunlesmesinde-federalist-akimlar/arid/46213fb2-2f92-448d-aec1-bb913d23c6a9>. [Accessed in 20.10.2019]
- Babalola, D. (2019). *Political economy of federalism in Nigeria*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bahcheli, T., & Noel, S. (2005). Imposed and proposed federations: Issues of self-determination and constitutional design in Bosnia Herzegovina, Cyprus, Sri Lanka and Iraq. *The Cyprus Review*, 17(1), 13–36.
- Barth, F. (1969). Introduction. In F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference* (pp. 9–38). introduction, Universitetsforlaget.
- Beer, W. R. (1980). *The Unexpected rebellion: ethnic activism in contemporary France*. New York University Press.
- Bindschedler, R. L. (1982). Neutrality, Concept and General Rules. In R. Dolzer, R. E. Hollweg, K. J. Madders, A. Rustemeyer, A. M. Trebilcock, J. Ignarski, & A. M. de Zayas (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of public international law: Use of force. War and neutrality peace treaties (N-Z)* (Vol. 4, pp. 9–14). North-Holland.
- Bonjour, E., Potter, G. R., & Offler, H. S. (1952). *A short history of Switzerland*. Oxford University Press.
- Breton, A., & Scott, A. (1980). *The design of federations*. Institute for Research on Public Policy.

- Bruinessen, M. V. (1996). *Kurds, Turks and the Alevi revival in Turkey*. Academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/707541/Kurds_Turks_and_the_Alevi_revival_in_Turkey?auto=download. [Accessed in 31.06.2020]
- Burgess, M. (1993). Federalism and Federation: A Reappraisal. In A. Gagnon & M. Burgess (Eds.), *Comparative federalism and federation: competing traditions and future directions* (pp. 3–14). essay, University of Toronto Press.
- Burgess, M. (2000). *Federalism and the European Union: the building of Europe, 1950-2000*. Routledge.
- Burgess, M. (2006). *Comparative federalism: theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Capotorti, F. (1991). *Study on the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities*. United Nations Digital Library. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/134362>. [Accessed in 14.06.2020]
- Carney, F. S. (1964). The New interest in the political theory of Althusius. In *The politics of Johannes Althusius: transl., with an introd.by Frederick S. Carney. Pref. by Carl J. Friedrich*. introduction, Beacon Press.
- Church, C. (2004). *Politics and government of Switzerland*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Church, C., & Dardanelli, P. (2005). The dynamics of confederalism and federalism: Comparing Switzerland and the EU. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 15(2), 163–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13597560500115444> [Accessed in 19.06.2020]
- Davis, S. R. (1978). *The federal principle: a journey through time in quest of a meaning*. University of California Press.
- Democracy: The Swiss political system*. <https://www.ch.ch/en/demokratie/federalism/federalism/>. [Accessed in 09.09.2020]
- Devore, M. R., & Stähli, A. (2011). From Armed Neutrality to External Dependence: Swiss Security in the 21st Century. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2011.02003.x> [Accessed in 07.07.2020]
- Dosenrode, S. (2007). Federalism. In S. Dosenrode (Ed.), *Approaching the EUropean Federation?* (pp. 7–35). essay, Ashgate Press.

- Dreyer, J., & Jesse, N. G. (2014). Swiss Neutrality Examined: Model, Exception or Both? *Journey of Military and Strategic Studies*, 15(3), 60–83. <https://jmss.org/article/view/58112>. [Accessed in 10.08.2020]
- Dunn, R. (2012). *Minority Studies: A Brief Sociological Text*. Openstax cnx. Connexions. <https://cnx.org/contents/WCLXWyr@13.2:PcTjZ8Nw@7/Introduction-to-Minority-Studies>. [Accessed in 12.06.2020]
- Elazar, D. J. (1991). *Exploring Federalism*. University of Alabama Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives* (3rd ed.). Pluto Press.
- Erk, J. (2008). *Explaining federalism: state, society and congruence in Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany and Switzerland*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Falola, T., & Aderinto, S. (2010). *Nigeria, nationalism, and writing history*. University of Rochester Press.
- The Federal Assembly*. <https://www.eda.admin.ch/aboutswitzerland/en/home/politik/uebersicht/bundesversammlung.html>. [Accessed in 09.09.2020]
- Federal Constitution of the Swiss Confederation (1999). <https://www.admin.ch/opc/en/classified-compilation/19995395/index.html>. [Accessed in 09.09.2020]
- Filippov, M., Ordeshook, P. C., & Shvetsova, O. (2004). *Designing federalism: a theory of self-sustainable federal institutions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fleiner, T. (2002). Recent Developments of Swiss Federalism. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 32(2), 97–123. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3330947>. [Accessed in 05.06.2020]
- Franck, T. M. (1968). Why Federations Fail. In T. M. Franck, G. H. Flanz, H. J. Spiro, & F. N. Trager (Eds.), *Why federations fail: an inquiry into the requisites for successful federalism* (pp. 167–199). essay, New York University Press.
- Gabriel, J. M. (2003). The Price of Political Uniqueness: Swiss Foreign Policy in a Changing World. In J. M. Gabriel & T. Fischer (Eds.), *Swiss foreign policy 1945-2002* (pp. 1–22). essay, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1975). Introduction. In N. Glazer & D. P. Moynihan (Eds.), *Ethnicity: theory and experience* (pp. 1–26). introduction, Harvard University Press.
- Guibernau, M., & Rex, J. (1997). The Growing Importance of the concept of ethnicity. In M. Guibernau & J. Rex (Eds.), *The ethnicity reader: nationalism, multiculturalism and migration* (pp. 1–12). introduction, Polity.
- Gurr, T. R., & Harff, B. (1994). *Ethnic conflict in world politics*. Westview Press.
- Halbrook, S. P. (1998). *Target Switzerland: Swiss armed neutrality in World War II*. Sarpedon.
- Harman, G. (2003). Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations. In M. Hawkesworth & M. Kogan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of government and politics* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 332–347). Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Healey, J. F., & O'Brien, E. (2015). *Race, ethnicity, gender, and class: the sociology of group conflict and change* (7th ed.). SAGE.
- Hicks, U. K. (1978). *Federalism: failure and success: a comparative study*. Oxford University Press.
- Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A. D. (1996). Introduction. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 3–16). introduction, Oxford University Press.
- Inouye, D. K. (1994). Multiculturalism. In S. Auerbach (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of multiculturalism* (Vol. 4, pp. 1179–1187). Marshall Cavendish.
- Irwin, C. (2013). Public Opinion and Power Sharing in Deeply Divided Places. In J. McEvoy & B. O'Leary (Eds.), *Power sharing in deeply divided places* (pp. 295–311). essay, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Isaacs, H. R. (1975). Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe. In N. Glazer & D. P. Moynihan (Eds.), *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (pp. 29–52). essay, Harvard University Press.
- Juhász, J. (2005). Ethno-federalism: Challenges and opportunities. *Medjunarodni Problemi (International Problems)*, 57(3), 245–263.
<https://doi.org/10.2298/MEDJPO503245J> [Accessed in 10.04.2020]

- Kataria, S. (2018). Explaining Ethnicity: Primordialism vs. Instrumentalism. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(4), 130–135.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.54.4394> [Accessed in 28.05.2020]
- Kelly, B. B. (2019). *Power-sharing and consociational theory*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kincaid, J. (2005). Comparative Observations. In J. Kincaid & G. A. Tarr (Eds.), *Constitutional Origins, Structure, and Change in Federal Countries* (pp. 409–448). essay, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- King, P. (1982). *Federalism and federation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). The Global Diffusion of Multiculturalism: Trends, Causes, Consequences. In S. Tierney (Ed.), *Accommodating cultural diversity* (pp. 17–33). essay, Ashgate Press.
- Ladner, A. (2019). Society, Government, and the Political System. In A. Ladner, N. Soguel, Y. Emery, S. Weertz, & S. Nahrath (Eds.), *Swiss public administration: making the state work successfully* (pp. 3–20). introduction, Palgrave Macmillan, Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330044272_Swiss_Public_Administrati on_Making_the_State_Work_Successfully_Making_the_State_Work_Successfully
 . [Accessed in 09.06.2020]
- Lanz, C. (2002). The Swiss Council of States. In R. C. Tripathi (Ed.), *Second Chambers: bicameralism today* (pp. 210–217). essay, Rajya Sabha Secretariat.
- Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in plural societies: a comparative exploration*. Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, A. (2008). *Thinking about democracy: power sharing and majority rule in theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Linder, W. (1994). *Swiss democracy: possible solutions to conflict in multicultural societies*. St. Martin's Press.
- Linder, W. (2015). Federalism: The case of Switzerland, 1–14.
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Federalism:-The-case-of-Switzerland-Linder/d1636odf9a8c29ca0aa106f63940edf24e2cefb1>. [Accessed in 18.02.2020]

- Linder, W., & Vatter, A. (2001). Institutions and outcomes of Swiss federalism: The role of the cantons in Swiss politics. *West European Politics*, 24(2), 95–122.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402380108425435> [Accessed in 05.04.2020]
- McCoy, C. S., & Baker, J. W. (1991). *Fountainhead of federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the covenantal tradition*. Westminster/John Knox Press.
- McCrudden, C., & O'Leary, B. (2013). *Courts and consociations: human rights versus power-sharing*. Oxford University Press.
- McGarry, J., & O'Leary, B. (2004). *The Northern Ireland conflict: consociational engagements*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Novak, M. (1972). *The rise of the unmeltable ethnics: politics and culture in the seventies*. Macmillan.
- O'Leary, B. (2001). An iron law of nationalism and federalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 7(3), 271–296.
- O'leary, B. (2013). Power Sharing in Deeply Divided Places: An Advocate's Introduction. In J. McEvoy & B. O'leary (Eds.), *Power sharing in deeply divided places* (pp. 1–64). introduction, University of Pennsylvania.
- O'leary, B. (n.d.). *Federalism and Federation | The Princeton Encyclopedia of Self-Determination*. Princeton University. <https://pesd.princeton.edu/node/431>. [Accessed in 01.09.2020]
- Preece, J. J. (2008). Minority/Majority. In R. T. Schaefer, S.-J. A. Cheng, & K. Kim (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of race, ethnicity, and society* (Vol. 3, pp. 905–907). Sage.
- Romano, D. (2006). *The Kurdish nationalist movement: opportunity, mobilization, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sausser-Hall, G. (1946). *The political institutions of Switzerland*. (H. Felkin, Trans.). The Swiss National Tourist Office Publishing Department.
- Schelbert, L. (2007). *Historical dictionary of Switzerland* (Ser. 53). Scarecrow Press.
- Schermerhorn, R. (1996). Ethnicity and Minority Groups. In A. D. Smith & J. Hutchinson (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 17–18). essay, Oxford University Press.

- Sciarini, P., & Nicolet, S. (2005). Internationalization and Domestic Politics: Evidence from the Swiss Case. In H. Kriesi, P. Farago, M. Kohli, & M. Zarin-Nejadan (Eds.), *Contemporary Switzerland: revisiting the special case* (pp. 221–238). essay, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seymour, M. (1999). On Redefining the Nation. *The Monist*, 82(3), 411–445.
- Skirbekk, G., & Gilje, N. (2001). *History of Western Thought: From Ancient Greece to the Twentieth Century*. (R. Worley, Trans.). Routledge.
- Smith, A. D. (1981). *The ethnic revival in the modern world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and nationalism in global era*. Polity Press.
- Smith, A. D. (1997). Structure and persistence of ethnies. In M. Guibernau & J. Rex (Eds.), *The ethnicity reader: nationalism, multiculturalism and migration* (pp. 27–33). essay, Polity Press.
- Stjepanovic, D. (2012). Regions and Territorial Autonomy in Southeastern Europe. In A. G. Gagnon & M. Keating (Eds.), *Political Autonomy and Divided Societies: Imagining Democratic Alternatives in Complex Settings* (pp. 185–199). essay, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (pp. 25–73). essay, Princeton University Press.
- Territorial organization*. Serbian Government >> Facts about Serbia >> Provinces >> Vojvodina.
<http://www.arhiva.serbia.gov.rs/cms/view.php?id=1045>. [Accessed in 07.09.2020]
- Tierney, S. (2018). Federalism and Constitutional Theory. In G. Jacobsohn & M. Schor (Eds.), *Comparative constitutional theory* (pp. 45–65). essay, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Tsebelis, G., & Money, J. (1997). *Bicameralism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wagley, C., & Harris, M. (1958). *Minorities in the new world: six case studies*. Columbia University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1991). The Construction of Peoplehood: Racism, Nationalism, Ethnicity. In E. Etienne Balibar & I. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Race, Nation and Class: Ambiguous Identities* (pp. 71–85). essay, Verso.

- Watts, R. L. (1977). Survival or Disintegration. In R. Simeon (Ed.), *Must Canada fail?* (pp. 42–60). essay, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Watts, R. L. (1998). Federalism, Federal Political Systems and Federations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1, 117–137.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.1.1.117> [Accessed in 17.05.2020]
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. (E. Fischoff, H. Gerth, A. M. Henderson, F. Colegar, C. W. Mills, T. Parsons, ... C. Wittich, Trans., G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.
- Wheare, K. C. (1964). *Federal government* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- White, K. (2002). *An introduction to the sociology of health and illness*. Sage Publications.
- Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Ziegler, A. R., Goff, P. M., & Broschek, J. (2020). Federalism in Times of Increased Integration: The Participation of the Cantons in Swiss Trade Policy. In *The multilevel politics of trade* (pp. 187–207). University of Toronto Press.