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UNCERTAIN CONNECTIONS:
GLOBALIZATION, LOCALIZATION, IDENTITIES, AND VIOLENCE

by Neil J. Smelser

University of California, Berkeley

Given the conceptual and geographical breadth of the papers prepared for this conference, providing a keynote for it has proved to be a formidable challenge. In the end I chose a strategy that is congenial for me but runs the risk of self-embarrassment. The strategy is to struggle with the issue of breadth by taking an even broader view. That is to say, I believe I can serve this occasion best by taking a critical look at the main conceptual frameworks around which the conference has been formulated. Among these are identities of dispossession, the state, borders, transnationalism (including globalization), and violence. Each of these frameworks is itself complex, and the relations among the phenomena identified are even more so. In my remarks I hope to contribute to the theoretical clarification of the frameworks, to raise some skeptical observations about some dominant presuppositions relating them to one another, and to point toward more adequate formulations and explanations. My mission is therefore both ambitious and modest—ambitious in that I intend to venture into very uncertain seas as though I have confidence that they may be made more certain, and modest in that I hope to provide a conceptual apparatus that will not challenge but will rather tease out some of the general implications of the many case studies that constitute the real meat of this conference. For documentation I have relied on a general search of the literature on the
relevant topics, but also I have exploited the recently-accumulated treasure of synthesized knowledge available in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, in which I had a major editorial role.

**A Loose Model Linking Globalization, Localization, Identity, and Violence**

To facilitate my tasks, I begin by creating what some might regard as a straw person—a kind of explanatory model (perspective or sketch might be a better terms) that ties together many of the ingredients listed above. This model is based on widely but not universally shared assumptions (that is why it is straw). Nevertheless, it represents a more or less coherent set of connections and serves as a foil for the more complex and contextualized discussion I wish to introduce.

The model begins with the world-phenomenon of *globalization*, which might be defined at the most general level as “the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of transcontinental flows and patterns of social interaction” (Held and McGrew, 2002, p. 1). To some commentators the process has the form of an “irresistible lava flow” (Langhorne, 2001, p. 1) that is transforming the world. There are disagreements about the essence of the process, but the common dimensions are the most commonly stressed:

- **technological**, which have “given human beings the ability to conduct their affairs across the world without reference to nationality, governmental authority, time of day or physical environment” (Langhorne, 2001, p. 2). Among these the information and communication revolutions are paramount
- **economic**, including the explosion in international trade, internationalization of production, and the galloping internationalization of capital and financial institutions.
• political, involving the rise of new but incomplete and inadequate forms of global governance—including international non-governmental organizations—which is “an array of formal legal arrangements, informal codes of conduct, and habitual practices based on shared expectations about legitimate action" (Benedict, 2001, p.6233).
• migration, the movement of increasing numbers of peoples across national lines
• cultural, or the spread and homogenization of a global culture, dominated by American and/or Western content and accomplished through the mass media.

An evidently complex process, globalization nevertheless is represented as an admittedly diffuse independent variable that produces two clear consequences. The first has to do with the declining the sovereignty of the nation-state occasioned by re-locating of decisive events and constellations of decision-making beyond the realm of national control (Held, 1995). Though this thesis is disputed by “anti-globalists” (Held and McGrew, 2002), it has had a certain staying power. The forces undermining the nation-state include “multinational companies, common markets, satellite communications and global environmental concerns, none of which have much respect for traditional political boundaries and the integrity of the sovereign state” (Samarasinghe, 1990, p. 1).

The second consequence of globalization is thought to excite various local, often but not always sub-national tendencies, represented as antagonistic to global tendencies which intrude in various ways—economic, political, cultural—on the autonomy and integrity of the local. In fact “most of the debates about globalization, whether scholarly or popular, have
centered around the relation and even polarity between the global and the local” (Beyer, 2001, p. 6287). On the cultural side, the tension is between homogenization of an international culture one the one hand and the reassertion of social and cultural diversity on the other (ibid.). These tendencies have been represented, albeit very simplistically, as opposites (Robertson, 2001, p. 6255). The “local” is not only regional as the term literally implies, but it subsumes groups that are ethnic, racial, indigenous, ethnonationalistic, religious, linguistic, cultural or style of life—often some mix of these. These are the foci of resistance to globalizing tendencies and the reassertion of local autonomy. In the extreme, this takes the form of “globaphobia,” or resistance to globalizing economic trends such as free trade and competition as alien and “threatening the integrity of primordiality of a particular collectivity” (ibid. p. 6256; see also Burtless, Lawrence, Litan and Shapiro, 1998).

This antagonism affects the nation-state as well, as these local assertions come to constitute claims against sovereignty as well; the nation-state is being challenged by a new wave of ethnic nationalism that has manifested itself across the globe” (Samarasinghe, 1990, p. 1). At an earlier time I myself voiced these relations as follows: nationally-based systems of political-legal and territorial integration are being increasingly besieged by economic and political developments mainly ‘from above’ and by cultural developments mainly ‘from below’ the nation-state level (Smelser, 1997, p.70). As my subsequent remarks will demonstrate, I am now in a position of wishing to recant partially on that formulation, because of its unacceptable simplicity. In all events, the drift of the reasoning I have summarized is to posit a set of zero-sum relations between globalization,
national sovereignty, and localist tendencies—that is, the more you have of the one, the more you are subtracting form the others.

The next ingredient in the complex is the group identity. The various “local” bases noted in fact constitute the major bases of identity and identity politics with which nation-states have to contend. As the local is made more salient by contemporary global developments, so are identities associated with localism. Those now writing on identity focus on (and often quietly laud) mainly the identities of minorities which involve claims for political rights or redress of past and present wrongs (Hardin, 2001, p. 7169). Identity movements defend the interest and promote the rights of these groups. There is also, frequently, “the search for symbolic recognition by a significant other” (Langlois, 2001, p. 7166).

The final and least certain connection is between identity and violence. The working assumption is that groups based on the particularistic identities may be particularly prone to violence. The bases for this assumption are two. First, even though identity groups certainly often behave like interest groups, the ideological bases of their claims are typically primordial and absolute. The further assumption is that these characteristics provide a ready legitimization for violence, containing as they do such a powerful distinction of a righteous “we” and an evil “they.” The second basis is more political in nature. Because of the ideological commitments of identity groups, they are—or at least present a posture that they are—unfriendly to compromise in a give-and-take in democratic polities which find their existence in fashioning compromises among conflict groups. Democratic regimes, in their turn, are taxed by identity groups for the very same reason, and are likely to give them short treatment because they insist on playing on the edges of the political rules of the game. The net result is
to rule out many options for accommodation of identity groups, and thereby
to increase their alienation and their willingness to turn toward more
desperate measures.

The reader will have little trouble in discerning from my language that
I am dissatisfied with the somewhat simplified connections I have described.
However simplified, they do inform much of the literature. By and large,
the rendition I have given takes whole complexes of variables and treats
them as undifferentiated causes. As such, the connections come up short
with respect to specific mechanisms involved and, consequently,
explanatory adequacy. My aim in the remainder of these remarks will be to
visit each one of the supposed connections and specify the contingent
variables that should be consulted in order to make our understanding of the
connections more realistic and adequate.

Transition #1: Subglobal Effects of Globalization

Under this heading I will discuss, first, the issue of the impact of
globalization on the system of nation-states—briefly, because this is
somewhat peripheral to the topic of the conference—and, second, the impact
of globalization on what I referred to above as “locality.”

The Nation-state. A certain case can be made for the argument that
states are weakened by the global economic system. With respect to the
familiar kinds of economic penetrations—arising from the economic impact
of decisions made by powerful nations, world inflation, shocks such as the
OPEC price crisis of 1973, and fluctuations in international currency rates—
it is true that these are “external” to states and that state governments are
often unable to prevent or control them. At the same time it must be
remembered that the responsibility for dealing with these penetrations
remains with nation-states. That is to say, national governments are the
agencies that have to cope with the consequences (for their domestic populations) of the vicissitudes of the world economy. The correct diagnosis is that sovereignty of nation-states is increasingly taxed in the context of globalization. However, states retain their sovereign power. The difference is that its ability to control events affecting its people is increasingly diminished. There has been, however, very little by way of handing over or transfer of sovereignty to supranational groups and agencies.

Similarly, the decisions made by supranational agencies continue, by and large, to be filtered through the apparatus of the nation-state. The extent to which such international agencies have spread is remarkable. Working from figures presented in the 1998-9 Yearbook of International Organizations, Haas (2001) counted some 6,000 international organizations at the end of the twentieth century. Of these, some 264 (170 in 1962) were organizations whose members were states (international governmental organizations, or IGOs), such as the United Nations and the Caribbean Community, another 5,766 (1,542 in 1962) were private associations with international objectives (NGOs), such as Doctors without Borders and the European Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Some 72 per cent of these organizations represented a regional rather than a universal constituency.

What are the normative relations of these organizations to the nation-state? As for the NGOs, they are by and large cooperative associations, many of which do not make collective decisions, and when they do these decisions are not even binding on their own members, much less anyone else. IGOs, however, vary along a dimension, which Haas describes as extending from “organizations” to “institutions.” Organizations are interest-based collectivities without power; institutions assume a certain level of
autonomy and an ability to bind their members by majority vote. The most remarkable transition from organization to institution is the European Union, but that is almost the only example. A few others, such as the International Monetary Fund, rely on strictures, which, if not adhered to, result in very adverse economic and political consequences; for this reason, these can be regarded as semi-coercive in character. Most other international governmental organizations are voluntary and rely on their members’ willingness to conform. A true world government would clearly be a fully developed institution, with a capacity to exercise binding power over its member units, but the world, as yet, has produced nothing close to that.

Even when cooperation at the national level is obtained, different states adapt the policies to their own economic circumstances, cultures, and political systems and evolve their own “policy styles” (see Jänick and Weidner, 1997; Richardson, 1982). In all cases, however, the state mediates in a de facto way—i.e., as the effective agency of normative control—between the supranational agencies and the people and groups who are affected by the influence locally, even though the origin of the normative influence originates externally to the state.

In all events, the “impact” of supra-national economic and political trends and events is highly variable according to the maturity and strength of the nation-state itself. To remind ourselves of the obvious, strong and mature modernized states surely have more control over the effects of global phenomena—indeed, they are the more active agents in engineering these phenomena—than the large number of post-colonial, weak, partially developed states, mainly in Africa and Asia. In a word, the impact of globalization is selective, both according to type of international penetration involved and according to the capacity of the “receiving” state.
“Local” Impacts. The last third of the twentieth century has witnessed a dramatic increase in the development of quasi-religious, sub-nationalist, local movements based on a mix of ethnic, religious, linguistic, and cultural considerations (Gurr, 2000). Examples are the “nationalistic” movements in Wales and Scotland, the Basque phenomenon, the resurfacing of fissiparous ethnic tendencies in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and similar phenomena in other areas of the world. We have also witnessed a growth of solidary groupings based on social movements pressing for recognition, status and rights, or advocating a cause such as women’s rights, peace, or antagonism to nuclear power. In exploring the determinants of these developments, I hope to throw light on the first orienting question for the conference—why are there so many identity conflicts in the world today?

This explosion in local political contentiousness is a remarkable turn of historical events, in part because it was unanticipated by (and an embarrassment for) most of the social-science paradigms that reigned at mid-century. Modernization theory (particularly of the “convergence” variety) anticipated a social and cultural homogenization; Marxian theory had always downplayed particularistic loyalties in favor of the dynamics of class; secularization theory in the sociology of religion posited a long-term decline in religious forces; and “liberal” political theory tended to treat particularistic loyalties as subject to processes of assimilation.

Since this explosion has coincided with the very rapid pace of world globalizing tendencies, it seems reasonable to regard the localist impulse as a counteractive response to them. What might be the mechanisms of such a response? Nearly a quarter of a century ago, Rokkan and Urwin suggested such a mechanism. Referring to Western Europe, they pointed first to
“globalizing” tendencies associated with the common market and the corresponding “erosion of inter-state boundaries.” These in turn constituted demands on the resources and manpower have increased by needs to expand welfare and education services. This relative “weakening” of the state led to “the multiplication of efforts to mobilize peripheries, regions and even localities against the national centres, and an assertion (or reassertion) of minority claims for cultural autonomy and for separate decision-making” (1982, p. 3). To generalize this formulation, global tendencies and events subtract from the ability of states to meet demands from local and particularistic constituencies, and this neglect heightens the political activity of these constituencies.

To focus on powers of the state in relation to sub-state particularistic groups seems a good lead, but the link to “globalization” seems problematical. It seems more profitable to look at the fate of the state as it has been conditioned by specific international processes, all of which can be subsumed under “globalization” only by an unhelpful stretching of the connotations of that term. The “international processes” I have in mind are long-term historical trends that have heightened the disjunction between the nation-state (and nationalism) and ethnic particularism throughout the world. The following trends are the major ones:

- The colonial heritage, in which the world’s major colonial powers divided up the colonized world into colonial territories that took little or no account of the tribal, religious, and other characteristics of those territories, except sometimes to exploit them for political purposes. As a result, they generated political units that were constituted by a multiplicity of particularistic groups.
• The post-colonial heritage, in which most of the colonies adopted the model of the nation-state—the mode of political organization represented by their former colonizers and the political mode preferred by the diplomatic communities and the United Nations for membership in the world system. In most cases this adaptation perpetuated the internal particularistic diversity (Gurr and Harff, 1994)

• The formal adoption of the traditional characteristics of nation-states by the new states (self-sufficiency, insistence on monopoly of violence, the focus of a national identity) but their actual ineffectiveness in developing the nation-state form, which had, in fact, been realized in the West only after a long and irregular historical process. In some cases the result was “failed states,” and in other cases “the insistence on the right to conduct internal affairs without outside interference gave unscrupulous dictators like Macias and Amin freedom to commit atrocities against their subjects in the name of ‘nation-building’” (ibid. p. 12).

• The dramatic “third wave” of democratization (Huntington, 1991), beginning in 1974, affecting dozens of nations throughout the world. The general shift was toward the dismantling of authoritarian regimes and the development of democratic institutions, but the results of this movement have been mixed in terms of the actual institutionalization of stable democracies. The transition to democracy implies a formal commitment to deal with contending opposition voices (including particularistic groups), thus giving them, legitimately, more political salience, but the
transition did not guarantee effectiveness in dealing with conflicts among such groups or between them and the state.

• The even more dramatic dismantling of the communist and socialist countries in 1989-90, which not only permitted the emergence of multiple ethnic, religious, and local forces held under by repression for decades, but also resulted in the formation of a significant number of new states. Almost all these states, moreover, did not “solve” issues of internal diversity, because in almost all cases residual minorities remained (e.g., Russians in Latvia).

• An accelerating process of international migration (this is the factor most closely associated with the concept of globalization). While international migrants make up only two percent of the world’s population, their absolute numbers have accelerated from approximately 75 million in 1965 to perhaps 140 million at the end of the 1990s (Castles, 2001, p. 9826). The occasions for migration have been both economic and political, and the process inevitably results in some kind of multiculturalism both for the receiving country and for the migrant populations who are caught in the struggle between inherited particularistic loyalties and the “pressures of the varied ideologies of cultural and legal inclusion which characterize their new homes” (Appadurai, 2001, p. 6269).

• The final factor is a kind of internal political dynamic. Countries in North America and Western Europe have gradually evolved from political aspirations for individual assimilation of minorities (an evolution dictated mainly because the those aspirations were not realized), to policies of recognition of cultural difference
through policies of pluralism and multiculturalism (Castles, 2001, p. 9827). Once the political system has made a commitment to recognize and respond to the demands of particularistic groups, this creates a kind of informal “invitation” or “hope” that politics based on claims of particularistic groups have a degree of political legitimacy.

This extended catalogue of (mainly political) developments provides much of the answer to the question of why there are so many more identity conflicts in the world. The answer is that all the preconditions for generating them have been moving in the same direction. The world has seen the immense growth in numbers of nation-states (185 in the United Nations in 2000). Almost all are multi-ethnic (or multi-particularistic) and many are multi-homeland (Said and Simmons, 1976, Connor, 2002). The number of multiply-oriented “border” populations at nations’ edges has increased correspondingly (Donnan and Wilson, 1999). Most of the nations have not been able to create political machinery for contending with particularistic conflict, and in those that have, the machinery is fragile.

While these general conditions together have produced the worldwide growth in particularistic conflicts, the combination of these conditions varies in specific cases. To explain multiculturalist politics in the United States, for example, one would look at the heritage of repressing indigenous peoples, slavery, and unprecedented waves of migration; the failure of class-based organizations (particularly labor unions) to subordinate ethnic to class loyalties; the recent weakening of the major political parties as conduits for channeling particularistic groups and the increased salience of the social movement as a mode of political expression; and the legitimization of particularistic groups by the governmental response to racial disturbances of
the 1960s in racial/political terms (including affirmative action), and the subsequent adoption of collectivist/solidarity rhetoric by other such groups. The multiculturalism of Western Europe is a combination of the incomplete absorption of new immigrant groups and the excitation of long-standing regional loyalties. In the new nations the glaring contradictions between the nation-state structure and sub-national groups and the relative weakness of the state would be the beginning point for analysis. In all these cases “globalization” may have something to do with the changing conditions, but in and of itself it cannot be profitably regarded as a generalized, undifferentiated explanation.

Transition #2: From Localism to Identity

To speak of the relationship between any given, racial, ethnic, religious, regional or other particularistic group and that group’s identity as a “transition” in a causal sense is somewhat meaningless, because the one virtually implies the other. Such a group would not be a group if it were not, already by definition set off by boundaries that are imposed on it both by others and by members of the group itself (Scherrer, 2002, p. 7). One inevitable ingredient of group identity is that it contains a usually dichotomous reference to “we” and “they,” though the “theys” may be multiple according to how different they are from the “we”, how friendly or how inimical they are, the degree to which they may be trusted, etc.

One initial conceptual clarification: Under the influence of scholars preoccupied with group oppression (including some post-modernist scholars), the contemporary literature tends to treat “identity” and “identity movements” in somewhat moral terms, i.e., focussing on the dispossessed, downtrodden, third world populations, minorities and subaltern peoples of the world—in short, wronged groups. Their identities tend to be taken for
granted, and are thought to be a positive asset for mobilizing such groups (Hardin, 2001, p. 7168). As Hardin notes, “actual supporters of group identity in many contexts would blanch at the thought of support for, say, Caucasian-American, Anglo-Saxon, or German identity, although each of these historically has been asserted against immigrant groups and, in the US, former slaves” (ibid.). My own view, consistent with Hardin’s expression, is that the question of identity is not a property of any one class of groups, but is a generic category applicable to all. It plays a significant role of regimes that perpetrate ethnic cleansings and genocides as well as their victims and potential victims, and reference to questions of identity are called for in the analysis of all of them.

The key question about identity, then, is not whether it is a characteristic of groups, but how salient it is for different kinds of groups, how this salience is likely to change over time, and under what conditions it is activated as a basis for a group’s behavior. Gurr has provided a very helpful list of factors affecting the salience of identity, which I present in schematic and somewhat modified form:

- how much of people’s lives are wrapped up in their “home” group
- whether invoking their identity is thought to contribute to its advantage or disadvantage
- open conflict with states or other ethnic groups, especially recent conflict
- “group capacity” including territorial concentration and coalitions among diverse segments and contending leaders
• “opportunity factors,” such as the political instability associated with the breakup of old states and establishment of new ones, transitions from one type of regime to another

• international factors, especially transnational networks and foreign interventions (Gurr, 2000, pp. 67-70).

Gurr lists these as “objective” factors, but analysis of the activation of identity calls for reference to two more dynamic and interactive elements.

The first issue has to do with fact that group identity often involves some kind of ideology, the elements of which include references to the glory and dignity of the group itself, threats to it, including its past and present mistreatment or victimization, grievances, and a vision of a better world. These ingredients provide the standards by which the group’s sense of relative deprivation is represented. Inevitably there are differences between group members, who go about their day-by-day business, and leaders who designate themselves and are sometimes designated by others as spokespersons or prolocutors for the group in the political arena. Tilly argues that such differences are omnipresent (Tilly, 2002). Furthermore, it is typical that leaders tend to “push” identity issues more than followers, both because their leadership depends on “representing” the group, and they are in competition with one another as expressers of the group’s identity and interests. The salience of group identity, then, is a function of two sets of negotiations—between leaders and group members on the one hand and between leaders and the outside publics to whom they represent their groups.

To frame the issue in this way, incidentally, shows the intellectual fruitlessness of the polemic opposition among scholars who define ethnic and related groups in "primordial” terms versus those who define them in “instrumental” terms, i.e., as groups seeking their own interest in the
political and economic arenas (Gurr and Harff, 1994, pp. 78-79). The evident resolution of this issue is that they are both primordial and instrumental, and both elements enter both into the dynamics of group behavior and into the larger political process.

Second, in connection with “opportunity factors”, I would extend the list of factors that augment group identity to the active intervention of authorities, especially the state. I give one example, dealing with the indigenous population of the United States. The fact that the American government drew up treaties with distinctive American encouraged a certain solidification of their identity as tribes, and this went counter to other strong tendencies to erase these distinctive identities—tendencies to decimate the tribes themselves through violence, famine, and disease, and tendencies for the dominant population to homogenize them into a population of “Indians” or “Native Americans”. More recently the United States government has held out positive economic incentives to tribes in the form of extending rights to organize gambling enterprises. This has proven to be an “invitation to identity,” in effect, asking tribes—some of which have long been dispersed—to declare their identity in hopes of economic gain (Wilkins and Vine, 1999; Wilkins, 2002).

Transition #3: From Identity to Identity Movement and Identity Politics

Earlier I observed that the existence of any kind of particularistic group more or less entails some notion of boundaries between that group and others and at least a minimum level of identity, self-imposed or imposed from outside (typically both). No such entailment is involved in the relationship between particularistic group identity and mobilization into some kind of movement. In fact, it may be more realistic to assume the opposite: that the identities remain latent and mobilizable but are not often
mobilized. Olzak speaks of “the seemingly natural resistance of individuals to sustain collective action” (2001, p. 4796). Moreover, there are good theoretical reasons for supposing that individuals will not be motivated to participate in social movements, including identity movements (Olson, 1965; Oberschall, 1973). Williams (2001) reminds us that the vast majority of ethnic groups in the world do not engage in collective violence or civil war. “Of some 1600 major cultural groupings, less than 300 have been recently mobilized in politicized protest or rebellion and only some 3050 wars are ongoing in a particular year” (p. 4809).

Despite this observation, collective mobilization remains a sufficiently frequent phenomenon to attempt to specify the major variables that affect its appearance and vicissitudes. As a general rule, an intensification of the conditions augmenting the identity of a group will also serve as conditions increasing the probability of mobilization into some kind of collective action. To make this observation more specific, I would mention three sets of variables that come to mind as especially salient in this transition:

1. The occurrence of a visible historical event that (a) augments the perceived adversity or threat under which the group sees itself as living—an intensification of discrimination, a notable political failure; (b) contrariwise, increases the hope of the group to improve its situation—a concession by a ruling government, a law that relieves their situation, a promise of help to the group from friendly outside forces. Such events raise the consciousness of identity groups and provide the occasion for them to reassess and perhaps act on their political situation. In an earlier characterization of these kinds of events I used the term “precipitating factor” (Smelser, 1962)

2. The capacity of leaders to integrate such events into a call for collective mobilization and action. This involves their ability to interpret
convincingly the event or situation at hand in terms as “evidence”
threatening or encouraging (or both) the identity group, articulating this
evidence with the world-view, and convincing the group that collective
action rather than some other form of response is the most important.

(3) The behavior of authorities in relation to group demands, which
may be considered as part of the opportunity structure for potentially
mobilizing groups (Tarrow, 1994). At the one extreme, violent repression of
a group by an effective state diminishes its power to mobilize, and tends to
force it into a latent state or drive it underground. At the other extreme the
collapse of a state authority—not infrequent in weak, new states, and
strikingly evident in the communist and socialist world in 1989-90, frees up
the political situation, permits long-passive groups to become activated, and
excites competitive political striving among them (Gurr, 2000, p. 70).
Between these two extremes, there is a particularly notable sequence of
vacillating behavior on the part of regimes that appears to be strong
invitation to political mobilization—a period of accommodation or reform
(raising expectations of the group), followed by a reversal of these policies
accompanied by a repressive posture (dashing those expectations), followed
by evidence of weakness, ineffectiveness, or vacillation on the part of
authorities (Smelser, 1962).

Transition #4: From Identity Movement to Violence

As indicated, the perpetration of social violence by collective
movements is not well understood, and, correspondingly, my reflections on
this will have to be the most tentative of all.

In his review of social violence, Tilly identifies three main, competing
views of violence:
• “propensity-driven behavior [which locates] its causes within the actor, calling attention to genetic, motional, or cognitive peculiarities”
• “instrumental interaction [which] characterize [violence] as means to power, wealth, prestige, or other ends
• “a cultural form—as in the claim that because of the frontier, slavery, or capitalist competition the USA has an exceptionally violent culture—argues that the ready availability of certain ideas, practices, models, and beliefs itself promotes violent action (Tilly, 2001, p. 16207)

All three views share a common frailty, namely that they formulated as constants that predispose individuals and groups to violence, but they are not framed in a way that would account for systematic variation in its occurrence. As a rule, it is analytically unsatisfactory to try to explain variations by reference to constants. In my own estimation, it is more fruitful to turn research in the direction of seeking variables that combine to produce empirically identifiable episodes of violence. In particular I would suggest that research look for the confluence of the four following sets of variables to increase our precision in explaining the occurrence of violence:

(1) A facilitating ideology, many instances of which are found in the world-view of identity groups. Ingredients of such an ideology are a profound sense on the part of a “we” group of a “they” that are responsible for the threat, accompanied by a righteous rage and perhaps a glorification of the we-group’s culture and history. The reason why such an ideology is facilitative of violence is that it legitimates extreme violence against a perceived evil in the name of high moral purpose, which serves to blunt what otherwise might be inhibitions to destructive behavior.
(2) The actual or perceived (usually some mix) unavailability of alternative political means to achieve one’s ends. The capacity to work through political parties or potentially effective social movements presumably “tames” groups and draws them into the polity. I would not push this insight so far as some, who suggest that “the more democratic the political environment, the more likely ethnopolitical groups will be to voice opposition nonviolently” (Gurr and Harff, 1994, p. 85), because democratic societies, as political systems, historically have experienced a great deal of political violence (Rapoport and Weinberg, 2001), but in specific historical situations the availability of non-violent options is an important consideration.

(3) Opportunities for the use of violence. Under effective totalitarian regimes, the state itself is able to repress not only violence but also political protest in general. Less repressive regimes are relatively more open to group violence, but the operative presumption—just enunciated—is that they provide more alternatives to it. The collapse of political regimes is also means a failure in their ability to stem violence and therefore a greater opportunity for groups to rely on it. Finally, one of the observations made is that some of the characteristics of globalization—open borders and points of entry, increased migration and geographical mobility—also constitute a greater opportunity for violence, in that the ease of movement also increases difficulty of detection and prevention.

(4) Access to the means of violence. This might be regarded as a sub-type of “opportunity,” but it deserves special mention. One of the characteristics of the episodes of genocide and ethnic cleansing in the past century is a regime that trumpets an ideology that is both nationalistic and ethnically or religiously specific, identifies “others" as inferior or
treacherous (Naimark, 2001, p. 4801). As a state regime the ruling group typically enjoys a monopoly on “legitimate” violence, as well as control of army and police forces. Minorities that are typically victims of genocide or cleaning are typically weaker in their capacity for violence, and when they do possess access to the means of violence the result is more likely to be civil war than cleansing.

As with other formulations contained in these remarks, I regard the several points made not so much as established social-science principles but rather as the most likely leads into systematic historical and comparative research.

A Concluding Note

My strategy in these remarks has probably been self-evident, but in the interests of intellectual closure I will make this strategy explicit in concluding. For the complex package of ingredients of interest on this occasion—globalization, localization, dispossession, identities and identity politics, and violence—I have tried to engage in an unpacking operation. Many dozens of explanatory variables have been assembled in the literature in the effort to establish connections among these ingredients. I have taken a critical attitude toward the adequacy of many of these diverse variables—concentrating especially on their vagueness and diffuseness—but above all I have attempted to pinpoint the precise locations in these connections where the respective variables assume their most salient roles. I have carried out this strategy in the context of an article of faith: that to disaggregate large classes of variables and to specify their respective roles is the most fruitful role in generating understandings and explanations of the great cultural and social forces with which we are concerned in this conference.
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Professor Quigley joined the OSU faculty in 1969. Previous to this he was a research scholar at Moscow State University, and a research associate in comparative law at Harvard Law School. He is active in international human rights work. His specializations include human rights, the United Nations, war and peace, east European law, African law and the Arab-Israeli conflict
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Kevin R. Cox

Professor, Department of Geography, The Ohio State University

Professor Cox holds a B.A. from Cambridge and graduate degrees from the University of Illinois. His main interest is in the relation between social theory, particularly political economy, and geography. More specific interests are critical realism and historical geographical materialism. Areas of application include the politics of urbanization in advanced capitalist societies; and the political economy, in its spatial aspects, of South Africa. Professor Cox is a political geographer with strong interests in theory and method.

Richard K. Herrmann received his Ph.D. in Political Science from University of Pittsburgh in August and joined the faculty of OSU in September 1981. His specializations include psychological approaches to international relations, Russian and Soviet foreign policy, and politics in the Middle East. He served on the policy planning staff at the U.S. department of State from 1989-91 and was co-editor of *International Studies Quarterly* from 1990-95.

John Mueller holds the Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science at Ohio State University. He specializes in international relations. He is the author of *War, Presidents and Public Opinion* (1973, Wiley), which has been described as a ‘classic’ by *American Political Science Review*. His more recent publications include *Policy and Opinion in the Gulf War* (1994, University of Chicago Press) and *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ralph’s Pretty Good Grocery* (1999, Princeton University Press). He is a member of the American Academy of Sciences, has been a John Simon Guggenheim Fellow, and has received grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Ileana Rodriguez (Ph.D. University of California, San Diego) is a professor of Latin American Literatures and Cultures at the Ohio State University. She has published extensively on the literatures, cultures, and politics of Central America and the Caribbean and has authored several books including *Women Guerrillas, and Love: Understanding War in Central America* (U of Minnesota P, 1999); *House, Garden, Nation,* (Duke UP, 199); *Registradas en la Historia: 10 años de quehacer feminista en Nicaragua* (CIAM: Nicaragua, 1990); *Primer Inventario del Invasor* (Editorial Nueva Nicaragua, 1984). She has also co-edited two volumes: with Marc Zimmerman, *The Process of Unity in Caribbean Society* (Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literatures, 1983); with William L. Rowe, *Marxism and New Left Ideology.* (Marxist Educational Press, 1977). Her last publications are *The Latin American Subaltern Reader* (Duke UP 2002); *Convergencia de Tiempos: Estudios Subalternos, Contextos Latinoamericanos: Cultura, Estado, Subalternidad* (Rodopi, 2002); and *Canones literarios masculinos y relecturas transculturales: Lo trans-femenino/masculino/queer.* (Anthropos, 2002). Her current book, *Islands, Highland, Jungle: Topographies of Miscognition in Transatlantic Interactions* will be published by the University of Minnesota Press.


Kazimierz M. Slomczynski

Professor, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University

He received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Warsaw in 1971. His current research interests include comparative methods, social inequality, and social psychology. He is a member of the Center of Slavic and East European Studies, Ohio State University. He is also affiliated with the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Polish Academy of Sciences.
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The Musha Rebellion as the Unthinkable: Coloniality, Aboriginality and the Epistemology of Colonial Difference

Leo Ching
Department of Asian & African Languages & Literature
Duke University

Abstract

This essay is an attempt to disrupt and displace the all-knowing coloniality of power regarding the 1930 Musha Rebellion in colonial Taiwan and the subsequent voluntarism by introducing the notion of what Michel-Rolph Trouillot calls “unthinkability” regarding historical events. I want to suggest that the Musha Rebellion constituted an unthinkable within Japanese colonial epistemology. The Rebellion was unthinkable in two temporalities: the event itself and the subsequent “volunteerism.” The event itself was beyond the comprehensibility of Japanese colonial knowledge because it was instigated by a relatively “enlightened” and “assimilated” aboriginal group. The event was unthinkable because it was incommensurable with the discourse of colonial benevolence. A decade later, despite the near elimination of its entire population, some descendants of the aborigines “volunteered” for the Japanese war effort. This volunteerism constituted a second unthinkable from the perspective of postcoloniality where postwar Japanese intellectuals could not fathom the motivation of the aborigines. Volunteerism was unthinkable because it was incomprehensible in light of colonial violence. The unthinkable of colonial benevolence and violence, despite their apparent difference in relation to Japanese colonial rule, converges in the epistemology of colonial difference. Colonial difference refers to the radical incommensurability between the colonizers and the colonized, not as essentialized categories, but as a structural cleavage and irreconcilable condition of being within the colonial system. The unthinkable points to a Japan-centrism that is unable to think beyond the limit of its own colonial design, that its mode of knowing is always already delimited by colonial difference. Colonial difference embodies the general contradiction of Japanese colonial discourse as it vacillates between the politics of difference and the politics of sameness.
States of Mind and the State of War:  
Public Attitudes and Ethnic Violence in Macedonia  
Robert Hislope  
Department of Political Science  
Union College  
Schenectady, New York 12308

abstract

This essay explores the relationship between public opinion and ethnic conflict. What is the character of mass attitudes in society prior to the onset of war? How is this collective disposition related to the instigation of violence? There are two fundamental points of reference for scholars who study these questions, primordialism and constructivism. Primordialists argue that ethnic stereotypes are deeply embedded in society and are sources of group mobilization. Constructivists contend that the source of mobilization comes from above as ethnic entrepreneurs construct out-group enmities. Despite the considerable amount of literature that revolves around these two concepts, there exists very little reliable data on the distribution of public attitudes in pre-war, post-communist societies. The one notable exception is Macedonia. Ten years of peace (1991-2001) enabled international and domestic organizations to conduct numerous public opinion polls. An analysis of this data leads to several conclusions: (1) the constructivist emphasis on nefarious elites fails to explain political patterns in Macedonia and why the conflict had an ethnic character; (2) public opinion in Macedonia matches the primordial image, but no direct linkage between general interethnic animosities and violence can be found; and (3) the most important finding to emerge is that young, rural-concentrated, Albanian men constitute a social cohort that is favorably disposed, both attitudinally and behaviorally, to politics-as-violence. The mobilization of this demographic enabled the National Liberation Army to turn an assault into an insurgency.
Dispossession and Possession: the Maya, Duplicity, and “Post”-war Guatemala

Diane M. Nelson
Department of Cultural Anthropology
Duke University

abstract

The indigenous people of Guatemala have been dispossessed of their land, means of production, languages and other identificatory practices through colonization, their family and community members through genocidal violence, their homes through counterinsurgency policies of displacement, and even their voices when they are accused of lying (as with critiques of Rigoberta Menchú Tum’s testimonial or charges of inauthenticity leveled at the Mayan revitalization movement). Given this dispossession, I have found it strange that, after peace accords ending 35 years of civil war were signed in 1996, indigenous people were frequently accused of being possessed, of acting not on their own initiative, but instead as puppets or dupes of others’ interests. This is most frequent with Mayan members of the revolutionary movement who are described, and also sometimes describe themselves, as fooled by utopian promises and the subtle manipulation by non-indigenous activists – acted on by outside forces. People who were not taught a Mayan language by their parents and are studying one at University, or who read ethnographic accounts from the 1930s as how-to guides for dances and rituals, are also accused of being duped by the desire to be Indian when they are “really” ladino (mestizo). Accounts of the savage lynchings of suspected thieves in highland villages also often describe the mobs as if they were possessed by an atavistic primitiveness that suddenly rises to the surface and makes usually well-behaved people into bloodthirsty murderers. People also attempt to explain the way community members collaborated with the security forces by killing, raping, and injuring their neighbors through the Civil Patrols as a form of possession, the person was taken over by a will other than their own. Some who participated in the Patrols deploy a similar story of doubleness/duplicity – they say they were two-faced, showing one face (of obedience) to the army and another to the people (who knew he did not want to carry out acts of violence). As the implementation period for the peace accords ends and the UN peacekeepers pull out, many people also describe the state as two-faced and duplicitous, possessed by corruption, or acting on the
demands of an external will (the IMF or US policy) rather than its own. The Post in post war is increasingly ephemeral nationally and certainly transnationally. In this paper I will explore these understandings of possession in the midst of increasing dispossession, as Guatemala experiences the global economic downturn and increasing delegitimation of the neo-liberal paradigm. I ask why this story of duplicity and doubleness seems so useful for understanding the current moment and what it contributes to understandings of identification and struggles for justice.
Inventing Authenticity: Reviving The Heritage and Preserving The Traditional In Post-War Beirut

Aseel Sawalha
Department of Criminal Justice and Sociology
Pace University

Abstract

Since the end of its protracted civil war in 1992, Beirut has been rebuilding its war-torn downtown area and negotiating to regain its cherished prominence as the cosmopolitan center of the Middle East. Regional and international investors and developers are shaping the future Beirut by erecting modern buildings and structures that will be able to compete in the international global market. In response to these reconstruction schemes, Lebanese intellectuals and concerned groups have developed alternative discourses about the rebuilding of Beirut. In these discourses, the multiple histories of Beirut are revisited and the city’s identities are contested and debated. This has led to a genre of writings that invoke ideas heritage, nostalgia, authenticity and memory. This paper discusses and analyzes the emergence of what I name “discourses of authenticity” in response to developmental plans of westernization and the modernization of the future city, considering the questions: Is it possible to read these counter-development discourses as anti-modernist and anti-global? Are the concepts of the local, heritage and the authentic themselves rooted within the “local” or are they rather outcomes of the modern, the western and the global?
ABKHAZIA: CAN SOCIAL THEORY PROVIDE THERAPY?

Georgi Derluguian
Department of Sociology
Northwestern University

ABSTRACT

The paper outlines what the social scientists can know today about the origins of ethnic civil wars compared to what is remembered in the collectively construed memories of the ethnic groups that are involved in such wars. The central claim is that the actual history is more contingent and chaotic during the moments of rapid transitions, contrary to the widespread conspiracy theories. Yet the deep causes of conflicts are structural and therefore need to be revealed by scholarly techniques because the structures are not evident from daily life perspective. But once revealed and rationally analyzed, structures could be changed through politically negotiated process. In all instances, social theory can significantly contribute to rationalizing what actually happened when the human minds went aflame.
THE KURDISH QUESTION IN PERSPECTIVE

Michael M. Gunter
Department of Political Science
Tennessee Technological University

ABSTRACT

Although a large majority within the mountainous Middle East where Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria meet, the Kurds have been gerrymandered into being mere minorities within the existing states they inhabit. The desire of many Kurds for statehood or at least cultural autonomy within the states they now inhabit has led to an almost continuous series of Kurdish revolts since the creation of the modern Middle East following World War I and constitutes the Kurdish question. The approximately 25 million Kurds are the largest nation in the world without its own independent state. Since the end of the first Gulf War in 1991 and the creation of a de facto state of Kurdistan in northern Iraq, the Kurdish problem has become increasingly important in Middle Eastern and even international politics. The U.S. victory in the second Gulf War in 2003 has further highlighted the Kurdish role because of their crucial role as a successful model for democracy and federalism in post-Saddam Iraq. Turkey and Iran, however, will contest this Kurdish self-expression in Iraq because they see it as encouragement to their own Kurds to divide Turkey and Iran. Turkey’s application for admission to the European Union (EU) has also served to make the Kurdish issue more significant. Since the Kurds sit on a great deal of the Middle East’s oil and possibly even more important water resources, the Kurdish question will become even more important in the 21st century.
Factors in Africa’s Crisis of State building

Kidane Mengisteab
African Studies and Political Science
Head of the Department of African and African-American Studies
Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

Many African countries are facing a crisis of state building manifested by the collapse of some states, such as Somalia, Sierra Leone, and Liberia, and the widespread chronic regional, ethnic, and religious conflicts and gross violations of human rights in many others, including the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Angola, the Sudan, Ethiopia, and the Ivory coast. The factors contributing to the crisis are complex and vary from country to country. There are, however, two common factors. One is the nature of the post-independence African state. The other is the nature of global economic system. At the time of their independence Africans expected their state to be an agent of their liberation and empowerment. Instead, the state in many cases has become an apparatus that dictators use for self-enrichment in the midst of abject poverty of their people and for self preservation in power. Such dictators often place themselves above the law and violate the rights of citizens with little restraint. In other cases the state identifies with the interests and cultural values of dominant ethnic groups and marginalizes other entities. Such oppressive states that behave like private clubs are incapable of building a community of citizens that share political and economic systems. The continued neo-colonial grip of African countries by the advanced countries has also compounded the crisis of state building by undermining the development process of African countries. The neo-liberal ideology that governs the global system also promotes an economic system that neglects social justice, which is an essential component of state building in the African context, where severe inequality of opportunity between social classes and ethnic entities is rampant. This paper examines how the interplay between these two general factors has contributed to the crisis of state building in Africa with emphasis on the Horn of Africa.
State Authority over Korean Buddhists in Contemporary Korea

Pori Park
Department of Religious Studies
Arizona State University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the close ties of Korean Buddhism and the state after Korea’s liberation from Japanese colonial rule. During colonial rule, the Japanese government implemented a “temple-ordinance” in which they established 30 independent monastery districts, which were placed under the direct control of the state. After liberation in 1945, Korean Buddhists focused on the decolonization of the religion. The elevated anti-Japanese sentiment among Koreans helped the Sangha liquidate their colonial past. During the colonial period, the majority of Korean clerics gave up their traditional practice of celibacy and got married. During the 1950s and 1960s, the Sangha spent most of their energy on the internal division between the celibate and married clerics. After vigorous attacks and counter-attacks, resulting in physical fights and litigation, the celibates claimed their final victory in 1970, while the married monks formed their own sect. Korean Buddhism’s dependency on government support during this internal conflict, however, led the Sangha to fall under the control of secular power. The celibates sided with the Yi S•ngman’s government, which became virtually the major force behind the victory of this minority faction. Korean Buddhists’ dependence on politics made them subject to the vicissitudes of political power. After the fall of the Yi regime, Korean Buddhism was subjected to the mercy of the succeeding governments. The infamous military regime of Pak Ch•ngh•i, during the 1960s and 1970s, wielded great power and control over Korean Buddhism, while directly intervening in the internal conflict of the Sangha. The Sangha were put under the secular laws, such as the laws of National Parks and of Forests, which were quite similar to those of the colonial occupation. In 1980, the Ch•n Tuwhan regime, another military regime, inflicted great violence on and damage to the clerics and temples in the name of cleansing the corruptions of the Sangha and Korean society in general. Again, Buddhism became an easy target of those in power. This paper presents the major issues and conflicts of the so-called “Purification Movement” of Korean Buddhism and the government’s intervention in this long battle. It includes an investigation of the intricate political maneuvers over the religion and Buddhist response to political control.
THE INTERCULTURAL CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AUTHORITY IN LATIN AMERICA

Donna Lee Van Cott
Department of Political Science
University of Tennessee

ABSTRACT

In the 1990s Latin American states experienced steep declines in public support, attributable to severe crises of legitimacy and authority for democratic institutions, politicians, and the state. Most undertook radical constitutional reforms to address these and other related crises. Throughout the region indigenous peoples’ organizations, which formed and became consolidated in the 1980s, took advantage of their increasing mobilizational strength and public support, and the weakening of traditional political and social actors, to demand and secure collective constitutional rights that carve out a space of politico-territorial autonomy, while easing access for this once-excluded group to the formal political system. Focusing mainly on the Andean region, I examine how indigenous movements are using these new constitutional rights to construct intercultural forms of public authority to fill the vacuum created by the failure of traditional politicians to respond to pressing societal needs. I concentrate on three spheres of activity: (1) the construction of a pluralistic legal system that recognizes indigenous customary law as public and binding, while connecting it to the larger national legal system; (2) the formation of political movement-parties that, although based on consolidated indigenous social movement organizations, incorporate non-indigenous militants and organizations in a multi-ethnic coalition guided by traditional indigenous values; and (3) experiments by indigenous party-dominated local governments to create alternative models of participatory, inter-cultural government based on traditional indigenous forms of self-government. In sum, I argue, these activities are improving the quality of democracy in the Andes.
Public Islam and the Common Good

Dale F. Eickelman
Professor of Anthropology, Dartmouth College and
Armando Salvatore
Institute of Social Sciences, Humboldt University, Berlin

Abstract

“9/11” and the subsequent regime change in Iraq have not in themselves been the catalyst for major social and political transformations in how authority and community are understood and practiced in Arab and Muslim-majority societies, but they have directed attention to long-term trends that suggest the opportunities for and constraints limiting democracy and public participation. Authoritarian regimes notwithstanding, we argue that the historical and contemporary development of certain informal, formal, and transnational social and political identities and forms of association in Muslim-majority and Arab societies has facilitated the emergence of a public sphere and limited the coercive power of state authority. This presentation suggests how a greater focus on religious ideas and forms of association, both religious and secular, can enhance the concept of the public sphere so that it better accounts for developments in Muslim-majority societies, as well as in European ones.
“Cyber-Separatism, Islam and the State in China”

Dru C. Gladney
Department of Asian Studies and Anthropology
University of Hawai‘i at Manoa

Abstract

National identities never arise in a vacuum. Rather than purely cultural or primordial bases for identity, national identities are constructed in relation to the interpretation of one's own myths of nostalgic descent from a common ancestry. This imagined identity, to use Benedict Anderson's (1991) phrase, is formed in the context of changing socioeconomic circumstances -- situations most often defined by the nation-state in the modern world, which has regularly abrogated to itself the task of identifying, labeling, and objectifying ethnic identities. The Uyghur provide an excellent illustration of this process in which a group of oasis-dwelling Turkic-speaking people shared a general historical experience but did not begin to think of themselves as a single national identity until the early part of this century, when Soviet and Chinese states identified them as one of several Turkic nationalities. Foreigner travel accounts of Xinjiang from the mid-16th century to the early 20th century, by famous explorers such as Muhammad Haidar, Sven Hedin, and Owen Lattimore, contained no references to any collective group referred to as Uyghur, but instead found people identifying themselves as Turki (from their language family), Sart (meaning "carvaneer" in old Persian), and other oasis-based ethnonyms, such as Kashgarlik, Turpanlik, and Kotanlik. I have described elsewhere the process of ethnogenesis in which these separate identities crystallized into the people now known as the Uyghur, with a population of 8.4 million according to the reasonably-accurate 2000 census. While this process is not unique to the Uyghur, and indeed has been documented by other case studies of ethnogenesis in China, such as the Hui (Gladney 1996), the Yi (Harrell 1998), the Naxi (Mckhann 1989), and the Miao (Diamond 1988), it is also a natural process of identity formation experienced by many groups of peoples who are often registered and incorporated into the modern nation-state (see Bentley 1989; Cohn 1987; Keyes 1984). For the Uyghur it has meant both their subjection to Chinese rule as well as their rise as a transnational ethnic group, their coalescence as an entity of 8.4 million that is recognized across China, and now the world -- the not entirely unwilling subjects of tourist brochures, religious and political tracts, and academic investigations. In this paper I explore a widespread movement largely among the Uyghur diaspora via the internet that has contributed to a “cyber-separatism” campaign which is anything but virtual. In this paper I will be arguing, therefore, that the nationalization and transnationalization of a Turkic-speaking, oasis-dwelling people in the Tarim basin of Northwest China, now known as the Uyghur, has contributed to the contemporary construction of Chinese national identity in general, and served the specific interests of the Chinese state in its Middle Eastern relations, as well as engendering a diasporic Uyghur response, which can best be described as cyber-separatism.
Ethnic/Religious Conflicts and Democratic Transitions in West Africa:

A Nigerian Case-Study

Muhammad S. Umar
Department of Religious Studies
Arizona State University

Abstract

During the 1990s, the ‘Third Wave of Democratization’ swept across West Africa, with each of the countries in the region taking various steps toward democratization: ending the tenures of many presidents-for-life, introducing multi-party elections, and making successful handovers from one administration to another via democratic elections. However, the 1990s also witnessed numerous violent conflicts: ethnic/religious conflicts, riots and violent protests in urban centers, bloody military coups and political assassinations, civil wars and anarchy in collapsed states. In this paper, I address the questions: Does democratic transition help to resolve or aggravate violent conflicts in general, and ethnic/religious conflicts in particular? To answer this question, the paper begins with brief regional overview of political developments in West Africa during the 1990s, with particular focus on analyzing the possible relationships between democratic transitions and violent conflicts that have ethnic and religious dimension, as well as the rise of Islamist movements in the West African region and their impact on the issues of identity, conflict, and political stability. Next, the paper focuses on Nigeria for a case-study of the complexities of these issues. From its national (Nigeria) and regional (West Africa) perspectives, this paper contributes to the larger debates on the future of nation-states in the era of globalization, the prospects of the “democratic peace,” and the tensions between local and global identities and loyalties.
Catherine Filloux's play, SILENCE OF GOD, was commissioned by Contemporary American Theater Festival and premiered there in 2002. Her play MARY AND MYRA was produced in CATF's 2000 season and appeared in 2002 at Todd Mountain Theater Project. Her short play, PHOTOGRAPHS FROM S-21, has toured the world. Catherine was selected for the 2002 Bay Area Playwrights Festival and as the 2003 James Thurber Playwright-in-Residence. In 2003 her newest play THE BEAUTY INSIDE was in the HotINK2 Festival in NY, and at OSU Theater's New Works Lab in Columbus, Ohio. She was commissioned by Theatreworks/USA for a new play with music, ARTHUR'S WAR. Her libretto for the opera THE FLOATING BOX: A STORY IN CHINATOWN (composer Jason Kao Hwang) premiered at the re-opening of the Asia Society in 2001; the CD will be released by New World Records. Catherine's other plays have been produced around the U.S. She has received awards from the Kennedy Center Fund for New American Plays, the O'Neill, the Rockefeller MAP Fund, and the Asian Cultural Council. She is a Fulbright Senior Specialist in playwriting in Cambodia in 2003. Her plays are published by Smith and Kraus and Playscripts, Inc. She is a member of New Dramatists.
Lesley Ferris obtained her Ph.D. from University of Minnesota in 1979. She is a director and scholar. Her research interests are focused on gender and performance, carnival, and the use of masks. She has served as the Resident Director for the London Theatre Program in summer of 2000, 2001, 2003. The Office of International Education awarded her an Outstanding Faculty Award in 2002 for her contributions to international education.
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