

**Prof. Thomas Diez**  
**Eberhard Karls University at Tübingen, Germany**

Prof. Dr. Diez raises three main points of discussion albeit finding the paper by Prof. Hughes interesting and thought provoking. The first issue tackled is the difficulty in predicting the outbreak of violence. Despite there being an inexorable desire to know with preciseness when violence will occur, history has shown that social scientists have been repeatedly wrong in predicting the outbreak of violence. There is a fundamental human element in politics which renders the irruption of violence difficult to anticipate, something which social scientist seem to overlook.

Social scientists, Prof. Dr. Diez claims, are only able to intervene in politics but never control it or its outcome. In admitting that politics takes place at a discursive level and that it is very difficult to find commonalities across the outcome of projects, our attention is turned specifically to the politics of these cases. In other words, one cannot bring about the end to an impasse in a controlled fashion as its variables are usually not foreseeable.

In terms of the macro-micro divide, many focus on solving problems through institutions. What Prof. Dr. Diez claims, however, is that putting a greater emphasis on institutions will ultimately generate difficulties not because of their lack of importance but because in order to set up institutions in the first place, one needs a political willingness to back their creation. The question one must therefore ask oneself is why there is no political will.

Prof. Dr. Diez's case studies revolve mostly around Turkey and Cyprus. It is in these case studies that political will has shown to be conspicuously absent for reasons related mainly to discourse. These discourses are historically produced and, if wanting to change them, one must adopt a long term perspective which in turn would attract institutions to operate in these problematic fields and stabilize the cooperation between minorities. One of these long term processes Prof. Dr. Diez mentions is the enabling for minorities to be articulated in an inclusive manner. We, however, can only offer certain aspects of this integration and so, if one wants to transform discourse in which policy makers act, one needs to provide a credible context in which one can operate.

The third and final point Prof. Dr. Diez raises is that even though minority rights can be articulated in both an exclusive and inclusive manner, one must strive for the latter form of self articulation. We must not necessarily correlate the term minority with conflict. If we do link minority issues to conflicts this involves the construction of minority problems as matters of exclusive identities. Instead, one should focus on what minorities bring to the community and put the emphasis on how to help those actors who, at a micro-level, have inclusive understandings of minority rights. An empirical example of this given by Prof. Dr. Diez is the manner in which Kurds articulate their minority rights. Some advocate exclusivist strategies which have negative consequences for all including the Kurds themselves. Others, on the other hand, promote a more inclusive programme which is what is needed to strengthen and help establish. However, the distinction between exclusive and inclusive, Prof. Dr. Diez concludes, is not exactly clear-cut and requires further development.

**ECMI Advisory Council Conference**  
**7 May 2012**  
**Berlin**