

## “Academic Network South East Europe”

642-BLV, MPS WS 2005/2006

27./28. October 2006

IFSH, Falkenstein 1, 22587 Hamburg

Prof. Nexhmedin Spahiu, Dr. Patricia Schneider

### Politics of the Balkan Countries

#### **Aims:**

1. Familiarize students with core concepts involved in the Politics of the Balkans Countries
2. Equip students with the analytic methods necessary for the advanced study of politics in Southeast Europe
3. Develop students' critical faculties in the direction of ethical evaluation
4. To facilitate students learning appropriate modes of action in diverse learning environments
5. To prepare for the Seminar in Kosovo in November 2006.

The seminar introduces students to the fundamental political concepts during the modern history of the Balkans. The primary aim is to highlight the relationship of different political concepts among the Balkan nations. The second aim is to analyze the methods and historical circumstances by which they are developed.

Students will be required to read some texts and to contribute to a group presentation of critical analyses of some of key concepts and arguments of Balkans politics.

<b>Day 1: Friday, October 27, 2006</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>lecturer/students</b>
13.00-14.00	Workshop: <b>Introduction</b> to key words, names, data. Exercise	N.Spahiu & all students
14.00-14.10	Break	
14.10-14.40	Lecture: <b>Turkish politics</b> -questions	N.Spahiu students
14.40-15.10	Break	
15.10-15.40	Lecture: <b>Greek and Albanian politics</b> -questions	N.Spahiu students
15.40-15.50	Break	
15.50-16.20	Lecture: <b>Romanian &amp; Bulgarian Politics</b> -presantation, questions	N.Spahiu, student:Namir Radojkovic
16.20-16.30	Break	
16.30-17.00	<b>Discussion about Turkish, Romanian, Bulgarian, Greek and Albanian politics</b>	Students
<b>Day 2: Saturday, October 28, 2006</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>lecturer/students</b>
10.00–10.30	<b>Serbien, Montenegrien,Croatian, Bosnien&amp;H. and Macedonien politics</b>	N.Spahiu
10.30–10.40	Break	
10.40 – 11.10	Presentations	7 students
11.10 – 11.20	Break	
11.20 – 12.00	<b>Discussions about Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia, Bosnia &amp;H. and Macedonia politics</b>	N.Spahiu and all students
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch Break	-
13.00 – 13.50	<b>Gender and Politics in post-conflict</b>	Lynn Alice

	<b>Kosovo</b> /lecture +discussion	
13.50 – 14.00	Break	-
14.00 – 14.40	<b>Evaluation round.</b> Exercise.	N.Spahiu, Patricia Schneider
14.40–14.45	Break	
14.45-15.00	<i>Organisational issues for Kosovo excursion</i>	Patricia Schneider

## Day 1 – 27/10/2006

### Introductory workshop (1300-1400)

Andrea Sensenschmidt

Professor Nexhmedin Spahiu began by explaining which countries he considers part of the Balkans:

**Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, (The former Yugoslav Republic of) Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Turkey** and although it is not yet an independent country: **Kosovo** (Albanian name: Kosova).

The students then received a placard for each Balkan county and were asked by Professor Spahiu to attach these placards to several large paper sheets prepared with different facts about the Balkan countries (such as currencies,

capitals, government type, etc.). For every correct answer a student received one point. The aim of this game was to inform the students about the Balkan countries. What follows is a summary for each country.



### **Albania**

Capital: Tirana

Number of inhabitants: 3.100.000- 3.500.000

National currency: Lek

(Main) National holiday: November 28 (1912): proclamation of independence from the Ottoman Empire

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Alfred Moisiu

Prime Minister: Sali Berisha

Main political parties: Democratic Party of

Albania (government), Republican Party

(government), Socialist Party (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 2,5 %

NATO-membership: no

### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Capital: Sarajevo

Number of inhabitants: 4.000.000-4.100.000.

National currency: Marka

(Main) National holiday: March 1 (1992): date of independence

Political System: Presidential

President: rotating system between one representative of the Bosnian-Muslim, Croat and Serbian populations; presently: Haris Silajdžić (Bosnian-Muslim representative), Željko Komšić (Croatian representative) Nebojsa Radmanovic (Serbian representative)

Prime Minister: Adnan Terzic

Main political parties: Party of Democratic Action (government), Croatian Democratic Union (government), Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 1%

NATO-membership: no

## **Bulgaria**

Capital: Sofia

Number of inhabitants: 7.500.000-7.800.000

National currency: Lev

(Main) National holiday: March 3 (1878): autonomy/ independence from the Ottoman Empire (“Peace of San Stefano”)

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Georgi Parvanov

Prime Minister: Sergey Dmitrievich Stanishev

Main political parties: Coalition for Bulgaria (government), National Movement (government), Coalition of the United Democratic Parties (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 4%

NATO-membership: yes

## **Croatia**

Capital: Zagreb

Number of inhabitants: 4.380.000-4.500.000

National currency: Kuna

(Main) National holiday: June 25 (1991): declaration of independence

Political System: Presidential

President: Stjepan Mesic

Prime Minister: Ivo Sanader

Main political parties: Croatian Democratic Union (government), Social Democratic Party (opposition), Croatian People's Party - Liberal Democrats (former “Croatian People’s Party”) (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 1%

NATO-membership: no

## **Greece**

Capital: Athens

Number of inhabitants: 10.500.000-10.600.000

National currency: Euro

National holiday: March 25 (1821): independence day

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Karolos Papoulias

Prime Minister: Kostas Karamanlis

Main political parties: New Democracy (government), Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) (government), Coalition of the Left and Progress (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 3 %

NATO-membership: yes

NATO-membership: no

## **Macedonia**

Capital: Skopje

Number of inhabitants: 2.000.000

National currency: Denar

National holiday: September 8 (1991):  
independence day

Political System: Parliamentary

President: Branko Crvenkovski

Prime Minister: Nikola Gruevski

Main political parties: Democratic Party for  
Macedonian National Unity (VMRO-DPMNE)  
(government), Democratic Party of Albanians  
(PDSH/DPA) (government), Social Democratic  
Union (opposition), Democratic Union for  
Integration (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the  
parliament: 1%

NATO-membership: no

## **Montenegro**

Capital: Podgorica

Number of inhabitants: 620.000-650.000

National currency: Euro

(Main) National holiday: July 13 (1878):  
independence day, recognition by the “Berlin  
Congress”

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Filip Vujanović

Prime Minister: Milo Djukanović

Main political parties: Democratic Party of the  
Socialists of Montenegro (government), Social  
Democratic Party (government), Socialist People's  
Party (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the  
parliament: 1%

## **Romania**

Capital: Bucharest

Number of inhabitants: 22.000.000

National currency: Ley

(Main) National holiday: December 1 (1918):  
unification with Transylvania, Banat and  
Bessarabia

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Traian Basescu

Prime Minister: Calin Popescu Tariceanu

Main political parties: National Liberal Party  
(government), Democratic Party (government),  
Social Democratic Party (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the  
parliament: 5 %

NATO-membership: yes

## **Serbia**

Capital: Belgrade

Number of inhabitants: 8.000.000 (without  
Kosovo)

National currency: Dinar

(Main) National holiday: February 15 (1804):  
uprising against the Ottoman Empire

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Boris Tadić

Prime Minister: Vojislav Koštunica

Main political parties: Democratic Party of Serbia  
(government), G 17 (government), Serbian  
Radical Party (opposition), Democratic Party  
(opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 5 %  
NATO-membership: no

## Turkey

Capital: Ankara

Number of inhabitants:

70.000.000-72.000.000

National currency: Lira

(Main) National holiday: October 29 (1923):

proclamation of „The Day of Republic“ by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk

Political System: Parliamentary Republic

President: Ahmet Necdet Sezer

Prime Minister: Recep Tayyip Erdogan

Main political parties: Justice and Development Party (government), Republican People's Party (opposition), Anavatan Party (former „Motherland Party“) (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 10 %

NATO-membership: yes



## Kosovo

*under the administration of the United Nations*

*(“United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo” (UNMIK))*

*since 1999*

Administration Capital:

Pristina

Number of inhabitants:

2.100.000-2.500.000

National currency: Euro

(Main) National holiday: no established national holiday

Political System: Parliamentary (“Kosovo Assembly”)

President: Fatmir Sejdiu

Prime Minister: Agim Ceku

Main political parties: Democratic League of Kosovo (government), Alliance for the Future of Kosovo (government), Democratic Party of Kosovo (opposition), Reformist Party- ORA (opposition)

Percentage needed for a party to enter into the parliament: 0, 5 %

NATO-membership: no

→ For further general information see also: “Auswärtiges Amt: Länderinformationen”:

<http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/LaenderReiseinformationen.jsp> and “CIA- The World Factbook”:

<https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

## Turkish politics (1410-1440)

*Heather Gilmartin*

Professor Spahiu first lectured on the history of each country’s political system, from the “national awakening” stage to the present day. He stressed the fact that one cannot understand the current political situation in a given country without knowing something of its history and development. Thus, much of the first day focused not on current events, but rather on the history that has influenced today’s circumstances.

Turkey, like most of the other countries in the region, began its awakening around the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, the “Father of Modern Turkey,” Gazi Mustafa Kemal Attaturk, arrived on the scene

slightly later, in the 1910s. He founded the Republican People's Party, which ruled from 1923 to 1950 as Turkey's only political party and is still the second-strongest party in Turkey.

Students were led through the history of the Turkish national awakening, which began as a result of the Crimean War (1853-1856), resolving in the Treaty of Paris of 1856. Because the Ottoman Empire, England and France had allied against Russia, the Ottoman Empire became "infected with the virus of Europe" and began adopting some European ideas and attitudes, particularly ideas about national identity and the rights of citizens that had emerged from the French Revolution. The Crimean War opened the Ottoman Empire to ideas of "modernity." Thus, in 1865 Namik Kemal and a few colleagues created a secret society for the creation of a "Turkish" national identity. In 1868, the Young Turks were founded. They believed that all (ethnically Turkish) Muslims in the area should form a Turkish empire, rather than the pan-Arabic or pan-Islamic empires that had been previously envisioned. They failed to create such an empire, but their ideas influenced the visions of later leaders, particularly Kemal Attaturk. (Here Professor Spahiu reiterated that the "national idea" and image of one's nation change over time, each idea influencing its successor.)

The year 1869 brought a number of new influences to the area that would become Turkey. The Suez Canal was completed, an event which had a large impact on the future of the Ottoman Empire. The



University of Istanbul also opened, and Sami Frasheri's influence in the region heightened. Today, both Albania and Turkey claim Sami Frasheri as their national hero, the leader of their respective national awakenings. In 1869 the first railway in the region was also begun, providing better transportation and communication.

This awakening process strongly influenced Kemal Attaturk's ideas about Turkish identity, as he developed his vision for the future of the region. The Ottoman Empire withdrew from the Balkans (and consequently lost influence in the area) after the Balkans War of 1912, and collapsed completely after World War I. Turkish national forces, led by Attaturk, successfully retook

some of the land that had been ceded by the Ottoman Empire after World War I, established the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1920 and the Republic of Turkey in 1922, and abolished the Caliphate a few months later. Attaturk's Republican People's Party began single-party rule in 1923.

Attaturk's vision for Turkey demanded a break with the past: no Ottomanism, no pan-Islamism, and no pan-Turanism. The latter meant that Attaturk no longer claimed that ethnic Turks living under Soviet rule should be part of Turkey.

Attaturk established six positive principles for the governance of the Republic of Turkey:

**Republicanism, Secularism, Statism, Nationalism, Populism and Reformism.**

- **Republicanism:** Turkey should be a one-party republic, not a monarchy or empire. This principle remained in place until 1950, when a multi-party system was established.
- **Secularism:** Although 97% of Turks were Muslim, Attaturk insisted on a separation of religion from government.
- **Statism:** Turkey should *not* try to expand its territory. This policy changed during the 1974 Cyprus Crisis, when Turkey invaded Cyprus after a coup d'etat that tried to unite Cyprus with Greece, because Turkey did not want Greece to block its access to international waters.
- **Nationalism:** Turkey *should* defend with all its strength the territory and people under its control. Today, Turkey has an extremely large army in proportion to its population. This has caused two things: many coups d'etat, and a huge drain on the nation's finances.

- **Populism:** All of Attaturk's ideas should be widely accepted before implementation. Popular opinion should determine domestic and foreign policy
- **Reformism:** Turkey should become more Europeanized. Attaturk changed the Turkish alphabet (it now uses Latin letters), the clothes that people wore (from Asiatic to European), and many other parts of daily life. These reforms were, for the most part, forcefully done. They were neither democratic nor populist.

### Turkish Foreign Policy

In World War II, Turkey remained loyal to Attaturk's principle of Statism, staying neutral until the very end of the war, when they joined the Allies and attacked Germany. This strategic decision was to protect Turkey from Soviet domination.

Turkey decided to stick to the United States, acting as its ally, joining NATO, and receiving lots of money and support in return. Because of its geostrategic position as the connection between Europe and Asia, Turkey has been surrounded by many regional crises and has relied on its alliance with the U.S. for stability and protection. This alliance continued through the Cold War. Turkey sent three battalions to fight in the Korean War, even though Attaturk's principles dictated that Turkish forces only fight to defend Turkish territory.



With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, many ethnically Turkish republics emerged in Central Asia, over which Turkey could have tried to gain influence. However, because Russia still carried a large amount of weight in that region, Turkey made the strategic decision not to attempt to expand its own influence there. Turkey did not have the economic strength to be more than a friendly neighbor to these republics.

During the first Iraq War, Turkey found itself in an extremely difficult position. On one hand, the Turkish leadership favored a continued alliance with the United States. On the other, however, the American invasion caused the Iraqi leadership to split into three parts, and the Kurdish part became stronger and more stable. Today, Kurds are largely excluded from Turkish politics and society. Turkey was afraid that Kurdish Iraqis would gain influence over Kurdish Turks and persuade them to rebel against the Turkish government. This would seriously threaten Turkish security. Thus, in the Iraq war Turkey took a moderate stance, stating its alliance to the United States but disallowing U.S. forces to fly through Turkish airspace.

### Greek and Albanian politics (1510-1540)

*Matthias Kock*

Albania was under a communist dictatorship between 1945 and 1991. Atheism was proclaimed, but today the population is 70% Muslim and 30% Christian. The state enjoyed a later independence than most of the other Balkan nations. This was due to an early conversion to Islam under the Ottomans. The people in today's Albanian territory were therefore well privileged.

In 1830 The Ottomans annihilated the Albanian elite, because it became too strong and was a threat to the local Ottoman leaders. Thereafter the Albanian national awakening process took part. The so-called League of Prizren was founded. With the conference of Berlin (June-July 1878) at the horizon, independence from the Ottoman rule was as close as never before. The League met in Prizren to decide whether they should try to separate from the Ottomans. It turned out that the surrounding Balkan states opposed that enterprise and tried to cut off land from Albanian territory instead. Only shortly before the Balkan Wars, as part of Austro-Hungarian efforts to prevent Serbia from getting access to the Adriatic, Albania was granted its independence on October 28, 1912. The first ruler was a German, which put Albania in a bad position in the First World War. During the war, Albania was occupied by Austro-Hungarians who left a very sophisticated political system. In 1924, Ahmed Zogu returned from Belgrade after he fled there earlier in that year. He expelled the local rulers with help from Serbia and became the Leader, later the King

of Albania. Under his rule the country oriented westward and the Catholic culture improved. Ahmed Zogu is seen as the modernizer of Albania such as Attatürk plays this role for the Turks. When the Italians invaded Albania in 1939, Zogu fled to Greece with which he had very good relations. After the war he was not able to stay in power, because the Communists under Enver Hoxha took over. Zogu died in 1961 in France. While Yugoslavia became Titoist, Albania stayed isolated with its communist regime until 1991. The first elections took place but there were still a lot of nationalist attitudes in the country. Nowadays the dust has settled and the state of Albania is striving towards NATO and EU membership.

*Session went far overschedule; discussion eliminated and remaining lectures moved to following day.*

## **Day 2 – 28/10/2006**

### **Romanian and Bulgarian politics (1000-1030)**

*Volker Simon Pabst*

Before 1918, both countries were ruled by a monarch, Carol I (1866-1914) in Romania and Ferdinand I (1887-1918) in Bulgaria.

Romania paid tribute to the Sultan, but since 1866 has been a formally independent state. The country has never been occupied by the Habsburgs, except Transylvania which was part of the Hungarian empire until 1918. Romania first declared neutrality, but then joined sides with the Allies and declared war on Austria-Hungary in 1916.

Bulgaria fought for enlargement of its territory, in particular for access to the Mediterranean, in the two Balkan Wars. As the main loser of the Second Balkan War, it joined the Central Powers in WWI to regain parts of its territory.

During the Interwar period and WWII, the settlement of Versailles granted huge territorial gains to Romania – mainly Transylvanian lands that used to belong to Hungary. Therefore, Romania was threatened by revanchist Hungarian plans. As Hungary joined the Axis powers, Bucharest feared that Hungary would be rewarded with Romanian lands if Germany wins the war, and thus it also joins German sides in order not to be neglected in the resettlement of post-war Europe.

Bulgaria is also in the pro-German coalition in order to secure gains after the defeat of Yugoslavia and Greece. However, Bulgaria always used to be among Moscow's closest allies in the Balkans and thus, as the only German ally in Europe, never declares war on the Soviet Union.

Between the end of WWII and 1990, both countries are in the Soviet zone of influence after the defeat of Germany. Moscow installs Communist dictatorships in Bucharest and Sofia. The countries' foreign policy is largely dependent on Moscow for most of the time, however, Romania exits from the Warsaw Pact and manages to pursue a more independent policy.

Compared to other Balkan States after 1990, the post-Soviet regimes in Bulgaria and Romania follow a more nationalistic line than Albania, but are more moderate than the governments of the ex-Yugoslavian republics. The two countries are members of NATO and will join the European Union in 2007.

Why have they been more successful in joining western institutions than Tirana? There is no risk factor like Kosovo in either of the two countries and the economic situation, although poor, is still more promising than in Albania.

### **Student presentations (1040-1200)**

*Students gave short presentations on readings from the recommended bibliography.*

*History of the former Yugoslavia and discussion thereof eliminated due to time constraints.*

### **Gender and Politics in post-conflict Kosovo (1300-1350)**

*Heather Gilmartin*

Dr. Lynne Alice, senior lecturer in International Relations at Deakin University, Burwood, Australia, gave a lecture on the ways in which gender and politics interact in today's Kosovo. Currently on leave from teaching, she is at the University of Bremen, writing a chapter for her new book. Her interests lie in human rights and humanitarian law, the politics of military intervention, and ethno-nationalism and feminist

political analysis. She has an ongoing partnership with the Kosovo Gender Studies Center and is the international consultant for the Kosovo Women's Network's report on the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in Kosovo.

Dr. Alice began her lecture by emphasizing that her work lies not at the level of elite government officials—the level most often discussed in a political science or international relations setting—but at the discursive level, the level of individuals and small groups. Dr. Alice's research does not focus on gender *per se*, but gender does provide a useful platform from which to study how social meanings and practices become internalized and politicized. She asks, how are these individual people or small groups of people involved in politics, and how does gender connect with this involvement? More specifically, what is the position of women in Kosovo in politics, both in and out of “official” discourse, given that “official” discourse is the world of men? Dr. Alice stressed that gender markers cannot and should not be understood *except* as they interact with other social markers. In other words, gender concepts must not be taken out of context.

Dr. Alice pointed to three different ways in which politics and gender interact.

- **Gender and politics:** The ways in which processes of government and the meanings attributed to maleness and femaleness in society impact each other
- **Politics of gender:** The nature of inter-relationships between women and men and their consequences for social and political issues
- **Gendered/ing politics:** The ways in which all levels and aspects of participation in government are shaped by and reveal the effects of the valuing given to femaleness and maleness in society

In addition, Dr. Alice stressed the connection between political events in Kosovo and the development of the women's movement:

#### The Official History

1974 Autonomy

1989 Autonomy rescinded

1990 Independence; gov't dissolved

1993-97 Conflict escalates

1998 Open Conflict

1999 NATO intervention

1999 JIAS/UNMIK administration

#### Women's History

1968-98 Civil Disobedience and the rise of women's public activism

1989-92 Uniting the Nation

1990-93 The “Great Divorce”

1993-97 Women's independent organizations

1999 Women's movement, renewed regional and international connections

In Kosovo, gender stereotypes at times were quite vicious, harsh and unchangeable. For example, in the media women were often presented as victims: the old lady in rags, sitting on the street, a representative of a suffering nation. However, Kosovar women have in fact been strong players at the grassroots level of politics, organizing across ethnic and other social boundaries to form networks that operated even at the height of the violence. From 1989 to 1992, during the “Uniting the Nation” period, women's groups in Kosovo united to provide education and health services, primarily to women but also to other people in the countryside who did not have other access to these types of services. From 1990 to 1993, the “Great Divorce” period, women's groups in Kosovo faced a unique challenge as one of the only types of ethnically mixed organization in the area. Members of these groups were confronted by propaganda attacking their friends and colleagues of different ethnicities—a challenge avoided by the higher-level,



segregated political organizations. This situation forced a renegotiation of alliances and allegiances within the women's groups, as they had to decide whether to become overtly political or not. Some chose to politicize, others did not, but for the most part they continued to be ethnically mixed.

The years after 1996 brought the most tangible progress for women's movements in Kosovo, as they developed closer ties to

international women's organizations. Although Kosovar women's involvement in politics is very different from women's activism in the West, the two movements are intricately connected. These connections include not only women's organizations but also political groups.

In her research, Dr. Alice primarily looks at three examples of gendering politics in post-conflict Kosovo: the gender quotas for political participation of 2001, the gender equality laws of 2004, and the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 of 2006. The gender quotas established a 1/3 gender quota system, which requires 1/3 of the seats in parliament to be reserved for women. The same law introduced ethnic quotas as well. One problem a new "country" like Kosovo faces is how to get high levels of participation in politics when there is no history or tradition of a democratic system. The quota law attempts to solve this problem. It guarantees high levels of participation by women in government, but it does also present the quandary that "We're giving you a democracy, but we're telling you who to vote for (sort of)." The gender equality laws of 2004 are some of the most sophisticated gender equality laws in the world, largely because they draw on many different international models. However, the problem is understanding how this law does and should work in a country that is still a protectorate. How should it be put into practice? Lastly, the implementation of the UNSCR 1325 allows many new opportunities for women's groups to network globally and be effective regionally. Because this resolution came from the U.N., at the level of global politics, it crosses from "nation building" into "state building." Thus, it presents a fascinating question of accountability and responsibility. Who is responsible for the proper implementation of the resolution? This question applies to all places in which the UN is attempting to do nation- and state-building but failing (such as East Timor).

Dr. Alice tries to see how these three gender laws apply in Kosovo—in other words, how the laws translate into policy and civil society in a Kosovar context. Gender necessarily means a grassroots or bottom-up approach, at least to some degree, so studying gender in Kosovo reminds us to understand the grassroots goings-on, which are very different from one country to another. For example, in Kosovo there is a very different translation of gender into civil society than there is in the English-speaking democracies. However, these differences do not prevent many connections from forming across cultures, ethnicities, and national boundaries. Solidarity between women has grown considerably since the conflict (although women's networks did survive through all kinds of horrors during the violence), and has now become institutionalized. Connections are now made at all levels of society, in recognition of the fact that these issues concern all parts of society.

These minutes were collected and edited by

*Hilary Bown*