Critical Thinking Assignment
Global Ethnic Stratification according to the Conflict Perspective and Game Theory

Based on the conflict perspective and game theory (see below), what are global causes of ethnic/racial conflict and stratification? Identify these common causes specifically for each of the following: Canada, Brazil, South Africa, Rwanda, and North Ireland. What changes in global structure would reduce such conflict and stratification?

MELDING THE CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE WITH GAME THEORY
From the conflict perspective, ethnic violence and stratification boil down to three dimensions (1) conflict over scarce resources, (2) power protecting privilege and (3) ideological legitimation.

1. The first dimension of conflict theory is conflict over scarce resources. There is never enough to go around when sources of wealth are land-based. There is always of a scarcity land itself, wildlife, crops, natural resources such as oil and gold, and even strategic advantage that comes with control over territory. None of these resources are infinitely expandable, hence competition for them is often a zero-sum game. For every winner there is also a loser. Accordingly, there will be conflict between groups for dominance and control of these scarce resources.

In contrast to conflict arising from scarcity, cooperation is central to expanding post-industrial wealth based on creating and disseminating information. In a word, competition is increasingly a nonzero-sum game. Information is infinitely expandable and its full benefit often cannot be reaped without cooperation among competitors. In the post-industrial age, labor and information flows render territorial boundaries increasingly permeable and irrelevant. Technical, managerial, and professional elites—constituting the upper level of the post-industrial middle class—have a vested interest in curbing ethnic conflict and territorial disputes that disrupt the free flow of labor and data generating wealth.

The second dimension in conflict theory is power used to protect privilege. A key example of this is European colonial expansion. Colonial rule provided access to either wealth or strategic advantage. Colonizers controlled commerce and finance, whereas indigenous population provided poorly paid or forced labor and lost access to resources in their own territory. This was true for English, Dutch, Belgian, Japanese, Portuguese, and German colonial expansion. To protect their privileges, a common tactic of the colonizers was to divide and rule. In the end, cooptation and division were effective strategies for weakening resistance by the colonized.

The third dimension in conflict theory is Ideological legitimation. A major example, again, is European colonial expansion. Europeans propagated ideologies that legitimated their privileges and power. The key was to characterize colonized populations as inherently inferior and therefore incapable of amassing privileges. The colonial legacy of conflict, cooptation, and conceptual bigotry remains central to ethnic turbulence that rocks the world today.


WHY SOUTH AFRICA IS A “COLOR-CODED” SOCIETY WITH 4 COLORS AND WHY AFRIKANERS CREATED APARTHEID
MAKE NO MISTAKE: SOUTH AFRICA HAS FOUR “RACIAL” CATEGORIES, NOT JUST TWO.

**First there are whites.** Less than 10% of the population, they completely dominated government until 1994

**Second there are Africans.** Constituting almost 80% of the population in South Africa today, they are not a single culturally unified group. **The third group would be Coloureds.** They were created from sexual and sometimes marital unions between whites and blacks during early settlement of Cape. **The fourth group is Asian.** Who are they? Mostly descendants of indentured servants brought from India in the 19th century to work in the sugarcane fields. Although they are more privileged than Coloureds or Africans, they are well below whites. Indians constitute a classic middle-man minority. Because middleman minorities are often situated midway—as shock absorbers—between the dominant group and the most oppressed group. Indians are more resented by most Africans than are Whites. Tensions between blacks and Indians remain today. What is very striking, is that these 4 color groups were all legally separated under system of apartheid. What would explain this fourfold color-coded system of separation and what brought it to an end?

Apartheid is a legally enforced nonwhite subordination and segregation. The system, indeed, was very complicated! The cornerstone of apartheid was the Population Registration Act of 1950, repealed in 1991. The act required the OFFICIAL racial classification of ALL persons. The enforcement of racial registration required the creation of a PASSBOOK SYSTEM. Detailed identification papers were required of all Africans. Ultimately, this passbook system failed to curb the urban flow of Africans and passbooks were eliminated 1986.

In addition to racial registration and passbooks, a key dimension of racial apartheid in South Africa was the GROUP AREAS ACT OF 1950. By law, each of four racial groups was given specific living areas. For example, by law, Asians could not live in an area demarcated for the Coloured population. The objective was to achieve total separation so there would be no social intermingling—or worse yet sexual relations—between any of the four racial categories. Why? This was to maintain the myth of RACE as a control mechanism for an INEXPENSIVE LABOR SUPPLY. CHEAP LABOR and CONTROL OVER RESOURCES are the foundation of PRIVILEGE in systems of COLONIAL DOMINATION.

Although Asians and Coloureds did not numerically overwhelm whites, the problem with Africans was that they comprised 80% of the population. This was a huge threat to white supremacy. Therefore, Africans were housed in separate areas next to white areas called “townships.” Africans were designated officially as “temporary” residents or migratory laborers: This was a solution to need for unskilled industrial labor entering white areas only to work and then leaving. In Soweto, the township next to Johannesburg, there were more Africans than there were whites in Johannesburg.

Finally, to maintain white minority control, the Nationalist government envisioned independent nations called “Bantustans” that were supposed to correspond to areas originally inhabited by particular Bantu tribes. This was a system designed to maintain white control over all VALUABLE RESOURCES: 15% of land area was reserved for 80% of the population in the so-called Bantustans. In contrast, 85% of land area was reserved for whites, who were only10% of the population.

The BANTUSTANS created ideological legitimation for white democratic institutions, but dictatorial control over blacks & their labor: ALL Africans, despite the majority actually living in white-designated areas, were declared “citizens” of one the homelands based on tribal origins. The Nationalist government goal, then, was to create the myth that THERE WERE NO AFRICANS IN SOUTH AFRICA, only guest workers!

However, the Homelands were fictional creations. None of the areas could sustain economic independence.
Moreover, Africans living in cities had no social or cultural ties to the homelands. Finally, the fictional homelands were treated as separate countries only in South Africa. These were never recognized abroad.

WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SYSTEM? The Purpose: provide flow of cheap labor; the homelands were dumping grounds for AGED, UNEMPLOYED, and INFIRM Africans. Ultimately, without Homelands, blacks would take control. The homelands were finally abolished in 1994 by a black-dominated government.

WHY DID AFRIKANERS CREATE APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA? The ROOTS OF APARTHEID are in EUROPEAN COLONIAL CONQUEST: The Dutch East India Company established a Dutch colony in Capetown in 1652. Following the establishment of the Dutch colony, Dutch, German, and French Huguenot colonists established farms in the interior and these settlers became known as “Boers,” later called “Afrikaners.” This so-called “TREKKING” movement into the interior lasted 150 years. The Boers had to be rugged because they fought with Africans in the interior in the “Kaffir wars” for several decades;

What is critical to understanding apartheid, as a virulent form of white dominance, is that the Boers increasingly distanced themselves from their European roots. These SUBSISTENCE farmers disengaged from colony. They created a distinct Boer culture: a unique Dutch dialect developed into “AFRIKAANS language.” The Boers, later called “Afrikaners” adhered to a variant of CALVINISM whose ideas of PREDISTINATION and RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM fit RURAL conditions. The Afrikaners saw themselves in Biblical light as “CHOSEN PEOPLE” destined to prevail over Bantu and later the British. The “chosen people” narrative helped propel Boers to RESIST CHANGE. The sense of ISOLATION & permanence explains much about determination to defend a way of life. This view was not altered until the 1980s, when it became clear that the apartheid system was collapsing under its own weight. The dependence on black labor gave these laborers increasing leverage.

Contrast the Afrikaners to the British colonizers, who did not take over the Cape colony from the Dutch until the early 1800s, driving the Dutch into the interior. The British were more liberal & cosmopolitan and clashed with the Afrikaners. The British saw Black Africans in a more “PATERNALISTIC” frame, whereas Afrikaners saw Black Africans as a THREAT to their ultimate survival as a people. A key difference is the Boer concept of ‘BAASKAP”—direct domination without any pretense that black Africans were being guided toward civilization. When the Afrikaner-led National party beat the British in 1948, the most extreme wing of Afrikaners spearheaded what they saw as a GOD-ORDAINED mission to create a system of white supremacy

ARE AFRIKANERS MORE PREJUDICED personalities with a different psychology? No, their culture was unconsciously transmitted through “SITUATIONAL NORMS.” An American sociologist studying South Africa in the 1970s was surprised when thinking about his attitude change during his short stay: “One falls in with the culture and those with whom one must cooperate in assumptions and behavior. Even in my short stay I could observe the process occurring in myself: by the time I left I was beginning to unconsciously accept conditions that I found shocking when I first confronted them” (Mechanic 1978:137)

Ultimately, civil unrest and violent protests in the townships caused the collapse of Apartheid. Successful tactics were black rent strikes, labor protests, consumer boycotts, student agitations, & national marches.
THE FUSION OF FIVE COLORS IN BRAZIL?

Certainly, ethnic blending has been the predominant philosophy in Brazil. Moreover, there has been the distinctive idea of COLOR FUSION. HOW DID THE FIVE COLORS IN BRAZIL EVOLVE OVER TIME?

Because Brazil was colonized by PORTUGAL, the bulk of colonial, pre-1822, white population consisted of Portuguese colonials. The Indigenous Indian population was reduced from approximately 2.5 million to insignificance in 300 years. They were made into slaves unlike most of indigenous Indians in U.S. and died from hard labor, small pox and measles.

African slaves, which were imported for use on the sugar plantations, at one point outnumbered whites. In the Late 1500s, sugarcane became a chief cash crop, requiring labor supplied by black slaves. Some 3 to 18 million slaves were imported between 1550 and the 1850s. Slavery was not abolished until 1888.

The European immigrant influx began in the mid-1800s, mainly going to coffee plantations because of slavery’s decline. The peak immigration of white European was between 1870 and 1920 with 3 million Europeans coming. Indeed, Brazil had adopted a Social Darwinist “whitening” policy of importing whites to DILUTE the black population. WHY? Brazilian intellectuals and leadership, consistent with Western thought, believed that WHITER IS BETTER. Ultimately, between 1850 and 1950, 5 million Europeans came to Brazil, rendering, at least officially, Brazil predominately white today. Most of these immigrants went to Sao Paulo.

Finally, the Japanese began coming in large numbers starting in 1908. They settled in Sao Paulo and Parana as agricultural labor. Presently, there are more than 1.5 million Japanese in Brazil, concentrated mainly in businesses and the professions. The Official racial proportions in Brazil in 2005, for five different color categories, were as follows: 54% white (Branco), 38% mulatto (Pardo), 6% black (Preto) and 1% Asian (Amarela or yellow) and Indigina (the indigenous Indian population); 1% are undeclared; Notably, the mulatto percentage is underestimated.

Amalgamation or racial intermixing is more advanced in Brazil than almost anywhere else in the world. Starting in early 1500s, white males had unencumbered sexual access to black and Indian women. Moreover, in recent years, the mulatto or mixed category is increasing as a proportion of the Brazilian population. Indeed, the OFFICIAL IDEAL in Brazil is fusion into a single racial and cultural group, blending together Portuguese, Indians, and Africans. In Brazil, there are distinctive examples of cultural fusion: West African religious rituals are fused with Catholicism, producing cults such as Candomble and Macumba. Ironically, because the ideal of racial democracy is embraced by most Brazilians, this idea discourages the formation of a civil rights movement.

To what degree does the ideal conform to reality? No doubt, OVERT interethnic conflict is rare. Nonetheless, stereotypes remain. Blacks are thought more likely to be criminal, lazy, or mentally dull. Regarding fusion, about ¼ of marriages are interracial, but these are concentrated at the lower end of the class structure. Notably, tolerance wanes dramatically with increased contrast in the color of the partners. Indeed, it is frowned upon to mix dark with light. The negative characterization of this is captured in Portuguese as “FLY IN THE MILK.” Consequently, most marriages take place between people of SIMILAR COLOR. Indeed, most mixed marriages are between blacks and mulattos. As would be expected, mixed marriages are more frequent in the northeast part of Brazil. This is where the nonwhite population is concentrated, generating more contact between color categories.
Regarding discrimination, Brazil has never experienced either Jim Crow or the physical violence that was commonplace in the U.S. before the 1960s. Nevertheless, blacks in Brazil may be barred from clubs and hotels and undergo police harassment. Another example would be apartment house elevators in Sao Paulo, which are marked “SOCIAL” for residents or guests and “SERVICE” for maids or workman. The discriminatory implication of this is subtle, because blacks are often guided into the service elevator without regard to their ACTUAL STATUS. In screening for job applicants, ads will often use the phrase “good appearance” which unmistakably means “white.” There is also INSTITUTIONAL discrimination in Brazil. For example, nonwhites are underrepresented at the university level. This is partly the result of SELF-FULFILLING prophecy. That is, the belief that blacks have less ability legitimates less investment in educational resources for blacks. This, in turn, produces lower educational performance.

In Brazil, the government has intervened to curb prejudice and discrimination. In 1951, Brazil enacted the Afonso Arinos law, updated in 1989. This anti-discrimination law is generally thought to be unenforceable. In the last decade, there has been a radical shift in government policy: contrary to the FUSION IDEAL, prejudice and discrimination are now officially acknowledged by the Brazilian government. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION has been introduced in the 2000s with targets in government, employment, university admissions, and businesses competing for public funds. However, in Brazil, there is fear that “marking of explicit racial boundaries” for affirmative action will, by looking at people in racial terms, be in effect “creating a race question,” and worse yet, prompt American-style racial divisions.

Despite the partially fulfilled ideals of “COLOR FUSION,” Brazil is now confronting the same colonial-origin color stratification system found elsewhere on the globe, whether it be South Africa, Canada, or the United States. The dynamics of a post-industrial economy, combined with affirmative action, will be required to ever so slowly erase the colonial legacy of color.

CANADA’S IMAGE of MULTI-ETHNIC TOLERANCE and the QUIET REVOLUTION

With more than 200 ethnic groups, Canada is one of the most heterogeneous societies in world. Is Canada a BEACON of MULTI-ETHNIC HARMONY? No doubt, Canadian ideology centers on tolerance of ethnic separateness or PLURALISM within the same polity and economy. Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, in 1971 pronounced Canadian policy to be “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework.” Indeed, in 1988, Canada became the first country to adopt a national multiculturalism law. The law made retaining ethnic cultures an official doctrine.

Yet in beginning in the 1960s, the “QUIET REVOLUTION”—fueled by a powerful NATIONLIST ideology—transformed French-speaking Quebec. The Parti Quebecois or PQ demanded political liberation—dependence—for the French-speaking population. The pronounced objective was “metre chez nous” or to be “masters of our own house.” In 1970, the violent tactics of the Front de Liberation due Quebec prompted Prime Minister Trudeau to invoke the WAR MEASURES ACT, granting the police wide powers to detain and arrest. HOW WAS THIS POSSIBLE? A language-group, French speakers or “Francophones” calling for Separation from Canada. Why? How could this happen in an ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL nation— particularly one in which the pronounced policy was “multiculturalism within a bilingual Framework?”

That answer is that European COLONIAL expansion lies at the ROOT of much ethnic CONFLICT in the world today. The evolution of the ENGLISH-FRENCH DIVISION in Canada is no exception. In 1759, the English
defeated the French in Quebec, ending France’s colonial presence in North America. Significantly, the French population was granted the right to retain French civil law, the French language and the practice of Catholicism. However, from then on, French Canadians became CONSUMED with avoiding assimilation into the dominant English-Speaking group. WHY? A key reason is that the British conquest of Canada prompted an exodus of the French commercial elite. Therefore, business and finance in French-speaking Quebec became an English domain. The French were subordinated economically, even though they were a numerical majority. Indeed, the French were confined mostly to the land as subsistence farmers.

The English of Quebec created their own institutional structure: schools, businesses, churches, and neighborhoods. Significantly, this INSTITUTIONAL COMPLETENESS allowed the ENGLISH to entirely ignore the French. There was simply no need to learn the French language. This was because Jobs were controlled by English speakers. This put pressure on French Canadians to learn English rather than vice-versa. The end result is what one commentator aptly describes as “TWO SOLITUDES:” French and English living side by side but in different social worlds!

Making matters even worse, the French were the most poorly paid workers in Quebec by 1960. They ranked below newly arriving European immigrants. At the same time, the industrialization of Quebec was led, NOT by the French, but by OUTSIDERS: English-Canadian, American, and British.

Notably, Canada is not one nation but two. Political autonomy is often sought when ethnic groups occupy a definable territory like the “Francophones” or French-speaking population in Quebec. In a sense, we can speak of “NATIONS WITHIN NATIONS.” As Martin Marger puts it so succinctly: “Canada is an experiment in ‘national dualism’ with unresolved issues separating the English-speaking and French-speaking populations.” Language may promote conflict because it is the vehicle for transmitting a people’s culture.

Prime Minister Trudeau promoted a BILINGUAL Canada, but this was IRRELEVANT to Quebec. The Quiet Revolution was about making French the KEY language in Quebec. This was seen as the only means of combatting economic and cultural domination by English speakers. Indeed, French WAS MADE the OFFICIAL LANGUAGE of Quebec in 1974. Access to any but French-language schools was curbed. In 1977, Bill 101 mandated French as the prime language in all official and business interaction in Quebec. The stringent restrictions placed on instruction in English caused an outflow of “Anglophones.” Nevertheless, today, French is the unchallenged language in all institutions in Quebec, which is the territorial base of Francophones.

Ultimately, the GOAL of the QUIET REVOLUTION, to be “masters of our own house” was achieved WITHOUT secession. It is instructive that a referendum was held in 1980 and again in 1995 on the so-called “sovereignty-association” or political independence. On both occasions, secession was ultimately rejected by the voters of Quebec. Sovereignty is less significant today. Indeed, Quebec has become a more multiethnic province. In part, this is because the labor demands of a post-industrial economy have generated an influx of non-French speaking immigrants who have no interest in the issue of separation. A post-industrial economy, based on permeable boundaries and the free flow of labor, is transforming heretofore zero-sum competition for territorial—particularly land-based—resources.

In the past, French Canadian concentration in agriculture had fueled a traditional nationalism centered on staunch Catholicism. Church-promoted agrarian values opposed urbanization and industrialism. The church emphasis on humanities, classics, & religion deprived Francophones of commercial & technical skills required
in an industrial system. As a consequence, few French Canadians were prepared for skilled positions in business and science.

It was industrial development that eventually undermined pastoral, clerical Quebec culture. The needs of a post-industrial economy created a more ethnically diverse workforce at all levels, causing ethnic inequality to decline. Some now claim differences among white ethnics are nearly nonexistent. Anglophone dominance of Quebec economy has ended. French is now language of commerce and French speakers are now among the elite.

**Where do non-French, non-English Groups fit into bilingual Canada today? Is Canada a BEACON OF MULTI-ETHNIC HARMONY with regard to these groups?** Non-English, Non-French groups are about 1/3 of the Canadian population; MOST are visible minorities, of which Chinese and East Indians are the largest group. Canada embraces diversity nearly UNMATCHED by any contemporary nation. This is quite striking because, before 1962, Canada had a white-only policy favoring northwestern Europeans, especially those from Britain. The discriminatory policy was much like that in the U.S. After 1962, when the policy was changed, there was a considerable Asian influx: Chinese, East Indians, Filipinos, Vietnamese, Pakistanis, Sri Lankans, etc. East and South Asian countries have continued to be a leading source of Canadian immigrants. In fact, so-called “Visible Minorities” have dominated immigration to Canada in last 40 years. They are composed mainly of blacks from the Caribbean as well as Asians. Immigrants overall are 1/5 of the population, higher than the U.S and only exceeded by Australia. Indeed, Canada has the highest per capita rate of immigration in the world!

It is noteworthy that indigenous or aboriginal peoples comprise 4 percent of Canada’s population. Included are Native Indians, Inuit or Eskimos, and lastly the Metis, who have mixed heritage that can be traced back to French fur traders who often lived with or married Indian women. The Inuit are isolated geographically in far North. They do not qualify for special political status and are not considered Indians. For the Inuit, an autonomy agreement in 1999 created a new territory called “Nunavut” or “our land.” The area comprises 135,000 sq. miles or 1/5 of Canada’s land mass. Promoting multi-ethnic harmony, the Canadian government agreed to pay the Inuit $1 billion over a 14-year period. In 1998, the Government apologized to native peoples for 150 years of a paternalistic, sometimes racist policy. Nonetheless, good intentions only go so far. Aboriginals are at bottom of Canadian society. For example, 1/3 have less than high-school degree versus only 13% for non-aboriginals.

Ultimately, John Porter, a Canadian sociologist, called Canada a “vertical mosaic.” It was vertical because he found that social class and ethnicity were associated. It was a mosaic because of Canada’s relatively egalitarian pluralism. However, an increasingly egalitarian ethnic system is a relatively recent development. No doubt, Canadians proudly reject explicit racism, and Canada is more tolerant than the U.S. For example, blacks—who are today 2.5% of the Canadian population—do not have level of residential segregation as would be characteristic of the U.S. Further indicating moderation, about 1/3 of blacks and 20% of South Asians say they experience discrimination sometimes or often.

In conclusion, Canada displays many elements of an equalitarian corporate pluralist society. Why? Two charter groups insured that a melting pot or Anglo conformity would not have meaning as in the U.S. Canadianizing people became an empty notion when there were two dominant groups—the French and the English—as a reference point. The British-French conflict created greater built-in tolerance for the perpetuation
of ethnic identities. Yet, the demands of a post-industrial economy may explain why the significance of ethnicity is declining in Canada with each generation. There is no evidence this is any different than in the U.S.

In the end, Canadian multiculturalism is largely symbolic. There is no more retention of ethnicity in Canada than in the U.S. Ultimately, structural processes, endemic to a global economy, may be trumping cultural differences as well as slowly erasing the legacy of colonialism.

**CONFLICT IN NORTH IRELAND**

Violent ethnic conflict has occurred in such diverse places as South Africa, Rwanda, Yugoslavia, and Even Canada. Notably, visible physical differences—and even substantial cultural differences—were not required to sustain these conflicts. In Canada, ethnic conflict was centered principally on language. Is it possible that religious differences, between Christians and Catholics, could result in 3700 deaths in a modern industrial country? Or are religious difference merely the surface manifestation of something far deeper, again rooted in European colonial expansion?

In the country in question Protestants and Catholics are segregated in INSTITUTIONALLY COMPLETE Communities. Each group has its OWN neighborhoods, schools, stores, voluntary associations, and even newspapers. Social and LEISURE activity principally takes place in the churches of both Protestants and Catholics. This further reduces contact between the two ethnic groups. MARITAL SEPARATION of these groups is enforced by endogamy; apparently, the full range of caste distinctions and separations do not require physical or even substantial cultural differences. Total separation is not enforced by law, as in apartheid. It is the result of a deep-rooted customary system.

**Which country are we talking about? North Ireland!** Particularly striking is that North Ireland’s residential patterns mirror black-white separation in U.S. Some working-class areas in Belfast are divided literally by a 20-foot-high reinforced wall ironically referred to as a “peace line.” School segregation is more complete than in housing; nearly every Catholic child goes to a Catholic school and Protestants attend state, or de facto Protestant, schools. Significantly, in these schools, different histories are taught—one featuring the British perspective and the other the Irish, reinforcing distinct national identities. This reveals that religion is not the real issue.

The ROOTS of the conflict between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland are traceable to England’s COLONIZATION of Ireland and suppression of Catholics. This started in the early 1600s. In the late 1800s, support grew in England for home rule for Ireland, but this was resisted by Protestants in Ulster who were fearful of being absorbed into a Catholic majority. In 1920, six counties in Ireland’s province of Ulster, which today constitute North Ireland, were steadfast in their desire to remain part of Britain. As a consequence, the rest of Ireland was partitioned and granted independence as the Irish Free State, now the Republic of Ireland, with a Catholic majority. North Ireland was retained by England. North Ireland was populated predominately by Protestants, but a large Catholic minority became a source of enduring conflict.

Significantly, religious identities simply mark off boundaries. In the words of Marger, Protestants and Catholics constitute two sharply divided ethnic communities whose differences TRANSCEND religion. Religious affiliation, quite simply, is fused with ethnic identity and takes precedence over social class and even gender. More important than any difference in religious doctrine, however, is that each group maintains a distinctly different view of history and national identity. Heritage is British for Protestants and Irish for Catholics.
How do the Irish know who is Catholic and who is Protestant? Key Ethnic markers are place of residence and the school attended because these are rigidly segregated. Such indicators are critical because there are no apparent physical distinctions between the two ethnic groups, and except for religion, even cultural differences between Catholics and Protestants are not apparent. There are also subtle cultural cues to serve as markers, such as names common for English/Scottish or Protestant heritage versus Irish or Catholic heritage. Other subtle cues are accent, dress, and demeanor.

What, then, is causing the division between Catholics and Protestants if there are no substantial cultural or physical differences? The bottom line is that British colonial expansion into Ireland lead to Catholic economic subordination. Ethnic discrimination has been both individual and institutional. Particularly in employment and politics, Catholics historically were the chief victims.

Moreover, the ideology legitimating privileges held by the dominant group, in this case Protestants with British or Scottish heritage, perpetuates standard stereotypes of subordinate groups in Western multiethnic societies. Catholics are seen as lazy, dirty, shiftless, oversexed, ignorant, and quarrelsome. In contrast, anti-Protestant animosity stems primarily from a legacy of discriminatory treatment rather than any long-standing stereotypes.

The key issue is not religion, but political & economic domination. Ethnic discrimination, originating in British colonial expansion, lead to a cycle of violence. Peaceful protest tactics in the 1960s, calling for equal treatment of Catholics, lead to harsh British repression. In response, the Irish Republican Army reemerged as the protector of Catholic neighborhoods and began its campaign against the British army. In the 1970s and 1980s, there were bombings and assassinations carried out by paramilitary groups on both sides. Notably Northern Ireland’s turmoil—laconically referred to as “The Troubles,” ultimately resulted in 3700 deaths. Fortunately, the conflict never reached the Bosnian or Rwandan level.

What brought this conflict to an end? An expanding middle class rooted in a post-industrial economy. Higher status professional and managerial jobs, at one time closed off to Catholics, have become more accessible. Also, during the past 30 years, the Catholic-Protestant gap has been narrowed in part due to efforts to promote ethnic parity. Ultimately, it is in middle class neighborhoods and at the university level that residential and educational separation is breaking down. The cycle of violence ended in 1994. Paramilitaries on both sides declared a cease fire. Talks, aided by the U.S. and in particular the efforts of President Bill Clinton, produced a peace proposal. Direct rule by Britain was eventually replaced by North Ireland’s own power-sharing system in 2007. A watershed moment occurred when, in 2012, the Queen of England publically shook hands with the former leader of the Irish Republican Army.

GENOCIDE IN RWANDA

The Year was 1994. The world was shocked. Were unfolding events a rupture with, or the result of, globalism and modernity? In the words of Martin Marger, the ORGY of killings “reached a level of almost unimaginable proportions;” neighbors killed neighbors; relatives killed relatives; women were sexually abused before being murdered; babies were hurled into pit latrines or their heads were smashed against a rock; people were burned alive as their relatives were forced to watch; killing was carried out by ordinary peasants in addition to militia and other military units. In modern history, Rwandan genocide can only be compared to the Nazi Holocaust in the 1940s. However, unlike the latter, this was done with crude weapons, mostly machetes; ¾ of Rwanda’s
Tutsi population was eliminated in 3 months; most estimates range from 800,000 to 1 million deaths; at the genocide’s peak, 8000 were killed per day, a rate faster than the Nazi Holocaust.

How was this possible? Up to 1 million brutal deaths? A POPULAR explanation is that the mass killings in Rwanda erupted out of “ANCIENT” rivalries that “NATURALLY” and “INEVITABLY” CAUSE HOSTILITY. However, this scenario invoking PRIMITIVE ANTAGONISM is rarely the case, no matter how convenient this explanation may be from a European standpoint. Indeed, it was competition between Germany and Belgium for colonial domination of Rwanda that first set the stage for the subsequent orgy. After WWI, Belgium prevailed and Germany withdrew from the region.

It is notable that PRIOR TO Colonization, neither indigenous TUTSI nor HUTU saw the other in ethnic terms. Indeed, they SHARED the same culture, with the same language and same religion. There was some difference, although unreliable, in stature. The Tutsis tend to be taller than Hutus, but intermarriage had caused the difference to fade. What, then, was the source of ethnic antagonism between the Hutu and the Tutsi? It was clearly the result of Belgium’s “divide and rule” strategy. Tutsis were elevated to strategic positions in the colonial administration, whereas the Hutus were reduced to an ethnic minority despite their numerical predominance. Applying racial ideologies legitimating European conquest and expansion, the Belgian colonialists viewed the Tutsi as a “superior race” to the Hutu. It is not surprising that the Tutsis adopted this view readily, whereas the Hutus started to hate the Tutsi. Compounding the purposely instilled rivalry, Ethnic identity cards were issued by the Belgian colonial regime in 1926, thereby creating an official basis for the ethnic division. Clearly, then, it was the strategy of Belgian colonialists that introduced, inculcated, and put into practice ethnic rivalry for the purpose of controlling the indigenous population.

Conflict between the Hutus and Tutsis unfolded as follows: in 1959, when the Belgians began to leave, the Hutus overthrew the Tutsi and created a Hutu-led republic; 20,000 Tutsis were slaughtered and 300,000 were forced into exile in adjoining countries. Three decades later, in 1990, exiled Tutsis launched an invasion into Rwanda. Subsequently, the president of Rwanda agreed to negotiations for a power-sharing government. Unfortunately, in 1994, the Rwandan president was killed when his plane was shot down. This cataclysmic event culminated in genocidal terror over the next six weeks.

Ironically, Rwanda today is ruled by a Tutsi-led government with no viable opposition party. Rwanda is orderly and prosperous, at least in comparison with other central African countries. A tenuous national unity has been achieved, with some prospect of ethnic tranquility.

GENOCIDE IN YUGOSLAVIA

On the eve of genocide in Rwanda, ethnic violence had erupted elsewhere in the world. The year was 1993. Was this tragedy another legacy of European conquest and its legitimating colonial ideology? Or was it caused by irreconcilable hatred rooted in religion and culture? Quoting from Martin Marger: hostilities between Serbs, Croats, and Muslims “degenerated into the most ferocious conflict in recent European history.” The most horrific atrocities were committed by Serbs in Bosnia as part of campaign of ETHNIC CLEANSING; mass executions, rape camps, savage mutilations and torture, and wanton destruction of homes, churches, and mosques occurred in 1993. In 1994, the U.N. documented 187 MASS GRAVES, each containing bodies of between 3000 and 5000 Muslims who were murdered by Serbs. Approximately 200,000 WERE KILLED or disappeared in the conflict.
In particular, the SREBRENICA massacre was “so monstrous as to border on the surreal.” The city, which had served as a refuge for 40,000 in a United Nations shelter, was subsequently overrun by the Serbian army. This event was followed by hundreds being taken to fields and warehouses where they were killed with automatic rifles and shoulder-held grenade launchers. This incident prompted military and diplomatic efforts by the United States and NATO to end the war. This was only one of many massacres.

What could cause such vitriol in modern Europe? The origins, again, are traceable to the territorial expansion of a major colonial power. As usual, racial ideologies were used to divide and conquer. During WWII, after overrunning Croatia, Hitler installed a puppet fascist regime run by the Utasha Party. This Nazi puppet government, applying eugenics ideology, sought to purge the country of all Serbs, who were branded as racially inferior. Hundreds of thousands were executed. This was burned into the collective memory of Serbs, who held all Croats responsible for the killings. Meanwhile, in Serbia, Serbian guerilla bands battled against Nazis and Utashas, but also slaughtered many Croatians. It was atrocities on both sides that engendered the vitriol and distrust in the Serb-Croat conflict during the 1990s. As a consequence of German militarism and eugenics ideology, 1.5 million Yugoslavs had died in WWII, mostly from interethnic fighting.

Yet the question remains, aren’t there irreconcilable differences between Serbs, Croats, and Muslims that naturally erupt into antagonism, particularly when these groups are forced to live together in a modern nation state? The unequivocal answer to this is NO. In fact, there were decades of ethnic harmony. Ironically, Bosnia had been the epitome of “pluralism and tolerance” according to David Rief (1995). In the words of Martin Marger, Serbs, Croats, and Muslims had lived peacefully in a relatively integrated society; Orthodox churches were adjacent to Muslim mosques; intermarriage and integrated neighborhoods were common.

What, then, can explain the disruption of Bosnian ethnic harmony, almost overnight? Enter Slobodan Milosevic, opportunist politician who was later charged with war crimes by the World Court. Critics note that Serbian president Milosevic heated up ethnic emotions to serve his own political interests. Serb leaders and media fostered fear among Croatian and Bosnian Serbs that if Croatia and Bosnia became independent from Yugoslavia, they would lose all their rights and property. To drive the message home, Serbian television frequently aired films of atrocities committed by Croatian Utashas during WWII.

Ultimately, the break-up of Yugoslavia is an example of failed corporate pluralism, a system in which the government distributes resources proportionally to officially recognized ethnic groups occupying distinct territories or geographic areas. A fragile peace was established in 1995. Largely through U.S. efforts, Bosnia was divided up into tightly enclosed ethnic enclaves, reflecting a system of educational and cultural apartheid.