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The Argument

74-year-old Batisha Hoxha was sitting in her kitchen with her 77-year-old husband, Izet, staying warm by the stove. They had heard explosions but did not realize that Serbian troops had already entered the town. The next thing she knew, five or six soldiers had burst through the front door and were demanding “Where are your children?”

The soldiers began beating Izet, “so hard that he fell to the floor,” she said. While they were kicking him, the soldiers demanded money and information on the whereabouts of the couple’s sons. Then, while Izet was still on the floor looking up at them, they killed him. “They shot him three times in the chest,” recalled Batisha. With her husband dying before her, the soldiers pulled the wedding ring off her finger.

“I can still feel the pain,” she said. They fired shots... and finally they kicked Batisha and a 10-year-old boy who was staying with them and told them to get out.

“I was not even outside the gate when they burned it.” ... Her husband’s body was in the flames. In that moment she was paralyzed. She was standing on the street in the rain with no house, no husband, no possessions but the clothes she was wearing. Finally, strangers passed in a tractor and bundled her into their wagon. Batisha’s daughter later found her in a refugee camp in northern Albania.

Looking tenderly at her one photograph of herself and Izet, Batisha murmurs: “Nobody understands what we have seen and what we have suffered. Only God knows.”

This is how murderous ethnic cleansing was wreaked on one household in the village of Belanica in Kosovo in the very last year of the 20th century. The perpetrators were Serbs, using murder and mayhem to terrify the local Albanians into flight. Then the land could be occupied by Serbs, as was “our historic right,” they said. Now the Kosovo boot is on the other foot. Since 1999 Albanians have been kicking out Serbs. Kosovo is now cleansed, not of Albanians but of almost all its Serbs.

Change the names of the people and places and the incident could have occurred almost anywhere in the world over the past few centuries – in
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Australia, Indonesia, India, Russia, Germany, Ireland, the United States, Brazil. Ethnic cleansing is one of the main evils of modern times. We now know that the Holocaust of the Jews — though unique in important ways — is not unique as a case of genocide. The world’s genocides remain thankfully few, but they are flanked by more numerous cases of less severe but nonetheless murderous cleansing.

This book offers an explanation of such terrible atrocities. For the sake of clarity, I lay it out up front now, in the form of eight general theses. These proceed from the very general to the particular, from the macro to the micro, successively adding parts of an overall explanation. I hope to prove these in the course of the book by examining in detail the very worst cases of cleansing, those that have involved mass murder.

1. My first thesis concerns the broad historical era in which murderous cleansing became common. Murderous cleansing is modern, because it is the dark side of democracy. Let me make clear at the outset that I do not claim that democracies routinely commit murderous cleansing. Very few have done so. Nor do I reject democracy as an ideal — I endorse that ideal. Yet democracy has always carried with it the possibility that the majority might tyrannize minorities, and this possibility carries more ominous consequences in certain types of multiethnic environments.

This thesis has two parts, concerning modernity and democracy. Ethnic cleansing is essentially modern. Though not unknown in previous history (and probably common among the very small groups who dominated prehistory), it became more frequent and deadly in modern times. The 20th-century death toll through ethnic conflict amounted to somewhere over 70 million, dwarfing that of previous centuries. Additionally, conventional warfare increasingly targeted entire peoples as the enemy. Whereas civilians accounted for less than 10 percent of deaths in World War I, they rocketed to over half in World War II and to somewhat above 80 percent in wars fought in the 1990s. Civil wars, mostly ethnic in nature, were now taking over from interstate wars as the main killers. Perhaps 20 million have died in them, though it is impossible to be precise (figures have been hazarded by Chesterman, 2001: 2; Fearon & Laitin, 2003; Gurr, 1993, 2000; Harff, 2003; Markusen & Kopf, 1995: 27–34).

Ethnic and religious conflicts continue to simmer as I write in 2003 – in Northern Ireland, the Basque Country, Cyprus, Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Algeria, Turkey, Israel, Iraq, Chechnya, Azerbaijan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka, Kashmir, Burma, Tibet, Chinese Xinjiang, Fiji, the southern Philippines, various islands of Indonesia, Bolivia, Peru, Mexico, the Sudan, Somalia, Senegal, Uganda, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Nigeria, Congo, Rwanda, and Burundi. Over half of these cases involve substantial killing. As you read these words, one ethnic crisis probably will be exploding into violence on your television screen or newspaper, while several other explosions will not
be deemed newsworthy. The 20th century was bad enough. Perhaps the 21st will be even worse.

The mayhem committed on September 11, 2001, and the “war against terrorism” that it triggered, have imprinted the horror of murderous ethnic and religious strife on the consciousness of the entire world. It has especially struck home in the prosperous countries of the North, shielded from such things over the past half-century. Neither the attack of September 11 nor the retaliatory attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq had as their intent ethnic cleansing, but they promptly became entwined with ethnic-religious conflicts involving cleansing between Israelis and Palestinians, Sunni and Shi’ite Muslims, Iraqis and Kurds, Russians and Chechens, Kashmiri Muslims and Hindus, and various Afghan tribes. In fact, some seem to be leading by the nose the foreign policies of the Great Powers.

Thus, unfortunately for us, murderous ethnic cleansing is not primitive or alien. It belongs to our own civilization and to us. Most say this is due to the rise of nationalism in the world, and this is true. But nationalism becomes very dangerous only when it is politicized, when it represents the perversion of modern aspirations to democracy in the nation-state. Democracy means rule by the people. But in modern times the people has come to mean two things. The first is what the Greeks meant by their word demos. This means the ordinary people, the mass of the population. So democracy is rule by the ordinary people, the masses. But in our civilization the people also means “nation” or another Greek term, ethnos, an ethnic group – a people that shares a common culture and sense of heritage, distinct from other peoples. But if the people is to rule in its own nation-state, and if the people is defined in ethnic terms, then its ethnic unity may outweigh the kind of citizen diversity that is central to democracy. If such a people is to rule, what is to happen to those of different ethnicity? Answers have often been unpleasant – especially when one ethnic group forms a majority, for then it can rule “democratically” but also tyrannically. As Wimmer (2002) argues, modernity is structured by ethnic and nationalist principles because the institutions of citizenship, democracy, and welfare are tied to ethnic and national forms of exclusion. I concede that some other features of modernity play more subsidiary roles in the upsurge of cleansing. We will see that some modern professional militaries have been tempted toward wars of annihilation of the enemy, while modern ideologies like fascism and communism have been similarly ruthless. But underlying all this is the notion that the enemy to be annihilated is a whole people.

I clarify this first thesis with some subtheses.

1a. Murderous ethnic cleansing is a hazard of the age of democracy since amid multiethnicity the ideal of rule by the people began to entwine the demos with the dominant ethnus, generating organic conceptions of the nation and the state that encouraged the cleansing of minorities. Later, socialist
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ideals of democracy also became perverted as the demos became entwined with the term proletariat, the working class, creating pressures to cleanse other classes. These have been the most general ways in which democratic ideals were transmuted into murderous cleansing.

1b. In modern colonies, settler democracies in certain contexts have been truly murderous, more so than more authoritarian colonial governments. The more settlers controlled colonial institutions, the more murderous the cleansing. This will be demonstrated in Chapter 4. It is the most direct relationship I have found between democratic regimes and mass murder.

1c. Regimes newly embarked upon democratization are more likely to commit murderous ethnic cleansing than are stable authoritarian regimes (Chua, 2004, also makes this argument). When authoritarian regimes weaken in multiethnic environments, demos and ethnos are most likely to become entwined. In contrast, stable authoritarian regimes in such contexts tend to govern by divide-and-rule. This leads them to seek to balance the demands of powerful groups, including ethnic ones. However, a few highly authoritarian regimes deviate. They mobilize majoritarian groups into a mass party-state mobilizing the people against “enemy” minorities. The Nazi and Communist regimes discussed in Chapters 7–11 were dictatorships, not democracies, though they did emerge out of would-be democratizing contexts, which they then exploited. They mobilized the people as ethnos or proletariat. They are partial exceptions to this subthesis.

1d. Stably institutionalized democracies are less likely than either democratizing or authoritarian regimes to commit murderous cleansing. They have entrenched not only elections and rule by the majority, but also constitutional guarantees for minorities. But their past was not so virtuous. Most of them committed sufficient ethnic cleansing to produce an essentially mono-ethnic citizen body in the present. In their past, cleansing and democratization proceeded hand in hand. Liberal democracies were built on top of ethnic cleansing, though outside of the colonies this took the form of institutionalized coercion, not mass murder.

1e. Regimes that are actually perpetrating murderous cleansing are never democratic, since that would be a contradiction in terms. These subtheses therefore apply beforehand, to the earlier phases of escalation of ethnic conflict. Indeed, as escalation proceeds, all perpetrating regimes become less and less democratic. The dark side of democracy is the perversion through time of either liberal or socialist ideals of democracy.

In view of these complex relations, we will not find any simple overall relationship in the world today between democracy and ethnic cleansing – as Fearon and Laitin (2003) confirm in their quantitative study of recent civil (mostly ethnic) wars. But mine is not a static comparative analysis. It is historical and dynamic: murderous cleansing has been moving across the world as it has modernized and democratized. Its past lay mainly among Europeans, who invented the democratic nation-state. The countries
inhabited by Europeans are now safely democratic, but most have also been ethnically cleansed (as in thesis 1d). Now the epicenter of cleansing has moved into the South of the world. Unless humanity takes evasive action, it will continue to spread until democracies – hopefully, not ethnically cleansed ones – rule the world. Then it will ease. But if we wish to ease it more quickly from the world, we now have to face squarely up to the dark side of democracy.

2. Ethnic hostility rises where ethnicity trumps class as the main form of social stratification, in the process capturing and channeling classlike sentiments toward ethnonationalism. Cleansing was rare in the past because most big historic societies were class-divided. Aristocracies or other small oligarchies dominated them, and they rarely shared a common culture or ethnic identity with the common people. In fact they despised the people, often considering them barely human. The people did not exist across class lines – class trumped ethnicity.

Even the first modern societies were dominated by the politics of class. Liberal representative states first emerged as a way of compromising class conflict, giving them a plural sense of people and nation. They tolerated some ethnic diversity. But where the modern struggle for democracy involved a whole people struggling against rulers defined as foreign, an ethnic sense of the people arose, often capturing class resentments. The people was seen as a proletarian nation asserting fundamental democratic rights against upper-class imperial nations, which retorted that they were bringing civilization to their backward peoples. Today the Palestinian cause is decidedly proletarian in its tone, seeing its oppressor as an exploiting and colonial Israel – backed up by American imperialism – while Israelis and Americans claim they are defending civilization against primitive terrorists. The arguments are similar to those of class enemies of former times.

Ethnic differences entwine with other social differences – especially of class, region, and gender. Ethnonationalism is strongest where it can capture other senses of exploitation. The most serious defect of recent writing on ethnonationalism has been its almost complete neglect of class relations (as in Brubaker, 1996; Hutchinson, 1994; Smith, 2001). Others wrongly see class as materialistic, ethnicity as emotional (Connor, 1994: 144–64; Horowitz, 1985: 105–35). This simply inverts the defect of previous generations of writers who believed that class conflict dominated while ignoring ethnicity. Now the reverse is true, and not only among scholars. Our media are dominated by ethnic strife while largely ignoring class struggles. Yet in actuality these two types of conflict infuse each other. Palestinians, Dayaks, Hutus, and so on believe they are being materially exploited. Bolsheviks and Maoists believed that landlord and Kulak classes were exploiting the nation. To neglect either ethnicity or class is mistaken. Sometimes one or the other may come to dominate, but this will involve the capturing and channeling of the other. The same can be said of gender and regional sentiments.
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Indeed, murderous cleansing does not occur among rival ethnic groups who are separate but equal. Mere difference is not enough to generate much conflict. It is not Christians against Muslims that causes problems, but contexts in which Muslims feel oppressed by Christians (or vice versa). If South Africa had actually lived up to its own apartheid claim to produce separate but equal development of the races, Africans would not have revolted. They revolted because apartheid was a sham, involving racial exploitation of Africans by whites. For serious ethnic conflict to develop, one ethnic group must be seen as exploiting the other. And in turn, the imperial oppressor will react in righteous outrage against the threat of having its “civilization” overwhelmed by “primitivism” – just as upper classes do when threatened with revolution.

3. The danger zone of murderous cleansing is reached when (a) movements claiming to represent two fairly old ethnic groups both lay claim to their own state over all or part of the same territory and (b) this claim seems to them to have substantial legitimacy and some plausible chance of being implemented. Almost all dangerous cases are bi-ethnic ones, where both groups are quite powerful and where rival claims to political sovereignty are laid on top of quite old senses of ethnic difference – though not on what are generally called ancient hatreds. Ethnic differences are worsened to serious hatreds, and to dangerous levels of cleansing, by persistent rival claims to political sovereignty. I characteristically identify four major sources of power in societies: ideological, economic, military, and political. Murderous ethnic conflict concerns primarily political power relations, though as it develops it also involves ideological, economic, and finally military power relations too. Mine is essentially a political explanation of ethnic cleansing.

4. The brink of murderous cleansing is reached when one of two alternative scenarios plays out. (4a). The less powerful side is bolstered to fight rather than to submit (for submission reduces the deadliness of the conflict) by believing that aid will be forthcoming from outside – usually from a neighboring state, perhaps its ethnic homeland state (as in Brubaker’s, 1996, model). In this scenario both sides are laying political claim to the same territory, and both believe they have the resources to achieve it. This was so in the Yugoslav, Rwandan, Kashmiri, and Chechen cases, for example. The current U.S. war against terrorism aims at eliminating such outside support, labeling it terrorism (see Chapter 17). (4b) The stronger side believes it has such overwhelming military power and ideological legitimacy that it can force through its own cleansed state at little physical or moral risk to itself. This is so in colonial settler cases, as in the North American, Australian, and Circassian cases considered later. The Armenian and Jewish cases mixed these two scenarios together, since the dominant Turkish and German sides believed they had to strike first in order to prevent the weaker Armenian and Jewish sides from allying with far more threatening outsiders. All these terrible eventualities were produced by interaction between the two sides. We
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cannot explain such escalation merely in terms of the actions or beliefs of the perpetrators. We need to examine the interactions between the perpetrator and victim groups – and usually with other groups as well. For few even bi-ethnic situations lead to murderous cleansing. One or both sides must first decide to fight rather than conciliate or manipulate, and that choice is unusual.

5. Going over the brink into the perpetration of murderous cleansing occurs where the state exercising sovereignty over the contested territory has been factionalized and radicalized amid an unstable geopolitical environment that usually leads to war. Out of such political and geopolitical crises radicals emerge calling for tougher treatment of perceived ethnic enemies. In fact, where ethnic conflict between rival groups is quite old, it is usually somewhat ritualized, cyclical, and manageable. Truly murderous cleansing, in contrast, is unexpected, originally unintended, emerging out of unrelated crises like war. Conversely, in cases where states and geopolitics remain stable, even severe ethnic tensions and violence tend to be cyclical and manageable at lesser levels of violence – as we see in Chapter 16 in present-day India. But where political institutions are unstable and affected by war, violence may lead to mass murder – as Harff’s (2003) study of political cleansings across the world confirms.

There are different forms of political instability. Some states were fragmenting and factionalizing (like the Hutu state of Rwanda); others had been seized and were being newly consolidated, determinedly repressing dissidents and factionalism (like the Nazi state). In some brand-new states, consolidation was very uneven (as in the new Bosnian and Croatian states). But these were not stable and cohesive states, whether democratic or authoritarian. Nor were they often the failed states that political science researchers have shown are most likely to generate civil wars (the Congo at the beginning of the 21st century is an exception). Ethnic cleansings are in their most murderous phases usually directed by states, and this requires some state coherence and capacity.

6. Murderous cleansing is rarely the initial intent of perpetrators. It is rare to find evil geniuses plotting mass murder from the very beginning. Not even Hitler did so. Murderous cleansing typically emerges as a kind of Plan C, developed only after the first two responses to a perceived ethnic threat fail. Plan A typically envisages a carefully planned solution in terms of either compromise or straightforward repression. Plan B is a more radically repressive adaptation to the failure of Plan A, more hastily conceived amid rising violence and some political destabilization. When these both fail, some of the planners radicalize further. To understand the outcome, we must analyze the unintended consequences of a series of interactions yielding escalation. These successive Plans may contain both logical and more contingent escalations. The perpetrators may be ideologically determined from quite early on to rid themselves of the ethnic out-group, and when milder methods fail, they
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almost logically seem to escalate with resolute determination to overcome all obstacles by more and more radical means. This was true of Hitler and his myrmidons: the Final Solution of the Jewish question seems much less of an accident than the logical escalation of an ideology ruthlessly overcoming all obstacles in its path. For the Young Turks, however, the final solution to the Armenian problem seems much more contingent, flowing out of what they saw as their suddenly desperate situation in 1915.

To downplay intentionality like this is morally uncomfortable, often involving me in arguing against those who speak in the name of the victims. Genocide of the Jews, the Armenians, the Tutsis, of some colonized native peoples, and of others was deliberately accomplished. The evidence is overwhelming. But surviving victims like to emphasize premeditation by their oppressors. This probably derives mostly from their need to find meaning in their sufferings. What could be worse than to regard such extreme suffering as accidental? In *King Lear*, Edgar says of his sufferings: “Like flies to wanton boys are we to the gods.” I find that a tempting theory of human society, but I doubt many victims do. I am not actually arguing that murderous cleansing is accidental, only that it is far more complex and contingent than blame-centered theories allow. It is eventually perpetrated deliberately, but the route to deliberation is usually a circuitous one.

7. There are three main levels of perpetrator: (a) radical elites running party-states; (b) bands of militants forming violent paramilitaries; and (c) core constituencies providing mass though not majority popular support. Elites, militants, and core constituencies are all normally necessary for murderous cleansing to ensue. We cannot simply blame malevolent leaders or ethnic groups en masse. That would be to credit leaders with truly magical powers of manipulation or whole peoples with truly remarkable single-mindedness. Both assumptions are at odds with everything sociologists know about the nature of human societies. In all my cases particular elites, militants, and core constituencies are linked together in quite complex ways, forming social movements that (like other social movements) embody mundane power relations. Power is exercised in three distinct ways: top-down by elites, bottom-up by popular pressures, and coercively sideways by paramilitaries. These pressures interact and so generate mundane relations like those found in all social movements – especially of hierarchy, comradeship, and career. This has a big impact on perpetrators’ motives, as we will see in a moment.

The notion of core constituencies reveals that murderous cleansing resonates more in environments favoring combinations of nationalism, statism, and violence. The main core constituencies are ethnic refugees and people from threatened border districts; those more dependent on the state for their subsistence and values; those living and working outside of the main sectors of the economy that generate class conflict (who are more likely to favor class over ethnonationalist models of conflict); those socialized into acceptance of physical violence as a way of solving social problems or achieving
personal advancement – like soldiers, policemen, criminals, hooligans, and athletes; and those attracted to machismo ideology – young males striving to assert themselves in the world, often led by older males who were socialized as youths in an earlier phase of violence. So the main axes of stratification involved in cleansing movements are region, economic sector, gender, and age. Radical ethnнационаlist movements tend to contain a normal class structure: leaders come from the upper and middle classes, the rank-and-file from lower down – with the real dirty work often performed by the working class. I explore all these groups’ motivations, careers, and interactions.

8. Finally, ordinary people are brought by normal social structures into committing murderous ethnic cleansing, and their motives are much more mundane. To understand ethnic cleansing, we need a sociology of power more than a special psychology of perpetrators as disturbed or psychotic people – though some may be. As the psychologist Charny (1986: 144) observes, “the mass killers of humankind are largely everyday human beings – what we have called normal people according to currently accepted definitions by the mental health profession.”

Placed in comparable situations and similar social constituencies, you or I might also commit murderous ethnic cleansing. No ethnic group or nation is invulnerable. Many Americans and Australians committed murderous cleansing in the past; some Jews and Armenians – the most victimized peoples of the 20th century – have perpetrated recent atrocities against Palestinians and Azeris (and, in turn, some of these victim groups are also perpetrators). There are no virtuous peoples. Religions tend to stress the presence in all humans of original sin, the human capacity for evil. Indeed, placed in the right circumstances and core constituencies, we are almost all capable of such evil – perhaps even of enjoying it. But original sin would be an insufficient explanation for this, since our capacity for evil becomes realized only in the circumstances explored in this book. In the case of cleansing, these circumstances are less primitive or ancient than modern. There is something in modernity releasing this particular evil on a mass scale.

Given the messiness and uniqueness of societies, my theses cannot be scientific laws. They do not even fit perfectly all my case studies. For example, Nazi genocide does not fit neatly into thesis 3, since Jews were not claiming sovereignty over any part of Germany. In Chapter 7 I offer a modified, indirect version of thesis 3 in which Jews seemed to German ethnнационаlists to be implicated as conspirators in other groups’ claims to political sovereignty (especially as so-called Judeo-Bolsheviks). In each case I investigate the extent to which my theses apply, pointing out necessary differences and modifications. Chapters 2 and 3 present a brief history of cleansing from ancient to modern times, showing how ethnic cleansing was originally quite rare but then became endemic in the world of the Europeans, at first in rather mild ways that remained subordinate to class conflict. Mass murder has been ubiquitous if uncommon throughout most of human history. But murder in
order to remove (" cleanse") a people was rare in earlier centuries. Things became more dangerous with the rise of salvation religions and then with the rise of rule by the people. The empirical core of the book then consists of a series of studies of the worst outbursts of modern murderous cleansing. In all of them I go from the most general causes of danger zones to the events that precipitated going over the brink to the actual processes and perpetrators of murderous cleansing.

My analysis must also confront two difficulties of method. Murderous cleansing is fortunately rare. How can we generalize about such few cases? Might not the causes be unique to each case? To some extent this is true. Nazis and their hatred for Jews were unique. So is the situation of Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda, living among each other across the country, unable to withdraw to their own core territories. All my cases have peculiarities that I must respect. Second, to consider only these cases would be to cover only cases that do escalate to mass murder, ignoring the more numerous cases where ethnic tensions get defused. This would be what social scientists call *sampling on the dependent variable*. So Chapter 16 examines contemporary India and Indonesia to see why diverse ethnic rivalries lead to varying degrees of violence. Finally, Chapter 17 reviews my theses and surveys trends in the world today.

**DEFINING TERMS: ETHNICITY, NATION, ETHNIC CLEANSING**

Ethnicity is not objective. Ethnic groups are normally defined as groups sharing a common culture and common descent. Yet culture is vague and descent usually fictitious. A common culture may refer to a relatively precise characteristic, like a shared religion or language. But it may merely refer to a claim to share a way of life – which cannot be precisely defined. Common descent is mythical for any group larger than a clan or a lineage (what I shall call a *micro-ethnicity*). The future use of DNA analysis will probably reveal that relatively immobile populations share substantial common heredity, but this will not be so for most large groups claiming ethnic commonality. People who define themselves as Serbs or Germans or Scots actually descend from many smaller descent groups who have moved around and intermarried with their neighbors. Claims to commonality among large groups actually aggregate together numerous descent groups. This book discusses these *macro-ethnicities* formed by social relations other than biology or kinship. None of the ethnic conflicts considered here are natural or primordial. They and their conflicts are socially created.

They are created in diverse ways. A common language is important in uniting Germans but not Serbs (their language is shared with Croats and Bosniaks). Religion is important for Serbs (their orthodox Christianity distinguishes them from Croats, Bosniaks, and Albanians) but not Germans (divided into Catholics and Protestants). Theories of civilization and race
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helped give Europeans a common sense of being civilized and then white, in contrast to their colonial subjects. Economic dominance or subordination can form identities, and so can military power. Imperial conquerors often create macro-ethnicities by allocating particular roles to groups they define as belonging to a single people or tribe. Finally, a shared political history as an independent state or province is of ubiquitous importance – as it is for Scots, not distinct in language or religion from the English but with a distinct political history. Given this diversity, it is safer to define ethnicities subjectively, in terms they themselves and/or their neighbors use.

An *ethnicity* is a group that defines itself or is defined by others as sharing common descent and culture. *So ethnic cleansing* is the removal by members of one such group of another such group from a locality they define as their own. A *nation* is such a group that also has political consciousness, claiming collective political rights in a given territory. A *nation-state* results where such a group has its own sovereign state. Not all self-conscious nations possess or desire nation-states. Some claim only local autonomy or entrenched rights within a broader multiethnic state.

Ethnic groups treat each other in many ways, most of which do not involve murder. Since the advent of global news media, the few cases involving mass murder have been imprinted upon our consciousness. But thankfully, they are rare. The continent of Africa figures mostly in the Western media only for really bad news. But there are only a few African cases of murderous ethnic cleansing – in a continent in which all states are multiethnic. Fearon and Laitin (1996) estimate all the cases of serious ethnic violence as less than 1 percent of all the multiethnic environments found in Africa. Table 1.1 identifies degrees of both violence and cleansing in ethnic relations. This enables us to distinguish murderous ethnic cleansing from nonmurderous cleansing, as well as from outbreaks of mass violence and killing whose purpose is not to ethnically cleanse. It concerns only the violent cleansing of civilians, excluding mass killings that are commonly legitimated by the rules of war.

Table 1.1 contains two dimensions: the extent to which a group is eliminated (cleansed) from a community and the extent to which violence is used to achieve it. Remember that since ethnic groups are culturally defined, they can be eliminated if their culture disappears, even if there is no physical removal of persons. People can change their cultural identity. But I shall not fly in the face of normal understandings of the term ethnic cleansing to include within it mere cultural elimination, except by placing inverted commas around the word cleansing in such cases – as I do in this table. But it is important to distinguish the various forms that cleansing and “cleansing” might take.

The terms found in Table 1.1 will be used throughout this book. The first row of the table begins with policies that contain no significant violence. Row 1, column 1 contains the ideal way to handle ethnic differences,
## Table 1.1 Types of Violence and Cleansing in Intergroup Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Violence</th>
<th>Types of Cleansing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. None</td>
<td>Partial abandoning of identity, e.g., through voluntary official language adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional coercion</td>
<td>Cultural suppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policed repression</td>
<td>Selective policed repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Violent repression</td>
<td>Generalized policed repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unpremeditated mass deaths</td>
<td>Exemplary and civil war repression, systematic reprisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Premeditated mass killing</td>
<td>Mistaken war, civil war and revolutionary projects, fratricide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Darker shading indicates the core of the zone of murderous cleansing discussed in this book; lighter shading indicates a borderline zone in which it may occasionally occur.
The Argument

through equal treatment and respect for all ethnic groups – \textit{multiculturalism}. Some multicultural states simply ignore ethnicity, treating all persons as equal regardless of their ethnicity. Their constitutions do not mention the rights of ethnic groups, while political parties and social movements (apart from cultural ones) do not organize around ethnicities. This is a common ideal in countries of ethnically plural immigration, like the United States or Australia. Since such immigrant groups cannot plausibly claim their own state, they present no threat to the existing state, and the constitution can safely ignore their ethnicity. Thus many people in the United States and Australia aspire to a culture that is multicultural but to a polity that is ethnically blind. Their politics would then concern class, region, gender, and so on more than ethnicity.

Things differ in the more potentially dangerous situation in which ethnic groups dominate distinct territories or can otherwise aspire to create their own states or regional autonomies. Multicultural ideals here have difficulty remaining ethnically blind in the political arena. They do not ignore ethnicity but explicitly build it into constitutions through collective guarantees for different ethnicities. This might be through \textit{confederal} methods (ethnicities have a degree of regional control, as in contemporary Nigeria) or \textit{consociational} methods (they are guaranteed power sharing at the center, as in Belgium). Such entrenchments are aimed at binding all major groups into the state. Here politics concerns ethnicity as well as class, region, gender, and so on, but hopefully they will be the politics of ethnic compromise. Affirmative action programs are a much milder, liberal version of this that guarantee protections at the individual level for out-groups. Toleration is the weaker and commoner version of recognizing the reality of multiculturalism. Toleration implies that we have feelings of hostility toward the out-group but are trying hard to suppress them. Unfortunately, these first policies are mostly ideal, not real-world, polities. Most ethnic relations are less tolerant than this.

The next two columns of row 1 include cases where ethnic groups weaken or disappear without violence, cleansed but by consent. This happened in the later phase of ethnic homogenization in Western Europe. By the mid-19th century in France or Britain, their states needed to apply little coercion to eliminate minority languages. Minorities accepted that their own regional language – say Breton or Welsh – was backward, depriving their children of success in modern society. Most immigrants to the United States or Australia similarly acquire English voluntarily, do not teach their children their own original language, and abandon many other ethnic cultural practices. Their descendants may retain only a sentimental sense of being Germans, Slovaks, or Welsh. So \textit{voluntary assimilation} produces a cleansed society, not from hostile acts by the dominant group but by positive inducements. White immigrant groups in the United States or Australia lost most of their earlier ethnic identity as they pursued economic and status success and social conformity
and became Americans or Australians. This is a pretty harmless and marginal form of cleansing, lamented only by those who value the preservation of traditional cultures. Indeed, the word cleansing (even inside its inverted commas) may be inappropriate here.

Row 2 contains the first escalation of violence, to *institutional coercion*. Discrimination is probably the most common policy of all. It limits the rights of the out-group but permits its members to retain their ethnic identity. Discrimination typically involves preferential hiring, redlining residential districts, negative cultural stereotyping, offensive interpersonal behavior, and police harassment. Most countries discriminate against some minorities. African Americans still suffer discrimination 150 years after the abolition of slavery and 50 years after the civil rights movement. Take, for example, the offense sardonically described in the United States as “driving while black,” in which the cop pulls over a black man because he is driving “too good” a car. All such discrimination is to be deplored, but it is a lot better than what follows in the rest of this table.

Severe discrimination can restrict rights to acquire education, the vote, public office, or property. The dominant group may also compel out-groups to use its language as the official one of education and the public sphere. Segregation is geographical partial cleansing: the out-group is ghettoized in apartheid or enslaved conditions. This may be far more oppressive than the milder forms of total cleansing. After all, many slaves would like to run away from their oppression (which would produce a more cleansed society) but are prevented by force from doing so. Here ethnic and class politics continue alongside each other. Apartheid South Africa had almost normal class politics within its white community, and some traces of them within its African and colored communities, but race dominated politics as a whole.

The next column, “Cultural Suppression,” involves total cleansing, though only through institutional coercion. Public institutions suppress the culture of the out-group, whose identity is thus forcibly assimilated into the dominant group. The group’s language may be banned from schools or offices, its religion banned, its distinctive family names changed by law. Though this is coercive, it is usually legal and involves little physical force, except to put down scattered resistance to the policy (which the next row covers). Such suppression is not often viewed as ethnic cleansing, especially if it is successfully imposed. Then, after the passage of some time, it may not be generally remembered by either group as cleansing – as, for example, with the assimilation of Welsh people into a British identity largely defined by the English. Welsh people are generally proud of what Welshness they believe they have retained, not the probably larger cultural traits they have lost. Another example is the virtually total assimilation of Provencals or Acquitainians into French identity. Many members of the out-group may react to all these ill treatments by emigrating, as the Irish did in such large numbers. This is also a partly coerced, partly voluntary form of cleansing.
The Argument

Physical violence begins in Row 3, containing *selective policed repression*. “Selective” means it is targeted at dissidents, usually protesters against row 2 policies. “Policed” means repression remains rather orderly, enforcing laws through routinized legitimate means – though this will typically also include some limited physical violence. The first column contains repression aimed specifically at protesters; the second escalates to an attempt to repress part of the out-group’s identity. The latter also contains policed implantation of settlers from the dominant group, displacing the indigenous out-group from their homes, though not from the society as a whole. An example would be the settlement of Protestant Scots on Ulster farms from the 17th century on, forcibly displacing thousands of Irish Catholic farmers. The third column moves us to *policed total cultural suppression, population exchanges, and policed deportations and emigrations*, a wide variety of state-run cleansings, coercive but not usually very violent. The policies discussed so far normally involve a fairly stable state believing only that it is enforcing the rule of law.

Row 4 introduces serious physical violence. In the first column this remains routinized and orderly. *General policed repression* is aimed at groups harboring protesters, rioters, rebels, or terrorists, inflicting sanguinary official punishment in order to coerce the main part of the group to submit. If this is routine, states will employ specialized paramilitaries whose names become notorious to out-groups – like the Cossacks or the Black-and-Tans. The next two columns involve less controlled violence. Escalation to violent partial cleansing involves settlement/displacement, as in most European colonizations, and *pogroms* and communal riots, varied short-lived forms of violence, including rioting and looting, plus some murder and rape, with mixed motives: state agencies seek to displace political tensions onto out-groups; locals enjoy the looting, violence, and rape; ethnic cleansers try to induce terrorized flight. Pogroms typically induce some emigration. Common victims have been the Jewish, Armenian, and Chinese. The next escalation is to *wild deportation and emigration*, involving enough brutality to persuade members of the out-group to flee – as in the former Yugoslavia in recent years. Cleansing of a more racial form may involve distinctively *biological* policies. Here the out-group is denied reproduction by restrictive marriage or sexual policies, escalating perhaps to forcible sterilization or to rape where the intent is to make the woman unlikely to bear children carrying the identity of the out-group. Biological cleansing tends to center on females for obvious reasons: maternity is certain, paternity only presumed.

Row 5 escalates to the violence of mass deaths that were the unintended consequence of the dominant group’s policies. The first column involves policy *mistakes*, often through submitting ethnic groups to labor conditions to which they were ill-adapted, or by revolutionaries seeking to achieve major social transformations with foolish policies – for example, the Great Leap Forward in China, which unintentionally killed millions. The implication is that once the mistake is realized, the policy will be abandoned, and so the
out-group will not be wiped out. I do not wish to exonerate the perpetrators here, for the number of dead may be enormous. Most big mistakes border on the next category, labeled callous policies. These are not directly intended to kill the out-group, but the dominant group has such negative views of the out-group that it does not particularly care if this ensues. This is not quite true of the leadership of the Great Leap Forward, but its slowness in reacting to the disaster did reveal a relative lack of concern for the lives of the victims. Wars and civil wars loom large in the callous category, especially in the devastation inflicted on civilian populations through laying waste to the country or bombing cities. The limiting case is the very first colonization of Caribbean islands by the Spanish. By the time the colonialists collectively realized what their impact on the natives was, virtually all the natives were dead, which makes this strictly ethnocide.

Ethnocide refers to the unintended wiping out of a group and its culture. This will usually be extremely callous, and the dominant group may even welcome the elimination of the out-group. Ethnocide characterized the main thrust of many terrible encounters between colonial settlers and indigenous peoples, in which most deaths resulted from diseases carried from the dominant to the out-group, worsened by living on reservations and terrible labor conditions that were not intended to kill, but that did wear down the natives to near death. More of this in Chapter 4.

Finally, row 6 contains premeditated mass killing of civilians. Exemplary repression is how I style most of the more atrocious imperial conquest policies of history— for example, putting an entire city to the sword in order to cow other cities into submission. Recent military campaigns have involved indiscriminate bombing of cities, as in Dresden, Tokyo, and Hiroshima. The Romans sometimes decimated, killing every tenth person of a rebellious population. In the Balkans in the 1940s, the German army killed 50 local civilians for every German killed by guerrillas. Rebels and terrorists are usually capable of only smaller atrocities of this type, though September 11 was a very large one. Today, all exemplary repression could be theoretically prosecuted under international law as war crimes or crimes against humanity— though those who win wars are rarely prosecuted. Civil wars usually involve greater slaughter of civilians than do interstate wars.

Then come mass murders whose intent is partial cleansing. Forced conversion offers a stark choice: “convert or die,” as Serbs were told by Croat Catholic Ustasha forces during World War II. In pogroms, Jews were often given such a choice. Some members of the out-group are killed, either because they resist or because perpetrators wish to show that the choice is for real. But most live, cleansed partially— of their religion but not their entire culture. Polticide, a recently coined term, refers to killing where the intended target is the entire leadership and potential leadership class of a more generally victimized and feared group (as defined by Harff & Gurr, 1988: 360). This may overlap with exemplary repression, though politicide has a more
cleansing intent. Wiping out leaders and intellectuals is intended to undermine the out-group’s cultural identity, whereas cities cowed into submission through exemplary repression may retain their identities. By killing all educated Poles, the Nazis intended to wipe out Polish cultural identity, just as Burundian Tutsis intended to wipe out Hutu cultural identity in killing educated Hutus.

I add my own coined term, classicide, to refer to the intended mass killing of entire social classes. Since this may be more murderous than forced conversion or politicide, I have arrowed it in the table toward, but not in, the genocide category. The Khmer Rouge were the worst perpetrators; Stalinists and Maoists perpetrated short bursts. The victim classes were thought to be irredeemable enemies. Classicide seems to be distinctive to leftists, since only they are tempted to believe they can do without opposed (“exploiting”) classes. Rightist regimes of capitalists and landlords always recognize that they need workers and peasants to do the work for them. Thus the mass slaughter by the Indonesian Army and Islamic paramilitaries of at least 500,000 Indonesian Communist sympathizers in 1965–6, though it disproportionately killed poor peasants, was targeted at a political rather than a class enemy—at Communists, not peasants or workers. It was politicide, not classicide. In Communist regimes like the Khmer Rouge, and under Stalinism and Mao, it entwined with mistakes and callousness. All three types can be prosecuted as war crimes or crimes against humanity.

Finally comes genocide, a term invented in 1944 by the Polish lawyer Raphael Lemkin. The United Nations modified Lemkin’s definition to say that genocide is a criminal act intended to destroy an ethnic, national, or religious group, which is targeted for destruction as such. This definition is sometimes criticized because it includes both too much and too little. It adds that “partial” destruction counts as genocide. Partial genocide makes sense only in geographic terms. Settlers in California in 1851 attempting to wipe out all the Indians from the Owens Valley embarked upon partial, in the sense of local, genocide. The decision of Bosnian Serb commanders to kill all the men and boys of Srebrenica in 1994 might be also so labeled, since local women could not survive on their own as a viable community. But when killings are mixed in with forced deportations as in the nearby cleansings of Prijedor, this seems not to be a local genocide. But, conversely, genocide should cover more than just ethnic groups (Andreopoulos, 1994: Part I). Genocide is intentional, aiming to wipe out an entire group, not only physically but also culturally (destroying its churches, libraries, museums, street names). Yet if only cultural cleansing occurs, I call this not genocide but only cultural suppression. Genocide is typically committed by majorities against minorities, whereas politicide is the reverse.

This book focuses on the worst, darkly shaded area of the table, which I collectively label murderous ethnic cleansing. I have also colored three adjacent cells in a lighter hue to acknowledge that these borderline zones