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Introduction

Ethnic issues have long been virtually ignored by students of International Relations (IR). During the Cold War, the causes and influence of ethnic problems and the relation between ethnic problems and international affairs went almost unnoticed by IR specialists. Several contributing factors can be readily identified. For instance, ethnic problems were suppressed within most regions of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe while East-West antagonism was perceived to be the greatest threat to international security. Moreover, as global economic interdependence increased, it seemed likely that ethnic identity would weaken as economic and political integration of Western Europe proceeded. Yet another reason ethnicity never became a subject of great concern to IR theorists was that they had traditionally taken the state-centric approach to international affairs and ethnic problems were considered domestic issues.

However, with the end of the Cold War, ethnicity has come to be regarded as a central issue related to questions of the international order. Therefore, the terms "ethnicity" and "ethnonationalism" have been appearing more frequently in IR writings. For example, IR specialists have been drawn to the issue, as the break-up of the Soviet Union was accelerated by heightened ethno-nationalism in its border regions where ethnic tensions still persist. Meanwhile, ethno-nationalism was a factor contributing to the collapse of the Yugoslavian state, and the ensuing violent ethnic conflict has had a strong impact on Western states
as well as serious repercussions for neighboring areas. Moreover, in Somalia’s case the civil war was between ethnic groups and the refugee problem has become a significant international concern.

Generally, IR analyses tend to depict these events as blowouts of historical ethnic antagonisms which had been latent during the Cold War. Some suggest that following the Cold War we should expect the reappearance of premodern kinds of ethnic conflict which will arise without warning. On the whole, IR interest in ethnicity is primarily related to its potential as a destabilizing or fragmentary factor which can threaten the Post-Cold War international order. We have to ask ourselves if this is in fact the correct approach?

Of course, there are numerous approaches to, and much research has been undertaken on ethnicity in disciplines other than IR. Perhaps it is necessary to introduce these findings into the IR discussions. If so, it may be possible to construct an independent IR theoretical approach to questions related to ethnicity, assuming that we first establish that ethnicity is an important issue in the IR field. In any case, we need to place ethnic conflict in an appropriate context within the theoretical framework of the post-Cold War world since ethnicity is clearly a factor in international conflict and ethnic conflict has increasingly become a focus of international attention.

This paper will consider how ethnicity is, and could be better, treated within the IR discipline. First a comparative overview of existing ethnicity theories will be made. Next, we will consider several recent IR studies which discuss ethnic conflict and then conclude by suggesting what directions we might pursue to consider the causes, and possibly the prevention and resolution of ethnic conflicts.

Considering Theories of Ethnicity

The term “ethnicity” came into common usage during the 1960s when there was a marked growth in ethno-national assertiveness and revitali-
zation despite moves toward increased integration in Western Europe. Particularly the Asatians, Basques, Bretons, Batalans, Corsicans, Flemings, and Occitanians asserted their rights to use their mother tongues while raising strong objections to the political and economic structures which they regarded as discriminatory. From about the same time, some ethnologists began criticizing certain assumptions of Modernization Theory including: (1) ethnic identity would necessarily wither away as a result of the processes collectively known as modernization, and (2) community loyalties would shift to those of larger communities like Canada, the European Union, or Pan-Africawith increased political and economic integration and with the expansion of communication networks.5

Though approaches to ethnicity may share similar points of view, ethnic theories differ greatly amongst disciplines, which makes it difficult to comprehend the relation among various approaches and the significance of each. The discussion below will introduce several approaches to ethnicity and consider some of their inherent shortcomings.

The Primordialist Approach

The primordial view of ethnicity has been advanced mainly by anthropologists and sociologists who have been influenced by sociobiology. They define ethnicity according to subjective and psychological features, including ethnic consciousness as recollections of ancestors and ethnic groups or nations.6 Ethnic groups are characterized by their cultures whose origins are traceable to premodern times. Moreover, group members are strongly aware of their culture, which can include such things as traditional rituals, attachment to a particular region, social practices and kinship.7 According to primordialists, blood, speech and custom have great coercive power since people have the ability to feel primordial attachment to these bonds.4 Before the advent of the primordialist approach (sometimes called as assimilationist approach), ethnicity was
generally considered a kind of residual, premodern and irrational phenomenon. However, primordialists approached ethnicity as an expression of a basic group identity. "Basic" because fundamental human attributes are passed down from one generation to the next. As a result, primordialists were able to suggest why it was quite difficult for certain ethnic groups to discard their own ethnic identity and merge with some other group. Thus, Clifford Geertz argues that primordial attachments are derived from "assumed 'givens' of social existence." 

The primordial attachments of ethnic groups are strengthened by way of resistance to modernization, regardless of whether this occurs in industrialized countries or developing ones. On one hand, Clifford Geertz suggests that it is natural that there will be explosions of grievances when the diversity of cultures, languages and primordial attachments are neglected as newly independent states are created out of colonies. On the other hand, Harold Isaacs focuses on primordial problems in industrialized countries, arguing that primordial attachments are also strengthened in contemporary industrialized societies when a crisis of identity (or "anomie") occurs between the industrialized social order and the situation despatched from traditional values and culture. Despite the diversity in points of view concerning primordial attachments, analysis is conducted using the common framework of methodological individualism.

Initially the individual character of ethnic group members is discussed, after which the personal characteristics are expanded to the level of community for analysis of the ethnic group. So, what prescription does the primordial approach advance? Geertz suggests that the state should take steps to "tame" friction between new attachments (to the modern nation state) and primordial attachments. Maintenance of domestic order in the new state requires the use of primordial attachments that are common to all ethnic groups, by striking a balance between national identity and ethnic identity in order to further pluralistic national integration.
While some aspects of the primordial approach are appealing, it is not entirely satisfactory from an IR point of view because it does not address several important questions. Firstly, it cannot satisfactorily explain why people hold fundamental attachments to their ethnicity in the first place. Secondly, it cannot deal with fluidity in the boundaries of ethnic groups, because the primordial approach emphasizes fixed ethnic boundaries. Finally, the ethnic maps drawn according to cultural factors, such as language and common ancestry, do not necessarily correspond to where actual ethnic conflict has broken out.

The Instrumentalist Approach

The instrumental interpretation is most commonly advanced by sociologists, especially those influenced by rational choice theory. Instrumentalists contend that ethnicity is something rationally selected by individuals. The central tenet is that as modernization proceeds—including industrialization and increased population mobility—ethnic identity is an outcome of objective inter-group competition in the distribution of economic resources and political authority. In other words, ethnic problems are due primarily to industrialization, which creates economic gaps of varying degree among the central urban district and rural regions. Certainly ethnicity has often been strengthened among socially disadvantaged groups as in the case of Mexican migrants to the United States. Though ethnicity can conceivably overshadow the importance of class, its attributes are changeable and far more dynamic. Important instrumentalist approaches include the “cultural division of labor approach,” the “intercolonial approach,” and even the “ethnic collective competition approach.” The last is noteworthy because it regards ethnicity as interest-seeking and functionally group-based.

These approaches emphasize the changeability of ethnicity and its fluidity, since people select their ethnicity according to the discriminatory structures which exist within their society. In stark contrast to
primordialism, instrumentalists consider economic, political and social problems as independent variables, and treat ethnicity as a dependent valuable. Obviously, the instrumentalist approach supports the position that reformation of domestic structures is necessary in order to solve ethnic problems.

From an IR perspective, the instrumentalist approach to ethnicity falls short in several ways. First, it tends to put too much emphasis on materialist factors and ethnic problems are simplified to such an extent that economic factors are made independent variables. Secondly, instrumentalists are at a disadvantage when it comes to explaining several cases in which the central economic region and the central political regions are different. For example, although Catalan is a relatively affluent region, the Catalan people still exhibit a strong sense of ethnic identity, and possible their sense of identity has even been solidified because of their affluence. Thirdly, while the primordialists give perhaps too great attention to the inner (or innate) logic of ethnic groups, instrumentalism seems to overplay the importance of socio-economic factors.

Ethno-politics

During the 1960s and 1970s, in particular, ethnic problems lead not only to the assertion of the rights of minority ethnic groups, but also to conflicts over the right of these groups to secede. As “self-determination” struggles continued, new approaches to ethnicity were advanced in order to explain or justify new realities. Consequently, certain ethnic researchers began focusing on ethnic opposition, ethnic strife and ethnic competition over the distribution of political, economic and social resources. The political ethnic approaches that emerged in this genre are generally called “ethnopolitics.”

The ethnopolitical approach rejects the preconditioning of the primordial approach, which implies that ethnic groups are essentially irrational.
The ethnopolitical approach also rejects the instrumentalist idea of a causal relationship between the reinforcement of ethnic identity from regional politico-economic disparities spurring political action by ethnic groups. Rather, Anthony Smith points out that while ethnic crystallization may require conditioning factors and situations, these alone are not sufficient conditions for the outbreak of ethnic conflict.

Smith isolates three basic processes of ethnonational transformation—“vernacular mobilization,” “cultural politicization,” and “ethnic purification”—which he uses to explain how politicization of ethnic cultures proceeds, how this politicization is linked to ethno-historical traditions, and how it can transform into ethno-nationalism. Smith argues that ethnic nationalism mainly derives from two factors: firstly, features of ethnicity and their crystallization into ethnic communities, and secondly, the impact of nationalist ideologies. In this sense, ethno-nationalists (most of whom are politicians) are the chief actors that intermediate between ethnic community and ethno-nationalism. In short, Smith’s explanation effectively differentiates among the variety of ethnic problems, simultaneously elucidating the logic of collective action by ethnic groups.

Furthermore, the ethnopolitical approach considers ethnic conflict not as the result of ethnicity being employed as a means to a rational end, but rather, as Donald Horowitz points out, ethnic enthusiasm exceeds economics, suggesting that we cannot overlook the enthusiastic aspect of ethno-nationalism given its character as a mass movement mobilized by ethnic nationalists.

Ethno-political discussions seem to hold several important implications for IR studies. One is that political leadership is indispensable for ethnic groups to take political action unless they have some acute complaints concerning the distribution of domestic resources. This approach also allows us to avoid having to choose between purely subjective or objective factors. Thus, unlike the primordialist emphasis on psychological factors
of the ethnic group, or the instrumentalist emphasis on materialism, ethnopolitics has the flexibility to effectively integrate both objective and subjective conditions. In addition, the ethnopolitical perspective can accommodate domestic political movements that arise as a result of intensive strife between ethnic groups.

An important further consideration for IR theory is that ethnopolitical researchers have undertaken extensive research into questions of how to deal with and/or solve ethnic problems. For instance, Walker Conner points out that in most cases when separatist movements are active, large segments of the ethnic group (in fact, usually the majority) do not favor secession. While separation and self-determination may often be advanced as choices available, in most cases they are unlikely to be the most preferred or actual choice of the ethnic group.

Bearing this in mind, we can appreciate how important it is to design and construct effective democratic political regimes for ethnically fragmented societies. On this it is interesting to note Ted Gurr’s observation that Western countries experienced a one-third decline in the magnitude of ethnopolitical conflict during the 1980s. Gurr’s work suggests that these countries have been relatively successful in devising policies of regional autonomy, integration and pluralism so as to prevent most ethnic protests from escalating into rebellion.

Ethnicity and International Relations

The existing research of ethnicity in the social sciences has concentrated on the relationship between the state and ethnic groups within the state, while the resolution of ethnic problems has also been considered within the framework of domestic policy. As a result, the relation between the question of ethnicity and international society has not been analyzed sufficiently, and it is difficult to consider the question of ethnicity in the context of the Post-Cold War international order because most previous studies dealt with these questions in the context of a single state. However,
it is presently necessary to examine ethnic problems from an international viewpoint, because ethnic conflict in recent years has become a serious destabilizing factor not only within states but also among them. For this reason, I would like to discuss and criticize how the mainstream approaches of realism and liberalism in IR theory treat the question of ethnic conflict.\(^7\)

Much of IR theory has paid scarce attention to the question of ethnicity. Realism has considered domestic factors as negligible in understanding international conflict, while early liberalism, which argued that people's loyalty would shift to a larger community as the transactions among them advanced, was criticized as modernism.\(^8\) While institutionalism argues the importance of international organizations, multinational corporations and NGOs, the central issue of discussion is still state-centric. In short, IR theory has considered global security and economic issues to explain international politics, and not local and parochial issues such as ethnicity.

**Realism and Ethnic Conflict**

John Lewis Gaddis argues that after the Cold War, a different form of competition from that in the Cold War period has been reemerging: The contest between forces of integration and fragmentation in the contemporary international environment.\(^9\) He argues that one of the most important forces of fragmentation is nationalism, which resurrects old barriers between nations and peoples. Gaddis considers this kind of competition "a historical fault-line" that dates back to at least the 18th century, and that has in many ways dominated the history of the 19th and the 20th-centuries.

Though his argument is deficient in the sense that it does not distinguish between state nationalism and ethnonationalism, it has become a common argument that the power of ethnic groups that has existed since their premodern period was stabilized or suppressed by the bipolar
structure of the Cold War, but in the Post-Cold War period we can expect more frequent upheavals of ethnic conflict. His argument has had a considerable impact on IR theory, and induced many arguments that the Post-Cold War would be unstable.30

Barry Posen discusses the relation between ethnicity and international structure of the Post-Cold War period more specifically.31 He applies a basic concept from the realist tradition of IR theory, “the security dilemma,” to the ethnic groups in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Posen insists that the collapse of imperial regimes can be viewed as a problem of “emerging anarchy.”32 In areas such as the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, “sovereigns” have disappeared and they have left in their wake a host of ethnic, religious and cultural groups. These groups must pay attention to a primal need: “the problem of security.” The key to security is power, and because relative power is difficult to measure, a security dilemma will follow—what seems sufficient to one state’s defense will seem offensive to its neighbors.

Posen argues that ethnic groups are doubly vulnerable because they have problems building new state structures from the wreckage of old empires. First, the capabilities available to newly independent groups will appear offensive to opposing groups because of the high cohesion of new groups. One group is likely to assume that another group’s sense of identity, and the cohesion that it produces, is dangerous, because their history rarely meets the standards that modern history holds as norms in the West. In other words, each group finds it difficult to recognize the history of other neighboring groups. Second, political geography will frequently create an “offense-dominant world” when empires collapse. Where a territorially concentrated group has “islands” of settlement of its members distributed across the nominal territory of another group, these islands can produce incentives for preventive war.33 Thus, the risks associated with ethnic conflicts in Eastern Europe are quite high, because the above situations
produce mutual fear and competition.

In such a situation, is there a way to foster a resolution of conflict in the region where ethnic conflict is taking place, or likely to take place in the near future? Realism argues that ethnic conflict cannot be resolved unless the historical hatred between the groups is remedied. As a result, realists conclude that it is difficult for outsiders like international institutions to threaten credibly in advance to intervene, on humanitarian grounds, to protect groups that fear for the future. 

Yet, if the conflict has perceived security implications for outside actors, such commitments may be considered necessary. Outside powers can provide material resources, including armaments to help groups protect themselves and maintain some semblance of a balance of power. However, this kind of policy will often increase offensive military capacities of those groups that sought defense in the first place and provide them with the means to launch an offensive assault. In addition, vague security commitments from outsiders who do not have much at stake will not be particularly credible. Security commitments will be credible not only if an ethnic war has perceived security implications for powerful outside actors, but also if those outside actors can make definite and enforceable commitments.

The realist security dilemma analysis of ethnic conflict is somewhat persuasive, but it is pessimistic about the ability of outside powers to resolve ethnic conflicts. The precondition of ethnic conflict that realism possesses is quite different from that of existing ethnic approaches and as a result highlights some weaknesses in the realist approach. First, realism has the same weakness as primordialism by assuming that ethnicity is a group rooted in pre-modern history and, as a result over-estimates the history of hostility towards other ethnic groups.

Second, the process of ethnic conflict which realism considers is quite different from existing ethnic research. Since realism stresses the impact of change in the international structure on ethnic relations, it is difficult
to apprehend the process of how ethnic conflict has been aggravated domestically. Certainly, realism can explain the international structural constraints on ethnic conflict and how, once those constraints are lifted, the risk of ethnic conflict rises. Yet, as existing ethnic research has shown most ethnic conflict occurs within existing states and a realist state-centric structural approach cannot adequately explain this because it neglects considerable domestic factors, such as regime types, state policies or the role of leaders of ethnic groups.

Third, the background of ethnic conflict is different. Existing ethnic research considers the decade of the 1960s as the beginning of ethnic conflict, when newly independent states, freed from colonial control, proceeded towards modernization. Gradually the feature and scope of ethnic conflict has changed. On the other hand, realism regards the emergence of ethnic conflict as a result of the end of the Cold War. It can be said that realism threats the Cold War as a stable period with no serious ethnic conflicts.

Liberalism and ethnic conflict

The realist analysis of ethnic conflict does not consider the definition of ethnicity and the process of ethnic conflict escalation, while systemic explanations of ethnic conflict have not been discussed in the existing ethnic research. Thus, IR could contribute to a new framework for ethnic research by probing the relation between international structure and ethnic conflict. However, realism is inadequate to consider the possibility of preventing and resolving ethnic conflict by outside actors.

Liberalism, on the other hand, has considered the importance of the role of international organizations, and the liberal framework argues that outside actors, especially the international organizations, have the potential to find a resolution to ethnic conflicts. Liberalism holds the proposition that the substance of anarchy could change. In this case, international institutions could be the key to solving serious ethnic
conflict. The role of outsiders such as the United Nations could survey and help mitigate ethnic tensions before disputes materialize into violence. More specifically, developing a set of guidelines for the protection of group rights by the United Nations and relevant regional organizations is considered worthwhile. It is important, therefore, that ethnic research incorporates the possibility of resolving ethnic conflict by outside actors.

Of course, the resolution of ethnic conflict in an international context has been attempted by several international organizations. First, they have been involved in domestic ethnic issues. Since the 1970s, the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities has been focusing on minority issues. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Labor Organization (ILO) has been committed to the improvement of the status of aboriginal peoples, while the Organization of American States (OAS) has been working for native-Americans. The European Union has also been involved in minority issues, and the Court of Human Rights in the Council of Europe has provided international guarantees for minority rights. Helsinki Watch, the monitoring group set up in 1978 to track compliance of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords among the signatory countries, and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) have been involved in ethnic issues within Eastern Europe.

For the most part, the human rights regime constructed by several international organizations to protect ethnic minorities in domestic society has been effective only in the western democracies, while at the broader global level the regime has remained weak. Yet, the current trend for international organizations to become involved in domestic ethnic issues on a broader scale is growing steadily. In December 1992, the UN General Assembly passed a Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities. The declaration enjoins states not just to prevent discrimination against minorities, but also to protect and promote their identity and rights. It
outlined the international community's views on ethnic issues. Discrimination against ethnic minorities had been the concern of national authorities, but the declaration reaffirms the treatment of minorities as a legitimate concern of the international community.\footnote{29}

On the other hand, the issue of ethnic conflict that extends beyond national boarders may require several sorts of involvement. In 1992, UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali presented a report, An Agenda for Peace, which insists on an enhanced capacity for preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping.\footnote{30}

The preventive diplomacy of ethnic conflict is a new issue for the UN and its code of conduct has yet to be established. In addition, it is not likely that the international resolution of ethnic conflict is superior to the principle of nonintervention in state sovereignty.\footnote{41} Yet, the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees is placing a greater emphasis on prevention, focusing on the circumstances that force people to flee. There are other international institutions concerned with ethnic conflict and refugees, including the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the CSCE, nongovernmental organizations, such as Amnesty International, and the international news media.

Conclusions

As discussed above, compared with realism, liberalism can present a more optimistic and positive view for the resolution of ethnic issues. Still, there are several weaknesses in liberalism referring to ethnic issues that must be considered.

First, liberalism does not adequately consider the cause of ethnic conflict and what factors are likely to sustain that conflict. If the amount and magnitude of ethnic conflict increases beyond the capability of international organizations to resolve it, liberals may be forced to take a more pessimistic view to the future as do realists. Second, liberalism does
not adequately explain the relation between the systematic level change brought on by the end of the Cold War and the recent increase of ethnic conflict.

It is notable here to refer to the research Ted Robert Gurr did, who insists that ethnic conflict in the Post-Cold War is the continuation of a trend that began in the 1960s.

The main issue of the fifty most serious current ethnopoltical conflicts is contention for state power among communal groups in the immediate aftermath of state formation, revolution, and democratization. The end of the Cold War contributed to the long-term trend mainly by increasing the number of states with such power transitions. Communal conflicts across fault lines between civilizations and religious traditions are more intense than others but have not increased in relative frequency or severity since the end of the Cold War. Nor is there a strong global force leading toward the further fragmentation of the state system: since 1989 no serious new secessionist conflicts have begun outside the Soviet and Yugoslav successor states... severe humanitarian problems occurs in Africa are foreseeable and, in principle, are capable of being contained and transformed through constructive regional and international action.

Liberalism will therefore have to inquire into both the longer historical roots of ethnic conflict and the systemic factors that intensity and multiply that conflict.

We might look back to the findings of ethnopoltics, which considered policies of regional autonomy, integration and pluralism that western countries have implemented. Policies of affirmative action and multiculturalism are much more likely to contribute to civil peace in multi-ethnic societies than historical patterns of segregation, involuntary assimilation and suppression of autonomy movements. To extend this finding, it can be said that the concern at the international level of ethnic issues and the attempt by many international organizations to protect minority rights, show that the norms which were constructed in western democracies are becoming internationalized and shared by more and more actors in international politics. Ethnic issues are no longer just considered domestic issues
and there is a trend towards international action to prevent and resolve ethnic conflicts.

If this hypothesis is valid, it appears that what has changed is the relation between ethnic conflict and outsiders. From the realist point of view, it seems that there was no ethnic conflict throughout the Cold War, but actually ethnopolitical conflicts were relatively common and increased steadily, as Walker Conner points out. The United States and the Soviet Union were involved as outsiders in many ethnic disputes, but these were regarded as East-West ideological disputes in the Third World and not as ethnic conflicts per se.⁴

Consequently, now that the Cold War has ended there is growing awareness in international society of ethnic issues and the need to resolve them as ethnic conflicts and not as pawns in the superpower global struggle for client states. Even though the two superpowers have ended their involvement in regional conflict, the role of outsiders to manage ethnic conflict in some regions still remains. International institutions are expected to play a meditative role in ethnic conflict. In addition, it is important to be actively involved in the domestic issues related to ethnic minorities because, as Jenonne Walker points out, the best course of action is to address ethnic problems early, before concrete disputes materialize and violence erupts.⁴ This view shows that ethnic conflicts are easier to prevent than resolve.

It may be useful to refer to the proposition of constructivist approaches.⁴５ Constructivist approaches propose that in all politics, domestic and international, actors reproduce or alter systems through their action. Political structures are dependent for their reproduction on the practices of actors. Moreover, reproduction of the practice of international actors depends on the reproduction of practices of domestic actors. Friedrich V. Kratochwil states that “fundamental changes of the international politics occur when actors, through their practices, change the rules and norms constitutive of international interaction...Fundamental changes in international politics occur when beliefs and identities of domestic
actors are altered, thereby altering the rules and norms constitutive of their political practices."

From the point of view that international norms and rules, which are constituted by the projection of domestic norms and rules of the main actors, affect the domestic norms of actors, it could be said that once the norms related to the protection of ethnic minorities are established at the international level, they could affect the practices and norms of most, if not all, states in international society. After the Cold War, international society has been growing more awareness of the need to consider ethnic conflict from an international perspective and the attitude toward the rights of minority ethnic groups has been changing. The questions of what outsiders can do to minimize the potential for ethnic conflict, or whether outsiders insist that cultural diversity be respected and even nourished in multiethnic states involve, are key analytical and normative issues for IR theorists to tackle.
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