

*Yurij Matsievsky*

## ETHNIC CONFLICTS: TYPOLOGY, CAUSES AND FORMS OF MANIFESTATIONS

*The article attempts to explain the causes of ethnic conflict by combining the possibilities of social-psychological and sociological approaches. The theoretical ideas are illustrated by the cases from case of Ukraine-Poland conflict on the time of Second World War.*

### *Theoretical problems of the analysis of ethnic conflict*

Like all forms of social conflict, ethnic conflict reflects strained relationships between the parties involved. As poliethnicity has become the norm of most human community, so has interethnic conflict become a salient and permanent aspect of social strain. Some conflicts are explicitly manifested while others are not, as their forms range from the private experiences of anger, frustration, contempt, to public pronouncements of ethnic slurs and violent confrontations. Each society, each locale, and each incident further adds an unique set of historical situations and psychological twists, making it difficult to generalise about the nature of ethnic conflict.

In spite of exuberant literature dedicated to this problem, there is still no fully elaborated theory of ethnic conflict. The problem is also complicated by the fact that there is no common point of agreement in the theories of race and ethnic relations both as to the main categories and strategies of investigation [1].

Scholars dealing with theory building may encounter several problems: Firstly, the problem of definition. What really is ethnic conflict? Whether it is simply a form of social conflict whose actors are ethnic groups, as many theorists tend to regard it, or there is some specific issue at stake. On the other hand, after more precise analysis, it is difficult to draw a strict border between purely social and purely ethnic conflicts. Ethnic conflicts often, if not always, bear some elements of social conflict, and social conflict may include some elements of "ethnicity". Conflict may start as social, however, as it develops, it may grow into an ethnic one. One may observe the overlapping of conflicts because indi-

viduals, who play some social role, possess some interest and pursue some goals, share certain ethnicity. When the social interests of conflict sides are enhanced by the ethnic factor, the conflict appears to be more intensive and violent.

Another problem is whether it is possible to employ the same categories for an ethnic group definition as is used with social groups. It seems to be possible if one takes into account some specific concepts which are not easy to put directly into the framework of the pure sociological or psychological theories. I mean such concepts as ethnicity, ethnic identity, nation, nationalism, ethnocentrism and so on. These categories are troublesome to explain in purely sociological or psychological terms. Moreover, debate over their essence is not yet finished.

Secondly, one of the reasons why sociologists are not eagerly to engage in the study of ethnic conflict is the necessity to answer a principal question: What is the nature of ethnic conflict? Put in other words, whether is it simply an irrational action caused by such factors as accumulated frustration or aggression, lack of identity, needs of maintaining group boundaries and cohesiveness, ineffectiveness of social co-ordination etc., or there is certain (and if so, to what extent) rationality in ethnic conflict?

Related to the problem of the nature of ethnic conflict is the question of the origin of ethnic conflicts. The latter as a more general one encompasses particular questions of the emergence and timing of ethnic conflict. It is considered that there is no universal reason for ethnic conflict emergence; some factors in some situations may provoke ethnic conflict but in another may not. The task of sociological analysis is to provide the possibility to identify the immediate reason of the outbreak of conflict. However, the most troubling question for

conflict theorists is — Why in some situations where, it may seem, all necessary factors are evident, conflict does not emerge, and why, in situations, which seems to be very quiet, conflict erupts and often obtains a violent form?

Here I have only highlighted the most evident and significant problems, which need to be studied in greater detail. In this chapter I do not pretend to give definitive answer to all of them, however, some more specific problems of typology and manifestation of ethnic conflict will be considered more broadly in the course of this study.

Yet another theoretical problem worth mentioning here is the necessity of developing a typology of ethnic conflicts. Scholars generally divide conflicts into internal (in-state) and external (inter-state) ethnic conflicts. However, every scholar uses his or her own terminology. Some employ the term *interethnic* [2] referring it to internal conflicts, others use a division between *international* and *ethnic* conflict [3]. In general the discipline lacks terminological clarity, which makes it difficult to generalise a problem in a cohesive manner.

It is strangely enough, that students of ethnic conflict pay little attention to this phenomenon definition. Under the general heading of "ethnic conflict" are often placed related to it and in fact, even different phenomena. A crucial point, which needs to be emphasised here is not to confuse a conflict with related psychological phenomena such as various forms of rivalry and hostility for which ethnic conflict may be just convenient label.

In this essay an attempt will be made to consider some of these less studied problems through more specific issues of typology, forms of manifestation and partly the causes of ethnic conflicts.

#### *Definitions Ethnic and National Conflicts*

To label processes of competitive relations which take place among different segments of multiethnic societies and even between them as "ethnic conflict" is a recent and predominantly Western fashion. The trend began in times of revival of the conflict theory that pretend to be more critical and, therefore, more realistic to the demand for change made by subordinate ethnic groups [4].

Since that time the term started to be used in a very broad sense, if not to say loosely, to describe disputes between ethnic groups, nationalities, nations, nation states, as well as ethnic majorities and minorities in multiethnic societies which often are not only ethnic in character but sometimes go beyond the meaning of the term "ethnic". Such a broad definition of the term "ethnic conflict" could hardly serve either for terminological clarity or analytical purpose.

I would rather advocate a specialist (in contrast to generalist) approach to the definition of the term, which stands for its narrow meaning. Thus, what criteria should be employed for definition of the ethnic conflict?

First, and the most obvious, is a descriptive criteria which enable us to designate the main actor to conflict. The adjective "ethnic" implies that the prime part to conflict play an ethnic community or a group.

According to A. D. Smith, an "ethnic community" is "a named human population with a myth of common ancestry, shared memories, and cultural elements; a link with a historic territory or homeland; and a measure of solidarity" [5]. Six criteria must be met, therefore, before a group can be called an ethnic community. First, the group must have a name for itself; a lack of name reflects an insufficiently developed collective identity. Second, the people in the group must believe in a common ancestry. This is more important than genetic ties, which may exist, but are not essential. Third, the members of the group must share historical memories, often myth or legend passed from generation to generation by word of mouth. Fourth, the group must have a shared culture, generally based on a combination of language, religion, laws, customs, institutions, dress even food. Fifth, the group must feel an attachment to a piece of territory, which it may or may not actually inhabit. Sixth and last, the people of the group must have a sense of their common ethnicity, that is group must be self — aware. Thus, ethnic conflict by definition is a dispute between two or more ethnic communities. However, as Michael E. Brown [6] has pointed out, many ethnic conflicts start out as domestic disputes, but become interstate conflicts when outside powers became involved. This observation implies that in order to have a clear delineation of the term "ethnic conflict" we also need a criterion of a system. This criterion would allow us to separate ethnic conflict, which I consider is predominantly domestic and internal from those, which go beyond the domestic level.

In fact, the latter are International conflicts, whose actor is at least one independent state represented by sovereign nation. Such a conflicts pass the border of domestic disputes and become internationalised. However, the most part of scholars dealing with the problem of ethnic conflict do not differentiate between ethnic and national conflict. On the other hand many scholars tend to use the term "national" for conflicts, which in fact are ethnic.

The latter trend is especially evident in the Polish sociological tradition that stems from the works of such classical authors as F. Znaniecki, S. Ossowski, J. Szczepacski. These scholars who developed the grounds for "Humanistic" sociology paid much

attention to the processes of nation building, the formation of national consciousness, stereotypes, and correspondingly, national conflict. This tradition was inherited by some contemporary Polish sociologists. The prime focus still is on the processes of nation building that has been broadened to Central and Eastern Europe. If it is spoken about ethnic conflict this is to be meant that there were some deviations in the way of nation building, as it happened in the Polish Eastern borderland. To put it another way, ethnic conflict is rarely distinguished as a separate phenomenon to explore. It is rather considered as accompanied one in general process of nation building.

Since the conflicts may happen at each stage of the process of nation building, they, however, more often than not take place at the end of the nationality formation, namely, when the ethnic community is very close to becoming a political community (nation), so they are often called as national.

The other situation is with ethnologists who are primarily interested in the processes of "ethnogenesis". Correspondingly, they are more eager to accept the term "ethnic conflict" [7].

Probably the specifics of the research determine why the Polish sociologists are more prone to use a term "national" while the ethnologists (and not only Polish) more often speak about "ethnic conflict".

One could argue, for example, that the term "conflict" (not only ethnic) can either be used in a broad or narrow meaning. However, as I have stated above I tend to adopt a "specialist" perspective, that in the case of ethnic conflict can provide us not only with terminological clarity, which, in turn, could allow for the typology of ethnic conflict but, what is also important, with the means of analysis of the phenomenon in the terms of social conflict.

Human community knows different forms of competitive relation. Often they tend to be categorised under the general heading "conflict". However, after more precise analysis competitive relation can be divided into more concrete forms. With the aim of precise identification of various forms of such relation it would be useful to differentiate between such phenomena as competition, hostility, rivalry and conflict itself. Some sociologists dealing with social conflicts share the necessity of such differentiation [8].

Since there is enormous number of definitions of social conflict, no matter what perspective (specialist or generalist) they follow, the definition of ethnic conflict is quite rare. Nevertheless the tendency to generalise under the term "ethnic conflict" related to it and even different phenomena is a salient trait in current scholarly studies.

In this study I suggest to differentiate between ethnic conflicts itself and such phenomena as com-

petition, rivalry and hostility, which often precede the conflict and more often are mixed with it.

Thus following the specialist perspective the formal definition of ethnic conflict may be expressed as an *extreme form of competitive relation between two or more ethnic communities about mutually important political, economic, social, cultural, or territorial issues*.

#### *Conditions determining the types of conflict*

Conflict, by definition is often conceived as a struggle over power or scarce resources. This is also true for ethnic conflicts. An unequal distribution of resources and political power among ethnic communities within multi-ethnic states is often considered to be the cause of the ethnic conflicts [9].

Thus, it may be said that almost every ethnic conflict, among those, which are played out in the contemporary world, bears considerable political meaning.

The politicisation of the ethnic conflict may increase depending on the character of system relations to which the conflict groups belong. For this purpose the term system is used in order to specify four different conditions.

1. Whether it is a conflict between ethnic groups, which belong to one political system.
2. Whether it is a conflict between at least one ethnic community and one independent state.
3. Whether it is a conflict between independent political actors (sovereign states).
4. Whether it is a conflict, which occurs as the result of the collapse of the political system in the broad territory where those groups in conflict are primarily located.

Point three goes beyond the scope of our analysis but is included to the scheme in order to fill the logical gap in the case of its absence.

The first type I suggest defining as an intra-system ethnic conflict. This is a conflict within one multi-ethnic state. Here it is important to consider whether ethnic groups possess equal power or there is situation of domination-subordination (minority discrimination) in which a minority group strives to win political autonomy or independence, or had even already declared it but it is not recognised by the governmental body (secession). This is the most common type of ethnic conflict and the example of the Russian-Czechonian conflict exactly fits here. Such ethnic conflicts are often referred to the secessionist type. The specification of the situation might be the one in which two minority ethnic groups are in conflict while the majority group which also holds political power does not take an active part in the conflict but might be a third party in conflict instigation or regulation. An example of such a situation may be found in the Armenian-Azerbaijan

conflict in former Soviet Union. (This was also a signal of its coming crisis).

The second type one may define as transitional (from intra-system to inter-system). The conflicts of this type usually begin inside a state and occasionally elicit the third party intervention. In some cases when, for example, trouble spills over into the neighbouring countries they have moral as well as legal right to intervene (to prevent civilian slaughters, refugees exodus, chain reaction effects).

In others, neighbouring powers intervene in domestic disputes to protect the interests of their ethnic brethren, or to use it as a pretext to incorporation of the brethren's territory into their own state. Various kinds of irredentist conflicts are often referred to this subtype. Irredentism (as opposed to secessionism) is defined as the attempt by one state to detach land and people from another to achieve incorporation within its boundaries [10]. Irredentist conflicts involve whole communities and states, with very little negotiation, high level of violence, and occasional escalation of full-scale war.

The first subtype might be called as Internationalised ethnic conflict and the second as Irredentist type.

The third type is essentially inter-system since its actors are independent states. This implies that conflicts of this type become international disputes and pass into the area of International Relations.

Finally, the fourth type one may define as the breakdown conflict. In such a conflict each party while seeking to provide for their own security try to set up political control over a given territory. The last example seems to be the most interesting because it is a rather contemporary phenomenon. (Conflicts in the area of the former Soviet Union, the Balkan's conflict). However, it is also fits the case of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict during World War II.

In this case the direct and ultimate cause of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict may be explained as a result of the collapse of the Polish political system.

The collapse of the political system may be defined as the breakdown of the previously operating rules in one or more key areas: military structure (e. g., effectiveness of military conscription), financial structure (e. g., monetary policy, withholding of taxation by local authorities), or political representation (e. g., national local and regional assemblies and elections). The most important component of a political system is the monopoly of legitimate physical force over the state territory. The means of exercising force is dependant on the type of the political regime.

The loss of the legitimate control (collapse of the political regime) over the given territory is ultimately a necessary condition but is not always a sufficient one for the emergence of ethnic conflict. The

collapse itself may be caused either by internal or external conditions. Of those internal, the role of political elite is decisive. (An example is the conflicts, which have emerged in the area of the former Soviet Union, especially the Russian-Czeczenian conflict.) Revolution also refers to internal conditions.

To the external conditions one may refer the significant change in the broader international environment (generally caused by a war), which influences the stability of a certain political system. The case of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict might be illustrated by this example.

The part of the Ukrainian population involved in the conflict was previously under the Polish political regime. The incorporation of the Western Ukrainian lands into the USSR was in fact a violation of the political control over this territory. (01.09.1939 the German troops invaded Poland territory and on 17.09. 1939 Soviet troops set foot in the Western Ukraine.). This was also the factual outbreak of World War II. However, the point is that the overt Polish-Ukrainian conflict began at least three years after they were occupied by the German and Soviet troops. In fact, this implies that the occupation was not the dissolution but the substitution of political control. The real breakdown of political control happened with the beginning of the German-Soviet War.

In the first three cases, conflict is supposed to take place within some institutional arrangements, which is presupposed by the existence of a legitimate system of political control. This may also influence the possibility of conflict regulation. While in the fourth case it is impossible because the system of legitimate control is lost. This in turn may influence the high level of intensity and violence of the conflict, which therefore impedes conflict regulation.

In the types of conflict mentioned above I have specified "structural" conditions, which determine political meaning of the ethnic conflicts. It also important to take into account environmental conditions.

Of these one may distinguished at least four:

1. *The role of the allies and the third party.* Whether there are any external allies of the parties in conflict. What are the role and the political influence of the third party / I parties? (Whether they take part or not in conflict; what is their influence on the conflict process; what are their attitude towards the parties in conflict; and what is their role in conflict regulation) [11].

2. *The role of the political elite.* (The behaviour of the nationalist or antinationalist elite; that is how do they influence the choice to assimilate or not assimilate; the role of the elite in political leadership) [12].

3. *External Political Aspect.* How the parties in conflict are treated in the broader international environment. (Especially by third parties; in other words, how, for example, the Polish or Ukrainian card was played by the great powers).

4. *Internal political aspects.* What influence the conflict has on the communities of the parties in conflict and vice versa; what influence has a party in the conflict on the rival's party's community (the role of ideology, propaganda, etc.).

A precise examination of these and other variable conditions, as they will be revealed in the course of further research may help to evaluate the role of the political factors in ethnic conflicts. Let us try again to employ them to the case of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict during World War II.

#### 1. The role of allies.

In fact, the Ukrainian underground movement during the inter-war period depended on material and ideological support from Germany, the Czech-Slovak Republic, and Lithuania. After 1925 Germany played the main role. The headquarters of the Ukrainian Military Organisation (UWO) was in Berlin and its members were drawn into the German Intelligence Service [13]. However, when the German authority forbade the activity of the Ukrainian's People Council after two weeks (declared in Lviv on 30.06.1941) and imprisoned most of its leaders, those OUN activists who escaped confinement gradually reconsidered their position towards the matter of the German collaboration. The final break with the Germans occurred at the third Congress of OUN on 21—22.08.1943, fully reflected in the motto "Neither Hitler nor Stalin". One has to point out that there were no intentions at all to cooperate with the Soviets because the nature of the Stalin's regime was better known both by the party leaders and the mass of the population. Thus, one may conclude that the Ukrainian side from the moment of overt conflicts that is from the mid of 1943, had no ally in the conflict. The Polish side was in a similar situation. Neither Germans nor Soviets could be an ally, they thought, because they simply divided the Polish territory. Though some the Polish left-oriented youth served in the Soviet partisan detachments this fact can not be treated as co-operation in the conflict. They were used by Soviets to injure the "Ukrainian nationalist". Only Great Britain who gave a refuge for the Emigrant Polish Government may be seen as an ally but in fact her help was rather ideological than material.

The role of the third party in the case of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict is rather specific in the sense that the previous ally of the Ukrainians became a third party engaged in the conflict. At the same time it was a main actor in another conflict, which takes

on a different significance, namely the Soviet-German one.

In general, the case of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict during World War II implies a significant difference from other ones of this type. This conflict took place as a local event within larger ones, the Soviet-German, which was also a part of the global World War II. This implies an important conclusion concerning the nature of War as a global phenomenon. A global war like World War II might cause local conflicts, which do not emerge as a polarisation of the potential allies, but by their own rather specific issue. In this sense the war had a catalysing effect on the outbreak of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict. This case is also distinctive in the sense that theoretically if the two parties in conflict face the more dangerous threat to the both of them they have to reconcile and even unite against the common enemy. (This partly ensues from Coser's statement that the conflict with the out-group ensures internal stability and maintain the cohesiveness of the group) [14]. But this did not happen in our case. Such an exception from the obvious tendency may be explained by two points: the first, by the *third we* have in fact to mean not a party but parties, that is both Germany and the Soviet Union which kept fighting with each other as a primary foe while interfering with the course of the Polish-Ukrainian conflict from the viewpoint of their particular interests. The second, these interests consisted in maximal use of the rivals energy in order to exhaust them while damaging one's own foe. Thus, as the Germans used the Ukrainians for their struggle with the Soviets (division SS "Halizien", battalions "Roland", "Nachtigal" and the local police administration), so did the Soviets by organising the Poles into the Soviet Partisan detachments. This is also referred to the external political aspect of the conflict (see point three in our scheme).

The Internal Political Aspect. It is obvious that every conflict has an influence on the larger community of the parties in a conflict. This particularly depends on whether the action of the active groups as well as their leaders will be supported or otherwise blamed by their respective communities. However, the political leaders of the conflict always try to find support in their community no matter what course it takes. The most common way is to blame the other while seeking the legitimisation of one's own action by means of ideology and propaganda. The role of ideology and propaganda is usually of a high importance in any kind of conflict but it is particularly evident in ethnic ones. As L. Coser accurately pointed out a group tends to fight more vigorously in the name of the larger community than on its own behalf. The awareness of the group

affiliation enhances the level of participation and affects the feeling of strength [15].

That is why group leaders usually resort to ideology and propaganda in order to "help" the common people to understand who is who, who is the real enemy, whom you have to fear and whom is to be obeyed. In our case both the ideology and the propaganda were successfully used by the parties in the conflict and by the third parties as well.

Finally the role of the political elite was decisive in the course of conflict. The Polish political leaders produced a number of appeals to their population calling on them to stay in their homes and defend a territory. Their "firm" position in the territorial question contributed greatly to the conflict escalation whose victims were the Polish people.

Instead of caring about the fate of the mass of the Poles who were endangered by the Ukrainian's hatred they thought about the "Greatness" of the Polish state. The same also refers to the Ukrainian leaders who overestimated their own role in the Ukrainian liberation movement, while underestimating the political responsibility for the nation's destiny. This ensued from their nationalist world-view which was dominated by self-sacrificing and eschatological premises such as "all or nothing" and the like. One may observe, in passing, that the Polish political leadership, represented by the Emigrant Government, was more or less uniform in their position in conflict, in comparison to the OUN leaders.

In the OUN there were generational contradictions between "old" and "new" leaders. This is especially evident from the moment of a split in organization on 10.02.1940 which was caused by the political and, more plausibly, by personal motives. The new generation of the party activists led by Stepán Bandera were more radically oriented in comparison with the old leaders grouping around A. Melnyk. It is noteworthy that as far back as at the beginning of the war the OUNB (Those who followed S. Bandera) treated the Germans as a temporarily ally, trying to use their help in order to liberate the nation and found an Independent State, while the OUN led by A. Melnyk built long-term plans concerning the German collaboration. These and other tensions in the circles of the Ukrainian political elite brought to bear an inconsistency of the Ukrainian liberation movement what in turn gave rise to its desperate action and make it impossible to mitigate the course of conflict.

Concluding this part I would like to stress once more the importance of a precise examination of the role of the political elite in any kind of social conflict, especially in its turning points — the origin, dynamics and the way of regulation.

### *Typology of ethnic conflict*

Following the criterion I have chosen above one may suggest several types of ethnic conflict, which may be distinguished by the principle of the system relations.

The character of system relations	Types of conflict	The impact of conflict on International stability
Intra-system	Internal / secessionist	Low
Transitional	a) Internationalized b) Irredentist	Moderate
Inter-system	International	The international stability is highly endangered
The system collapsed	Breakdown	The stability is violated

Using this principle I propose to divide them into internal (secessionist, transitional — a) internationalized, b) irredentist) and external — International conflicts and finally, breakdown conflicts.

As to the fourth type of conflict, it may be considered as a specification of those first three because such a conflict may take place after the collapse of the single political system (one state), or to be broadened to larger political environment. Thus, the collapse of the USSR, for example, has influenced the escalation of old and the emergence of new ethnic conflicts in the Asia region. (Afghanistan, Tajikistan).

The scheme shows that as the level of complexity of the system relation increase so does a destructive impact on the International stability. The scheme also allows to separate ethnic conflicts from that of national (international) and to trace the increasing influence of the conflict on the International stability.

### *Manifestations of the ethnic conflict*

I have already mentioned that the problem of manifestation is not sufficiently elaborated in the subjects literature. There is a tendency (among some scholars) not to pay proper attention to the forms of manifestations of ethnic conflict. Here there is a risk of confusing a conflict with related phenomena such as various forms of hostility and competitive behaviour, which generally may be defined as ethnic tensions. They often precede the emergence of overt conflict, and may be said, to constitute a pre-conflict situation.

The important contribution of the sociological approach to the study of conflict consists in the

view of conflict as a process, which has separate stages of development.

Now, in order to illustrate more clearly the differences between pre-conflict situation and the conflict itself, I would like to present a general model of the conflict dynamics.

The nearly common feature of most sociological definitions of a conflict is a concentration on the notion of a process. This assumption provides a possibility to perceive a conflict as a dynamic process and distinguish each phase of its development. Thus, the period of the origin of conflict includes at least three stages: the emergence of inconsistencies in human relations (latent conflict), rationalisation of inconsistencies and their association with certain system of values (perceived conflict), the emergence of disturbances, stresses, tensions, hostile feelings and attitudes in group members mentality (felt conflict). These initial stages of the conflict process may be conceived as a pre-conflict situation. The next stage is overt (manifest) conflict, which essentially differs from the previous stages in behavioural aspects, that is the parties activity aims to achieve the object of desire. In this situation one party's activity is essentially incompatible with that of the other's, which constitutes a conflict itself. The fifth stage comes when a desire appears for conflict elimination and normalisation of the situation. It may be caused by decisive victory of one side which may try to use its victory in order to establish a new profitable order. It also may be determined by exhausting the strength of the both parties of conflict or their longing for peace. The last stage of the conflict process covers the period of normalisation of situation after the end of the conflict where the new relation and social order is formed. One has to admit, however, that this point is considered differently by various sociologists [16]. The first three stages are characterised by such phenomena as the contradiction of interests, hostile or competitive feelings. All of them are marked by negative attitudes towards the other. The central category is hostility. When the accumulated psychological tensions outflow in a hostile action toward the other, then a shift from psychological to behavioural level of conflict takes place. Thus a conflict situation resolves itself in overt conflict. As J. Bernard puts it "If the parties in question were not in the same place at the same time, or performing two incompatible functions at the same time, or co-operating to inflict reciprocal injury, there would be no conflict" [17]. Here lies an essential difference between a conflict situation and the conflict itself. A conflict thus defined is perceived as a specific form of interaction, while the hostility is nothing more than a psychological phenomenon, a certain attitude, or a predisposition towards conflict behaviour. Hostility does

not necessary turn to conflict and in each conflict hostility is not always a dominant factor. Here I tend to agree with H. Bialyszewski who suggests that each conflict bears some dose of hostility whereas different types of conflicts are characterised by different levels of hostile attitudes, and even in the same conflict the level of hostility may change from time to time. Hostility without doubt develops during the conflict, deepens it, but nevertheless remains only the variable characteristic of conflict.

In this concern, one of the most important research tasks as well as practical one is proper evaluation of the conditions under which interethnic hostility outflow into the conflict in behavioural sense.

Following this perspective one can discriminate between the three most common modes of expression or forms of manifestation of ethnic competitive relations

A) Rivalry — as an "objective" competition of group interests. (However, Mack and Snider [18], in summarising earlier research, state that competition is not regarded as conflict or a form of conflict but Dahrendorf [19], for example, made no distinction between conflict and competition).

B) Hostility — antagonism nourished by hostile sentiments. Hostility appears when one party tends to see an enemy in its opponent. This mode, according to our scheme, may be understood as "conflict" in terms of consciousness. It differs from the first one, because there are situations when the "enemy" may be viewed among those with whom there is no rivalry or struggle at all. Such "consciousness" conflict is transmitted from the past and with the help of stereotypes fixed in the present may often be observed in ethnic relations.

C) Struggle — hostile action towards each other.

Type (A) (as far as we are agreed that it may really exist) becomes really important only through empirically tested aspirations (for the observer) of one of the groups toward cultural exclusivity, or toward the occupation of some societal niches. It seems to me that conflict in the behavioural meaning (type C) appears to be crucial here. It does not necessary mean the direct contacts in the form of a physical struggle, which usually takes place in extreme situations, but also a hidden aggression, different kinds of pressures (such as by threat of strike, boycott, restriction of communication), forming hostile coalitions, etc.

### *Explaining the Causes of Ethnic Conflict*

Following two main (social-psychological and sociological) approaches ethnic conflict may be studied simultaneously as individual and group phenomena.

Thus, it seems to be useful to explore the possibilities of the social-psychological approach to ascertain what the micro- or individual level conditions influencing the emergence of ethnic conflict are, while using sociological methods for the identification of the macro-systemic or group level conditions. Y. Y. Kim [20] has named four micro-level conditions — (1) cognitive simplicity / rigidity, (2) in-group bias, (3) insecurity / frustration, and (4) divergent behaviour—which the author considered as key theoretical concepts that help draw a psychological profile of the individuals who are most likely to contribute to ethnic conflict.

As to the macro-level condition Y. Y. Kim enumerates the following: (1) history of subjugation, (2) Ideological / structural inequality, and (3) minority group strength.

A history of subjugation has been defined as fundamental societal condition crucial to understanding contemporary incidents of ethnic conflict. As Y. Y. Kim pointed out, subjugation often has taken the form of political, economic, and cultural domination through slavery, colonisation, and military conquest. I may add that these conditions explain only the internal or the conflict, which takes place within a single state.

Structural inequality presumes unequal excess to power, prestige, and economic reward, which are often considered to be scarce resources. In a colonial situation, for example, the indigenous group who was granted special status by the external group becomes the politically dominant group in the new state. The other ethnic groups either enter into political contests to protect citizen rights, ask for autonomy, or mount a secessionist movement [21]. (As such, it has been observed that society operate by and large based on the interests of the dominant ethnic group, whose beliefs and values are primarily responsible for the societal ideology). Implicitly or explicitly, the dominant societal ideology may legitimise discriminatory actions against certain minority groups. Under such an inequitable societal condition, subordinate groups' ethnic action are primarily expressions of their comparative feelings of dissatisfaction, or "relative deprivation" and symbolic claims to social parity over the political, economic, social, and cultural structures of their society [22].

Similar to this is L. Coser's explanation of the emergence of social conflict. For Coser [23], the emergence of conflict depends, in part, on whether an unequal distribution of rights is considered legitimate. Legitimacy is a crucial intervening variable without which it is impossible to predict whether feelings of hostility arising out of an unequal distribution of privileges and rights will actually lead to conflict. The negatively privileged group must

first develop the awareness that it is, indeed negatively privileged. It must come to believe that it is being denied rights to which it is entitled. It must reject any justification for the existing distribution of rights and privileges. Shifts in the degree of acceptance of a given distribution of power, wealth or status are closely connected, according to Coser, with shifts in the selection of reference groups in varying social situations.

Minority group strength is an additional factor that contributes to the emergence of inter-ethnic conflict. Given the societal inequities, minority ethnic groups vary in their ability to mobilise their community opinions and resources into collective actions against such inequities.

Sociologists have provided explanations on the differential strengths of ethnic groups according to evolutionary stages. Clarke and Opler [24], theorised that ethnic action evolves by a three-stage development: (1) the initial stage of the economic adjustment which occurs upon arrival of the group until they become an integral part of the permanent economy; (2) the second stage of community building, or the development of community leadership and institutional resources used to assert the ethnic group's interests; and (3) the third stage of aggressive self-assertion that develops into the group's conventional use of the existing political system. As a given ethnic group grows from its initial, economic adjustment stage to the later stages of community building and political self-assertion, it will increasingly show its group strength, with which it may manipulate its cultural identity or ethnicity for the common interest of the group.

As one can see this observation also refers to the case of internal conflict.

Having defined the micro and macro conditions of the emergence of ethnic conflict, one has to include here also a "technical" condition of conflict groups formation, which are common for all the types of conflict previously defined. It is obvious that the emergence of conflict demands at least two relatively organised groups. So, the question is — How are they organised? What are the causes of group formation? For this purpose I propose to distinguish between ethnic community and an ethnic conflict group. Differences between them are not only in their actual status. The more important thing is the level of organisation.

An ethnic community is a group of people, who publicly recognize their kindred origin, which differentiates them from other members of the population. Ethnic communities are characterized by certain types of culture. In contrast to an ethnic community, an ethnic conflict group, in order to be defined, demands different criteria. Here it is not enough to recognize a kindred origin, attention

should be paid to the level of organization and mobilization of the group. One ethnic community, in the case of conflict, should not necessarily be the conflict group. Moreover, one ethnic community may be divided into several groups, which are more or less organized to start a conflict. This implies a purely sociological criteria for the evaluation of the level of "readiness" of such a group to march into conflict. These sub-groups may be analysed as social groups within one ethnic community. The common feature of such groups is the public recognition of their kindred origin; the specific one is the level of organization that is the "readiness" to march into conflict. The latter may correlate with the degree of recognition of one's own distinctiveness, or the degree of ethnic identity. One ethnic group might be compared with Dahrendorf's quasi-group, where active conflict groups are formed. Dahrendorf [25] suggests that the ultimate reason for conflict group formation is the availability of interest. Their (group) orientation of interests is determined by possession or exclusion from authority. For an ethnic conflict group (a further conflict group) formation within one multi-ethnic state it seems to be a sufficient reason. But a more interesting case may be observed, with rival groups belonging to different states. For them it is an essential but not sufficient reason. Here again, we have to deal with categories, which are not purely sociological. These categories are supposed to be found within ethnic consciousness and identity. If the ethnic community occupies a relatively large territory, it is evident that the degree of ethnic consciousness may vary within its limits. The epicentre of ethnic consciousness may not necessarily coincide with the geographical centre of community. To my mind it depends on two factors: External and internal.

External: What side of the territory is most threatened for the community, this is supposed to be more ethnically consciousness (but only, if the level of ethnic consciousness was relatively high up to the moment of threat appeared, otherwise the process of assimilation would be impossible to escape).

Internal: There are a number of reasons, which should be taken into account and the most evident of them are the following:

- a) educational level of the population,
- b) urban / rural character, and
- c) the level of homogeneity of the population.

Another set of conditions which refer generally to the external conflict may be defined, follow-

ing M. Brown [26], as systemic: first, two or more ethnic groups must reside in close proximity. Second, national, regional, and international authorities must be too weak to keep groups from fighting and too weak to ensure the security of individual groups. It is far from clear, however, that the presence of these and other systemic factors by themselves will be sufficient for ethnic conflict to break out.

As I have mentioned above, a conflict may suddenly explode in a situation, which seems very quiet. Precise identification of all necessary conditions is a task for further research however those conditions just discussed might help to elucidate situations when actual conflict has the greatest chance of eruption.

### Summary

The aim of the article is to discuss the less studied problems in the field of ethnic conflict. There are visible difficulties in the theory of race and ethnic relations as to the definition, nature and origin of ethnic conflict. Besides, there are some "technical" problems of typology and manifestation of the phenomenon.

In order to develop a typology of ethnic conflict a system approach was suggested. For this purpose the term system is used in order to specify four different conditions.

1. Whether it is a conflict between ethnic groups, which belong to one political system.
2. Whether it is a conflict between independent political actors that belongs to different political systems.
3. Whether it is a conflict between at least one ethnic community and one independent state.
4. Whether it is a conflict that occurs as the result of the collapse of the political system in the broad territory where those groups in conflict are primarily located.

Using this principle I propose to divide conflicts into internal — (secessionist), transitional — a) internationalized, b) irredentist, external- international conflict and finally, breakdown conflict.

The five stages model of conflict dynamics has been developed (latent conflict, perceived conflict, felt conflict, manifest conflict and the period of normalization of situation) and three forms of manifestation defined: rivalry, hostility and struggle.

1. *Rex, J., Mason, D., Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations.* New York: Cambridge Univers. Press, 1986.

2. *Kim, Y. Y., "Explaining Interethnic Conflict".* The Annual Review of Conflict Knowledge and Conflict

- Resolution. vol. 1. Ed., by B. Gittier, Gracold Publishing, New York, 1989.
3. *Carment, D., James P.* "Internal Constraints and Interstate Ethnic Conflict", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 39, N 1, 1995, p. 86.
  4. *Horton J.* "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies", in *American Journal of Sociology*, 1966, vol.71, N 8.
  5. *Smith, A. D.* "Pluralism, Race and Ethnicity in selected African Countries". *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Ed. by J. Rex and D. Mason, pp. 28–29.
  6. *Brown, M.,* "Causes and Implications of Ethnic Conflict" in *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations*. Ed. by J. Rex and D. Mason. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p. 5.
  7. *Konflikty Etniczne*, Instytut Etnologii PAN, Warszawa, 1995.
  8. *Fine C. F.* Some conceptual difficulties in the theory of social conflict in *Journal of Conflict Resolution* N 3, 1968.
  9. *Renée de Nevers,* "Democratization and ethnic conflict". *Survival*, 1993, vol. 35, N 2.
  10. *Chazan, N.,* ed. *Irredentism and International Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991.
  11. *Dahrendorf, R.,* *Class and Class conflict in Industrial Societies*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959.
  12. *Franzjetti, Guido M. R.* "The Timing of Ethnic Conflict", unpublished manuscript.
  13. *Olszanski, T. A.* *Historia Ukrainy XX Wieku*. Volumen, Warszawa, pp. 140–142.
  14. *Coser, L.,* *The Functions of Social Conflict*, The Free Press, New York, 1966, p. 37.
  15. *Coser, L.,* *Ibidem*, pp. 116-118.
  16. *Białyczewski, H.* *Teoretyczne Problemy Sprzeczności i Konfliktów Społecznych*, Warszawa, PWN, 1983, s. 52-54.
  17. *Bernard, J.,* *The Nature of Conflict*, Paris, UNESCO, 1957, p. 47.
  18. *Mack, R. W. and Snyder, R. S.,* *The Analysis of Social Conflict: Toward an Overview and Synthesis*. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1 (1957), pp. 212–248.
  19. *Dahrendorf, R.,* *Class and Class conflict in Industrial Societies*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959.
  20. *Kim, Y. Y.,* "Explaining Interethnic Conflict", p. 105.
  21. *Nash, M.,* *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
  22. *Baker, D. G.,* *Race, Ethnicity and Power*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.
  23. *Coser, L.,* *The Functions of Social Conflict*, The Free Press, New York, 1966, p. 138.
  24. *Clarke, S. E., and J. L. Obler.* "Ethnic Conflict, Community-building, and the Emergence of Ethnic Political Traditions in the United States." *Urban Ethnic Conflicts: A Comparative Perspective*. Edited by S. E. Clarke and J. L. Obler. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1976.
  25. *Dahrendorf, R.,* *Class and Class conflict in Industrial Societies*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1959.
  26. *Brown, M.,* *Causes and Implications of Ethnic Conflict*, p. 147.

*Юрій Мацієвський*

## ЕТНІЧНІ КОНФЛІКТИ: ТИПОЛОГІЯ, ПРИЧИНИ Й ФОРМИ ВИРАЖЕННЯ

*У статті проаналізовано мало вивчені питання, що існують у галузі етнічного конфлікту. Передусім, це стосується типології, динаміки та форм маніфестації конфлікту. Для типології етнічних конфліктів запропоновано системний підхід, де за критерій взято характер відносин поміж етнічними групами у політичній системі. Теоретичні положення підкріплюються прикладами українсько-польського конфлікту в роки Другої світової війни.*