

Notes from  
“Crafting State – Nations: India and Other Multinational Democracies”  
By Alfred Stepan, Juan J. Linz, Yogendra Yadav

11 – In a chart, they show us how democracy is unlikely in a Multinational state. Thus diversity is inimical to democracy in their formulation.

12 - Multiculturalism, herein, is diversity in which no nation is making a claim to a separate state.

In this regard, they say the US is multicultural, but not multinational (they, apparently, have not heard of La Raza) and India is multinational.

12 – In a pure multinational state, composed of nations, we have a confederation. In such conditions, the state is reduced to an “empty shell.” Under this theory, to manage diversity, America is now afraid to say the word Christmas. It is sucking out of content.

13 – They think it necessary that the state induce some sort of “we-feeling.” What in the “empty shell” is to produce this?

15 – They propose complementary and multiple identities. This can allow various cultural nationalisms and retain the single state.

Some scholars do say that granting any recognition to territorially concentrated groups, will loosen attachment to common symbols, institutions, and individual rights. (Good footnotes). Conflict, not complementary identities will arise.

16 – but they provide Belgium, Canada, Spain, and India as counter examples. (Canada with its frequent referendums on splitting which gain %49 of the vote! Really?)

One continuous weakness of this book is that it deals with nations with steady populations. None of the examples deal with the mass concentrated influx of Mexicans that we in the States have. If the model requires we must celebrate Mexican heritage, etc, must we increase immigration to buy that buy-in?

21 – They want people politically integrated, but not culturally assimilated. But it is possible that “cultural nationalists,” would win election in a state and turn the national resources they command against the center state.

23 – The French model of trying to make all assimilate to the main culture will backfire.

24 – Media destroys assimilation.

25 – Coming together federations are formed by a process in which relatively autonomous units with similar backgrounds come together to form a new state. The US for example.

But with new states we get a “holding together” people coming together with diverse backgrounds, such as with Belgium. These devolve power to lower units to satisfy their demands.

27 – It is apparent that what is being presented is a culturally neutral (as with all social sciences) model. Islam and Christians in Switzerland are the same. History does not enter this model. It is scientific and thus sucks.

32 – They selectively quote their own chart to show these complimentary identity models work. In fact in Catalonia 16% feel only Catalanian and 27% feel more Catalanian than Spanish. So 53% don’t feel a strong attachment to Spain. For the

Basque nation it is %50. Only 45% feel only Spanish or “As Spanish as Catalanian.” In Basque land, that is only 40%. Their numbers are better in Belgium.

34 – But in the Belgium model, we have no history of animosity or war. So this would likely not apply to US / Mexico or Islam / Europe.

47 – They make the claim that the US is more homogeneous than India. They have 81 % the same Hindu religion. 20% of our households don’t speak English and those speaking Spanish are concentrated in one area. I am not sure how they make these categories.

49 – This book loves international comparisons, but would chafe at using Chinese policies. They say their policies would help china if it became a democracy. It is doing well, thank you.

50 – He needs to note 81% are Hindu. How are the authors so blind to culture? They base their claim of multinational status for India based on a book from the 1880s.

59 – Muslims, their studies show, are proud Indians. Well, they are a small percentage of the population, dispersed evenly (except in areas where their concentration leads to separatist movements and civil war like Pakistan partition). But, would they be so mellow were they 81% of the population?

61 – Muslims, they say, are dispersed. And, they feel more Indian than Muslim. That is challenging. But, Muslims have a long history of conquest in India. Thus feeling Indian and wishing Muslim hegemony are not in conflict.

79 – In India, the lower the SES, the more likely to vote. In the US the rich and educated vote more. Time and time again, culturism trumps social science platitudes. We see the same with social capital literature. The generalities stop with our western borders.

100 – 81% of Indians are Hindu.

101 – 1935 Franchise to India. Brits have a colonial policy of leaving tribes alone!

105 – The wonderful holding together solution in Mizo means that only Mizos can vote in local elections and only Mizos can buy land in Mizoram. So would the authors like this law in California, as it is in Mexico, that only Mexicans can buy land or vote? Is this really a good model?

107 – Homogeneity helps peace process and diversity helps it. This is shown with the Nagaland people and the Misoram. Nagaland has more languages and their people don’t match their borders, so they’ve had no peace with India. Culturism is necessary.

108 – Messy borders cause war.

109 – Nations should match states.

111 – He lauds the laws wherein the Indian parliament cannot make laws for Jammu and Kashmir without the states’ approval. But, it is violated. And, if the Muslims had been given control, the 68 year war might have been averted. [The authors claim that Muslims liking the democracy of India disproves the clash of civilizations model. But, this is a small group dispersed, a definite minority].

113 – The rebels in Kashmir, the Muslim United Front (in India’s most contracted civil war), have no significance to the word Muslim. And, while the MUF rejects ties to Pakistan, it would be interesting if the authors noted the genocide of non-Muslims in Pakistan and put culture into their model.

122 – Nation States in India. Again, would they suggest that we make Spanish the state language of California?

128 – 129 – Linguistic diversity is dangerous.

131 – How the potential system prevents separatism: it allows cultural nationalism. Though they push for coalition governments in parliamentary mode, the authors are happy to have exclusive nationalism within states.

141 – Only 22% of Latinos in the US say I am an American first and a Latino second. 76 percent are the opposite. Though, as the authors say, this forced choice sort of survey polarizes people.

142 – Also, cultural identity and political affiliation don't always vary together.

149 – In Sri Lanka, the Sinhalese government disenfranchised up country Tamils because they were laboring immigrants from the nearby Tamil Nadu. Again, loose borders destabilize.

157 – Sri Lanka goes Buddhist only .

154 & 167 – “Majority with a minority complex” in Sri Lanka – Due to Tamil Nadu being next door is not explored enough by the authors.

173 – In this section we see how inclusion of Russians in the new Ukraine state created a ‘we feeling’ and avoided conflict.

185 – Russia and Ukraine are very similar languages.

186 – Both groups have the same history of hating Stalin. They have the same historical heroes.

189 – Good linguistic, culturist policies, and tv policies recommended too.

190 – But the Ukraine has a strong central government partially as a foil to Russia.

191 – So they use the Ukraine and Sri Lanka to show the harm of culturism and the benefit of State – Nations. But these are loaded examples. Sri Lanka was so horrible and Ukraine had much unity when the threat of diversity was handled.

195 – Russians don't all like democracy – And the Ukrainians don't trust their police or courts; worse than all other post communists.

204 – Federacy – their ideal type – is outlined:

“A federacy is a political-administrative unit in an independent unitary state with exclusive power in certain areas, including some legislative power, constitutionally or quasi – constitutionally embedded, that cannot be changed unilaterally and whose inhabitants have full citizenship rights in the otherwise unitary state.”

205 – There is a Federal – like division of state and federacy functions. The locals (the Federacy) have exclusive jurisdiction “over culture – making and culture – preserving powers, such as the right to establish the indigenous language as the official language.”

Again, indigenous Spanish in California? Sharia law in Europe? To avoid this, his examples are all European non-immigrant examples.

Defining Characteristic # 1 :

They have control over the content and administration of education (sex segregated madrasses paid for by the government, they control the hiring and promotion of civil servants (no Danes need apply), and possibly the right of granting citizenships (no Danes need apply) They may also have the right to create “extremely restrictive immigration policies and to prohibit those citizens of the polity who are not citizens of the federacy from buying land or establishing commercial enterprises.” [So these would be no – go zones for the English. “Some powers, such as foreign affairs, defense, currency, and a final court of appeals, would generally remain the exclusive prerogatives of the center.”

Pensions, welfare, and hospital costs may be transferred to the federacy.

THIS IS SECESSION in all but name. The fact that it is still America, but non-Mexicans can't vote, buy property, run for office, establish businesses, or immigrate to California is not a happy solution for loyalty to the USA.

Defining Characteristic #2 – Quasi – Constitutionally embedded political autonomy of the federacy. The federacy's laws cannot be altered without agreements from both sides.

#3 – Dispute resolution procedures

#4 - Reciprocal representation between the unitary state and the federacy. They hope to foster a high level of trust, voice, and loyalty between the federacy and the center, so there is joint citizenry for those in the federacy. Those in the federacy can vote in central elections, have reps in parliament. The central government would have a rep who would coordinate central prerogatives in the federacy.

So, the local federacy members can vote in central elections, and may even have lay away seats in the parliament. But the central government only gets an overseer. This is to create commonality. I suppose the sight of a Western stooge implementing Sharia would warm the cockles of Muslim Belgium.

The authors' examples all involve western nations and western nations. The non-western example is Christian and Indian. Buy even one of those didn't work.

206 - #5 – The federacy is part of an internationally recognized state. So while Londonstan will be largely independent it is still English (in name).

207 - Facilitating characteristic # 1 – International guarantors would monitor the implementation of the federacy arrangement. So there goes even more of your sovereignty. Now the Muslim state in Sweden will have international armies protecting it.

Facilitating characteristic # 2 – If a treaty hurt the federacy, the federacy could opt out.

222 – Minorities get permanent representation

224 – In the Faroe island example, we see that the loyalty is bought with huge subsidies / transfers of wealth to the federacy. And, even then – between like cultural groups – secession talks happen. And, when, as with the case of Greenland, they have enough money, Greenland will bail.

225 – Greenland traditionally came under the Monroe Doctrine.

228 – Greenland's subsidies.

242 – Strict Islam in Indonesia's break away Aceh. But, this being the basis of the independence is not seen as peculiarly related to culture. The giving of near sovereignty, federacy, is the solution.

250 – 251 – The federacy results in Indonesia, the newly recognized Aceh passed a law of death by stoning for adultery. But, the authors assure us, this is not significant. (love to have that in Spain)! And, a terrorist base in Aceh was discovered. But this is not significant either. People in Aceh are satisfied with the arrangement. Good.

260 – Comparing the US constitution to other nations. Our system is symmetrical, not asymmetrical. So we give equal rights to each state. Federacy means getting rid of this – different cultural states would have different rights.

264 – Our winner-take-all presidential system makes for poor coalition building. So we would fare poorly with the federacy secession model.

271 – If governments have less veto power, they are more flexible. We have too many vetoes built into our system, so we'd implement the federacy poorly. So I guess they suggest we amend our Constitution to make way for the coming multinational US.