

# CONFLICT IN CITIES AND THE CONTESTED STATE

Everyday life and the possibilities for transformation in Belfast, Jerusalem and other divided cities

---

[www.conflictincities.org](http://www.conflictincities.org)

## Belfast Commentary

November 2010



## Belfast 2010:

### Tales of Political Retrenchment, Economic Optimism and Rubbing Shoulders in Public Space

- ‘Cohesion, Sharing and Integration’

On October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2010 the [Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland](#)<sup>1</sup> (CRC) held a half-day open conference, entitled *Live Issues*, at the Stormont Hotel in Belfast. This was mainly an opportunity for the Council to publically express their views on the new [Cohesion, Sharing and Integration](#)<sup>2</sup> (CSI) government strategy, out for public consultation from July until early November 2010. This ‘CSI document’, (as it is commonly referred to), has been long in the making and was expected to lay out government’s vision for addressing sectarianism and racism in Northern Ireland or, more broadly speaking, to deal with the issues named in its very title. As it happens it might have done neither. The views expressed at the *Live Issues* conference – those of members of the CRC, of the delegates, and of the panels of attending politicians and public figures, (bar the representatives of the two main political parties of [Sinn Fein](#)<sup>3</sup> and [DUP](#)<sup>4</sup> who have masterminded the document), can be neatly summed up with the phrase that Duncan Morrow – the CRC chief executive – used: ‘Must do better!’ It would also seem that this latter phrase echoes opinions across society, with the [Belfast Telegraph](#)<sup>5</sup> announcing last month that more than 150 ‘senior figures’ across Northern Ireland have demanded that the strategy document be rewritten. Reportedly too, three out of the five parties represented on the [Stormont Executive](#)<sup>6</sup> are opposed to the document, describing it as ‘fundamentally flawed’ ([SDLP](#)<sup>7</sup>) and calling for it to be overhauled ([Alliance](#)<sup>8</sup>).

Residents of countless ‘divided’ cities around the world will struggle to comprehend the significance of the above, caught up as they are in a much more dramatic fight for their daily survival. For them the city of Belfast, albeit notorious for its divisions, is simply a distant, now peaceful, (and certainly much, much more affluent), dot on the map. Without a doubt some brief background is needed by way of explanation:

The present *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* document is the outcome of a long and convoluted political process that goes back to the [Good Friday Agreement](#) (1998)<sup>9</sup>. Resulting from that commitment, the first devolved *Programme for Government* (2001) sought to promote a strategy of ‘community’ or ‘good relations’. The first such attempt painfully emerged years after that commitment had first been made, in the shape of the government’s [A Shared Future](#)<sup>10</sup> document of 2005. The explicit aim of that strategy was ‘to establish a shared society defined by a culture of tolerance ... A society where there is equity, respect for diversity and recognition of our interdependence’ (2005: 10). This was a vision for change – much needed for a society that had just emerged from a prolonged

spasm (and not the first one in its history at that) of violent conflict. It sought to develop a systematic approach to addressing the need for societal reconciliation through an integrated governmental policy. Above all it was expected to demonstrate that government cared, saw itself as a party to, and wanted to lead on, a process that was more than about ticking boxes but about real people being given a tangible chance to live better lives. It is worth remarking that the *A Shared Future* strategy was only realised after a period of repeated dissolutions of the local Assembly, and then published by the [Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister](#)<sup>11</sup> whilst under direct rule from Westminster. This was an ominous sign, some might say, of the ambiguities deep in the heart of the peace agreement itself, based as it is on accommodation between political elites whose 'very existence depends on the segregation from which they derive their votes' (Belfast Telegraph, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010).

At the time, many of the responses to the public consultation, which the *A Shared Future* was itself subjected to, were trenchantly critical. There was a definite air of disappointment when it was pointed out that the broad policy aim of developing 'good relations' was addressed by the *A Shared Future* as a mere aspiration and only by way of a 'constructive ambiguity' (Graham and Nash, 2006: 261)<sup>12</sup>. Many [responses](#)<sup>13</sup> criticised this Good Relations Strategy for lacking working definitions of key terms such as sectarianism, racism, reconciliation, integration and sharing; for being vague on the definition of 'good relations', and for inadequately specifying their role in an overall process of peace-building. In addition the *A Shared Future* was criticised for its generic treatment of questions of 'identity' as a subset of 'culture', where it stated that 'addressing diversity through culture is crucial in promoting good relations' (*A Shared Future* 2005: 31). By contrast, Catherine Nash has argued that the use of the idiom of 'culture' in the context of continued division, albeit as an attempt to 'constructively shift the meanings of "identity", "tradition" and "heritage"' (2005: 272), has ambiguous effects: 'arguments for tolerance of diversity can be used to legitimate separatist versions of cultural difference and sometimes antagonistic expressions of tradition' (Ibid: 293)<sup>14</sup>.

The fact that the *A Shared Future* is now praised, *post mortem*, as superior to its successor - *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* - is worrying. Especially so, because the responses to the *A Shared Future* consultation by Sinn Fein and DUP<sup>15</sup>, who are now the minds behind the new *CSI document*, demonstrated at the time that these parties belittled – each in their own way – the significance of 'good relations'. They questioned the need to deal with it at all through a public political or governmental commitment. This was partly manifested in the parties' apparent understanding of 'good relations' as not including attempts at cultural and attitudinal change but as rather confined to settling the otherwise crucial question of equality and human rights in *legal* and *constitutional* terms. Of course, the achievement of equality of opportunity is, and should be, central and irreplaceable in any democratic society, and in the Northern Ireland peace process in particular. (This, it seems is in any case reflected in [Section 75 of the NI Act](#)<sup>16</sup> (1998) where the 'good relations' duty is subordinate to the equality duty). The problem is that, the two said political parties ultimately deny that 'good relations' has a merit of its own. It is not reducible to, nor does it naturally flow, from the observation of the equality requirement<sup>17</sup>.

After much stalling of the peace process and spells of direct rule from Westminster, fast-forwarding a year from the publishing of the *A Shared Future*, the [St. Andrew's Agreement](#)<sup>18</sup> of 2006 heralded an apparently steadier devolution era<sup>19</sup>. The new [Programme](#)

[for Government](#)<sup>20</sup> (of 2008–2011) promised a new *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration Strategy* to effectively replace the existing Good Relations (aka *A Shared Future*) and [Racial Equality](#)<sup>21</sup> strategies. Presumably, the *A Shared Future* was not good enough because, as Sinn Féin have pointed out on numerous occasions, it was a legacy, a residue from direct rule, and as such did not reflect the new political equilibrium after the St. Andrew's Agreement. Arguably also, the *Shared Future* agenda did not take equality seriously. It looked 'at building good relations as a way of delivering harmony...; at the symptoms of conflict rather than the causes of conflict'<sup>22</sup>. The new 'blueprint for combating sectarianism' (Belfast Telegraph, November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010) was due to be delivered for the summer of 2008 and then promised for November of that year. In September 2009 the news broke that Sinn Féin had published their own version of the policy under the title *Rights and Respect*. Outraged, the DUP released a different version of the document which was said to have been the result of negotiations between the different political parties in office – negotiations from which Sinn Féin had reportedly withdrawn. Finally, in July 2010 the consultation document on the long awaited new strategy was published.

- **Which comes first – equality or good relations?**

According to the comparative analysis of the two Northern Ireland's policy frameworks – *A Shared Future* (ASF) and *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* (CSI) – produced for the [Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust](#)<sup>23</sup> by Jennifer Todd and Joseph Ruane, 'the comparative lessons are bleak'. It reveals that:

- CSI 'jettisons the goal of 'reconciliation' emphasised in Shared Future' and replaces it instead with a fuzzy notion of 'mutual accommodation';
- CSI also 'sees 'cultures' and 'identities' as given and stable entities...amounting 'to a reification of 'cultures' which pushes change into the future and loses sight both of the positive potential and of the dangers of the present' (2010: 3).

It is concluded that '*Cohesion* is in danger of treating the community relations task too simply and of jettisoning key strategic goals. For example, the important goals of "encouraging shared neighbourhoods, tackling the multiple social issues effecting (sic) and entrenching community separation, exclusion and hate"' (2010: 4). Not only have both documents failed to effectively advance a discussion on 'how to best organise the institutional delivery of the community relations imperative' (ibid) but by not elaborating on the very notion of 'good relations' (which, despite being mentioned over 70 times is not defined in any part of the *Cohesion* document<sup>24</sup>) the CSI in effect increases the chances of the good relations duty being interpreted in a manner that actually runs contrary to both human rights and equality duties ([NI Human Rights Commission, response to CSI](#)<sup>25</sup>). Surely in Sinn Féin's books this must go down as ironic.

#### Materialising the Debate in Belfast

Many may wonder whether the apparent stage fight between 'equality' and 'good relations' (which during the *Live Issues* conference Duncan Morrow called 'one of the most frustrating arguments you can ever imagine'), is 'an argument about angels dancing on a pin

or is there a real substance'?'<sup>26</sup> One thing is certain - this is most definitely not an abstract issue. The real damage that the unimaginative juxtaposition between 'equality' and 'good relations' can do is manifested in the segregated neighbourhoods and public spaces of Belfast. It has immediate and material ramifications for the development of safe and accessible (or shared) public spaces in the city and most directly shapes not only people's livelihoods but their life chances.

Examples are easily found and perhaps none has been more notorious in recent years than the 'failure to launch' the Crumlin Road Gaol and Girdwood Barracks Regeneration Scheme which was studied in the *Conflict in Cities* Project recent research of urban regeneration in Belfast (O'Dowd, L. and Komarova, M., forthcoming). The planned regeneration is located in North Belfast, among a mosaic of loyalist and republican communities, fractured by walls and peace-lines. North Belfast was one of the key cockpits of conflict throughout the Northern Ireland Troubles<sup>27</sup> and in the years since the Good Friday Agreement has seen the most frequent and serious incidents of sectarian unrest and violence, including the [riots of the past summer](#)<sup>28</sup> over the passing of the Orange Parade through the nationalist Ardoyne area. Even more poignantly, North Belfast is notorious for deprivation in employment, housing, health and education. Some parts of it are prosperous but the five electoral wards immediately surrounding the regeneration site in question all rank in the top 5% most deprived in Northern Ireland (NISRA, multiple deprivation measure 2005). North Belfast remains firmly part of 'Troubles' or 'Interface' Belfast where territoriality is a contentious issue. It is particularly acute in the context of housing where overcrowded Catholic/nationalist areas are juxtaposed with vacant dilapidated spaces in some Protestant/unionist areas (Dunlop et al., 2002).

The draft [Masterplan for the Crumlin Road Gaol and Girdwood Barracks Regeneration Scheme](#)<sup>29</sup> (2007) is based on an aspiration for 'a transformational *Shared Future* scheme' (e.g. developing shared space). It proposes a number of developments comprising a £320m investment in the 27-acre site over a period of 15 years – an investment unheard of in this part of the city so far. It has the potential to positively transform the lives of the communities living around it – yet it has been most adamantly challenged over its proposals to develop 'shared' residential space. Bluntly put Protestant communities and politicians have vetoed such a development because the overwhelming housing need among Catholics in the area would mean that any social housing built on the site is automatically allocated to people from a Catholic community background. The fears expressed have been of the development site turning into 'Catholic territory' which is seen to be in conflict with the aspirations of the scheme to develop shared space. The public debate over the matter has been framed by the very same provisions of Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act (1998) that we discussed previously, e.g. the duties of public bodies to promote 'equality of opportunity' and 'good relations'.

The positions of the two main political parties with respect to this regeneration scheme have been to treat the wider policy context represented by *A Shared Future* from a strictly party-political point of view. Sinn Fein representatives reject the validity of this government policy and see it as sacrificing equality and social justice to inter-communal harmony. DUP representatives say that they fully support the principles behind *A Shared Future* and would defend the need to embed it in every policy context but their arguments are constructed in a way that rhetorically undermine the importance of the strategy with

respect to residential space. The position of the Department for Social Development (the managers of the scheme) on housing development within the site remains vague and in practice its role has remained equivocal. The stalling of that regeneration scheme and the debates around the public consultation on its proposed masterplan demonstrate most succinctly that changes in political governance in Northern Ireland have not undermined territorialism as a principle of spatial and social organisation in Belfast: Firstly, as it is used by the main political parties the discourse of a 'shared future' through 'shared space' fails to effectively challenge territorialism and juxtaposes the 'equality' and 'good relations' agendas, rather than linking them creatively; secondly, a complex and fragmented governance structure in Belfast means lack of clear policy integration, unsatisfactory engagement with segregation and territoriality, and ineffective policy delivery (Bradley and Murtagh, 2007)<sup>30</sup>; and thirdly, instead of leading on the process of developing shared spaces, bureaucratic management of regeneration projects acquiesces with the mutual vetoes of communities over territory in the city. These are the kind of issues that the *CSI document* should have developed a framework to address in substance but it has not.

- **'Diversity Means Business' and 'Business Means Diversity'<sup>31</sup> or Is the city more successful than its people?**

One thing, however, that there has been a degree of agreement on, with respect to the Girdwood Barracks Regeneration Scheme, is the need for economic development on the site. If sharing is not conceivable in terms of living space, it is certainly conceivable in terms of work and leisure space and support has been expressed across the board by communities and politicians for attracting investment, tourism and related job opportunities to this part of the city. On the optimistic side, this is a measure of agreement which seems to mark a significant change from the violent expressions of antagonism during the Troubles and some willingness to embrace a new system of agreed governance in Northern Ireland. The above brings us to a new, but far from unrelated point to the discussion so far:

In a city like Belfast, regeneration expresses the tension between the creative destruction and fluidity of capital and the antagonistic politics and culture of territorial fixity. But what role has capital to play in the matter of achieving a cohesive, shared and integrated society? Does its creative destructive logic have the ability to offer a viable alternative to the old Belfast of territorial fixity? Certainly, in the example above there was evidence of some cross-communal support for the project of re-imagining Belfast as a new consumerist city. But does a prosperous city mean a shared and inclusive city, and is it the city or its people that really matter?

To be sure, the link between peace-building and economic development has long been in the making with respect to the peace-process in Northern Ireland and has certainly been seen as a selling point of the political Agreement itself. The idea has been that enhanced economic development can change the substance of zero-sum territorialist politics and replace it with politics primarily concerned with economic discourse. But as the CRC chief executive Duncan Morrow was reported to have said of the *CSI* consultation document, its proposals lack co-ordination and could not deliver, partly because they did not recognise the link between community divisions and the current economic situation: "The Government's economic aims can only succeed with a serious programme to tackle

sectarianism, racism and violence. Sectarianism and antagonism cement social exclusion and destroy prosperity” (The Belfast Telegraph November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010).

Unfortunately, there are further and more unpleasant points to be made with respect to Belfast’s economic development, which may hold lessons for conflict resolution in other divided cities: The goals of tackling sectarianism, racism and violence can apparently only be ‘sold’ to politicians by waving the carrot of economic development at them because the only question on which a political agreement exists in substance is the need to enhance Northern Ireland’s and Belfast’s economic competitiveness. Regrettably, that type of agreement only works on a generic level because once crystallised around particular spaces in the city the territoriality on which political affiliation itself is based takes primacy in political discourse. Even if it didn’t, at a political level there seems to be a lack of proper interrogation and engagement with the ambiguities and precariousness of economic development itself, with respect to social inclusion.

That there is a difference between the ‘peace dividend discourse’ spawned by the peace process (O’Hearn, 2008)<sup>32</sup> and the realities of urban economic development is clear. According to the discourse Belfast already is and should continue to develop as a gentrified cosmopolitan city, based on the primacy of the knowledge economy, property development, new commercial sites and consumerism. Indeed, only recently it was reported that Belfast has one of the most successful micro-economies, being among the top five GVA (gross—value added per head) cities in the UK (Office of National Statistics, 2009 – based on statistics from 2007). Yet, this type of development is neither based on the regeneration of marginalised communities, nor stable from an economic point of view. Looking at other statistics and digging beyond them, we discover that:

- ‘Belfast is the most deprived out of the 26 Local Government Districts (LGDs).
- Belfast has eight of the 10 most deprived wards in Northern Ireland.
- Belfast has nine of the 10 worst wards in the region in relation to health deprivation.
- There are 82,986 people in Belfast experiencing income deprivation and 30,119 people experiencing employment deprivation<sup>33</sup>.
- Belfast has 150 Super Output Areas (SOAs) in total and 34% of these SOAs fall within the most deprived 10% of all SOAs in Northern Ireland.
- 6.5% of the city’s population live in 10% of the most deprived SOAs in Northern Ireland’.

**Source:** Northern Ireland Multiple Deprivation Measure 2005 (NISRA), as listed in Belfast: A Profile of the City 2010 (Belfast City Council, 2009).

In fact, looking at figures from nine years ago, when Belfast was reported to have 9, out of 10 most deprived wards in Northern Ireland ([Belfast City Council Development Brief, 2001](#)<sup>34</sup>) we can see that for the past decade the economic development discourse has brought hardly any change in the situation of those who were deprived at the outset of the peace process. Furthermore, as O’Hearn (2008) points out:

- The contraction of manufacturing in the city persists and there is lack of new industrial expansion.

- The above is accompanied by a disproportionately big and unsustainable public sector.
- An overall rise of employees hides trends, such as: irregularity of employment, gender differences (Part-time jobs for women in the service industry), and big proportion of working-age people on sickness/disability benefits.
- The economy of the city is spatially disproportionate and internally disconnected and the population of the city has benefitted unequally from the new economic conditions.

Paradoxically then, as Mike Morrissey (University of Ulster) put it at a recent seminar in the Belfast City Hall (Belfast City Council Good Relations Unit, November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010): *The city has become more successful than its people.*

- **Shared Space**

Again as Mike Morrissey suggested, over the past 20 years segregation has taken the place of religion (or community background) in being the biggest single predictor of deprivation in Belfast. Therefore, where the economic development discourse meets the imperative of desegregating the city is in the question of 'shared space' in Belfast. The creation of shared space as an aspect of promoting sharing in society in Northern Ireland has been a part of the *A Shared Future* Strategy where it was described as: 'developing and protecting town and city centres as safe and welcoming places'; 'creating safe and shared space for meeting, sharing, playing, working and living'; and freeing the public realm from threat, aggression and intimidation while allowing for legitimate expression of cultural celebration' (2005: 21). Yet, as an aspect of the broader policy approaches needed to achieve some degree of sharing among communities in Northern Ireland 'shared space' bears all the difficulties associated with defining what 'shared' means and with the above discussed diverging understandings of the role of good relations and equality for 'sharing'. Certainly, in the new *CSI document*, 'shared space' has a very limited space of its own. If anything, the suggested order of steps needed to develop shared spaces appears muddled up. On pages eight and nine of the document developing shared space is listed as a short term goal, yet at the same time reducing intimidating expressions of identity in public space, such as flags and murals, is listed as a long term goal. This is bemusing but then again perhaps, as with the case of the Crumlin Road Gaol Regeneration scheme, the purpose is not to challenge territoriality where territoriality is at its most prominent in the city but rather to further develop sharing in places like the city centre.

Not that there is anything wrong with that but we do have to ask ourselves what is the relative significance of being able to shop together or celebrate public holidays together in the city centre in the overall balance of people's everyday lives. Yes, until 10 or 15 years ago developing the city centre as a shared space was a much bigger challenge (and certainly had a bigger symbolic significance) but shouldn't we have become more ambitious than that at this stage – at least as far as visions are concerned? Again, a concern creeps up that the focus here is on developing the physical attractiveness of the city as a means to its economic competitiveness and success. A valid point, so long as the above discussed necessity for engaging with the limitations of the economic agenda are seriously addressed. The *Cohesion Sharing and Integration* document in its present form does not suggest it is.

Quoting again Duncan Morrow's words from the *Live Issues* conference (with which this commentary started): 'This policy document is too small to deal with this big stuff!'

[Responses to the Cohesion, Sharing and Integration Strategy](#)<sup>35</sup> consultation document from the voluntary sector in Northern Ireland are available on the web.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.community-relations.org.uk/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/content-equality-newpage-csi/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.sinnfein.ie/>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.dup.org.uk/default.htm/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.northernireland.gov.uk/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.sdip.ie/>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.allianceparty.org/>

<sup>9</sup> For the text of the Agreement go to <http://www.nio.gov.uk/agreement.pdf> ; For commentaries on the significance of the Agreement go to the following BBC web page: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/northern\\_ireland/understanding/events/good\\_friday.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/northern_ireland/understanding/events/good_friday.stm)

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/index/equality/community-relations/a-shared-future-strategy.htm/>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/>

<sup>12</sup> Graham, B. and Nash, C. (2006) 'A Shared Future: Territoriality, pluralism and public policy in Northern Ireland', *Political Geography*, 25 (3): 253 – 278.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.asharedfutureni.gov.uk/index/responses-atoz.htm/>

<sup>14</sup> Nash, C. (2005) 'Equity, diversity and interdependence: cultural policy in Northern Ireland' *Antipode* 37(2), 272–300.

<sup>15</sup> In fact, since the DUP's response was not made publically available at the above mentioned website, it has been said that the party did not produce such a response – something which was considered telling of their whole attitude to good relations (see article in endnote 2). Here we refer to another document in which the position of the party with respect to the *A Shared Future* consultation document was expressed, e.g. Hinds, B. (2004) (ed.) [A Shared Future: Written Report. Working paper QU/GOV/1/2004.](#)

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/index/equality/statutory-duty/section\\_75.htm/](http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/index/equality/statutory-duty/section_75.htm/)

<sup>17</sup> As the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission helpfully point out in their response to the *CSI* consultation, '[t]he term 'good relations' is not defined in the legislation. A definition of the term is found in the good relations duty in the Equality Act 2010 [for Great Britain], but this does not apply to Northern Ireland'. The latter document defines the duty to promote good relations as '... having due regard in particular as the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding' [section 149 (5)] (NIHRC, 2010: 12).

- 
- <sup>18</sup> [http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/transitional/info\\_office/Act.pdf/](http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/transitional/info_office/Act.pdf/)
- <sup>19</sup> Media comments on the significance of the [St. Andrew's Agreement](#) .
- <sup>20</sup> <http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/issues/politics/programme/pfg251007.pdf/>
- <sup>21</sup> <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/race-equality-strategy.pdf/>
- <sup>22</sup> Interview with Sinn Féin representative for the 'Conflict in Cities' research project, February 2009.
- <sup>23</sup> <http://www.jrct.org.uk/>
- <sup>24</sup> As pointed out by the NI Human Rights Commission in their response to CSI (2010).
- <sup>25</sup> [http://www.nihrc.org/dms/data/NIHRC/attachments/dd/files/114/Response to CSI consultation \(October 2010\).pdf/](http://www.nihrc.org/dms/data/NIHRC/attachments/dd/files/114/Response_to_CSI_consultation_(October_2010).pdf/)
- <sup>26</sup> In the words of Noel Thompson – the host journalist of a recent [BBC2 Hearts and Minds Programme](#) (20 September, 2010).
- <sup>27</sup> Accounting (together with West Belfast), for over one third of the total number of fatalities during the conflict.
- <sup>28</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-11379746/>
- <sup>29</sup> <http://www.dsdni.gov.uk/precis-crumlin-masterplan.pdf/>
- <sup>30</sup> Bradley, C. and Murtagh, B. (2007) *Good Practice in Local Area Planning in the Context of Promoting Good Relations*. Belfast: Belfast City Council (Good Relations Research Programme).
- <sup>31</sup> Posters for the EU, European Regional Development Fund, *Investing in your Future* programme.
- <sup>32</sup> 'The Northern Irish Economy after Ten Years of 'Peace'', *Ethnopolitics*, 7:1 (2008), pp.101-118.
- <sup>33</sup> Presently, the population of Belfast Urban Area is estimated at approx. 567,000 - of which 276,000 are in the Belfast City Council area.
- <sup>34</sup> <http://www.belfastcity.gov.uk/stateofthecity/docs/developmentbriefarchive/developmentbrief2.pdf/>
- <sup>35</sup> <http://www.community-relations.org.uk/campaigns/csi-consultation/>