A "Self-determined" Failure of the Ethnically Fractionalised?: A Comparative Review of Self-Deterministic Peacebuilding Governance in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar

Jaeho Kim and Chong Sup Kim

This paper critically examines the implementation of self-determination principled governance in the post-conflict contexts of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar. It delves into the complex and dynamic nexus of ethnically fractionalised states' peacebuilding regimes, exploring whether the self-determination framework, often considered a cornerstone of post-conflict governance, has worked positively in achieving sustainable peace and reconciliation in these contexts. This paper evaluates key indicators of success or failure in peacebuilding regimes, such as minority rights. By utilising Dahl's polyarchy and Habermas and Fraser's participation parity framework on governance, this research evaluates the underlying discrepancies in the desired results of the application of self-determination principles. It offers an authentic matrix for analysing into the difficulties of self-determination-grounded peacebuilding, shedding light on the potential obstacles associated with self-determination. The findings of this study provide a basis for maturity-first peacebuilding governance, based on ethnic participation rather than conceptual 'determination' as an alternative to be considered in future peacebuilding.

Keywords: Peacebuilding, Ethnic Self-Determination, Ethnic Fractionalisation, Governance, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Myanmar

Jaeho Kim is a Master's candidate at Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University. E-mail: raphael_vianney@snu.ac.kr

Chong Sup Kim is a Professor at the Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University. E-mail: chongsup@snu.ac.kr (Corresponding Author)

INTRODUCTION

"L'humanité s'installe dans la mono-culture; elle s'apprête à produire la civilisation en masse, comme la betterave. Son ordinaire ne comportera plus que ce plat."

Claude Lévi-Strauss (1955)

The quote by Claude Lévi-Strauss encapsulates the intricate nature of ethnicity, which humanity has grappled with throughout its history. This duality, the acceptance of ethnic diversity on one hand and the search for a common denominator to unite the species on the other underscores the complex and often paradoxical role of ethnicity in our societies. Lévi-Strauss's observation provides context to with the broader scholarly discourse on ethnicity, where thinkers such as Clifford Geertz (1973) and Anthony Smith (1986) have explored the intricate relationship between culture, identity, and ethnicity. Geertz, in his work on symbolic anthropology, delves into the symbolic significance of ethnicity, emphasising how it shapes individuals' perceptions of themselves and their place in the world. Smith, on the other hand, has examined the role of ethnicity in nation-building and the construction of collective identities.

In the context of self-deterministic peacebuilding governance after ethnic conflicts (civil wars, genocides, etc.), understanding this dual nature of ethnicity is paramount. It requires acknowledging the potential for both unity and division that ethnicity brings to the forefront. While self-determination can offer a pathway to peace by recognising the aspirations of diverse ethnic groups, it must be approached with sensitivity to the complexities of ethnic identities and the historical grievances that underlie them. In doing so, this study aligns with the wisdom of structural sociologists and anthropologists, urging humanity to confront the dual nature of ethnicity and seek intrinsic solutions that may promote unity while mitigating division. It is a call for a nuanced, context-sensitive approach to peacebuilding that recognises the intricacies of ethnicity and its potential to both bind and divide a state, especially those already 'trapped' within the dysphoria of post-colonial geographical borders and coagulated ethnic presences.

The paper explores self-deterministic peacebuilding governance in post-conflict nations, with a focus on Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar, both characterised by deep ethnic fractionalisation and conflict. (Alesina et al, 2003) This paper examines whether self-determination, often seen as an instrumental element to sustainable peacebuilding governance structure, has yielded expected results or exacerbated ethnic fault lines. Bosnia-Herzegovina's experience with international intervention after the Dayton Agreement is contrasted with Myanmar's struggle for self-determination amid military rule and inter-ethnic strife. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Dayton Agreement's power-sharing along ethnic lines has maintained fragile peace but perpetuated divisions and segregation. Myanmar's journey highlights that premature and ill-matured implementation of self-determination, without inclusivity and democratic principles, can fuel ethnic violence. These cases underscore the need to address structural inequalities, historical grievances, and power imbalances alongside self-determination in the governance structure setting in the peacebuilding processes.

In this context, this paper explores the intricate interplay between self-determination, ethnic fractionalisation, and governance in post-conflict states, emphasising the need for a comprehensive and context-sensitive approach to peacebuilding that addresses underlying complexities, inclusivity, reconciliation, and justice. This study contributes to the broader discourse on conflict resolution and peacebuilding, offering insights into the challenges posed by ethnic diversity in emerging post-conflict states.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ethnic Self-determinism, Fractionalisation and Public Goods Provision Nexus

After World War I, the international community witnessed a significant shift in political boundaries and the emergence of new nation-states, accompanied by the crucial concept of ethnic self-determination. This idea, rooted in the belief that ethnic groups should possess the right to determine their political fate, gained prominence in post-war diplomacy. President Wilson, in his 1918 Fourteen Points speech, advocated for nations to "be free to choose their governments and destinies". This call resonated with nationalist movements across Europe and beyond, sparking hopes for independence among oppressed ethnic groups. The League of Nations furthered the development of self-determination norms and provided a platform for stateless or aspiring nations to assert their claims, marking a significant shift in international relations. It is essential to recognise that the nation-state, although loosely intertwined with the concept of ethnic self-determination, is inherently a political and diplomatic entity, often used by ideologies to further their core beliefs.

Notably, proponents of this concept often emerged from the socialist side of the Cold War or the Third World movement. While Lenin's advocacy for self-determination served pragmatic political objectives, it also left a lasting impact on international discussions regarding ethnic rights and self-governance. Moving into the post-colonial era, Kwame Nkrumah's (1963) call for self-determination was in alignment with the pan-African movement, which sought to unite African nations against colonial powers. Aimé Césaire (1950) challenged colonial domination, emphasising the rights of colonised nations and ethnic groups to assert their identities and pursue self-rule. Césaire's contributions were instrumental in the global movement against colonialism and the eventual dismantling of colonial empires. It is important to note that up until this stage, ethnic self-determination remained a maxim for interstate cooperation, with its actuality of implementation practically an obscurity.

In the late 20th century, Ibrahim Rugova, inaugural president of Kosovo and leader of the Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK), emerged as a prominent figure in the Kosovo Liberation Movement, advocating for the self-determination of ethnic Albanians from the Serb-dominant authoritarian context of the former Yugoslavia. Rugova's leadership focused on peaceful resistance and diplomacy, emphasising political and cultural autonomy for Kosovo's Albanian majority against undue ethnic discrimination and surging human rights violation cases. His efforts highlighted the complexities

of applying self-determination principles in post-conflict governance scenarios, emphasising the importance of incremental peaceful negotiation and diplomacy in pursuing ethnic autonomy, setting one of the most successful cases of ethnic self-determination in actual political schemes as a governance principle. (Schmidt, 1999).

The nexus between ethnic fractionalisation and public goods provision has been a focal point in contemporary international relations literature, building on foundational works by Alesina. This body of research has expanded the understanding of how ethnic fractionalisation affects the governance and provision of public goods in diverse states. Ethnic fractionalisation, measured by indices like the Ethnic Fractionalisation Index (EFI), has been empirically linked to challenges in public goods provision (Alesina et al., 2003).

Ethnic fractionalisation (EF) deals with the number, sizes, socioeconomic distribution, and geographical location of distinct cultural groups, usually within state borders. Language, skin colour, religion, ethnicity, customs and tradition, history, or another distinctive criterion, alone or in combination can be a feature for these indices to occur, both in causal and correlative relations. Frequently these features are used for social exclusion and the monopolisation of power.

Ethnic fractionalisation, as an empirical concept derived from real-world quantitative research, is intrinsically linked to contemporary international relations theories. The negative correlation between ethnic fractionalisation and public goods provision is a recurrent theme in studies of state fragility (Montalvo & Reynal-Querol, 2005). Scholars like Fearon and Laitin (2003) have explored how ethnic diversity can exacerbate civil conflict. The empirical observations of Alesina et al. (2003) have been integrated into theoretical frameworks that emphasise the challenges posed by ethnically divided societies in the provision of public goods (Habyarimana et al., 2007).

To define a nexus between ethnic self-determination (as a *jus cogens* principle in international public law) and ethnic fractionalisation (as an empirical concept in IR), it is essential to acknowledge the complexity of this relationship. Ethnic self-determination, rooted in principles of international law, underscores the importance of ethnic groups determining their political status as well as creating a dialogue between groups as well. However, when applied in ethnically fractionalised states, the outcomes may not align with the envisioned ideals. The link between ethnic self-determination and the exacerbation of ethnic tensions is exemplified in cases like Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar.

This raises a crucial question: Does the pursuit of self-determination, as advocated in international law, inadvertently contribute to further ethnic tensions? Furthermore, does it ostensibly worsen the legacies of the ethnically fractionalised status quo, thereby hindering the equitable provision of public goods like peace? The yet-to-be-quantified effects of self-determination on peacebuilding in countries with high ethnic fractionalisation suggest that a nuanced understanding is required. While self-determination is a principle with noble intentions, its application must be carefully tailored to the unique dynamics of ethnically fractionalised states. It is not solely a matter of granting autonomy but also addressing the structural inequalities, historical grievances, and power imbalances that underlie ethnic fractionalisation (Habyarimana et al., 2007). Moreover, the role of external actors and international interventions cannot

be underestimated, as they often shape the trajectory of self-determination efforts in ethnically divided societies (Paris, 2004).

In summation, the relationship between ethnic self-determination and sustainable peacebuilding (in a country with ethnic fractionalisation), is complex and multifaceted. While self-determination is a foundational principle in international law, its application in ethnically fractionalised states can have unintended consequences, exacerbating ethnic tensions and hindering public goods provision, including peace. A thorough examination of this nexus underscores the need for a more comprehensive and context-sensitive approach to self-deterministic peacebuilding governance, one that recognises the complexities of ethnically fractionalised societies and the imperative of genuine inclusivity, reconciliation, and justice as fundamental components of lasting and sustainable peace (Chandler, 2006). This study contributes to the broader discourse on conflict resolution and peacebuilding, offering valuable insights into the intricate interplay between self-determination, ethnic fractionalisation, and governance in societies emerging from protracted conflicts.

Theoretical Structures for Ethnic Self-Determination in Governance: Liberalism and Discontents

The development of liberalist ideas for addressing the intricate challenges posed by ethnic fractionalisation and its consequential impact on the equitable distribution of public goods, most notably the elusive pursuit of peace, in post-conflict ethnically fractionalised states like Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar, has ignited a robust and multifaceted scholarly debate. Scholars, drawn from both ends of the ideological spectrum, with some staunchly supporting liberalized international peacebuilding while others approaching it with reservations, have made significant contributions to this intricate discourse.

Among the advocates of liberalized international peacebuilding, Michale Doyle's (1997) work, "Ways of War and Peace," underscores the salience of democratic governance as a potent antidote to the perils of ethnic conflict. Doyle contends that liberal democratic states, by their inherent principles and institutions, exhibit a diminished proclivity for engaging in ethnically driven strife. He further asserts that the underpinning of democratic governance, comprising principles of ethnic self-determination and safeguarding minority rights, serves as a constructive mechanism for the management of ethnic fractionalisation and the subsequent establishment of peace.

Similarly, Paul Collier (2000) acknowledges the formidable challenges that ethnic fractionalisation can pose but posits a remedy grounded in market-oriented economic policies. Collier postulates that liberal economic reforms, marked by the encouragement of economic opportunities for all segments of society, can facilitate cooperation among ethnically diverse groups. By doing so, these reforms hold the promise of mitigating ethnic tensions and fostering the equitable distribution of public goods, peace being one of paramount significance. Larry Diamond (2002) offers a resounding endorsement of democracy as a panacea for the post-conflict tribulations of ethnically fractionalised states. Diamond's thesis asserts that democratic governance, characterised by its ethos of inclusivity and power-sharing, constitutes an effective means of tempering ethnic

animosities and engendering a climate conducive to the just allocation of public goods, peace chief among them.

However, in counterpoint to the proponents of liberalized international peacebuilding, there exists a cadre of scholars who harbour reservations about its universal applicability and potential unintended consequences. Roland Paris (2004), in his pivotal work, "At War's End," advances a critique of liberal peacebuilding strategies, decrying their predilection for employing a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach. Paris argues that such interventions often disregard the unique intricacies of local contexts and the dynamics of ethnic fractionalisation, which can inadvertently exacerbate tensions. He posits the need for context-specific strategies that are underpinned by the active involvement of local actors in the peacebuilding process.

Oliver P. Richmond (2008), in his comprehensive analysis titled "Peace in International Relations," raises pertinent questions about the applicability of liberal peacebuilding in diverse societies. Richmond contends that this approach frequently imposes Western norms and values on complex, ethnically heterogeneous landscapes, inadvertently stoking rather than quelling ethnic tensions. Richmond's plea is for a more culturally sensitive, context-specific approach to peacebuilding that takes into account the unique circumstances and dynamics of each post-conflict state. David Chandler (2006) challenges liberal peacebuilding by framing it as a manifestation of neo-imperialism. Chandler asserts that these interventions, often characterised by power imbalances, not only undermine the self-determination of post-conflict states but also perpetuate global disparities. He contends that peacebuilding efforts should strive for a more equitable partnership between international actors and local communities, wherein the voices and agency of the latter are duly acknowledged and respected.

John Paul Lederach (1997) emphasises the paramount importance of grassroots reconciliation and conflict resolution efforts. Lederach contends that liberal peacebuilding, in its quest for high-level political agreements, often neglects the essential process of deep social healing and the restoration of trust among ethnically divided groups. He advocates for a bottom-up approach to peacebuilding, one that centres on community-level reconciliation as a prerequisite for lasting peace.

In summation, the discourse surrounding the development of liberalist ideas to address the multifaceted challenges posed by ethnic fractionalisation and the equitable distribution of public goods, particularly the elusive goal of peace, in post-conflict ethnically fractionalised states, is a nuanced and ongoing conversation. Scholars such as Doyle, Collier, and Diamond emphasise the potential benefits of democratic governance and market-oriented economic reforms, while critics like Paris, Richmond, Chandler, and Lederach underscore the limitations of a one-size-fits-all approach, urging for context-specific, culturally sensitive, and locally inclusive strategies in the complex endeavour of peacebuilding.

Ethnic Self-Determination in International Public Law

The principle of ethnic self-determination in international public law has been significantly shaped and reinforced through a series of crucial documents, most notably the United Nations Charter, UN General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV), UN General

Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and UN General Assembly Resolution 50/6. These documents collectively define, formulate, and apply the concept of ethnic self-determination, shedding light on its legal implications, especially in the context of post-colonial or post-genocide peacebuilding and realignment.

The United Nations Charter, the foundational document of the United Nations adopted in 1945, laid the groundwork for the principle of self-determination by affirming the commitment to "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples" (UN Charter, 1945). This provision reflects the acknowledgement of the inherent right of all peoples to freely determine their political status, a fundamental tenet of ethnic self-determination.

UN General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960, known as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, further solidified the principle. The resolution declares that "all peoples have the right to self-determination" and "shall freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development" (UN GA Resolution 1514 (XV), 1960). This document unequivocally supports the idea that ethnic communities living under colonial rule or foreign domination possess the right to determine their destiny and govern themselves. UN General Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, also known as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States by the Charter of the United Nations, builds upon the foundation laid by Resolution 1514. It emphasises the principle of self-determination and affirms that "by that right, they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development" (UN GA Resolution 2625 (XXV), 1970). This declaration underscores the significance of self-determination as a core principle in the context of international relations, emphasising its applicability to all peoples.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), both adopted in 1966, reinforce the principle of self-determination. The ICCPR acknowledges in its preamble the "inherent dignity" of all individuals and their "inalienable rights," which include the right to self-determination (ICCPR, 1966). The ICESCR likewise recognises the right to self-determination as a fundamental principle and highlights the importance of economic, social, and cultural development in achieving this right (ICESCR, 1966). UN General Assembly Resolution 50/6, adopted in 1995 and titled "Declaration on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations," reiterates the commitment to self-determination by affirming that "all peoples have the right to self-determination" (UN GA Resolution 50/6, 1995). This declaration emphasises the enduring importance of the principle in the modern era, particularly in the context of post-colonial and post-genocide scenarios.

These documents collectively contribute to the legal framework surrounding ethnic self-determination in international public law. They define the concept, articulate its principles, and underscore its centrality in the quest for justice, human rights, and equitable governance. In post-colonial and post-genocide contexts, the legal implications of these documents are profound. They affirm the legitimacy of ethnic

communities' aspirations for self-governance and the pursuit of their economic, social, and cultural development. These principles have practical implications in shaping the course of peacebuilding efforts, emphasising the importance of respecting the rights and aspirations of ethnic groups within a framework of international legality. Furthermore, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) decisions, such as the Advisory Opinion on Western Sahara (1975), have also reinforced the principle of self-determination by affirming that the application of the principle is a matter of international law (ICJ Advisory Opinion on Western Sahara, 1975). In this manner, these documents and judicial decisions collectively contribute to the evolving landscape of ethnic self-determination in international public law, offering guidance and legitimacy to post-conflict efforts aimed at achieving lasting peace and justice.

However, implementations in the real-world cases of international public law and consequences in actual governance have been less than idealistic. The 1991 Badinter Committee, determining the self-determination assertions posed by the dissolution of the Yugoslav, affirmed self-determination as a guideline, whilst denying possibilities for minority populations in literal 'geographic incarceration' can create their own states based on the principles of self-determination, which ultimately finalised the borders of the former Yugoslavia within the confines of previously determined borders. (Oklopcic, 2018) The 1992 Five Expert Opinion on the question of Quebec reiterates the same *uti possidetis* principle, citing that the procurement of territory should follow post-colonial precedents in that "states emerging from decolonisation shall presumptively inherit the colonial administrative borders that they held at the time of independence" (Ratner, 1996) In some views, self-determination may have been labelled as being a "lex obscura" in and of itself being based on a subjective anthropological notion with weaker correlative basis and fluctuant identity-holders as main constituents of the concept. (Crawford, 2001)

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the analysis of peacebuilding governance structures in post-conflict settings, it is imperative to employ a theoretical framework that enables a comprehensive examination of the dynamics at play. This section introduces and elucidates key theoretical perspectives that underpin the analysis of peacebuilding governance structures, drawing on scholars from various theoretical traditions. These theories provide essential insights into regulatory and international law compliance as well as governance evaluation tools. Each theoretical perspective is defined, its key concepts are outlined, and the developments within the theories are discussed. Additionally, ideological differences leading to diverse policymaking implications are explored.

Governance Evaluating Tools Theory

Robert A. Dahl's Polyarchy, Contestation, and Civics
Robert A. Dahl's (1971) theories of polyarchy, contestation, and civics provide a lens through which to evaluate governance structures and practices within democratic

systems. Polyarchy refers to a system of government characterised by open, competitive elections and the existence of multiple political parties. Contestation emphasises the importance of meaningful political competition and the ability of citizens to express their preferences through voting and participation in political processes. Key concepts within Dahl's framework include the idea that polyarchies are more likely to ensure citizens' political rights and civil liberties. The presence of meaningful political competition and contestation is seen as essential for holding governments accountable and promoting good governance.

Developments within this theory include the incorporation of insights from scholars like Amartya Sen (1999), who has emphasised the importance of expanding citizens' capabilities and freedoms. Hanna Pitkin's (1968) work on representation and Carole Pateman's (1970) exploration of participatory democracy have also contributed to discussions on democratic governance. Ideological differences within this theory relate to debates over the nature of democracy and the extent to which contestation and participation should be extended to all citizens. Some scholars argue for a broader understanding of democracy, while others may advocate for more limited forms of political participation.

Juergen Habermas and Nancy Fraser's "Participatory Parity"

Juergen Habermas (1996) and Nancy Fraser (1997) have contributed to theories of democratic governance by emphasising the importance of participatory parity and deliberative democracy. Participatory parity entails ensuring that all citizens have equal opportunities to participate in political processes and decision-making, irrespective of their social or economic status. Deliberative democracy highlights the value of informed and rational public deliberation in shaping policy decisions. Key concepts within this framework include the idea that participatory parity is essential for achieving social justice and preventing the marginalisation of disadvantaged groups. Deliberative democracy emphasises the importance of reasoned discourse and public reasoning in democratic decision-making. Developments within this theory have explored the challenges of achieving participatory parity in diverse and unequal societies. Additionally, scholars have examined the role of institutions and practices in facilitating deliberative processes (Bohman, 1998).

Ideological differences within this theory revolve around questions of how to balance the principles of participatory parity and deliberation with the practical challenges of governance. Some argue for a stronger emphasis on participatory democracy, while others emphasise the role of deliberation in achieving consensus and rational policy outcomes.

Authentic Framework on Power-sharing and Transitional Justice

Building upon the theoretical foundations laid by Dahl, Habermas and Fraser, the authentic framework for analyzing peacebuilding governance in post-conflict settings integrates the dimensions of Power-sharing and Transitional Justice in Ethnic Fractionalized States. This framework recognises the nuances within power dynamics and justice processes, distinguishing between just and unjust procedures and their

impact on peacebuilding.

Power-Sharing Matrix:

1. Unjustified Process (Intervention only):

In cases where power-sharing is implemented through unjustified processes, typically involving external intervention without due consideration for local context, the governance structure tends to be fragile. This approach may lead to resentment among various ethnic groups, exacerbating existing tensions rather than fostering sustainable peace. Dahl's concepts of polyarchy and contestation become crucial here, as an externally imposed system may lack the necessary elements for meaningful political competition, hindering accountability.

2. Justified Due Process (Ideal):

The ideal scenario involves a power-sharing arrangement established through justified due processes. This aligns with Habermas and Fraser's emphasis on participatory parity and deliberative democracy. In this context, all ethnic groups have equal opportunities for participation in decision-making, ensuring that governance reflects the diverse needs and preferences of the population. This approach aligns with Dahl's contention that meaningful political competition is vital for safeguarding political rights and civil liberties.

Transitional Justice Matrix:

1. Unjustified Process (Retained Status Quo):

When transitional justice mechanisms are implemented through unjustified processes, such as retaining the status quo without addressing historical injustices, it can perpetuate grievances and hinder reconciliation. The concept of participatory parity becomes crucial here, as marginalized groups may continue to experience exclusion and injustice, impeding the development of a just and stable society.

2. Justified Due Process (Centralised Justification):

The centralisation of justification in transitional justice processes, guided by fair and inclusive mechanisms, aligns with the principles of both Dahl and Habermas & Fraser. This approach involves informed and rational public deliberation, reflecting the value of reasoned discourse in shaping policy decisions. It acknowledges the importance of addressing historical injustices to achieve social justice, in line with the broader goals of participatory democracy.

By integrating Dahl's polyarchy and contestation with Habermas & Fraser's participatory parity and deliberative democracy, this authentic framework provides a comprehensive lens to evaluate governance structures in post-conflict settings. It emphasizes the need for power-sharing and transitional justice processes that are not only justified but also incorporate meaningful political competition and participatory decision-making. The ideological differences within this framework revolve around finding a delicate balance between contestation and deliberation, acknowledging the practical challenges while striving for inclusive governance that upholds political rights, civil liberties, and social justice.

CASE APPLICATION & ANALYSIS

Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar represent two distinct post-conflict contexts with unique peacebuilding models. To comprehensively evaluate these models in light of Dahl's Polyarchy concept and Habermas and Fraser's "Participatory Parity," it is crucial to delve into the key dimensions of governance, reconciliation, and international involvement in each case.

Historicity of Bosnia-Herzegovina & Myanmar Peacebuilding Regimes

Bosnia-Herzegovina Peacebuilding Regime: Self-Determination in Foreign Governance
The Bosnia-Herzegovina peacebuilding regime, marked by the pursuit of self-determination through foreign governance, represents a complex and multifaceted experiment in post-conflict reconstruction. This framework emerged as a response to the devastating Balkan wars in the 1990s and was formalized through the Dayton Accords in 1995, a critical juncture in the nation's history (Schmidt, 1999). The agreement introduced a unique governance structure that aimed to accommodate competing ethnic aspirations, ultimately leading to the establishment of two semi-autonomous entities: the Bosniak-Croat Federation and the Republika Srpska, alongside the Brčko District under international supervision (Lintner, 2020).

The post-conflict resolution bodies, including the Office of the High Representative (OHR) and the Peace Implementation Council (PIC), played pivotal roles in overseeing and implementing the Dayton Accords. The OHR, vested with significant authority, had the mandate to ensure compliance with the peace agreement's provisions and maintain stability. This international oversight also included the use of the Bonn Powers, granting the OHR the authority to remove elected officials who obstructed the peace process, underscoring the extent of foreign involvement in the country's governance (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

Ethnic participation in peacebuilding was encouraged but often remained fragmented along ethnic lines, with political parties predominantly representing their respective ethnic constituencies' interests. While these entities and structures contributed to maintaining a fragile peace, they faced challenges in addressing the root causes of inter-ethnic tensions, highlighting the intricate dynamics of self-determination in ethnically fractionalised societies (Schmidt, 1999).

The current status quo in Bosnia-Herzegovina continues to be marked by a delicate balance, where ethnic divisions persist, and the country remains divided along political and ethnic lines. The power-sharing arrangement, while preventing a return to full-scale conflict, has led to political gridlock, hindering progress in governance, economic development, and reconciliation efforts. Challenges such as corruption, political patronage, and economic stagnation persist, posing significant obstacles to the country's path towards sustainable peace (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

In this complex landscape, the role of international actors, particularly the European Union and the United States, remains pivotal in maintaining stability and guiding the nation towards further integration with Euro-Atlantic institutions (Lintner,

2020). Scholars and experts continue to debate the effectiveness of the Dayton Accords and the prospects for Bosnia-Herzegovina's peacebuilding journey (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

In conclusion, the Bosnia-Herzegovina peacebuilding regime, characterised by the pursuit of self-determination through foreign governance under the Dayton Accords, represents a unique and challenging endeavour. While it has prevented a return to large-scale conflict, the persistence of ethnic divisions and governance obstacles underscore the complexities of self-determination in ethnically fractionalised societies. International actors, scholars, and policymakers grapple with the ongoing challenges and prospects for a more stable and integrated Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Myanmar Peacebuilding Regime: A Failed Self-Determination

The history of modern Myanmar peacebuilding is marked by a longstanding conflict between the central government and ethnic minority populations inhabiting the hilly regions (Lamb, 1968). This conflict stems from the tension between the military government's dominance and the ethnic minorities' desire for federalism, autonomy, and civil rights equality, as articulated in the 1947 Panglong Agreement. Ethnic groups like the Karen National Union (KNU), Shan militant organisations, and the Chin National Front (CNF) seek greater autonomy within a unified Burma (Saw et al., n.d.; MAR Project, 2006; PHR, 2011:15).

Efforts at "Panglong-style" discussions have been ineffective, especially when armed ethnic groups negotiate from positions of strength. Government attempts, such as the 2003 ceasefire with the KNU, yielded limited progress and sometimes disrupted the peace process. These protracted conflicts have deeply influenced the country's political discourse and shaped the experiences of those involved (Perry, 2007; Nakanishi, 2013).

Myanmar's conflict landscape is multifaceted, impacting various aspects of national security, including the Rakhine crisis, constitutional disputes, rising nationalism, economic challenges, terrorism, drug trade, education, health, and relations with neighbouring states.

Addressing these challenges necessitates a comprehensive approach, including informal dialogues, counter-terrorism plans, anti-narcotics operations, and diplomatic engagement through mechanisms like the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus) and the Belt and Road Initiative. The undue constitutional power granted to the military remains contentious, and nationalistic sentiments highlight the need for greater involvement of religious and community leaders in peace efforts. Myanmar's evolving relationships with India and Bangladesh add layers of complexity to the peace dynamics. Efforts to address the Rakhine crisis, repatriation of Rohingya refugees, and combatting ethno-nationalism remain ongoing, alongside the changing landscape of ethnic politics within Myanmar.

While democratisation transformed ethnic political struggles into domestic political mobilisation, achieving comprehensive political participation and long-term peace remains challenging. Electoral milestones have led to growing recognition of the need for a new consensus to manage ethnic disputes and institutional representation reflecting Myanmar's diversity. Laws have allowed progressive practices in certain regions, while others lag due to historical legacies of violence. Conflict intensity varies,

with clashes between ethnic and religious groups contributing to tensions across the nation.

Myanmar's journey toward peacebuilding is a complex interplay of historical, political, economic, social, and diplomatic factors. It involves challenges and opportunities, demanding a nuanced approach that engages diverse ethnic groups, learns from history, and strives for a more inclusive and peaceful future.

Structure of Peacebuilding Governance & Theoretical Application

Governance Mechanisms

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the governance model outlined in the Dayton Agreement aimed to prevent the domination of any single ethnic group by instituting complex power-sharing arrangements among Bosniaks, Croats, and Serbs. This arrangement has succeeded in maintaining a fragile peace and providing political representation for major ethnic groups, aligning with some aspects of Dahl's Polyarchy, particularly in terms of inclusivity (Birch, 2014). However, it has also led to a highly fragmented government structure, hindering effective decision-making, economic development, and national unity—a departure from Dahl's criteria of responsiveness and governing in the broader interest (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

In Myanmar, the transition towards democratic governance, while promising, has faced significant challenges. The military's influence on politics persists, and power remains concentrated, raising concerns about the true extent of inclusivity and power-sharing (Lintner, 2020). This situation falls short of Dahl's ideal of polyarchy, which emphasises a more equitable distribution of power and broader political participation. While Myanmar's recent elections have allowed for increased political competition, ethnic minority representation remains limited, raising questions about political equality and the extent to which Habermas and Fraser's "Participatory Parity" has been realized (Lintner, 2020).

Reconciliation and Transitional Justice

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, reconciliation efforts have been marked by the establishment of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the War Crimes Chamber. These initiatives aimed to hold individuals accountable for war crimes and provide justice for victims, aligning with transitional justice principles (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019). However, the slow progress in addressing wartime crimes and the persistence of ethnic divisions challenge the full realisation of reconciliation and transitional justice ideals (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

In Myanmar, the reconciliation process has been elusive, with deep divisions along ethnic lines and resistance to addressing past atrocities. The limited success in holding accountable those responsible for human rights violations raises questions about the application of transitional justice principles (Lintner, 2020). Furthermore, the ongoing Rakhine crisis and the government's handling of the Rohingya issue highlight the challenges in achieving reconciliation and providing justice for marginalized communities, indicating shortcomings in reflecting "Participatory Parity" (Lintner,

2020).

International Involvement

Both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar have seen substantial international involvement in their post-conflict governance models. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, international actors, particularly the United Nations, the European Union, and the United States have played a central role in shaping the country's governance structure and ensuring compliance with peace agreements (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019). While this international involvement has contributed to stability, it has also created dependency and occasionally prioritised short-term stability over long-term reconciliation, challenging the concept of self-governance and raising questions about Dahl's criteria of accountability (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2019).

In Myanmar, international actors have also played a significant role, particularly in encouraging political reforms and providing development assistance (Lintner, 2020). However, the military's influence and international compromises have sometimes hindered a more comprehensive transition towards democratic governance (Lintner, 2020). The limited ability of local institutions to shape the nation's future raises concerns about Dahl's criteria of responsiveness and accountability (Lintner, 2020).

In conclusion, while both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar have made progress in their post-conflict governance models, they face persistent challenges related to governance mechanisms, reconciliation, and international involvement. These challenges raise questions about the extent to which Dahl's Polyarchy concept and Habermas and Fraser's "Participatory Parity" have been realized in these contexts. Achieving sustainable peace and democratic governance in both cases will require renewed efforts to address these challenges comprehensively and inclusively.

Evaluation

1) Commonalities of the Two States' Post-Conflict Ethnic Self-Deterministic Governance Structures

Both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar grappled with post-conflict governance structures that sought to address ethnic fractionalisation and self-determination aspirations. In commonality, both nations adopted a form of power-sharing as a central mechanism to accommodate multiple ethnic groups. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Dayton Agreement established a tripartite presidency and complex administrative divisions along ethnic lines, while Myanmar's Panglong Agreements and later the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement aimed to grant autonomy to ethnic minority regions within a federal framework. These arrangements were intended to prevent the domination of any single ethnic group, thereby promoting inclusivity and stability.

2) Key Core Differences of the Said Structures:

Despite their common goal of addressing ethnic divisions, the structures in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar exhibit significant differences. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the power-sharing model resulted in a highly fragmented and inefficient government structure, with separate entities and cantonal governments that often perpetuated ethnic divisions. In contrast, Myanmar's governance model was heavily centralized under

military rule, with the military junta exerting control over all aspects of governance. The military's dominance in Myanmar led to a lack of political representation and autonomy for ethnic minority regions, exacerbating ethnic tensions.

3) Effective Policy Analysis of How Self-Determinism as an International Public Law Principle Tried to Be Translated into the Procedure:

Both cases reveal the challenges of translating the international public law principle of self-determination into effective governance structures. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, international actors played a central role in shaping the Dayton Agreement, emphasising power-sharing to maintain peace but often neglecting deeper reconciliation and justice issues. In Myanmar, international involvement has been instrumental in facilitating peace negotiations and drawing attention to human rights abuses, but the military's actions have undermined these efforts. Effective policy analysis requires a more nuanced understanding of how international principles like self-determination interact with complex local dynamics and the need for inclusive, context-specific approaches.

4) Where Principles/Mechanisms of Self-Determinism Were Unable to Fully Realize Due to Limitations of Ethnic Groups' Disagreements or Failure of Persuasion by Outside Intervention:

In both cases, the limitations of self-deterministic principles became evident due to deep-seated ethnic disagreements and failures of outside intervention. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the power-sharing model, while preventing large-scale violence, has failed to address the underlying issues of ethnic division and has led to political gridlock. Ethnic groups remain deeply polarised, and there is a lack of genuine reconciliation. In Myanmar, despite international efforts to facilitate peace negotiations, some ethnic armed groups have refused to sign agreements, and the military coup in 2021 has further hindered the peace process. The failure of persuasion by outside actors highlights the complexities of negotiating self-determination in contexts where historical grievances and mistrust run deep.

5) Overall Policy Evaluation: Post-Conflict Ethnic Self-Determination Peacebuilding Governance in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar

The post-conflict governance structures in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar represent complex experiments in addressing ethnic fractionalisation and self-determination aspirations. This policy evaluation section assesses these governance structures based on four key factors: the soundness and sustainability of the governance model, the protection of minority rights, the promotion of intergroup relations and reconciliation, and the role of international actors in the peacebuilding process. Drawing upon the insights of political scientists like Mary Douglas and Roland Paris, this paper aims to provide an objective analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of these governance models.

A. Soundness and Sustainability of Governance Structure:

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the governance structure established by the Dayton Agreement has been instrumental in preventing large-scale violence but raises questions about its

long-term sustainability. Mary Douglas' analysis of governance structures highlights the importance of coherence and efficiency in governance. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the complex, multi-layered system with distinct entities and cantonal governments has resulted in inefficiencies and political gridlock. While it has maintained a fragile peace, it struggles to address the deeper issues of ethnic divisions. The model appears sound on the surface, with its emphasis on power-sharing, but it has not proven sustainable in fostering genuine reconciliation and inclusive governance.

The governance model in Myanmar under military rule lacked soundness and sustainability from the outset. Roland Paris' work on peacebuilding emphasises the importance of inclusive and participatory governance. Myanmar's centralized military control, where minority rights were not institutionally protected, created a situation where ethnic groups felt excluded and marginalized. The military's dominance and lack of political representation for ethnic minorities exacerbated ethnic tensions and made the governance structure inherently unsustainable. The military coup in 2021 further destabilized the country and highlighted the fragility of the existing governance model.

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the complexity of the governance structure is both its strength and weakness. The power-sharing model, designed to prevent the domination of any single ethnic group, has contributed to fragile peace by ensuring that none of the major ethnic groups feels marginalized. However, this complexity has resulted in a fragmented and inefficient government structure, characterised by multiple layers of governance at different levels, including the federation, entities, and the state. This fragmentation has hindered effective decision-making, economic development, and the delivery of public services. Inefficient governance has, in turn, fostered public frustration and disillusionment, leading to political stagnation.

In contrast, Myanmar's governance model under military rule was highly centralized, with the military junta exerting control over all aspects of governance. While this centralized control provided the military with a tight grip on power, it marginalized ethnic minority regions and communities. As Roland Paris has argued, inclusive and participatory governance is crucial for post-conflict peacebuilding. However, Myanmar's governance structure did not prioritise inclusivity or political representation for ethnic minorities, leading to deep-seated grievances and ongoing ethnic conflicts. The lack of soundness and sustainability in Myanmar's governance model was exacerbated by the military coup in February 2021, which further destabilized the country.

B. Protection of Minority Rights:

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the protection of minority rights has been a contentious issue. While the power-sharing model aimed to provide representation for all major ethnic groups, it often prioritised group identities over individual rights. As Mary Douglas has argued, an effective governance structure should prioritise individual rights and freedoms. However, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the emphasis on ethnic-based politics has sometimes compromised individual rights. This is particularly evident in issues related to freedom of movement and property rights, where individuals have faced restrictions based on their ethnic identity.

In Myanmar, the protection of minority rights was virtually non-existent under military rule. The centralized governance structure marginalized ethnic minorities

and created a climate of discrimination and violence. As Roland Paris has emphasised, inclusive and participatory governance is crucial for protecting minority rights and achieving post-conflict reconciliation. However, Myanmar's governance model did not prioritise these principles, resulting in widespread human rights abuses against ethnic minorities. The plight of the Rohingya, in particular, illustrates the dire consequences of the absence of institutional protection for minority rights.

C. Promotion of Intergroup Relations and Reconciliation:

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the governance structure has faced significant challenges in promoting intergroup relations and reconciliation. While it has succeeded in preventing large-scale violence, it has struggled to address the deeper issues of ethnic divisions. The power-sharing model, while preventing outright conflict, has not fostered genuine reconciliation among ethnic groups. As Mary Douglas has argued, fostering shared identities and bridging cultural divides is essential for long-term peacebuilding. However, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the governance model has reinforced ethnic identities and divisions, making it difficult to promote intergroup relations and reconciliation. Efforts to build trust and bridge divides have been limited in scope and have not addressed the historical grievances that underlie ethnic tensions.

In Myanmar, the governance model under military rule actively contributed to intergroup conflict and hindered reconciliation. Roland Paris' analysis emphasises the importance of cooperative measures and inclusivity in post-conflict peacebuilding. However, Myanmar's centralized governance structure marginalized ethnic minorities and created a hostile environment. This, in turn, fuelled ongoing ethnic conflicts and violence, making reconciliation efforts extremely challenging. The recent military coup has further strained intergroup relations, with resistance and protests erupting across the country. Reconciliation in Myanmar faces significant obstacles, given the entrenched ethnic grievances and the military's continued hold on power.

D. Guaranteed Role of International Actors:

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, international actors played a central role in shaping the Dayton Agreement and mediating political negotiations. However, their involvement has faced criticism for prioritizing short-term stability over long-term reconciliation. Roland Paris has emphasised the need for a balanced approach that addresses the root causes of conflict. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, international actors focused on power-sharing as a means of maintaining peace, often at the expense of addressing deeper ethnic grievances. This approach limited the effectiveness of international intervention in promoting reconciliation, as the focus on formal power-sharing mechanisms overshadowed the need for trust-building and addressing historical grievances.

In Myanmar, international actors have been actively engaged in peacebuilding efforts, providing diplomatic support, financial assistance, and mediation. However, their influence has been constrained by the military's dominance in the country. Roland Paris has emphasised the importance of local ownership in post-conflict peacebuilding. In Myanmar, the military coup in 2021 has further complicated international involvement, as the military's actions have undermined efforts to facilitate dialogue and reconciliation. The challenges of external intervention in Myanmar highlight the

difficulties of promoting peace and reconciliation in contexts where political power remains highly centralized and resistant to external pressure.

CONCLUSION

Policy Suggestions: Towards an Ideal Model of Post-Conflict Ethnic Self-Determination Peacebuilding Governance

In light of the complex and challenging experiences of post-conflict ethnic self-determination peacebuilding governance in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Myanmar, it is essential to draw lessons and develop a policy framework that can serve as a blueprint for future ethnically fractionalised states facing the dangers of ethnic conflicts and genocide. This policy suggestion aims to outline an ideal model of ethnic self-determination that can promote peace, reconciliation, and cooperation while avoiding the pitfalls of ethnic federalisation, promoting the development of a meta-ethnic identity, and early mechanisms to determine the true will of disparate ethnic constituents. Such a model should prioritise inclusivity, individual rights, and democratic governance.

1. Inclusive Governance:

At the core of the proposed model lies the foundational principle of inclusive governance that transcends ethnic divisions, ensuring equal participation for all citizens irrespective of their ethnic backgrounds. Recognizing the importance of ethnic diversity, the governance structures this paper advocates prioritise the safeguarding of individual rights above group identities. This approach resonates with Mary Douglas' vision of effective governance that promotes shared values and identities beyond ethnic lines. In order to realize this vision, the model calls for ameliorated power-sharing mechanisms, avoiding the creation of separate, ethnically-based governing entities. Instead, it promotes the development of inclusive models that encourage cooperation and collaboration among diverse communities within a unified, national framework. Additionally, constitutional protections are deemed essential, with the Constitution serving as a safeguard for individual rights and freedoms. This includes the explicit guarantee of equal opportunities and protections for all citizens. To prevent the abuse of power and discrimination based on ethnicity, the model advocates for the incorporation of robust checks and balances within the constitutional framework, ensuring a just and inclusive governance structure that transcends ethnic divisions.

2. Meta-Ethnic Identity Building:

The second pillar of the proposed model places a strong emphasis on cultivating a meta-ethnic identity through the strategic influence of institutions and interventions. Contrary to perpetuating divisions along ethnic lines, the overarching objective is to nurture a collective sense of national identity and unity. Drawing inspiration from Roland Paris' insights on peacebuilding, which underscore the significance of bridging cultural divides and championing inclusivity, the model outlines specific strategies

to achieve this transformative goal. These strategies include the implementation of educational curricula and media programming designed to accentuate shared national values, history, and culture. By encouraging cross-ethnic interactions within educational settings and media platforms, the aim is to foster meaningful connections and bonds among diverse communities. Furthermore, the model advocates for the facilitation of cultural exchange programs, festivals, and events that not only celebrate the rich diversity of the nation but also actively contribute to promoting a profound sense of unity. Concurrently, support for civil society initiatives that champion interethnic dialogue and cooperation is considered integral to fortifying the foundations of a meta-ethnic identity, thereby advancing the broader objectives of peacebuilding.

3. Early Mechanisms for Determining Ethnic Will:

In the pursuit of averting the outbreak of ethnic conflicts and addressing the legitimate aspirations of ethnic constituents within colonialist or Cold War-era national borders, the model underscores the critical importance of establishing early mechanisms to ascertain the genuine will of diverse ethnic groups. This necessitates comprehensive assessments to discern their preferences concerning cooperation and integration, fostering an environment where ethnic communities can openly express their desires without the fear of reprisals. To realize this objective, the model recommends the organisation of community consultations, surveys, and participatory decision-making processes aimed at understanding the preferences of different ethnic groups regarding cooperation and integration. Emphasis is placed on ensuring these processes are inclusive, transparent, and conducted within a safe environment, allowing for the authentic expression of diverse perspectives. Additionally, the model advocates for the establishment of conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms to address disputes and grievances as they arise, promoting the peaceful resolution of conflicts without resorting to violence. Furthermore, it encourages the engagement of international actors to provide neutral mediation and facilitation in situations where ethnic tensions emerge. The involvement of international mediation is seen as instrumental in building trust and ensuring that the voices of all ethnic groups are heard, thereby contributing to the prevention and resolution of potential conflicts.

4. International Support and Engagement:

In concluding the proposed model, the role of international actors is underscored as both supportive and facilitative, recognizing the necessity of local ownership while acknowledging the valuable contributions international support can make to ensure the success of the model. With an understanding that international assistance can provide crucial resources and expertise, the model outlines specific strategies to achieve this collaborative approach. Firstly, it advocates for capacity building by offering technical assistance and support to local institutions, civil society organisations, and government agencies. This includes training initiatives in conflict resolution, governance, and inclusive policymaking, enhancing the local capacity for effective implementation. Additionally, the model emphasizes diplomatic engagement by encouraging

international actors to facilitate dialogue among ethnic groups and promote cooperation. Furthermore, it suggests that international actors can play a pivotal role in providing a platform for dialogue and negotiation when necessary, contributing to conflict resolution and fostering collaboration. Finally, financial support is deemed essential, with a recommendation to allocate resources to bolster the implementation of reconciliation and peacebuilding initiatives. This encompasses funding for cultural exchange programs, education reforms, and community consultations, ensuring that financial backing is directed toward initiatives that directly contribute to the model's objectives.

In conclusion, an ideal model of post-conflict ethnic self-determination peacebuilding governance should prioritise inclusive governance, the promotion of a meta-ethnic identity, early mechanisms for determining ethnic will, and international support and engagement. By adopting such a model, ethnically fractionalised states can move away from the dangers of ethnic conflicts and genocide, promoting peace, trust, and cooperation among diverse communities. While every context is unique, these principles can serve as a valuable foundation for addressing the complex challenges posed by ethnic fractionalisation in post-conflict settings.

Limitations and Further Studies

In concluding this comparative research on peacebuilding regimes in Myanmar and Bosnia-Herzegovina, it is essential to acknowledge its inherent limitations. While this study has strived to provide a comprehensive analysis of the post-conflict governance models in these two nations, it is imperative to recognise that the complexities of peacebuilding extend beyond the scope of any single analysis. The multifaceted nature of ethnic conflicts, the historical nuances unique to each case, and the evolving dynamics of international involvement all contribute to the intricate tapestry of peacebuilding in these regions. As such, this research represents only a snapshot of these nations' journeys toward sustainable peace.

One limitation of this study lies in its focus on two specific cases, Myanmar and Bosnia-Herzegovina. While these cases offer valuable insights, numerous other post-conflict regions across the globe warrant scholarly attention. For instance, the ongoing Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict presents an intriguing and pressing subject for comparative research. Exploring the dynamics of peacebuilding in the South Caucasus region, with its long-standing ethnic tensions and external influences, would shed light on yet another facet of the intricate process of conflict resolution.

Furthermore, future research could delve deeper into specific aspects of peacebuilding that remain relatively underexplored. Topics such as the role of gender in peacebuilding, the impact of economic development on conflict resolution, and the dynamics of transitional justice in diverse societies offer rich avenues for academic inquiry. Additionally, examining the influence of regional actors and non-state actors in peacebuilding efforts can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the forces at play in post-conflict governance.

In conclusion, while this comparative research has sought to illuminate the complexities and challenges of peacebuilding in Myanmar and Bosnia-Herzegovina,

it is imperative to view it as a stepping stone in the broader field of conflict resolution studies. As this paper continues to navigate the intricate terrain of post-conflict governance, it is essential to remain open to new perspectives, uncharted territories, and evolving dynamics. By doing so, this study can contribute to a more profound and nuanced understanding of the diverse paths toward peace and reconciliation in our complex world.

REFERENCES

Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer, A., Easterly, W., Kurlat, S., & Wacziarg, R. 2003. "Fractionalisation." *Journal of Economic Growth*, 8(2), 155-194.

Césaire, Aimé. 1950. "Discourse on Colonialism." *Monthly Review Press*, pp.29-28

Chandler, David. 2006. *Empire in Denial: The Politics of State-building*. Pluto Press, pp. 48-70.

Crawford, J. 2001. "Right of Self-Determination in International Law: Its Development and Future", *People's Rights*, Oxford University Press, pp. 7-10

Dahl, Robert Alan. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale University Press.

Diamond, Larry. 2002. "Promoting Democracy in Post-Conflict and Failed States." *Foreign Affairs*.

Doyle, Michael. 1997. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 201-280.

Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. 2003. "Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war." *American Political Science Review*, 97(1), 75-90.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, pp. 112-209.

Habyarimana, J., Humphreys, M., Posner, D. N., & Weinstein, J. M. 2007. "Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision?" *American Political Science Review*, 101(4), 709-725.

Lamb, Alastair. 1968. *Asian Frontiers: Studies in a Continuing Problem*, F.W. Cheshire, Melbourne. p 148

Lederach, John Paul. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. USIP Press., pp. 87-97

Levi-Strauss, C. 1955. *Tristes Tropiques*. Librairie Plon.

Lintner, Bertil. 2020. "Why Burma's Peace Efforts Have Failed to End Its Internal Wars". *Peaceworks*, Issue No. 169, United States Institute of Peace.

Montalvo, J. G., & Reynal-Querol, M. 2005. "Ethnic diversity and economic development." *Journal of Development Economics*, 76(2), 293-323.

Nakanishi, Yoshihiro. 2013. *Strong Soldiers, Failed Revolution: The State and Military in Burma, 1962-88*, National University of Singapore Press, Singapore, in association with Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1963. *Africa Must Unite*. PANAF Books, pp. 52-96

Oklopcic, Zoran. 2007. "Eight theses on Self-Determination: From Self-Determination of Peoples to Principles of Polity Formation?". *2ⁿᵈ ESIL Research Forum 'The Power of International Law in Times of European Integration'*, 28-29 September 2008, European Society of International Law.

Paris, Roland. 2004. *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. Cambridge University Press.

Perry, Peter John. 2007. *Myanmar (Burma) Since 1962: The Failure of Development*, Ashgate, Aldershot

Ratner, Steven R. 1996. "Drawing a Better Line: Uti Possidetis and the Borders of New States". *The American Journal of International Law*. Cambridge University Press. 90 (4): 590–624.

Richmond, Oliver P. 2008. *Peace in International Relations*. Routledge.

Smith, Jeremy. 1996. *The Bolsheviks and the National Question, 1917–23*. Springer.

Schmidt, Fabian. 1999. "Rugova and the Kosovar power struggle", RFE/RL

Smith, A. D. 1990. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Basil Blackwell, pp. 15-187

Wilson, Woodrow. *1914. Fourteen Points.* Speech delivered in 1918.