

Dr. Zlatko Isakovic

**DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS
IN THE PROCESS OF GLOBALISATION**

Copenhagen Peace Research Institute Working Paper, No. 3, 2002
Paper presented at the Canadian Peace Research and Education
Association (CPREA) Conference, Kingston, Ontario, Canada,
May 31 – June 3, 2001

Dr. Zlatko Isakovic*

DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS IN THE GLOBALISED WORLD**

The aim of this paper is to elaborate relationships between democracy, human rights and ethnic conflicts in the globalised world. The first part is devoted to analysis of the impacts of democracy and human rights on the ethnic conflicts, and second elaborates impacts of the conflicts on the democracy and human rights. Both parts are supposed to

* Visiting Scholar, Institute of European and Russian Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, email: bmisakovic@hotmail.com.

** This paper is one of the results of the project *Democracy, Human Rights and Ethnic Conflicts in the Process of Globalisation* developed by the author since 1998 at the YUPeace – Centre for Peace and Conflict Research, Institute of International Politics and Economics and Institute for European Studies, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, and during his visiting fellowships at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI), Denmark. Prof. Biljana Vankovska, Faculty of Philosophy, Balkan Peace Study Center, St. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje, Macedonia took part as the coauthor in initial phases of the project development. Later development of the project was achieved during author's teaching and research engagement at several scholarly institutions including the Institute of Canadian Studies and Human Rights Research and Education Centre, the Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa (1999-2000), Ottawa, Canada, The Institute of European and Russian Studies (EURUS, 2000-2001), The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA, 2001) and the Law Department (2001), Carleton University, Ottawa Canada. The author appreciates the chances and supports by the directors/chairs of the institutions Prof. Hakan Wiberg, Prof. Chad Gaffield, Prof. Errol Mendes, Prof. Joan DeBardeleben, Prof. Maureen Appel Molot, and Prof. Michael MacNeil. Additional results of the project have included the author's papers "Democratization and Ethnic Conflicts in the Balkans", Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Biennial International Conference, Baltimore, October 22-24, 1999; "Peace and/or Human Rights", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 12 (2000): pp. 15; <http://www.copri.dk/copri/downloads/12-2000.doc>; <https://www.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/wpsfrm.html>; Global Conference on Peace, University of Ottawa, Canada, August 16-19, 2000 (summary <http://www.angelfire.com/ok3/peaceportal/summary1.html>); "Choosing Between Peace and Human Rights?", Key Note Address, Canadian Peace Research & Education Association (CPREA) Conference, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, June 1-4, 2000, *Peace Research – The Canadian Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (May 2001): 37-46 (abstract published in Vol. 32, No. 3 (August 2000): 69-70); "Democratization, Democracy and Ethnic Conflicts in the Balkans", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 9 (2000); *Southeast European Politics Online*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (October 2000); "Democracy, Human Rights and Ethnic Conflict in the South Eastern Europe" (2001), <http://www.stabilitypact.mzt.si>; "Academic Freedoms and Ethnic Conflicts in the Balkans: The Cases of Bulgaria, Macedonia and Yugoslavia", *International Relations* (forthcoming), <http://www.csscasopis.cjb.net/>, etc.

elaborate the topic within the context of globalised world. The main conclusion is that if a system cannot be qualified as democratic one and respectful for human rights, appears the complex dilemma what should and would come first: developing democracy and/or respecting human rights or eliminating ethnic conflicts or preventing their escalations/deescalating them.

Observing states and societies, one can distinguish several criteria for their classification within the globalised world. From the perspective of the topic of this paper the most important their feature seems to be that numerous states and societies have and take part in more or less similar and sometimes mutual ethnic conflicts. As the conflicts and the states have at least to some degree general features, they can be observed as parts of the process of globalisation. Second, a great majority of these states and societies is in certain stages of the post-Cold War transformation process, which also has at least partly global nature.

The classic theory of democracy has elaborated the issue of the ethnicity cursory manner and mostly periodically. Since the end of the Cold War the interest of numerous scholars has been focused on the security aspects of the ethnic conflicts (ethnic aspects of security in the world), and on political aspects of the development of democracy or transition toward democracy (i.e. its general pattern).

The human rights situation after the end of the Second World War has been featured mostly by entering into force the following International Covenants in 1976:

- ❖ On Civil and Political Rights (first, “Western” absolute generation requiring immediate state compliance, certain rights can be assured thanks to some affirmative government action, the core value is liberty):
 - Right to life, liberty, and the security of the person,
 - freedom of residence and movement,
 - right to asylum from persecution,
 - freedom from racial and equivalent forms of discrimination,
 - freedom of opinion and its expression,
 - freedom of peaceful association and assembly,
 - freedom from slavery or involuntary servitude,
 - freedom from arbitrary detention, arrest, or exile,

- right to a public and fair trial,
 - freedom from torture and from cruel, degrading, or inhuman punishment or treatment,
 - freedom from interference in correspondence and privacy,
 - freedom of conscience, thought, and religion,
 - right to directly or indirectly participate in government,
 - right not to be deprived of one's property arbitrarily,
 - right to own property, etc.
- ❖ On Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (second, "socialist" relative generation, depending upon the development of the state in question; most of the rights do need state intervention in the allocation of resources, the core value is social equality):
- Right to work and to protection against unemployment,
 - right to social security,
 - right to leisure and rest,
 - right to education,
 - right to a standard of living adequate for the well-being and health of self and family and
 - right to the protection of one's literary, artistic, and scientific production.
- ❖ The third generation of human rights has not been usually included among internationally recognised human rights yet. It is composed of so-called solidarity rights (collective ones having individual dimensions):
- Right to political, economic, social, and cultural self-determination,
 - right to social and economic development,
 - right to participate in and benefit from "the common heritage of mankind", i.e. shared Earth-space resources,
 - right to scientific, technical, and some other information and progress,
 - right to cultural monuments, traditions, and sites,
 - right to peace (see the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1984),
 - right to humanitarian disaster relief,
 - right to a healthy and balanced environment,
 - right to development (see Kindred, 2000: 781-784).

There is the dilemma *does the globalised world need both peace and respect for human rights or just one of them* thanks to the possibility that the definition of peace could include respect for (some of) the human rights. On the other hand, this generation of

human rights includes – at least according to some authors – the right to peace.

The dilemma can be avoided or resolved in one of the following ways:

- inclusion of peace within the categories of human rights or
- inclusion of human rights within notions of peace.

If such inclusions are not acceptable, at least in situations in which they are in collision, then one must decide which one of them is more important. In that case, an additional dilemma could appear: *does any violation of one of the two phenomena or their segments represent sufficient reason for sacrificing the other phenomena or its segments?*

Although the general theoretical conclusion could be that people(s) should not have to choose between human rights and peace, in real life situations there is sometimes a choice to make (see Isakovic, 2000b: 9-11).

The numerous human rights bodies established under the UN umbrella have weaknesses, particularly the lack of any enforcement or mandatory power, except under the UN collective security umbrella as in the case of South Rhodesia or judicial tribunals for violations of humanitarian law in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda (see: White, 1996: 234-235), or the Permanent International Criminal Court.

The issue of ethnic conflict and its elimination for a long time has been a *terra incognita* for relatively numerous scholars. Present-days researchers seem to overlook or in many cases even ignore the possibilities of conflict elimination within the context of democratisation and *vice versa*.

According to definitions of democracy, it is a rule of majority and a procedure used for the non-violent elimination of political, ethnic, economic conflicts and other discrepancies in interests, i.e. positions in society. However, sometimes, even without abusing or violating the mentioned procedures, one party in the conflict is merely partly satisfied or dissatisfied with the decisions, which shows that the conflict has not been fully resolved (and in this way eliminated), i.e. that it has been 'resolved' in formal, but not in essential regard.

Conflict in general could be defined in the meaning of dynamic and manifest conflict process consisting of certain phases. In this case, the term conflict is utilised in a more specific meaning: *a political process (dynamic situation) in which engaged parties have incompatible attitudes and behaviours*. Conflict has three

inter-related components: (1) conflict situation, manifested in expressing various political aims or conflict of interest (see Galtung, 1990: 247), which cannot be simultaneously achieved and for that reason could be qualified as mutually exclusive; (2) conflict behaviour (at the first place aimed to achieve the mentioned political aims); and (3) conflicting attitudes and perceptions having emotional dimension (feeling of anger, mistrust, fear, scorn, hatred, etc.) as well as cognitive dimension (maintenance of certain stereotypes and beliefs regarding the opposite side) (compare: Michell, 1981: 29). As it was noticed, one should stay away from the notion that conflict behaviour should always be something that is to be stopped. Moreover, it should not be assumed that conflict in a wider sense of the term is something that should be necessarily avoided (Wiberg, 1998:176).

The collapse of communism and the re-emergence of a number of small, at least to some degree multiethnic and easy to manipulate states, which have rather poor democratic traditions (partly thanks to the fact that many of them were born in the war conditions) have represented earthshaking events. They have heavily influenced the re-emergence of numerous ethnic conflicts and tensions within the states as well as in inter-state relations. For instance, in addition to the four ethnic conflicts in former Yugoslavia (Serbo-Croatian in Croatia, Serbo-Moslem, and Serbo-Croatian in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbo-Albanian in Yugoslavia, i.e. Serbia), now there are some four new ones (Moslem-Croatian in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonian-Albanian, Macedonian-Bulgarian and Macedonian-Greek) and several potential intra-state and international conflicts of the successor states (for example, Montenegrin-Serbian). After it used to be a member of the Serbo-Croatian conflict in Croatia in 1991, Slovenia has been the only conflict-free successor state, which managed to establish relatively stable system of human rights protection and democratic interethnic relations, seen as one concrete way of overcoming the Balkan legacies as well as a concrete contribution to the peace in the region and beyond.

The situation in the Balkans has a special weight for the prospects of European security and European integration, which – according to some authors' beliefs – could be effectively thwarted by ethnic conflicts. It seems that the basic reasons for this belief came from already clearly demonstrated manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism as elementary and general generators and indicators of ethnic conflicts in Europe and elsewhere. This

belief is further corroborated by the world inclination toward establishing ethnically pure states, confinement to one's own borders, national particularism, selfishness, xenophobia or hegemonism, domination, authoritarian rule over other nations or parts of them, etc.

The formal and substantive aspects of the democracy itself seem to be equally important. Democracy in formal meaning of that word could be understood as a set of procedures, rules and institutions, such as rule of law, inclusive citizenship, separation of powers, elected power-holders, fair and free elections, freedom of expression and alternative sources of information, associational autonomy, and civilian control over the security and similar forces. As main features of substantive democracy could be taken the following: (a) the way in which human rights are perceived and the character of constitutions; (b) the role of political parties including the extent to which they provide a vehicle for participation in politics; (c) the role of media including the extent to which they introduce a broad political debate; (d) whether and how far the administration is capable to transform itself into a public service in which citizens have trust; (e) the extent to which local government is able to respond to local concerns and manage them; (f) the existence of an active civil society (independent institutions and associations) able to point out the abuse of state power, etc. One could examine the political systems and in this context make the distinction between substantive and formal democracy in order to evaluate the development of key aspects of the democratic practices. The political systems constitute, at least in some cases, particular variants of democracy, that is a *sui generis* political model influenced both by their legacies and by weaknesses and strengths of historical and modern features of democracy, including their nationalistic, even chauvinistic and other elements.

By making distinction between formal and substantive democracy, one could reach a more differentiated understanding of the democratisation process as it is experienced by each country. The experience of several years or decades in promoting democratic systems is not enough for making meaningful assertion as to the foundations and prospects of democracy. Sometimes, even democracies considered as old and mature in this regard corroborate by its (un)democratic practice that no one could be considered as perfect. In any case, one can make assessments about whether a process of genuine democratisation is under way, and how it can affect elimination and/or preventing escalation of

ethnic conflicts in societies by “managing”, “mitigating”, “regulating”, “mediating”, “transformation”, “resolving”, its “marginalisation”, etc.

One can detect existence of interdependence between the democracy and the modes of ethnic conflicts’ elimination. The political and social statuses of divers ethnic groups as well as the level of their involvement in the process of democratisation in each country are based on (1) the speed and course with which ethnic issues have been recognised; (2) the size and power of different ethnic groups; (3) the level of ethnic tension when the democratic process begins; (4) the political positions of the leaders of the main ethnic groups; (5) the ethnic composition of the previous and the present regime; (6) the presence or absence of external ethnic allies; and (7) ethnic composition of the military, police forces, etc. (see Isakovic, 2000: 4).

Senghaas’ model consists of the main (pre)conditions for lasting peace. Within his hexagon model (“Civilisatorian Hexagone” – *Zivilisatorisches Hexagon*) all conditions should be fulfilled simultaneously. First condition is that monopoly of power (*Gewaltmonopol*) should be held by democratically controlled authority,¹ and not by interest groups (for instance, warlords) or individuals. Second, the maintenance of rule of law (*Rechtsstaatlichkeit*) should be practised in keeping with a broadly accepted democratically and constitutionally adopted legal code. Third, control of interdependency and affects (*Affektkontrolle und Interdependenz*), i.e. the acceptance that social and/or political decisions should not be made on the basis of any affects and that individuals and groups in society and groups and individual states depend mutually. Fourth, democratic participation (*Demokratische Partizipation*) means that citizens within a state shall have equal opportunities to participate on local, regional, and national levels in policy making. Fifth, social justice (*Soziale Gerechtigkeit*) is a just distribution of resources at both national and international and

¹ In 1995 Lijphart stressed that the fulfilment of stable democracy and consociation needs cooperation between élites belonging to different groups, and the possibility that organizations and individuals of different ethnic groups affiliate themselves and cooperate beyond borders of their respective federal or ethnic units. The developments in ex-Yugoslavia and processes in other countries demonstrated that “political élites monopolize the mediating role between the groups, and reduce the possibilities of direct cooperation between citizens and organizations from the areas they have the control over. It is said that élites support heterogeneity of the society as a whole, i.e. between the ethnic groups, but act very energetically in order to impose homogeneity within the groups they control (Elazar)” (Stanovicic, 1996: 68).

national levels. Finally, sixth, the culture of conflict behaviour (*Konfliktkultur*) means that actors on all levels should learn to deal with conflicts peacefully, primarily through the equalisation and balancing of diverging interests calling for certain sacrifices by all parties (but without winners and losers) and compromises by them (see 1998).

This paper is a scholarly attempt to explore the general impact of ethnic conflicts on the democracy and human rights and *vice versa* in the present globalised world.

Democracy, human rights and the ethnic conflicts

It is considered that ethnic terrorism and violence in general will be continued in decreasing parts of the world and number of countries. One predicts that – although democracy will win – many countries will be faced with significant challenges during the democratisation process (see Fukuyama, 1991: 659–63; Hobsbawn, 1990: 164). This attitude opens the question of the extent to which democratic and human rights devoted countries could support others becoming alike in the globalised world. However, this dilemma raises new questions, numerous of them boiling down to whether force can be used for an export of democracy or ‘democracy’ (see Barzun, 1987; Gillies and Schmitz, 1992). In that way, democracy (thanks to the process of globalisation) could become global problem instead of a world benefit. As the 2000 presidential elections in the USA and a few other countries demonstrated, nobody is perfect as far as democracy is concerned (more details: Isakovic, forthcoming) and thus cannot have, pretend or claim the monopoly in this regard.

Wiberg stressed that before the 1991 war broke out in the former Yugoslavia, the EC offered several billion ECU as a reward if the conflict escalation parties found out a political solution (1994: 234). Cohen says that the European Ministerial Council and European Commission Chairmen suggested to the local leaders in the capital of Yugoslavia May 1991, that the European Union would be willing to intervene obtaining an intercession in the IMF and other international financial institutions. Reportedly, the capital goal was ensuring a support to Yugoslav economic stabilisation supporting investments, consolidating the reserves of foreign currency, country’s currency exchange...). The EC was ready to soon begin talks on Yugoslavia’s associate or similar membership if the sides overcame to the country’s constitutional order

problems. If an agreement was reached, the Union would offer some US\$ 4 – 5 billion financial aid (1995: 219).

In 1993 and 1992 the two American Presidents threatened Yugoslavia (the Belgrade government) warning that an escalation of the conflict in Kosovo/a could lead to intervention (see Caplan, 1998: 753). Preventing violent escalation of ethnic conflicts was at least temporarily and/or partly successful in Romania, Bulgaria and Macedonia and in several other members of the world state entities. In numerous other cases (particularly in Cyprus, Rwanda, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in Yugoslavia, i.e. Kosovo/a) the conflicts escalated; in some cases they were transformed into lasting warfare (see Galtung, 1997; Pugh, 2000). In some cases – perceived widely as disputes democracy vs. authoritarian rule – it was later shown that, in fact, there were border conflicts. In that way, a struggle for democracy could serve as an excuse for conflict escalation, territorial expansion and for camouflaging own authoritarian rule. At the other side, as Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Henry Hugh Shelton told the Senate Armed Services Committee May 3, 2001, "terrorists are adaptive adversaries who constantly look for ways to strike where their victims are most vulnerable" ("Shelton on Terrorism", 2001). Consequently, terrorist could feed authoritarian rulers and vice versa.

The (quasi)ethnic and similar conflicts have created major challenges for the world after the Cold War. One could conclude that major world actors have been insufficiently capable for creating ethnic conflicts analysis, which could be used for peacefully preventing conflict escalation and deescalating them. One could assume that some NGOs and other similar organisations featuring democratic societies could provide and offer the requisite competence, knowledge, skills and enthusiasm that could be potentially useful in conflicts, and lacking the means to realise their programs, ideas, and activities. The involved third parties, like international organisations (UN, NATO, OSCE, etc.) their members (governments and/or others) have had at least to some degree adequate means and sources, but incapable for eliminating the conflict without their engagement in it by imposing a solution.

One can define features of democratic state's engagement in the process of conflict escalation. First, the states are vulnerable to foreign and/or local propaganda and political pressures linked to conflict. The conflict parties are tempted by the mediator's vulnerability. They perceive the conflict as own opportunity for

launching a propaganda war over the issue of the mediator. In addition, the mediator's suitability to remain efficient and accepted is reduced by the one party's victory in that war. The vulnerable mediator is more likely to allow their initiatives to be conditioned by political and propaganda pressures exerted on them than by the successful mediation requirements.

In this aspect, a group of East Asian states would be superior than the EC, because the states would have the advantage of not being composed either of Catholic, Moslems, or the Orthodox. Thus, one is considering that for the role of mediator more appropriate are the countries less vulnerable to local or foreign propaganda and political conflict pressures. While some nations are linked with a just one religion and/or ethnic origin, the others' religious/ethnic division creates, in fact, links with a variety of the religions and/or nations ('worlds') (more details Isakovic, 1999: 19).

The propaganda war in Kosovo/a has been going on since the escalation of the conflict began and even before that.² One of its features appeared to be that the conflict sides tried to distinguish between the opposite side 'good' and 'bad' members: the Serbian side distinguished between the terrorists who from time to time attacked those who cooperate and those Albanians who cooperated with the state; the Albanian side issued declarations to the effect that their struggle was not aimed against all Serbs, but against Milosevic's regime. The leaders of Albanian political parties were somewhere in between. It was concluded, "the biased international media coverage has repeated itself; the Serb side (also independent sources such as human rights institutes, independent media and the NGO Serb Media Centre in Pristina) has been largely ignored by leading media such as CNN, the *New York Times* and even the BBC" ("Questions before bombing Serbia", 1998). The need for avoiding intensive repressive and brutal measures against civilians was suggested,

² Radojkovic has noticed that the Kosovo/a circumstances – compared with the situation in FRY – were "different, because of repression, for the press there exists mainly in the framework of the secession movement." The state managed Radio-Television of Serbia (RTS) center in Kosovo/a "treated also Serbs as minority and by 1989 it turned entirely to Albanian as language of information – the remaining minorities in Kosovo were completely neglected. After closing RTV Pristina in its old form in 1990, the balance was lost again, this time to the detriment of Albanians. However, because of their boycott this center of RTS is not able to realise provided quotas in Albanian language; new subsidies and staff are required." The author concluded, "it seems that it is convenient for Albanian political parties to maintain such situation as a permanent source of tensions, making use of it as a proof of violation of their human rights" and of the European standards (see more details: Uzunova and Vydrin 1996: 418).

and particularly if they last continually a two weeks (see Simic, 1993). The Serbian side also did not devote enough attention to the warnings that CNN become the sixth permanent informal member of the UN Security Council. After the end of the Milosevic's regime, the division between 'bad' and 'good' guys seems to have disappear. Thus, the Western politics is faced with the task of providing a political fine tuning in the Balkan political arena.

In some situations at least a fragile and temporary peace it was possible to be established by force, and it seems to be a more efficient way when ethnic conflicts are removed by even illusory arguments in the narrow or proper meaning of that term. *"Conflict-resolution is not about harming or killing people. It is about killing problems and harnessing the human and circumstantial attraction to violence. Violence is always part of the problem, never the solution"* (Øberg, 1994: 140). In the case of some conflicts the most appropriate way seems to be, at least theoretically, when all not directly engaged actors have the role of conflict mediator as a complex consortium or enterprise, trying to employ their democratic, human rights or other advantages, and to avoid their temptations or handicaps and weakness (see Isakovic, 1999: 28). However, some politicians of some of the conflicts parties use more arguments, and some more force as an argument.

Lutovac concluded, "international pressure will play a positive role only if it initiates the creation of authentic democratic potentials" (1997: 14). There is the open question – if the internal and/or international pressure is too great and thus coercive – is it going to be counterproductive?

In 2001, when, after the US was ousted from UN Human Rights Commission, "Mr. Bush called the vote 'outrageous,' and said 'it undermines the whole credibility of this commission, to kick the United States off, one of the great bastions of human rights, and allow Sudan to be on.' But what really stung was not that the United States was voted off the commission for the first time since 1947, it was that the snub was from U.S. allies, not from the usual array of America-bashers" (see Koring, 2001). This shows that the origins and perceptions of a pressure are important for their effects in (democratic and other) states.

Caplan considered "one requirement for a stable peace ... would seem to be the emergence of a new and truly democratic leadership in FRY – one which is respectful of the rights of all its constituent peoples". It was assumed that in that case Albanians would be less categorically opposed to solution by the restoration

of autonomy and concluded that there is no “evidence that the Serbian public is particularly unhappy about the country’s democratic deficit or opposed to Milosevic’s Kosovo policy – not yet, at least” (1998: 756). However, the events in Serbia and Kosovo/a 2000-2001 have not approved at least the second part of this consideration.

Democratisation has a potential to assist mitigate ethnic conflict. However, in some cases such a potential has been wasted, as the transition towards democracy produced a fertile ground for ethnic animosity, hatred and political demands of power-thirsty domestic and foreign political leaders and forces. Democratic turnabouts allowed many ethnic tensions including conflicts, but because democracy was fragile and young, it had not been able to manage them peacefully and properly. This thesis has probably a wider validity in the Balkans and numerous other areas (and maybe in the whole globalised world) known as focal points of ethnic conflicts and which have been traditionally (and at least, temporarily) ‘resolved’ or ‘eliminated’ through both legally and morally extremely unacceptable options, such as bombardment, forced expulsion and ethnic cleansing, etc.

Ethnic conflicts and the democracy and human rights

Wiberg considers the republic/nation Yugoslav elites before the big mutually quarrel started operated “pretty much like the European balance-of-power system of the nineteenth century”; coalitions were issue-related and shifting. When these rules collapsed, Yugoslavia drifted from “mature anarchy” into a “raw anarchy” (see 1994a: 231–2). The first formally democratic multi-party elections came at the worst possible moment since they were won by ardent nationalists everywhere; “the runners-up included even more extreme nationalists, giving the winners little leeway for compromises.” It was stressed, “they engaged in various demonstrations of sovereignty, accelerating the conflict spiral: attacks on remaining pan-Yugoslav institutions increased Serbian fears and actions inspired by these fears” (Wiberg, 1995b: 100).

There is the great debate whether democracies wage wars or not. It seems that the result of the debate could depend on accepted definitions of both the democracy and the war. One could consider democracies do not wage wars as in these circumstances the democracies actually become temporary (to extends wars could be perceived as transient phenomena) constitutional dictatorships featured by some characteristics common with

permanent dictatorships. For instance, as the decision to utilise nuclear weapons has to be created within seconds in acute danger situation, the decisions must be entrusted to a very small group or even one man. Hence the Dimitrijevic's conclusion that "notwithstanding the democracy of the system, all nuclear states are actually dictatorships at these 'moments of truth', because one individual decides on life or death, thereby expressing all his traits, including permanent or temporary insanity" (1985: 212).

Democracy is imperfect decision-making system because it – among other segments – includes mass manipulation, which is regularly easier in young than in mature and old democracies, and no one is perfect in this and numerous other regards. In a post-communist society, the manipulation could be directed toward many issues including even the very idea of democratic society.³ Simultaneously, acceptance of its imperfection is regarded as a strong side of democracy. *Ethnic mobilisation could become possible with democratisation, but the mobilisation could threaten and in good part destroyed democracy itself.*

Interethnic relations in many states are burdened by the presence of strong ethnic stereotypes and the bitter historical legacies in society in general including in what is called civil society (associations, political parties and trade unions⁴) (see Wiberg, 1995: 95). In some cases within the interethnic relations one could discover marks of their authoritarian past.

During its very beginning and its development, a study of ethnic conflicts could take into consideration significant difficulties and distinctions in the structural positions of ethnic groups. Within the context of future and current interethnic relations in countries, the crucial question is how to prevent or eliminate escalation of existing ethnic conflicts in order to provide democratic power a chance to assert itself?

The advantages of the development of civil society and democratisation in general may be used as a platform for conflict elimination depending of, among other circumstances, the forms

³ It was discovered that in a 1991 opinion poll in Russia, "a mere 10 percents of respondents adequately understand what a democratic society is. Another 11 percent support the idea of democracy, but understand it in an egalitarian or a liberal sense. The absolute majority of respondents is formed by the 47 percent who have no idea of what a democracy is and the 23 percent who defined it in a totalitarian, authoritarian or anarchistic sense" (1995: 44-45).

⁴ It was concluded, "the civil principle, established as a basic social value, insists upon the equality of conditions, rights and guarantees of all citizens, and is an adequate guard against ethno-nationalistic particularism of any kind" (Basic, 1996: 54).

which escalation of ethnic conflict may take. The more violent conflict escalation is the advantages seem harder to use, including eliminating the conflict in a peaceful way. Examining this thesis, in this paper will be analysed the cases of terrorism and terror as means used for achieving the goals for which armed force would otherwise have to be employed.

Etymology shows that the chief weapon of both terrorism and terror is causing fear; “this fear is created for a political goal, it is linked to maintaining or seizing power. Both terror and terrorism have dual targets, dual addressees: the victim of the violence and the threat recipient. Finally, both terror and terrorism are in discord with certain norms of political behaviour, which are different in case of terror and in case of terrorism, because, as a rule, terror is an action taken by those possessing legislative power, while individual terrorists are non-sovereign individuals, private individuals, differently subjected to a legal order” (Dimitrijevic, 1985: 111). One author by definition eliminates governmental violence (terror) as a form of terrorism as the state has a legitimate violence monopoly. Even here there are differences between situation, types, tactics, activities, degree to which social, psychological, etc. dimensions are important (Merkl, 1986).

When reviewing the intimidation actions and methods used by 20th century terror states, one could create the picture resembling the visions of orders considered ideal or at least suitable for achieving goals of various terrorist organisations. The same phenomenon can be found in both cases: the mass production of fear justified by superior principles and goals utilised as a means for ruling over society.

There is technical possibility for several terrorist organisations fighting to achieve different goals, to utilise the same actions due to their limited communication values. Some communications are possible to be established by choosing the time, place, means and some other modalities and circumstances of action and by the (un)selective choice of physical victims, and all this does not to be sufficient for reflecting the terrorists’ political, ideological and other goals and values in greater detail. If these efforts would be exhausted in violence, the terrorists’ message utilised to generate fear would be lost.

Terrorists’ resort to additional propaganda and other communications to win publicity and announce their goals among the intimidated people often is practised via mass media. Through their announcements, statements and other messages they

sometimes make the media to convey, they try to at least partly modify or even enhance the impact of their acts, when possible even before committing them. These messages are used as amplifiers or resonators of intimidating messages that is often obvious in the instances portraying the terrorists as “extremely efficient”, “omnipotent men-machines”, even “ready to do anything”, etc.

The intimidated people and others try to gather as much information as possible attempting to secure themselves, out of sensationalism or curiosity. It is difficult to achieve longer-lasting secrecy of data on terrorists’ actions – including the very fact that they were committed, particularly if they themselves want publicity, and particularly if the acts were committed in public, in presence of groups of people, etc. “Informing on an act of terrorism benefits the terrorists, because it fulfils one of their needs. However, it must also be emphasized that failure to report on a terrorist act allows for a much more dangerous type of informing, by word of mouth, rumors, which are by nature more difficult to control and prone to irresponsible exaggerations” (Dimitrijevic, 1985: 228). As in the mass media era few lies can remain hidden for longer lasting periods, these secrets may leak incurring greater damage than the fear would be caused by media reports of the terrorism.

According to some authors, reporting should be censored as media coverage in fact guarantees the achievement of terrorists’ goals to attract attention. This stand is based on the assumption that terrorist acts would not be conducted if the terrorist knew those acts could not win publicity and on the attitude that there would be no terrorism without contemporary communications (Schmid and de Graaf, 1982: 15). The stand is also corroborated by the fact that it is often impossible to affect main social conditions conducive to terrorism and causes of that phenomenon, especially when it is supported and assisted from abroad. Finally, the authors hold that by advocating the opposite stand, terrorism and its unacceptable brutality would be given legitimacy (more details Netanyahu, 1986).

However, journalists – particularly in democratic systems – are usually not willing to accept outside censorship of their reports (see Rehak, 1993: 198-201; Pelletier, 1991/1992: 6-7; Chambers, 1990: 21-23). Some authors maintain terrorism appears when and as long as one group feels unfairly treated, notwithstanding the media behaviour, the army’s and police’s ability to counter it, etc. (see Beeman, 1986: 29-36). In addition, application of

contemporary technology for combating terrorism could jeopardise and violate certain human and civic rights and freedoms (such as the right to receive and convey information). One author analyses methods in which the two imperatives could be fulfilled searching a compromise (see Clutterback 1991: 2-10).

In October 1970, Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau made into law the War Measures Act, which suspended numerous fundamental human rights during the civil strife, as “there can be no protection of fundamental rights without minimally stable society in which the state can enforce the rule of law”. Indeed, as it is well known, human rights are often derogated during times of emergency; numerous human rights treaties and other documents “contain a clause permitting the suspension of many fundamental human rights during a time of emergency” (Kindred, 2000: 808).

It could be concluded that conflicts (and particularly escalated ones like the one of the four conflicts in Macedonia) along with some governments are (among) worst enemies of human rights. Thus, conflict-thirsty governments could use their chance by escalating or provoking conflict escalation by the other sides in purpose to hide their own role in violating the freedoms and rights.

If the failure in publishing news devoted to terrorist acts can qualified as too risky, remains the question about ways and means for informing the public on them. As a rule, newsmen are willing to publish any news devoted to every terrorist act, attaching to it more or less sensationalism. In any case, terrorism is a negative sensation and – according with the mass media rules – should be and is treated as such. As it was noted “only a few rare phenomena can compare” with the attraction of terrorism (Radojkovic, 1988: 10).

Treating terrorism, mass media are faced by the obstacles, including primarily the restrictions demanded by the state political and legal rules and/or the community customs and ethic rules. From them stems the double standards use in the journalists' position on that topic: they qualify positive terrorists by words having positive connotations (independence or freedom fighters, dissidents, resistance movements, etc.), and the negative terrorists are called criminals, gunmen, terrorists, mercenaries, even communists and similar (more details Isakovic, 2000).

A compromise might be found applying the principle that *the media should inform on terrorist and comparable acts but not turning them into the mouthpieces of the terrorists*. Informing should be accompanied by explanations of the background and

ultimate goals of the terrorist acts. In the late 1989, during the events following the Nicolae Ceausescu's overthrow (when the secret policy launched terrorism) the behaviour of Romanian media showed that guided informing on along with explanation of terrorism, which was in fact practised by Free Romania TV, could have social and psychological impact opposite to that wanted by the terrorists. In the public opinion – instead of fear – prevailed aversion, revolt, even terrorists' defiance.

More reporting on who initiates reconciliation, reconstruction and resolution, and who are only reaping benefits (reconstruction contracts, etc.), and the conflict over and in Northern Ireland “would have entered a more peaceful phase long ago. Focus on the violence of IRA/RUC only hides the conflict and nourishes more violence. Focus on nonviolent outcomes, empathy with all parties, creativity: and peace may come” (Galtung, 1997). Between the avoiding being the mouthpiece of terrorists and commitment to inform the public on their acts, there is a broad area that may contain a rather large space for journalists' inclination for sensationalism, bureaucratic arbitrariness in determining what will, and what will not be published and the terrorists' strivings to gain publicity. Thus, the mentioned stand does not adequately resolve the problem of the position of the media toward the terrorist and similar acts, in the first place because it seems to be too general. “Theoretical thought is faced with the insoluble riddle of valuing contemporary forms of terrorism. Due to its proneness to the same factors imposing double standards on the media, it, too, can fall prey to them. If departing from the position that there should be full understanding of terrorism, theoretical thought risks to clash with moral and humanistic values, because terrorist methods are directed against them. If, however, science departs from the position that every existing order is justified, it risks fully turning into apologetics and abandoning the critical distance and option of revolutionary change. This temptation is attractive as well, again, because of the difficult evaluation of means used in terrorism” (more details Radojkovic, 1988: 47-50). The mentioned problems provoked one author to try to create a neutral definition of the terrorism as the utilisation of force or its threat supposed to achieve a political goal by producing fear, frustration or uncertainty (Mozaffari, 1988: 182).

The dilemma on the media attitude on violence has not been resolved as people are still not ready to condemn any violence, notwithstanding in which circumstances it was committed, who is

committing it and what are her/his motives and goals, who its victims are, etc. (see Isakovic, 2000: 198). Even in societies with long democratic traditions and that can be perceived as democratic ones, escalated ethnic or other conflicts make all sides to (try to) restrain democracy and/or reduce substantive (the role of media as a way for introducing political debate), formal (the freedom of expression, etc.) and democratic practice and principles and the certain human rights.

Thanks to its violent form, both terrorism and terror degenerate and degrade the advantages of democracy along with the results of the civil society development, which may be used as a platform for conflict deescalation and elimination and as a basis for its resolution. *The more violent conflict escalation is the advantages and achievements are harder to use including eliminating the (potentially) violent conflict in a nonviolent way.*

During the Kosovo/a crisis statesmen harden the positions of the actors in a conflict and helped to solidify their locked positions by attacking the actors. The political leaders who wanted to prevent violence would have addressed the problem or dispute and asked how they could contribute to its resolving. In addition to diplomatic, political and other skill and knowledge needed for the mentioned purposes and goals, they would need analyses, facts and some basic conflict knowledge as well as a reasonable quantity of understanding of psychology, social psychology, history and other related disciplines (see "Kosovo - Why it is serious...", 1998). In the case of the Kosovo/a conflict, it seems that mediators have not fulfilled the conditions for their role, and history will give its judgement. It is well known that global and other history is written by winners, and in the Kosovo/a conflict case as well as those in and around Macedonia, all sides (including the globalised world) seem to be at least partly defeated. If this is the case, there is the open question who is going to create the history of the Kosovo/a conflict? Probably each side will have own version of the history showing and representing itself as the (at least partial) winner, and in that case the (globalised) world will be main loser as its history will be segmented and its segments will be contradictory. More or less similar situation had existed before the Kosovo/a (and Macedonian) conflict escalation; that situation could be perceived as one of the causes of its (their) escalation.

It seems that the problems with democracy in the world were generated by various global and local factors including the relative lack of democratic traditions (particularly in some parts of the

world); the violent ethnic conflicts escalations in various parts of the world with relatively wide utilisation of UN, EU and other forms of the multilateral and unilateral sanctions within the conditions of multistate world system. In keeping with the tradition lack, after the Albanians were “cleansed” from Kosovo/a and after the NATO intervention, supported KLA is “not committed to a democratic future for Kosovo.” The KLA’s vision is not a multiethnic Kosovo/a, but the one “from which Serbs have been ethnically cleansed” (Layne, 1999).

Successful state and world democratisation needs national and world unity as a basic precondition, which can hardly be fulfilled due to the existing ethnic and other conflict, particularly in multiethnic societies and the world. Even in societies that can be considered as democratic ones and with long democratic traditions, escalated ethnic conflicts have lead their parties to restrain democracy and/or reduce democratic principles and human rights, and limit the functioning power of their democratic processes and institutions although in some parts of the world suspensions and restrictions seem to be more durable or severe. As a rule, ethnic conflicts, and especially escalated ones, have negative impacts on democracy, and at least partly disable the development of the democratisation process. The more conflicts, the harder it is to achieve democracy and even more so to experience it (cf. de Nevers, 1993: 31-48). An analogous conclusion can be created for the relationships between ethnic conflicts, and again especially escalated ones, and globalisation process.

A fearful situation – which within conditions of ethnic conflicts stimulates ethnonational mobilisation and division – cannot be assessed as favourable for the development of democracy as well as globalisation. The kind of democracy which may appear within such conditions could be similar to that existing in some of the old Greek city-states exclusively reserved for the ruling class of citizens, and not accessible for slaves. In many parts of the globalised or ‘globalised’ world there are no slaves any more but there are national and other divisions. Within these circumstances, threats generating the “rally-round-the-flag” effect and fears, could be qualified as counterproductive from the point of view of actors who utilise them as a means, and whose purpose might nevertheless be the democratisation of threatened states.

Lacking an expected higher GNP and socio-political cohesion in developing and other parts of the world have probably

contributed to the nervous way in which terrorists, states and other actors (re)acted and have been using terror(ism), even in situations in which a goal could be reached by means other than violence. In Kosovo/a and elsewhere in the world, that what the predominant group/state sees as “law and order” may be seen as deliberate discrimination by others; and what the former sees as peaceful assimilation and/or globalisation may look like (planned) ethnocide or imposition of own system and culture in the eyes of others (see Wiberg, 1995: 49). However, the more the sides use terror(ism) the more they will be lacking socio-political cohesion bringing additional readiness to utilise terror(ism), lack of the cohesion, etc. What can help sides in world, regional and local (intra-state) conflicts is a stable and socio-politically united (globalised) society and (global) state. As long as economic situation in EU is more or less stable, it will be attractive for the existing and new members; main dangers and threats one can see for this Union in deteriorating economic situation.

External threats seem to be counterproductive in so far as they aim to eliminate the conflict by protecting minorities (for example, Albanians, who are minority in Serbia, or Serbs, who are minority in Kosovo/a) who try to disintegrate state or other political entity whose part they are. The more outsiders threaten to use force, the more they reinforce the cycle of violence and make democracy future distant phenomenon. Many generally democratic oriented people, cease to be that if they perceive democracy as a way for disintegration of their state. In a similar way, chauvinists also get what they need, as the threats became more or less valid excuses for achieving their goals, i.e. isolation of their ethnic group and the whole society from the rest of the (globalised) world.

According to one author, there is the question whether it is acceptable for international community to tolerate jeopardising democracy, its principles and human rights in the name of (principle of) non-violence if one assumes that all principles are relative. “With some security spaces being based on systematic repression and murdering, the luxury of operating with absolute principles is no longer there ... With human rights and democracy played against non-violence, the compromise could also be about non-violence”. Thus, “the emergence of an international society built on common values such as human rights and democracy presents the peace movements with some formidable challenges” (Joenniemi, 1999: 57). It seems that one of the challenges appears as soon as one tries to analyse a case such is the NATO

bombardment of Yugoslavia, which punished the Serbian violation of human and some other rights of Albanians and/or Muslims or Bosniacs (during the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina) by violation of human rights including at the first place those which belong to their “third generation”: the right to peace, the right to development and the right to a healthy environment (see “NATO’s War...”, 1999; Isakovic, 2000b). In that regard, the NATO could be compared with the Serbs’ siege and bombardment of Sarajevo and some other places in Bosnia and elsewhere during the wars in the former Yugoslav republics.

The proper way of democracy’s defence is its development and widening of the human and other rights that compose it. The more democratic mechanisms for eliminating ethnic conflicts are available the less it is likely that they will become violently escalated conflicts which endanger democracy; the less the conflicts become violent the more are chances that they could be transformed or removed in a democratic way, etc. However, democratic systems, especially if endangered, may sooner or later start to defend themselves by means which could be passed in a democratic procedure, but in its essence are undemocratic as they could be considered as harmful to at least some of mentioned substantive aspects and elements of the democratisation process.

Finally, global, regional and state security should be maintained by the experts and democratic procedures associated with diplomacy and conflict resolution, and not only by soldiers and armaments (see Wiberg, 1998: 178). Otherwise, the world, regions and states as well armies could follow the unfortunate destiny of the Second Yugoslavia and its YPA, but in some cases having (much) poorer resources.

Conclusions

Examining the relationship between democracy, human rights and ethnic conflict in the globalised world one could verify the thesis that the relationship is two-sided: democracy and human rights have the potential to help eliminate or at least mitigate ethnic tensions and conflicts, but democracy and human rights could create a fertile climate for biases, hatred and thus conflicts. There is an open question what can concerned countries and the (at least partly) globalised world do in order to promote democracy and human rights without their imposition and exacerbating ethnic conflict?

Trying to answer mentioned question, one could have in mind that democracy could dampen, even eliminate ethnic conflicts, resolve them or prevent their escalation under certain conditions. First, it is necessary that the democratic oriented forces acknowledge and recognise the ethnic diversity existing in the state along with the fact that nobody is perfect. Second, they also have to discover a way – commonly perceived to be fair – to accommodate the interests of different groups and their human and other rights. On the one hand, the democracy provides a propitious setting for allaying ethnic problems, preventing their transformation to conflicts that should be avoided and/or their escalation, and on the other hand – successful democracy needs national unity as the basic precondition. Another precondition for democracy, respecting human rights and for dampening or preventing ethnic conflicts is at least some economic prosperity, which could be also harder reached and maintained in conflict situations.

Majority nations will not be secure unless the individual and collective human rights of the minorities will be protected to a feasible and necessary degree. Within these conditions, minorities should be deprived only of the democratic right to self-determination interpreted as the right to secession.⁵ As Eriksen has stressed, “as soon as minorities become majorities, new minorities appear. If the present number of nation-states is doubled, the number of minority problems may also be (roughly) doubled” (1992: 221).

Majorities should be deprived only of the ‘right’ to violate and imperil minorities’ human and democratic rights, which are the safeguards and guaranties of minorities’ dignity and distinct identity. In this way, the majorities’ states could protect their territorial integrity and they could (at least in some cases) gradually lose their reputations of the “powder kegs” or similar. For this reason, the countries need stable democracies, systems of human rights, which are protected by law along with traditional and other habits and developed economies (more details Isakovic, 1994: 35).

⁵ Glenny suggested that maybe a solution – at least for the former Yugoslavia – could be within the scope of the principle “all rights to minorities, excluding the right to secession” (see 1995: 57). One author says “so-called ethnic principle of self-determination has never been seriously considered by the international community to be the sole, or even primary, factor in assessing claims to statehood. Nevertheless, the rhetoric of ‘one people, one state’ echoes in the speeches of every dissatisfied minority” (Hannum, 1990: 7).

The more a minority is far from being loyal to state in which it has been living, presumably the more the state will use its repression; looking from the other side, the more the repression is used by the state the less is the minority likely to be loyal and to perceive the state power or authority as legitimate, but perceiving it as "plain domination" (see Duverger, 1972: 18).

Although democracy is not a perfect system, as long as it exists it creates possibilities and potentials for peaceful elimination of ethnic conflicts and problems. Before any proposal for conflict elimination, resolution or management is made one should learn and understand how to cope with conflicts with peaceful political means. However, when existing system cannot be qualified as democratic one, appears the complex dilemma what could and should come first: developing democracy (including human rights) or eliminating, preventing escalation or deescalating ethnic conflicts.

May 2001, Ottawa

Literature and References

- Arblaster, Anthony (1987) *Democracy*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Barzun, Jacques (1987) "Is Democratic Theory for Export?", *Ethic and International Affairs*, Vol. 1
- Basic, Goran (1996) "The Post-Communist National State and Ethnic Minorities - The Case of the Second Yugoslavia", *Munchner zeitschrift fur Balkankunde*, Munchen: Slavica Verlag
- Beeman, William (1986) "Terrorism: Community Based or State Supported", *American-Arab Affairs*, Vol. 16, Spring
- Brown, J.F. (1992) *Nationalism, Democracy and Security in the Balkans*, Aldershot: Dartmouth
- Buzan, Barry (1993) "Societal Security and European Security", in Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup and Pierre Lemaitre (eds.), *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*, Aldershot: Pinter Publishers Ltd
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner
- Caplan, Richard (1998) "International diplomacy and the crisis in Kosovo", *International Affairs* Vol. 4, No. 74
- Chambers, Thomas F. (1990) "A Willing Hostage", *Canada and the World*, Vol. 55, No. 6, February
- Clutterback, Richard (1991) "Technology and Civil Liberties", *Conflict Studies*, No. 238, February
- Danopoulos, Constantine P. and Emilia Laneva (1998) "Democratization and Poverty in the Balkans: The Cases of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia", paper presented at the Second CROP Workshop on the Role of the State in Poverty Alleviation (ROSA II) organized by CROP in cooperation with SALDRU, Cape Town, South Africa, September 18-22
- Danopoulos, Constantine P., & Kostas G. Messas (eds.) (1997) *Crises in the Balkans. Views from the Participants*, Boulder, CO: Westview
- de Nevers, Renee (1993) "Democratization and Ethnic Conflict", *Survival*, vol. 35, no. 2, Summer 1993, pp. 31-48
- Dimitrijevic, Vojin (1985) *Strahovlada – Ogled o ljudskim pravima i drzavnom teroru (Reign of Terror – Essay on Human Rights and State Terror)*, Belgrade: Rad

- Eriksen, Hylland Thomas (1992) "Ethnicity and Nationalism: Definitions and Critical Reflections", *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, Vol. 23, No. 2
- Fukuyama, Francis (1991) "Liberal Democracy as a Global Phenomenon", *PS: Political Sciences and Politics*, Vol 24. No. 4, December
- Galtung, Johan (1989) *Europe in the Making*, New York: Taylor & Francis
- Galtung, Johan (1990) "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", in Johan A. Vasquez (ed.), *Classics of International Relations*, 2nd edition, Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Galtung, Johan (1996) *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage
- Galtung, Johan (1997) "The Peace Journalism Option" (<http://www.transcend.org/PJOPTION.HTM>)
- Gillies, David and Gerald Schmitz (1992) *The Challenge of Democratic Development*, Ottawa: The North-South Institute
- Glenny, Misha (1995) "The Yugoslav Nightmare", *The New York Review of Books*, March 23, Vol. XLII, no. 5
- Hobsbawn, E. J. (1995) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 – Programme, Myth, Reality*, second edition, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Isakovic, Zlatko (1994) "Polozaj Makedonije u balkanskom okruzenju" (Macedonia on the Balkans), *Medjunarodna politika (Review of International Affairs)*, (Belgrade), no. 1024
- Isakovic, Zlatko (1997) "Human Rights Related to the Expression of Religion and Ethnic Relations in Macedonia and Balkans", Anthology of Papers Presented at the International Conference/Round Table *The Contribution of Religious Communities to Peace and the Removal of the Consequences of the War on the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia*, ISCOMET, Maribor, in cooperation with The Foundation for International Understanding, Copenhagen, and The European Centre for Ethnic, Regional and Sociological Studies, University of Maribor, Rogaska Slatina, Slovenia, September 19-21 (forthcoming)
- Isakovic, Zlatko (1999) "Diplomacy and the Conflict in Kosovo – Notes on Threats and Fears", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 10, www.ciaonet.org/

- Isakovic, Zlatko (2000) "Democratization, Democracy and Ethnic Conflicts in the Balkans", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 9; <http://www.copri.dk/copri/downloads/2000/9-2000.doc>
- Isakovic, Zlatko (2000a) *Introduction to a Theory of Political Power in International Relations*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Isakovic, Zlatko (2000b), "Peace and/or Human Rights?", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 12, pp. 15; <http://www.copri.dk/copri/downloads/12-2000.doc>; <https://www.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/wpsfrm.html>.
- Isakovic, Zlatko (forthcoming) "NATO and the South-eastern Europe – Powerless of Powerfuls and Power of Weaks in Ethnic Conflicts", in: Predrag Simic (ed.), *The European Union, NATO, and Their South-eastern European Neighbours*, Belgrade: Institute of International Politics and Economics (forthcoming)
- Joenniemi, Pertti (1999) "Toward Postmodern Peace Movements", *Peace Work for the Next Millennium*, Mariehamn: The Åland Islands Peace Institute
- Hugh Kindred, et al (2000) *International Law: Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied in Canada*, 6th ed. Toronto: Emond Montgomery
- "Kosovo - Why it is serious and what not to do" (1998) *TFF PressInfo*, No. 34, 6 March
- Layne, Christopher (1999) "Perspective on the Balkans: The Next War Has Begun - The Western Alliance Will Not Accept an Independent Nation There, and the KLA Will Not Settle for Less", *Los Angeles Times*, 19 August, www.transnational.org/features/balkanperspective.html, 7 September 1999
- Koring, Paul (2001) "U.S.-UN rift threatens to worsen", *Globe and Mail*, May 21, 2001
- Merkel, Peter H. (ed.) (1986) *Political Violence and Terror: Motifs and Motivations*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Michell C. R. (1981) *The Structure of International Conflict*, New York: St. Martin's Press
- Mouritzen, Hans (1997) *External Danger and Democracy. Old Nordic Lessons and New European Challenges*, Aldershot: Dartmouth
- Mozaffari, Mehdi (1988) "The New Era of Terrorism: Approaches and Typologies", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 23, No. 4
- "NATO's War – Boomerang Against the West" (1999) Part A, *TFF PressInfo*, No. 65, April 30

www.transnational.org/features/balkanperspective.html, 7
September 1999

- Netanyahu, Benyamin (ed.) (1986) *Terrorism: How the West Can Win*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux
- berg, Jan (1994) "Conflict-Mitigation in Former Yugoslavia - It Could Still Be Possible," In: Radmila Nakarada (ed.), *Europe and Disintegration of Yugoslavia*. Belgrade: Institute for European Studies
- Pelletier, Jean (1991/92) "When to Speak Out, When to Keep Silent", *Peace and Security*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Winter
- Pridham, Geoffrey & Tatu Vanhanen (eds.) (1994) *Democratization in Eastern Europe. Domestic and International Perspectives*, London: Roulledge
- Pugh, Michael (2000) "'Protectorate Democracy' in South-east Europe", *COPRI Working Papers*, no. 10 (<http://www.copri.dk/copri/downloads/10-2000.doc>)
- Radojkovic, Miroljub (1988) *Terorizam i sredstva komunikacija* (Terrorism and Means of Communication), Gornji Milanovac: NIRO Decje novine
- Radojkovic, Miroljub (1996) "Mediji nacionalnih manjina izmedju pozitivne i negativne diskriminacije" (Media of National Minorities between Negative and Positive Discrimination), *Polozaj manjina u Saveznoj Republici Jugoslaviji* (Status of Minorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), Collection of Papers Presented at the Scientific Meeting Held on January 11, 12 and 13, 1995, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
- Rehak, Peter (1993) "Terrorism and the Electronic Media: Regulation is not the Answer", in Mark Charlton and Elizabeth Ridell-Dixon (eds.), *Crosscurrents International Relations in the Post-Cold War Era*, Scarborough: Nelson Canada
- Remington, Robin Alison (1994) "Security Dilemmas in the Post-Communist Balkans – Party-Army Dynamics", *Eurobalkans*, Winter 94/95, no. 17
- Schmid, A. P. and J. de Graaf (1982) *Violence as Communication*, London: Sage
- Senghaas, Dieter (1998) *Zivilisierung wider Willen. Der Konflikt der Kulturen mit sich selbst*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp
- "Shelton on Terrorism" (2001), Defense Department Report, Automatic digest processor LISTSERV@LISTS.STATE.GOV, May 3

- Simic, Predrag (1993) "Instant Publicity and Foreign Policy", *Media Studies Journal*, Fall
- Stanovcic, Vojislav (1996) "Vladavina prava i suzivot etnickih grupa" (The Rule of Law and Consociation of Ethnic Groups), *Status of Minorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Collection of Papers Presented at the Scientific Meeting Held on January 11, 12 and 13, 1995, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
- Uzunova, Valentina and Vydrin, Valentin F. (1995) "Violence as a Side Effect of the Shift of Values in Post-Totalitarian Society", in Håkan Wiberg (ed.), *Peace and War – Social and Cultural Aspects*, Warsaw: UNESCO, Centre for Peace and Conflict Research & BEL CORP
- Vankovska-Cvetkovska, Biljana (1995) *Vojskata i demokratijata (The Military and Democracy)*, Skopje: Detska radost
- N. D. White (1996) *The Law of International Organisations*, New York: Manchester University Press
- Wiberg, Håkan (1992) "Divided States and Divided Nations as a Security Problem – The Case of Yugoslavia", *Working Papers*, no. 14, Copenhagen: Centre for Peace and Conflict Research
- Wiberg, Håkan (1993) "Societal Security and the Explosion of Yugoslavia", in Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup & Pierre Lemaitre, (eds.), *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*, London: Pinter Publishers Ltd
- Wiberg, Håkan (1994) "Making Peace in former Yugoslavia: Problems and Lessons", in: James Calleja, Håkan Wiberg & Salvino Busuttil, in collaboration with Sanaa Osseiran & Peri Pamir (eds.), *The Search for Peace in the Mediterranean Region. Problems and Prospects*, Valetta: Mireva Publishers
- Wiberg, Håkan (1995) "Former Yugoslavia: nations above all", in: Bogdan Góralczyk, Wojciech Kosteci, Katarzyna Zukrowska (eds.), *In Pursuit of Europe – Transformations of Post-Communist States, 1989-1994*, Warsaw: Institute of Political Studies Polish Academy of Sciences
- Wiberg, Håkan (1996) "Third Party Intervention in Yugoslavia - Problems and Lessons," in: Jaap de Wilde and Håkan Wiberg (eds.), *Organized Anarchy in Europe – The Role of States and Intergovernmental Organizations*, London – New York: Taurus Academic Studies - I. B. Taurus Publishers
- Wiberg, Håkan (1998) "Identifying Conflicts and Solutions", *Review of International Affairs*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1070-71, pp. 175-188

Dr. Zlatko Isakovic

DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS IN THE GLOBALISED WORLD

Summary

The aim of this paper is to elaborate relationships between nascent democracy, human rights and ethnic conflicts in the globalised world. The first part is devoted to analysis of the impacts of democracy and human rights on the ethnic conflicts. The starting point of the elaboration is the thesis that democracy and protection of human rights have a potential to help mitigate ethnic conflict. However, the potential can hardly be activated if the transition towards democracy produces a fertile ground for animosity, ethnic hatred and political demands of the external and internal power-thirsty political leaders and forces. Moreover, ethnic conflicts have been (at least, temporarily) 'eliminated' through both legally and morally extremely unacceptable options, such as forced expulsion and ethnic cleansing. There is the open question what can countries and the globalised world do in order to promote democracy and human rights without their imposition and exacerbating ethnic conflict? A democratic turnabout permits the appearance of many ethnic conflicts and tensions. Particularly young and fragile democracies are not yet able to manage them properly and peacefully, and no one state is perfect in this regard. This thesis has a special validity in the areas that are focal points of ethnic conflicts. As long as democracy flourishes it creates a possibility for solution to ethnic problems and conflicts, which one should understand and learn how to cope with them using peaceful political means. A deteriorating economic situation is main obstacle for democracy, eliminating ethnic conflicts and human rights.

The second part of the paper is dealing with the question of impacts made by ethnic conflicts (and particularly escalated ones in which terrorist means and terror are used) on democracy and human rights. Even in societies that can be considered as democratic ones and with long democratic traditions, escalated ethnic conflicts make all sides to reduce democratic principles and restrain human rights and democracy and scope of functioning the democratic processes and institutions. In some parts of the globalised world, suspensions and restrictions seem to be more durable and severe. As a rule, ethnic conflicts, and especially escalated ones, have negative impacts on democracy and respecting human rights. Successful democracy – as a basic precondition – needs national unity, which can hardly be fulfilled due to existing ethnic conflicts, particularly in multiethnic societies. The more conflicts, the harder it is to achieve democracy and less to experience it. An analogous conclusion is created for the relationships between ethnic conflicts, and again especially escalated ones, and globalisation process.

The main conclusion is that – if a system cannot be qualified as democratic one – appears the complex dilemma what should and could

come first: developing democracy or eliminating ethnic conflicts, resolving them, or preventing their escalations or deescalating them?