ENCYCLOPEDIA OF GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Volume I

Edited by

Mary Hawkesworth

and

Maurice Kogan

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

between modernization and Marxist schools of social development. Both have depicted ethnic identification as a primordial sentiment whose relevance would diminish with the expansion and penetration of the modern industrial society. Contrary to the expectations of both schools, however, we have witnessed a resurgence of ethnic politics at a point in time when the penetration of the global political economy and the diffusion of the modern culture into all corners of the globe had led mainstream comparative analysts to anticipate the imminent demise of ethnicity as an issue nexus for politics within nations. The frustration of these expectations is summarized by Walker Connor:

> The preponderant number of states are multiethnic. Ethnic consciousness has been definitely increasing, not decreasing, in recent years. No particular classification of multiethnic states has proven immune to the fissiparous impact of ethnicity: authoritarian and democratic; federative and unitary; Asian, African, American, and European states have all been afflicted. Form of government and geography have clearly not been determinative. Nor has the level of economic development. But the accompaniments of economic development–increased social mobilization and communication–appear to have increased ethnic tensions and to be conducive to separatist demands. Despite all this, leading theoreticians of 'nation-building' have tended to ignore or slight the problems associated with ethnicity.
>
> (Connor 1972:332)

Thus, we are presented with the questions that will serve as the focus of this essay. Why has ethnicity remained such a powerful focus of political identification in the contemporary global community? Why has the diffusion of global political culture, economic institutions and modernization processes not led to the anticipated decline in the salience of ethnicity in politics and perhaps even intensified its political relevance? What are the different forms that ethnic political mobilization assumes, and what structural, cultural and individual factors account for differences in the probability, form and issue focus of ethnic collective action?

This essay presents an overview of some of the more compelling themes in recent research on ethnic politics. By describing the theoretical principles upon which this body of research is grounded, this essay can perhaps illustrate the extent to which this research is in fact integrated theoretically into the broader paradigmatic terrain of collective political action. In this manner, we can perhaps highlight the relevance of research on ethnicity and politics to the evolution, refinement and elaboration of the major research traditions dealing with social change and political development.

DIMENSIONS OF ETHNICITY AND ETHNIC CONFLICT

When one realizes that ethnic heterogeneity is the norm among the nations of the contemporary global community, it should not be surprising that ethnicity has remained such a powerful factor in the domestic politics of so many nations. Nearly twenty years ago, Walter Connor (1972:320) pointed out that, of the 132 nation-states in existence at that time, only twelve (9.1 per cent) were essentially ethnically homogeneous, while twenty-five (18.9 per cent) had one ethnic group that accounted for more than 90 per cent of the population and another twenty-five had one group that accounted for between 75 and 90 per cent of the population. However, in thirty-one nations (23.5 per cent) the largest ethnic group comprised only 50 to 74 per cent of the population, and in another thirty-nine (29.5 per cent) the largest single ethnic group accounted for less than half of the population. In fifty-three states (40.2 per cent) the population was divided among more than *five* significant groups. In view of what Connor termed 'the remarkable lack of coincidence…between ethnic and political borders', it should not be surprising to find that ethnicity remains a focal point of political organization and competition throughout the world.

The evidence on the extent of ethnic violence testifies to the intensity with which ethnic issues are prosecuted in the political arena. In a study of conflicts in Africa occurring between 1946 and 1976, Istvan Kende categorized 120 conflicts into three types: internal anti-regime, internal tribal, and border wars (Kende 1978:231–2). He found that 85 per cent of these conflicts were of the two internal types, which were not only the most frequent (102 out of 120 conflicts) but also the most persistent (97.7 per cent of the total number of 'nation-years' of war). In the last ten years covered by his study (1967–76), there was an increase in the proportion of all war that was internal, and internal tribal war with foreign intervention was found to be the form most rapidly increasing in frequency. All of the internal tribal and most of the internal anti-regime wars had an ethnic component to them.

For instance, Horowitz (1985:10–12) points out that the independence movement in Guinea-Bissau was confined largely to the Balante with little support from the Fula. In Mozambique the Makone provided most of the soldiers for the war against Portugal while the Shangana provided most of the movement's political leadership. The three rebel armies in Portuguese Angola were ethnically based, and Jonas Savimbi's UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola) has continued to wage war against the post-independence government of Angola from its ethnic base among the Ovambo of the south of the country. Across the border in Namibia, Sam Nujoma's SWAPO (South-West Africa People's Organization) is largely a movement of the Ovambo. In Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe's support was from the Shona majority while Joshua Nkomo's army drew on the Ndebele minority.

What Kende's study indicates is that, once the dismantling of colonial sovereignty was virtually completed, civil conflict did not disappear in the Third World. Instead, indigenous ethnic and tribal hostilities supplanted colonial domination as the predominant issue driving the continuing diffusion of revolution throughout the Third World. Many of the newly independent nations became subject to conflict involving the efforts of ethnically and regionally based groupings to gain regional independence, or the efforts of revolutionaries from the subordinate ethnic group to seize control of the government from a superordinate group. In both forms of civil strife, ethnicity has provided a powerful and perhaps critical basis for popular mobilization. Hence, we have witnessed secessionist warfare in Burma, Bangladesh, the Sudan, Nigeria, Morocco, Iraq, Ethiopia and the Philippines, ethnically based civil wars in Lebanon, Zaire, Angola and Afghanistan, interstate war between Ethiopia and Somalia over the Ogaden region, between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, ethnic riots in India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Zaire and Guyana, attacks by an army of one ethnic group against civilians from another ethnic group in Uganda and Zimbabwe, and the expulsion of Asians from Uganda, and of Beninese from the Ivory Coast and Gabon (Horowitz 1985:3; see also Small and Singer 1982:59–60, and 80 for a listing of conflicts).

Ethnic conflict has by no means been confined to the former colonial territories of the Third World. Basque separatism in Spain, South Tyrolean discontent with Italian rule, resurgent Scottish and Welsh nationalism in the United Kingdom, the chronic violence of Northern Ireland, Franco-Canadian separatist sentiments in Quebec, the Walloon-Flemish rivalry in Belgium, continued racial conflict in the United States and the emergence of similar strife in Great Britain all attest to the durability of ethnic loyalties as a source of conflict in the major post-industrial democracies of Western Europe and North America (see Connor 1972:327; Ragin 1979; Hechter 1974; Birch 1978; Tiryakian and Rogowski 1985).

Nor has the adoption of Marxist-Leninist ideology in Eastern Europe immunized those nations against ethnically based internal conflict. The Lithuanian declaration of independence from the Soviet Union and the persistence of similar sentiments within the other two Baltic republics of Latvia and Estonia, the bloody interethnic conflicts between Armenians and Azerbaijanis in the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh, and the rumblings of separatist sentiments among the peoples of the other southern republics of the Soviet Union reveal the extent to which ethnically based nationalist sentiments have endured in the Soviet Union despite more than a generation of officially sanctioned socialization promoting the notion that such sentiments are revisionist in nature. The escalation of Slovenian and Croatian separatist sentiments into interethnic warfare in Yugoslavia, recent persecution of Hungarian minorities in Romania, the suspicion with which ethnic Germans are

regarded by Poles in the territory returned to Poland at the end of the Second World War, and the failure of the People's Republic of China to eradicate independence sentiment among Tibetans likewise attest to the pervasiveness of ethnic loyalties and identity among the peoples of the putatively proletarian states of Eastern Europe and Asia.

This raises the question of why ethnicity has persisted and even intensified amid the rapid diffusion of 'modernization' (however one wishes to conceive it) and its many correlates, such as industrialization, urbanization and the penetration of modern communications and modern values into every corner of the globe. Indeed, it is this paradigmatic anomaly, common to both the Marxist and modernization schools of development, that has served as the starting point for much of the contemporary theoretical work on ethnicity and politics. In the next section, we explore some of these arguments.

MODERNIZATION AND THE PERSISTENCE OF ETHNIC POLITICS

The proposition that the multi-dimensional process of modernization should lead to a withering away of ethnicity as a source of group identity is by no means new to the social sciences. As far back as the middle of the nineteenth century, social theorists believed that with the evolution of industrial society economic interests would supersede ethnicity as the focus of people's social identity and participation in politics. Ethnicity was regarded as a set of 'residual loyalties from an earlier phase of social development' that inevitably would be displaced by economic rationality as the motivational basis of people's behaviour (Birch 1978:325). More recently, authors such as Parsons and Smelser (1956), Lipset and Rokkan (1967) and Butler and Stokes (1969) have argued that 'extensions in the scope and centrality of the market would lead to the erosion of ethnic attachments' because ethnic identities have no direct relevance to the transactions of the market-place and, therefore, should lose their social meaning (Leifer 1981:24–5). The expanded spatial mobility of labour, capital, and goods and services should likewise discourage the geographic concentration of any ethnic group and thereby facilitate its assimilation into a more universal social order (Hechter and Levi 1979:266).

Yet, as we have seen above, the diffusion of modernization throughout the world has not resulted in the diminution of ethnicity as a political force. How, then, do we account for this? Ethno-regional movements could have been anticipated in some of the multi-ethnic nation-states of Asia and Africa in the aftermath of independence from colonial rule. In Africa, nation-state boundaries were drawn with little or no regard for the ethnic boundaries among indigenous peoples. In many cases an explicit component of the colonial power's 'divide and

rule' strategy was to preserve intact the cultural autonomy of the various ethnic groups. Upon achieving independence, the institutions of the newly formed state posed no immediate threat to this patchwork of ethnically distinct social subsystems left over from the colonial era. However, as the central state increased its capacity to regulate society and extended its authority into the ethno-regional enclaves, the isolation that had allowed ethnically distinct subsystems to retain their autonomy under colonial rule gradually dissolved. All too often, the resultant challenges faced by ethnic groups evoked in them an almost xenophobic 'reactive ethnicity' characterized by the resistance of previously autonomous ethnic enclaves to the potentially corrosive and exploitive penetration of the modern state's institutions and authority (Connor 1972:329; Hechter and Levi 1979:263; Nielsen 1985:134).

The persistence of ethnic conflict in the advanced industrial societies of Western Europe and North America is less readily explained by modernization theory or Marxism. Indeed, both schools postulate the displacement of 'primordial' identities such as ethnicity by more universal modern identities such as class and other identities based on shared economic interest (Rogowski and Wasserspring 1971:9). The continued reality of ethnicity as a force in advanced societies poses an anomaly of paradigmatic import for both Marxists and modernization theorists alike. Rogowski and Wasserspring (1971:9–10) have argued that, contrary to modernization theory, greater interaction does not increase the 'cognitive problem' of placing people by particularistic criteria; indeed, it may serve to crowd out *all but* ascriptive criteria. Amid the cognitive overload that inevitably accompanies the transition from tradition to modernity, race and ethnicity often become more salient as determinants of people's behaviour because they are identification mechanisms that have a low cost of information. The increasing complexity of modern society, and the accompanying difficulty of distinguishing potential allies from potential rivals in the competitions that characterize it, reinforce the tendency toward ethnic solidarity because it is easier to distinguish allies from rivals on the basis of ethnicity than on the less obvious (and hence more costly to determine) criteria of occupation, class, political preferences, or other non-ascriptive criteria.

A major structural consequence of these tendencies is that ethnic solidarity and the ethnic identification are reinforced because the benefits of modernization are not equally (or at least equitably) distributed across ethnic groups (Brass 1976; Melson and Wolpe 1970; Bates 1974; for an alternative view see Horowitz 1985:103). The questions of why ethnicity has remained a salient criterion for the distribution of the rewards and costs of modernization, and what consequences flow from this tendency, have come to serve as the central foci of much of the theoretical literature on contemporary ethnic politics. We turn now to these works.

ETHNICITY AND POLITICS: THEORETICAL APPROACHES

The realization that modernization theory and Marxism's depictions of ethnicity were at best incomplete in their failure to account for the persistence of ethnicity has led to a number of theoretical efforts to resolve this paradigmatic blind spot. An important initial step was to define ethnicity in terms that allow its integration as a concept into existing theoretical frameworks on social change, political development and collective action. Rogowski's (1974:71) definition of a 'stigma' as any identifying characteristic that has a low cost of detection and a high cost of conversion has proven to be theoretically rich in that it provides us with access to the conceptual tools with which to explore the extent to which ethnicity and other ascriptive characteristics affect individual political behaviour and participation in collective action. By this definition, for instance, race and gender are relatively powerful stigmas in that one's race or gender can be determined rather easily by others and can be altered only at great expense, if at all; by contrast, language and accent are less powerful stigmatic bases for group solidarity because they are less readily detected and more easily altered.

From this perspective, it becomes possible to conceive of ways in which modernization or any other form of social change could reinforce ethnic identity and interethnic conflict. First, modernization creates benefits and costs, both public and private in nature. These benefits must be allocated among different constituencies in society. Ethnicity is one way in which constituencies can be distinguished from each other in that it is relatively easy to allocate benefits and costs differentially according to ethnic criteria. In this manner, the opportunity structure and the changes in it that are generated by modernization may be biased in favour of one ethnic group over another.

The differential distribution of the benefits of modernization may occur for a number of reasons. Largely serendipitous environmental factors may advantage one ethnic group over another when, for instance, one group happens to occupy territory in which rare minerals are located or the soil and climate are more appropriate for a particularly valued cash crop. In other cases, geography affords one group earlier and more frequent contact with the outside world and thereby gives that group a developmental 'head start' over other ethnic enclaves that are more isolated from global contacts. Some cultural groups may be more predisposed than others to take advantage of the new opportunities presented by the advent of modernization and to compete for the benefits of modernization (Melson and Wolpe 1970:1115–16; see also Bates 1974:464–6). In some cases this cultural predisposition may be a function of the niche occupied by that group in the pre-modern 'cultural division of labour'. For instance, an ethnic group that traditionally was denied access to land and therefore became concentrated in commercial activity as merchants may find itself favourably positioned to take

advantage of the changes in the indigenous economy and social structure brought on by its integration into the global economy.

If the benefits of modernization are distributed according to ethnic criteria, then the structural relationship between different ethnic groups becomes significant for explaining ethnic differences in the distribution of social costs and benefits, the extent to which these differences lead to ethnic conflict and what form that conflict will assume. The fundamental distinction between forms of ethnic differentiation is between vertical and horizontal differentiation, or between 'ranked' and 'unranked' systems. In a vertically integrated or 'ranked' system of interethnic relations, stratification is synonymous with ethnicity in the sense that the social structure is characterized by one ethnic group being subordinate to the other. Because ethnicity and class coincide, mobility is restricted by ascriptive criteria (Horowitz 1971:232; 1985:23–5). Generally, the different ethnic groups are intermixed geographically so that interaction between members of the different ethnic groups is a routine feature of everyday social life. However, the relations between groups are governed by clearly recognized norms of superordinate and subordinate status. Behavioural norms governing intergroup relations in ranked systems typically have ritualized modes of expressing the subordinate group's deference and the superordinate group's dominance and interactions approximate the etiquette of a caste system (Horowitz 1985:26).

Despite the rigidity of ranked systems, relations between superordinate and subordinate ethnic group are usually characterized by some measure of social cohesion and shared expectations in addition to the coercion and conflict that preserve the status quo. The dominant modality of interactions between members of the subordinate and superordinate groups is that of a clientelist exchange: members of the subordinate group seek protection from their patrons in the superordinate group in exchange for providing those patrons with services, loyalty, deference and goods (Horowitz 1985:26; for patron-client politics, see Powell 1970; Scott 1972). To challenge the system is to jeopardize one's security against threats to bare survival and, as Scott (1976) and Popkin (1979) have argued (though from different perspectives), such an extreme risk is not undertaken lightly. Thus, we witness the persistence of ethnically ranked social structures in many Third World nations despite the rather obvious inequities that characterize them.

However, such structures are subject to erosion by what Horowitz (1971:236) terms the 'diffusion of universalistic norms' that accompanies modernization. The exchange relationship between ethnic groups breaks down as a result of changes in the local political economy induced by the nation's increasing integration into the global political economy. This process alters the local markets for land, labour and capital in such a way that elites in the superordinate group find it profitable to divert resources away from production for local

consumption and towards production for world markets. Under such circumstances, the cost of insuring their clients against the risks of subsistence crisis begins to appear less attractive compared to the returns they could accrue from diverting those resources into additional production for global markets. Consequently, they begin displacing clients from land and reducing their labour costs. When, as a consequence, members of the subordinate group lose their protection against the threat of subsistence crisis, the rationale for continued deference to the superordinate group erodes, and the masses of the subordinate group are subject to mobilization for collective action.

The alternative to ranked systems is the 'unranked' or horizontally integrated system. Here, each ethnic group has its own stratification system internal to the group and distinct from all other groups. Different ethnic groups co-exist as parallel social hierarchies, with each group organized effectively as an incipient whole society. Indeed, in many cases they were formerly constituted as more or less autonomous whole societies (Horowitz 1985:24). In unranked systems, relations among members of different ethnic groups are far less predictable. There is often a lack of mediating national authority to establish a high level of reciprocity premised on equality in interactions between members of different groups (ibid.: 28). In this respect relations between groups take on the character of international relations (Horowitz 1971:234).

Horowitz (1985:35) argues that unranked systems have more ability to survive the changes and dislocations that accompany modernization and development because, within each ethnic group, there are opportunities for upward mobility, and the exploitation of these opportunities does not necessarily lead to interethnic conflict. When interethnic conflict does occur in an unranked system, it usually aims not at social transformation but at the exclusion from power of one group by another and the desire to revert to some ethnically homogeneous *status quo ante* (Horowitz 1971:235). For this reason, violent interethnic conflict in an unranked system is more likely to take the form of a separatist revolt than a social revolution.

The implications of this distinction between ranked and unranked systems has been elaborated theoretically in the analytical juxtaposition of Michael Hechter's 'internal colonialism' model of interethnic relations with the emerging 'ethnic competition' model of such relations. Internal colonialism explores the social and behavioural implications of ranked structures of interethnic relations while the competition model can be seen as an elaboration of the social and political implications of unranked structures of ethnic relations.

Central to Hechter's internal colonialism model is the concept of a 'cultural division of labour' (CDL). This refers to a pattern of structural discrimination such that 'individuals are assigned to specific types of occupations and other social roles on the basis of observable cultural traits or markers' (Hechter

1974:1154). From this perspective, the structure of relations between subordinate and superordinate ethnic groups corresponds to the sort of exploitation that characterizes relations between peripheral and core nations in neo-colonial patterns of international relations (hence the term 'internal colonialism'). Ethnic boundaries coincide with lines of structural differentiation, and as a consequence ethnic solidarity is intensified (Nielsen 1985:133). Where the stratification system links ethnic identity and economic status, it confers a meaning to ethnic identity that persists so long as this linkage between status and ascriptive stigmas remains. Ethnic solidarity is reinforced as a reaction of a culturally distinct periphery against exploitation by the centre. Hence, a number of scholars have referred to this consequence of CDL as 'reactive ethnicity', whereby ethnic solidarity is reinforced by the perceived exploitation of the subordinate group by the superordinate (Nielsen 1985:133). Under these circumstances, ethnic differences do not disappear and indeed may form the basis for collective action by members of the peripheral communities against the core community because ethnic identity cannot be detached from one's economic and political interests within the system (Leifer 1981:26; Birch 1978:326–7).

Whereas the 'internal colonialism' argument and other reactive ethnicity variants predict that ethnic resurgence is more likely when there is a cultural division of labour, there has emerged an alternative 'ethnic competition' model that predicts that ethnic resurgence is more likely where the cultural division of labour has broken down and group inequalities have diminished (Nagel and Olzak 1982:130–7). In an unranked system, competitive ethnicity emerges as members of different groups find themselves competing for the same resources (Nielsen 1985:134). As culturally heterogeneous societies become industrialized, the extension of the market economy throughout the nation along with the increasing bureaucratization of society and other correlates of modernity should enhance the precedence of universalistic criteria that cut across the traditional ethnically based systems of ascribed status. The assignment of individuals to occupations and the distribution of societal rewards in general will increasingly be made on the basis of rational and achievement-based criteria that transcend ethnic boundaries.

However, this does not render ethnic distinctions irrelevant. The benefits of modernization are highly desired but relatively scarce. Consequently, members of different ethnic groups increasingly find themselves in a position to compete against each other for the same occupations and rewards. As these changes progress, they tend to reinforce rather than erode ethnic solidarity (Nielsen 1985:133–4; see also Hannan 1979; Nielsen 1980; Ragin 1979; Olzak 1983). Extension of the rational labour market renders the types of interests motivating members of an ethnic group more nearly homogeneous and thereby makes the ethnic group more salient as an organizational channel for

collective action (Nielsen 1985:142). Therefore, ethnic groups persist because of their capacity to extract goods and services from the modern sector and thereby satisfy the demands of their members for the benefits of modernity (Bates 1974:471).

The capacity of ethnic groups to extract resources from the modern sector depends upon their capacity to impose sanctions on those of their membership who do not act to advance the status of the group, especially elites who do not use their elite status to enhance their standing within their own ethnic group. Many modernized members of an ethnic group convert their success in the modern sector into status in the traditional sector of the ethnic group, often by using the income they have received from the modern sector to cultivate clientelist support networks among those members of their own ethnic group (Bates 1974:472–4). If they decline to do so, they may be subject to sanctions by the membership of their own ethnic group. The likelihood of this occurring would depend on how easily they can be identified as members, how readily their non-support can be detected, and how capable the existing regime is in imposing its will on a discontented ethnic group. Hence, ethnicity becomes salient in the competition over the benefits of modernization for both elites and non-elites.

Bates (1974:465–6) has argued that in many African nations the rise of ethnic competition is a direct legacy of colonial administration. By delineating administrative boundaries along tribal lines, colonial powers made it in the interests of their subjects to organize along ethnic lines so as to gain control over the administrative machinery with which the modernization process was managed. Local administration controlled such things as access to markets and market stalls, the regulation of crop production and animal husbandry, the construction of roads for the export of produce, and, in many cases, access to land. Local councils often acted to bias the distribution of and access to these resources in favour of the local ethnic group. Because control over the distribution of the benefits of modernity was vested in the local administration whose jurisdiction corresponded with ethnic boundaries, it was natural for local communities to coalesce into politically cohesive ethnic groupings and to utilize this solidarity to restrict the degree to which local or national administration could compel the sharing of the benefits of modernity with members of other ethnic groups (Bates 1974:464–7).

Ranked and unranked systems create two rather distinct bases for ethnic competition and conflict. However, conflict of interests does not necessarily lead to collective action. Cultural divisions of labour and competitive ethnicity are far more pervasive than ethnic conflict. Theories of ethnic conflict must address the question of how mobilization along ethnic lines is achieved. With ethnicity as the basis of shared interests, what are the obstacles to collective action in pursuit of

those interests and what role does ethnicity play in overcoming those obstacles to collective action?

ETHNIC CONFLICT

The research discussed above describes the ways in which scholars have depicted ethnicity as a source of shared interests that could become the basis for collective action. However, shared interests do not automatically lead to collective action. Hechter *et al.* (1982:414) note the relative rarity of ethnic collective action and attribute this to the obstacles to such action posed by the disjunction between individual interest and collective action. Ethnic divisions, as we have seen, are rather common features among the members of the contemporary nation-state system, and ethnic groups typically co-exist in some structural arrangement characterized by the differential distribution of societal benefits on the basis of ethnicity. If such discrimination were sufficient to induce ethnic conflict, then such conflict would be far more pervasive and persistent than it is in fact. Indeed, what is striking is the relative rarity of ethnic collective action in a global system in which ethnic stratification is anything but rare.

Rational choice theory offers an explanation for why such conflict is so rare: despite the presence of shared interests defined along ethnic lines, it is still not rational for individuals to participate in ethnic collective action to advance those interests (or redress their grievances) unless the free rider problem, as elaborated by Mancur Olson (1965) can be overcome. According to Olson, individuals have an incentive to withhold their support for or participation in group action aimed at the production of collective benefits because, should the action succeed, they will be able to partake of the collective benefits anyway and, assuming the group is large enough, their own particular contribution will not substantially affect the probability that the collective action will produce the desired public benefits. Free rider tendencies can be overcome by the provision of 'selective incentives', which are private benefits (or punishments) that are available only to those who participate (or do not participate) in the collective action. Beyond selective incentives, anything that decreases the cost of participation or increases the impact of one's own contribution on the production of collective benefits will make an individual more inclined to participate. In particular, free rider tendencies can be diminished by the presence of a leadership whose organizational skills give people the assurance that their contributions will make a difference and will not be in vain (Frohlich *et al.* 1971). Hence, the central issue of specifically ethnic conflict is how ethnicity facilitates the task of overcoming free rider tendencies (Rogowski 1985:88–9).

Accordingly, rational choice theory suggests that 'the position of an ethnic group in the stratification system has no direct bearing either on any member's

decision to participate or on the group's propensity to engage in collective action' (Hechter *et al.* 1982:420). Instead, 'the role of stratification in collective action is indirect; it operates principally through its effects on group solidarity (that is, the member's compliance with the group's normative obligations) and organization' (ibid.: 421).

According to Rogowski and Wasserspring (1971:20–1), the necessary and sufficient conditions under which it will be rational for an individual to engage in ethnically based collective action are:

1 the individual must be a member of a stigmatized group;
2 he/she must perceive some group-specific collective good as desirable;
3 ethnic collective action must offer a 'cheaper' way of obtaining the good than does conversion out of the group;
4 the individual must believe that his/her own contribution will make at least some difference in determining whether or not the desired good is produced.

For the individual to conclude that ethnic collective action is a cost-effective way of producing the collective benefits and that his/her contribution will make some difference in whether or not the benefits are provided, there must emerge from among the aggrieved ethnic group a leadership that is capable of organizing collective action and persuading potential contributors that their contributions will make a difference.

Rogowski (1985) argues that the tendency toward ethnically based collective action will differ depending upon whether the structure of interethnic relations is characterized by a cultural division of labour (i.e. a ranked system) or, alternatively, a 'pillarized' structure of parallel (i.e. unranked) ethnic communities. In the former, upward social mobility effectively requires assimilation into the culture of the superordinate ethnic group (ibid.: 92). The ease with which they can be assimilated will be a function of the willingness of the superordinate group to accept them and the ability of the upwardly mobile to avoid negative sanctions from the subordinate group for assimilating. This, in turn, will often depend upon the strength of the stigma that distinguishes the subordinate from the superordinate group. Ethnicity, as a stigma that is relatively easy to detect and costly to alter, renders the detection and punishment of defectors relatively easy and therefore makes upwardly mobile members of a subordinate ethnic group more inclined to pursue the mobilization of their own ethnic compatriots rather than to seek assimilation into the superordinate group.

If the superordinate group resists assimilation of upwardly mobile members of the subordinate group, then eventually the subordinate group will have its own cadre of skilled leaders. Having been denied access to leadership positions in the society because of their ethnic heritage, these leaders have a powerful incentive to organize the subordinate group for collective action aimed at altering

permanently the cultural division of labour in such a way as to create opportunities for themselves to assume leadership positions. For example, the independence movement in India was led by British-educated Indians who, despite their qualifications, were denied acceptance into British society or advancement beyond middle levels of the British colonial administration. In these circumstances, free rider tendencies are overcome, first for the elite of the subordinate group by the promise of the selective incentives of leadership positions in the new social order that will result from collective action, and for the masses of the subordinate group by the organizational activities of these aspiring elites. The creation of an organization increases non-elites' estimate of the likelihood that their contributions, no matter how small, will be aggregated with those of others in such a way as to produce the collective benefits. In short, the creation of an organization enhances their willingness to participate in collective action by giving them greater confidence that their contributions will not be in vain (Frohlich *et al.* 1971). Following Rogowski (1985), then, the role of ethnicity in collective action is that it simplifies the identification of potential allies in the collective action and the detection and sanctioning of those members who attempt to free ride and/or assimilate into the status system of the rival ethnic group.

In Hechter and Levi's (1979:266) resource mobilization formulation of ethnic conflict, any group will engage in collective action only if it has the capacity to do so, and this will depend upon the tolerance of dissident cultural and political organization by the central state; an infrastructure of pre-existent voluntary associations; and the availability of sufficient resources to sustain organized activity (see also Tilly 1978; McCarthy and Zald 1977). In an ethnically divided society, whether ranked or unranked, traditional communal organizations typically will be ethnically based: because social benefits are distributed along ethnic lines, shared needs and grievances will likewise correspond to ethnic divisions as will the communal organizations that emerge to address those needs.

We can expect the state to be more tolerant of such organizations when they are ethnically based because to attempt their suppression would be to invite an ethnic backlash. Furthermore, in a ranked system, a central state controlled by the superordinate ethnic group would prefer the emergence of local communal organizations among the subordinate groups to the necessity of the state itself having to provide the same services out of its own resources. Similarly, in an unranked system, the central state will be tolerant of ethnically based communal organizations because, by definition, each ethnic group has a complete hierarchy of social strata and, consequently, will develop its own organizational infrastructure to address the needs of its members.

Indeed, for these reasons, the central state may be more tolerant of an ethnically based network of dissident political organizations in an unranked

system than in a ranked one. In a ranked system, the state has a greater capacity to suppress such organizations. And in a ranked system, the constituency of such organizations would have at their disposal a smaller pool of resources to contribute to the support of opposition political organizations. Hence, ethnically based communal organizations are less likely to arise and more easily repressed in ranked than in unranked systems. In summary, because ethnicity facilitates mobilization, we would expect collective action to be more easily mobilized in ethnically divided societies than in ethnically homogeneous societies. Likewise, among those that are ethnically divided, we would expect unranked social systems to be more susceptible to ethnic collective action than ranked systems are.

This still leaves us with the question of how individual members of an ethnic group can be induced to participate in ethnic collective action generally and ethnic conflict specifically. Individuals can be induced to participate in collective action if they perceive that their participation will bring them private rewards ('selective incentives') and if they perceive that their contribution to the collective action will make some difference in the outcome (i.e. the production of the collective benefits). According to Hechter *et al.* (1982:425–7), an individual's estimate of the private rewards from participation in collective action will increase when: the organization has a store of resources apart from those to be gained through collective action; the organization's monitoring capacities are extensive enough that it can identify those supporters who are deserving of selective incentives and those free riders who are deserving of negative sanctions; and the organization has a proven record of justice in distribution. Following Olson (1965), they note that both the organization's ability to monitor and the individual's perception of the efficacy of the monitoring process will be increased when membership is small.

Ethnicity can enhance the individual's willingness to contribute to collective action in several ways. First of all, ethnicity makes the identification of potential participants easier for the leadership. They can target their recruitment efforts more efficiently by not wasting time and effort on non-members of the aggrieved ethnic group. Likewise, it is easier for the leadership to detect and sanction those who attempt to free ride. In short, as Rogowski (1985) has argued, ethnicity reduces the cost of information for the leadership in its efforts to overcome free rider tendencies.

When collective action takes the form of violent conflict, the calculus of participation is complicated by the additional consideration of the risks of participation. Here, too, ethnicity can enhance the ability of leaders to overcome the tendency of group members to free ride in order to avoid the risks of participation in violent conflict. The strategy that the incumbent government adopts in dealing with ethnically based challenges to its stability and legitimacy is

likewise affected by the ethnic component of the conflict. Just as ethnic divisions enhance the ability of dissident leaders to identify and sanction free riders, the government can also use ethnicity as a means of identifying its actual, potential, or imagined enemies. If the government confines its repressive actions to known participants in opposition activities, the fact that those participants are from an identifiable ethnic group facilitates the government's ability to identify and punish them. So long as government is precise in targeting its repression, it can undermine the ability of the opposition leadership to mobilize additional participants in its programme. However, if government repression escalates in scope and intensity to the point that its selection of targets for repression becomes relatively indiscriminate, then the ethnic character of the conflict can become an advantage for the opposition. When repression becomes so widespread and indiscriminate that membership in the dissident ethnic group effectively marks one as a target for repression regardless of one's participation or non-participation in opposition activities, then members of the opposition ethnic group will have an incentive to join the opposition organization if for no other reason than to seek protection from indiscriminate government repression (Mason and Krane 1989). Free rider tendencies are overcome by the calculus of fear that is induced by government repression targeted indiscriminately against members of the dissident ethnic group.

CONCLUSION

That ethnicity remains a powerful force in the contemporary political arena cannot be denied. This essay has presented an overview of the central theoretical issues defining the study of ethnic politics and the major conceptual frameworks that have evolved from the efforts of scholars to resolve these issues. While this body of work is complex and compelling in its analysis of ethnic politics, several scholars have noted that the mainstream literature on social change and political development has not accorded ethnic politics a great deal of attention. As a consequence, the rich body of literature on the various dimensions of ethnic politics has remained somewhat isolated from this mainstream. In discussing the major theoretical frameworks in the field of ethnic politics, I have tried to illustrate their grounding in existing paradigms of behavioural science, their compatibility with those paradigms, and their contributions to the elaboration of the mainstream of research traditions on social change and development. In so doing, perhaps this essay will contribute in some small way to the recognition of this body of research by the mainstream and its incorporation into its rightful place in textbooks and scholarly discourse on the general themes of development.

REFERENCES

Bates, R. (1974) 'Ethnic competition and modernization in contemporary Africa', *Comparative Political Studies* 6:457–84.

Birch, A.H. (1978) 'Minority nationalist movements and theories of political integration', *World Politics* 30:325–44.

Brass, P.R. (1976) 'Ethnicity and nationality formation', *Ethnicity* 3:225–41.

Butler, D. and Stokes D. (1969) *Political Change in Britain,* New York: St Martin's Press.

Connor, W. (1972) 'Nation-building or nation destroying?', *World Politics* 24:31–55.

Frohlich, N., Oppenheimer, J.A. and Young, O. (1971) *Political Leadership and Collective Goods,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hannan, M. (1979) 'The dynamics of ethnic boundaries in modern states', in M. Hannan and J.Meyer (eds) *National Development and the World System: Educational Economic, and Political Change 1950–1970,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hechter, M. (1974) 'The political economy of ethnic change', *American Journal of Sociology* 79:1151–78.

Hechter, M. and Levi, M. (1979) 'The comparative analysis of ethnoregional movements', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:260–74.

Hechter, M., Friedman, D. and Appelbaum, M. (1982) 'A theory of ethnic collective action', *International Migration Review* 16:412–34.

Horowitz, D. (1971) 'Three dimensions of ethnic politics', *World Politics* 23:232–44.

——(1985) *Ethnic Politics,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kende, I. (1978) 'Wars of ten years, 1967–1976', *Journal of Peace Research* 15:227–41.

Leifer, E.M. (1981) 'Competing models of political mobilization: the role of ethnicties', *American Journal of Sociology* 87:23–47.

Lipset, S.M. and Rokkan, S. (1967) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments,* New York: Free Press.

McCarthy, J.D. and Zald, M.N. (1977) 'Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory', *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212–41.

Mason, T.D. and Krane, D.A. (1989) 'The political economy of death squads', *International Studies Quarterly* 33:175–98.

Melson, R. and Wolpe, H. (1970) 'Modernization and the politics of communalism: a theoretical perspective', *American Political Science Review* 64:1112–30.

Nagel, J. and Olzak, S. (1982) 'Ethnic mobilization in new and old states: an extension of the competition model', *Social Problems* 30:127–43.

Nielsen, F. (1985) 'Toward a theory of ethnic solidarity in modern societies', *American Sociological Review* 50:133–49.

Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UniversityPress .

Parsons, T. and Smelser, N. (1956) *Economy and Society,* New York: Free Press.

Popkin, S.L. (1979) *The Rational Peasant: The Political Economy of Rural Society in Vietnam,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Powell, J.D. (1970) 'Peasant society and clientelist politics', *American Political Science Review* 64:411–25.

Ragin, C.C. (1979) 'Ethnic political mobilization: the Welsh case', *American Sociological Review* 44:619–35.

Rogowski, R. (1974) *Rational Legitimacy: A Theory of Political Support*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

——(1985) 'Causes and varieties of nationalism: a rationalist account', in E.A.Tiryakian and R.Rogowski (eds) *New Nationalisms of the Developed West,* Winchester, Mass.: Allen & Unwin.

Rogowski, R. and Wasserspring, L. (1971) *Does Political Modernization Exist? Corporatism in Old and New Societies,* Beverly Hills Calif.: Sage Professional Papers.

Scott, J.C. (1972) 'Patron-client politics and political change in Southeast Asia', *American Political Science Review* 66:68–90.

——(1976) *The Moral Economy of the Peasant,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Small, M. and Singer, J.D. (1982) *Resort to Arms,* Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Tilly, C. (1978) *From Mobilization to Revolution,* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Tiryakian, E.A. and Rogowski, R. (1985) *New Nationalisms of the Developed West,* Winchester, Mass.: Allen & Unwin.

FURTHER READING

Armstrong, J. (1982) *Nations before Nationalism,* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bonacich, E. (1972) 'A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market', *American Sociological Review* 37:547–59.

Enloe, C.H. (1973) *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development,* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Esman, M.J. (1977) *Ethnic Conflict in the Western World,* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D.P. (eds) (1975) *Ethnicity and Experience,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Gourevitch, P.A. (1979) 'The reemergence of "peripheral nationalisms": some comparative speculations on the spatial distribution of political leadership and economic growth', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 21:303–22.

Hall, R.L. (ed.) (1979) *Ethnic Autonomy—Comparative Dynamics: The Americas, Europe and the Developing World,* New York: Pergamon Press.

Hechter, M. (1975) *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development,* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

——(1978) 'Group formation and the cultural division of labor', *American Journal of Sociology* 84:293–318.

Horowitz, D. (1973) 'Direct, displaced, and cumulative ethnic aggression', *Comparative Politics* 6:1–16.

——(1981) 'Patterns of ethnic separatism', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23:165–95.

Jenkins, J.C. (1983) 'Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements', *Annual Review of Sociology* 9:527–53.

Kende, I. (1971) 'Twenty-five years of local wars', *Journal of Peace Research* 8:5–22.

Laver, M. (1980) 'Political solutions to the collective action problems', *Political Studies* 28:195–209.

Levi, M. and Hechter, M. (1985) 'A rational choice approach to the rise and decline of ethnoregional political parties', in E.A.Tiryakian and R.Rogowski (eds) *New Nationalisms of the Developed West,* Winchester, Mass.: Allen & Unwin.

Margolis, H. (1982) *Selfishness, Altruism, and Rationality: A Theory of Social Choice,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milne, R.S. (1981) *Politics in Ethnically Bipolar States,* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Olzak, S. (1983) 'Contemporary ethnic mobilization', *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 355–74.

Parenti, M. (1967) 'Ethnic politics and the persistence of ethnic identification', *American Political Science Review* 61:717–26.

Polèse, M. (1985) 'Economic integration, national policies, and the rationality of regional separatism', in E.A.Tiryakian and R.Rogowski (eds) *New Nationalisms of the Developed West,* Winchester, Mass.: Allen & Unwin.

Ragin, C.C. (1977) 'Class, status, and "reactive ethnic cleavages": the social bases of political regionalism', *American Sociological Review* 42:438–50.

Rothschild, J. (1981) *Ethnopolitics: A Conceptual Framework,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Young, C. (1976) *The Politics of Cultural Pluralism,* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Zald, M.N. and McCarthy, J.P. (ed.) (1979) *The Dynamic of Social Movements,* Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.

36

LANGUAGE AND POLITICS

J.A.LAPONCE

Languages that come into contact become linked by a communication network, the density of which varies according to circumstances; but, loose or dense, communication among these languages is unavoidable. There is no example of a living language not linked by translation to at least one other living language. Bilingualism and multilingualism are thus worldwide phenomena (Mackey 1966). Humans cannot ignore humans, languages cannot ignore other languages. This seemingly trivial fact has consequences of considerable importance which have been studied by psycholinguists, sociolinguists, geographers and, more recently, by political scientists (for an overview of the field see Williams 1988).

Bilingual and multilingual political systems (henceforth *bilingual* to simplify) are markedly affected by the kind of relations–co-operative or conflictual–associated with the transfer of information from one language to another; inversely, political systems–notably the modern state–attempt, more and more frequently, to regulate language contact by means of language planning (Poole 1979). Among the 166 independent states surveyed by Laponce, 104 had linguistic minorities accounting for more than 10 per cent of their population, thirty of these states used more than one official language in the operations of their central government, and all of them were engaged in some form of language planning, if only at the school level (Laponce, 1987:90–4).

Much confusion has resulted from the use of the single term 'bilingual' to describe a variety of phenomena ranging from the rough school-type of knowledge of a foreign language to the knowledge of different languages learned in infancy and constantly needed for communication within the family or within the surrounding community; so much confusion that, before considering the specifically political aspects of language contact, we need to distinguish various situations resulting from two languages co-existing within the mind of a given individual.

THE BILINGUAL MIND

Can one say exactly the same thing in two different languages? Does the language we use shape what we think or is it on the contrary a neutral instrument under our complete control? The so-called 'Whorf-Sapir' hypothesis (Whorf 1956; Sapir 1949), according to which language shapes thought, has fallen into disfavour among contemporary linguists who point out that any language is 'potentially' able to express what is said or written in any other language. English may not have as many words as Dene to express different types of snow but can express all these varieties by means of periphrases; Arabic is not, at present, able to describe simply and effectively the complexities of modern science but it is potentially capable of doing so; Malay still needs to develop a complex legal vocabulary before it could fully replace English in the courts of law of Malaysia. But demotic Greek created in a short time the thousands of words needed for the translation of the regulations of the European Commission into that language following the entry of Greece into the European Community.

The Whorf-Sapir hypothesis, however, is far from dead. It continues to inspire research. Take, for example, the work of Rogers, TenHouten and their colleagues who, measuring the brain activity of bilingual children reacting to either Hopi or English story telling, found that their Hopi subjects had more right brain wave activity when reacting to Hopi than to English sounds (Rogers *et al.* 1977; TenHouten 1980); the explanation, according to the authors, is that Hopi, as a language, puts one into more direct contact with nature, while English, being more analytical, puts one at a distance from what it describes (for a review of supporting and negating experiments, see Hamers and Blanc 1989:45). Tsunoda (1978), in a controversial experiment that still needs to be duplicated, found that his Japanese-English bilingual subjects used their right brain to a greater extent when processing Japanese than when processing English sounds. According to Tsunoda, this was due to the fact that in Japanese, unlike in English, the steady vowel, a natural sound, has semantic meaning, hence blurring the distinction between the musical and the analytical.

Whether or not different languages are wired differently in the brain and whether or not the bilingual differs from the unilingual brain (Albert and Obler 1978) it remains that, even if we are capable of learning two languages in the same context and to the same degree of fluency, in fact we practically never do so. The languages we know typically form a hierarchy of both knowledge and liking and trigger different social and psychological contexts. Different languages embody different historical experiences: the longer history of the languages themselves as well as the shorter history of the speaker who will typically relate different languages to different roles and events. Mackey (1971) has shown, for example, that the associations of ideas built into French and English by means of

composite words and expressions vary considerably on some of the most commonly used words (lady-killer does not convey the same meaning as its French translation *'homme à femme'*); and it is quite rare for two languages, even if learned simultaneously in infancy, not to be distinguished by remarkable specificity such as one being the language of the mother and the other that of the father or the school friends. The perfect fit of two languages–a fit measurable by such means as Osgood's Semantic Differential–is an ideal from which there are considerable variations, but an ideal that is practically never reached.

The cost of acquiring a second language–a cost measurable in terms of time, effort and frustration–and the difficulty of obtaining a perfect bilingual fit would suffice to explain that the mind tends to reject language redundancy. Rare are the individuals who, in the absence of any need to communicate with foreigners, acquire an extra language for the sole sake of having more than one. They belong to the pathological cases studied by Steyn (1972), a classic example of which is offered by Psalmanazar, who obtained an appointment at the University of Oxford in the seventeenth century to teach a language that was supposedly spoken by Formosans but was in fact a personal invention. In the absence of the need to communicate with people who speak a language other than one's own, the mind rejects language redundancy as it rejects true synonymy within a given language (Genouvrier and Peytard 1970).

Bilingualism, thought to be harmful to a child's intellectual development by most pre-Second World War educators, has subsequently been shown to have no such negative effect and in fact to facilitate what is variously called the 'Leopold effect' (Leopold 1939–49) or 'divergent thinking'–the ability to distinguish the significant from the signifier (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981).

The fact of most direct relevance to the politics of language contacts is in the finding that one can normally distinguish, even among so-called 'balanced' bilinguals (bilinguals with a seemingly equal knowledge of their two languages), a dominant language (L1) and a second or dominated language (L2). In a series of simple experiments, Dornic (1975, 1980) found that while nearly indistinguishable on simple tasks, the reaction times of bilinguals using either their L1 or their L2 increased markedly as one increased the difficulty of the problem to be resolved. Thus, in a conversation between two individuals speaking the same two languages but not having the same L1, the speaker who imposes his or her dominant language has a communication advantage over the other speaker, and the latter will often feel frustrated by his or her inability to operate at their normal level of effectiveness.

Since the knowledge of a second language is costly in terms of acquisition and maintenance time, and since the use of an L2 is less efficient than that of an L1, it follows that individuals will naturally tend to group themselves socially and geographically in such a way as to reduce the overlap among languages, unless of

course they want to use more than one language to separate social functions, as in some cases of diglossia.

BILINGUALISM WITH AND BILINGUALISM WITHOUT DIGLOSSIA

Ferguson (1959) coined the term 'diglossia' to distinguish two types of bilingualism according to whether the bilingual individual uses two languages across all social roles or uses one language in some specific situations and contexts while the other language is used in other cases. These ideal types have been useful in separating two kinds of bilingualism that do not result in the same type of language contact (Fishman 1967) and hence do not call for the same types of language policies even though the object of the policies may be the same, for example to prevent conflict and reinforce inter-ethnic collaboration.

The strong correlation between social role and language use which characterizes diglossia appears most clearly when a language such as Latin, Old Slavonic or Hebrew is used as a sacred tongue while another language–English, Russian or Yiddish, for example–is used in the secular domain. The separation is not as marked, but obvious nevertheless, when the diglossic contact is between secular languages that distinguish private from public domains and are used, the one to affirm one's local ethnicity, the other to participate instrumentally if not emotionally in the communication system of a wider community.

Unlike the Francophone Swiss who uses only standard French, the Germanophone Swiss uses two forms of German, the standard literary language that links the user to the greater German community, and a local Swiss German that is learned and spoken at home as well as in public life at the local level (Swiss German is spoken in the cantonal legislatures while standard German is used in the federal parliament; see McRae 1984). In Luxemburg, nearly all citizens speak three languages: Luxemburgese in private and either French or German in public settings, with French dominating in church and government and German in the field of business. This type of diglossia is the norm in Africa and Asia where local, regional and international languages are typically associated with markedly different social roles and contexts.

Diglossic bilingualism tends to be relatively stable when the languages in contact collaborate at separating social roles that the individual wishes to keep separated (rather than conflict with each other). The more the diglossic situation is wanted by the individual concerned–as in German Switzerland, Luxembourg, Andorra or Paraguay–the more the contact between the languages concerned will be collaborative, hence stable and thereby in lesser need of intervention by the political system to either assimilate or protect one of the languages.

By contrast, instability characterizes the cases where diglossia is imposed by circumstances and is perceived as a burden by the individuals who have to know two languages–one to communicate with their parents for example, and the other to communicate with their own children, as in Brittany in the early twentieth century. In such cases diglossia fades rapidly into unilingualism (Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter 1977).

Bilingualism without diglossia is a more frequent source of individual frustrations, hence of social and political conflicts. Extending as they do to all the social roles, ready to be used in all or at least in most important social contexts, the languages are engaged in a competition for dominance.

If everyone in the community concerned preferred the same L1, then there would be no reason–internal to the group–to retain the L2. The latter would be abandoned, if not by the individuals who acquired it then at least by their children or grandchildren. This is the way most languages 'imported' into English-speaking North America keep being assimilated and would be quickly annihilated in the absence of new migrations. However, if the individuals in contact do not all have the same preferred L1, then differences between languages are very likely to become associated with differences in social and political power, differences that are likely to lead to the formation of ethno-linguistic minorities.

Asymmetrical power sharing between two language groups results in the dominant group having the power to decide how the burden of bilingualism will be borne and what language will have the greater social spread. In some rare occasions the dominant group decides to assume the cost of bilingualism. This happens when an invader, being comparatively small in number compared to the population conquered, adopts the latter's language to avoid the military and social costs of imposing its own tongue. The Roman conquerors spoke Greek in their Eastern empire and the Arabs who invaded Persia adopted Persian (MacKey 1988). In Bolivia, in the early days of Spanish colonization, the ruling group decided to learn Quechua because the natives were thought unworthy, if not incapable, of learning Castilian (Breton 1976).

More frequently the dominant group shifts the cost of bilingualism onto the ethnic minority. Flemish Belgians were and are still more likely to speak French than Walloons to speak Dutch; French Canadians are more likely to speak English than English Canadians to speak French; and in Switzerland, in the federal bureaucracy, the Francophones are more likely to use German than the Germanophones to use French (Laponce 1987).

If the minority accepts that its language be given subordinate status, or if it obtains satisfactory compensations (in Switzerland, for example, the weakness of French at the federal level is compensated by its uncontested dominance in the western cantons), the asymmetrical sharing of the bilingual burden may not be a

source of tension. If, on the contrary, subordinate status is resented or if the compensations are thought to be insufficient, the language asymmetry characterizing bilingualism without diglossia will often be a major source of ethnic and political conflicts.

STUDYING AND PREDICTING LANGUAGE OUTCOMES

The language strategies of individuals and groups–whether to prefer unilingualism or bilingualism and, in the latter case, what language to select as L1 and in what circumstances–are typically the result of the interplay of relatively few factors, notably communication costs, social benefits and ethnic loyalty. The importance of these factors has led some social scientists to propose the use of simple rational-choice models and two-player games to explain bilingual outcomes (Pool 1991; Laitin 1988). These powerful models will, of course, often fail to predict the actual outcome, and if they do predict accurately will sometimes do so for the wrong reasons. Nevertheless, they are one of the more promising developments in a field much in need of theoretical constructs, and even when they fail they can still be turned to profit, if only as an invitation to identify the factors that were overlooked.

Most political analysts of language contacts and conflicts have preferred the case study approach that enables the analyst to study languages within the specificity of a complex socio-historical context. Many of these studies are based on interviews with respondents who are typically asked to indicate what language they use and in what circumstances (see notably Rubin (1968) for Paraguay; Fishman (1966) and Fishman *et al.* (1971) for the United States; O'Brian (1976) and Corbeil and Delude (1982) for Canada; Gendron (1973) for Quebec; and Laitin (1977) for Somalia). Relatively rare are the studies, such as those of Gumperz (1971), Bourhis (1984) or Gardner-Chloros (1985), that use non-reactive measures such as the taping of conversations to produce accurate behavioural maps of language use. The technique developed by Wiegele *et al.* (1985) and Schubert (1988) to measure voice stress could be (but has not yet been) applied to the study of recorded language interactions in multilingual settings to determine the level of stress associated with the use of a second language and with the shift from one language to another.

LANGUAGE COMPARED TO OTHER ETHNIC DEFINERS

Can the study of the ethno-linguistic minorities created by language contact be done by means of the general typologies and theories used for the study of minority-dominant group relations? To a very large extent it is indeed possible. One may use, among others, the typology proposed by Louis Wirth (1945), who

distinguishes assimilationist, pluralist, secessionist and militant minorities; or that suggested by Laponce (1960), who contrasts minorities according to whether they accept remaining as minorities for the sake of preserving their distinctiveness or are forced to retain their separateness by a dominant group refusing to assimilate them; or that of Schermerhorn (1970), who relates the respective attitudes of the minority and of the dominant group according to whether these attitudes are centripetal or centrifugal. One can also apply the theory of Tajfel and Turner (1979), which posits that in order to avoid self-doubt and debasement a minority must think of itself as superior to the dominant group in at least one domain of thought or activity.

The fact that asymmetrical power relationships between language groups is the norm in non-diglossic situations justifies to a large extent the fact that the study of language minorities is so often subsumed under the larger study of ethnic relations, as in the study of ethnic groups in conflict by Horowitz (1985). But that should not lead one to forget or push to the background a very specific characteristic of language minorities to which geographers and political scientists have been more sensitive than sociologists and sociolinguists: the need of a language group, particularly so of a language minority, for a territory of its own; the need for a secure spatial base covered by the same L1.

Since in most bilingual societies the members of minority groups are more likely to know the language of the dominant group than the latter to know the minority language, and since the dominant group normally has greater power over the production of spoken and written material (from TV and radio broadcasts to internal memos and contracts), the minority, as already noted, will be at a disadvantage in an unregulated system where the languages are allowed to mix and to be chosen freely for all kinds of interactions. Thus, unless it accepts a diglossic situation that would restrict the use of its language to certain domains of activity, a minority will become all the more frustrated as the communication system grows more dense.

Unlike religions or races that can adjust their survival strategies to geographical dispersion and geographical penetration by the dominant group, a language needs a degree of spatial concentration that is commensurate with the degree of development of the society concerned.

Some Indian languages of the Canadian West Coast or the jungle of Venezuela could survive for centuries even though they are spoken by very few people. But this could happen only as long as they remain isolated from the more powerful ethnic groups that surround them and as long as the types of activities required for the survival of the community are limited to primitive fruit gathering, hunting, or agriculture.

A modern industrial society that needs a university to educate its elites will need a relatively large concentration of population. With only 100,000 inhabitants,

Iceland cannot operate its university fully in Icelandic (although its language is protected by isolation); with only about half a million speakers, the Swedes of Finland and the Francophones of Ontario experience similar difficulties in operating a full-scale university covering the scientific as well as the other disciplines in their own languages. Languages *qua* languages need geographical concentration and, to protect themselves against the inroads of more powerful languages, linguistic minorities need linguistic territorial homogeneity. Consequently, languages pose to political systems problems involving boundaries that non-linguistic minorities do not pose to the same extent, if they pose them at all. While non-linguistic minorities will often be satisfied with the granting of territorially transportable individual rights, linguistic minorities will typically want group rights that are territorially grounded.

THE 'WAR' AMONG LANGUAGES

Writing the history of languages as one writes the natural history of animal species led Cailleux (1953)–who had restricted his corpus to major literary languages such as Latin, Greek, Chinese, German and French–to note that languages had a positive birth rate. For any language that died, he estimated that two were born. His figures should not be taken for more than what they could possibly be: a rough indication of a general trend. For the period he had selected–the last three millennia–Cailleux's observations are probably valid beyond the limits of his selected corpus of cases. The world was then in a process of linguistic diversification. This appears no longer to be the case. A trend dating back to the origins of humanity seems to have been reversed. Languages are in a period of negative birth rate, and this is unlikely to be a passing phase. In the intensified system of communication that characterizes what Paul Valéry (1945) called the 'completed world'–*le monde fini*–the stronger languages eliminate the weaker ones, sometimes violently but more often peacefully as a result of people shifting from a language with a weaker purchasing power to a language with a greater purchasing power, whether the purchase be of economic, political, or cultural goods.

Adapting Hirschman's voice-exit model (Hirschman 1970) to our subject, we note that when the voice that a language offers is no longer heard or no longer heard adequately, exit to a better language will take place, unless there be a strong enough loyalty boundary preventing such a transfer, a loyalty that will typically be measured by the strength of one's ethno-linguistic identity.

Large markets and population mobility–from countryside to cities as well as from poorer to richer and from overpopulated to low birth-rate countries–reduce the purchasing power of small languages and weaken the ethnic identity tied to these languages. Hence the prediction that most of the existing 7,000-odd languages spoken today in the world will disappear and that relatively few

will be born (7,000 is the upper estimate given by Ferguson); other estimates are lower, notably those of Muller (1964) and Burney (1966), who give a range of 2,500 to 3,500).

In the intensified 'war' among languages, what factors will favour survival and expansion? The answer varies, of course, according to whether we consider local, regional, or international contexts.

Mackey (1973) has drawn attention to six factors: the number of speakers; the geographical implantation of the same language in different areas of the world; geographical mobility of individuals; the economic achievements of the groups using the language; their ideological diffusion (whether religious or political); and their cultural power measured by indices such as book production. Tsunoda (1983) has measured the recent evolution of the languages of science to show the increased dominance of English (see also Fishman *et al.* 1975 on the spread of English as a world language). To these measures, Laponce (1987) added military and economic power, and predicted that, irrespective of the factors listed above, the languages best able to survive the worldwide competition among languages would be those that had a state as their champion, or more precisely the languages used in the central administration of an independent state. In the mid-1980s there were only sixty-five such languages, forty-eight of which were the central administrative language of only one state. The languages used in the central administration of more than five states were few. English 'had' forty-two states, French twenty-eight, Spanish twenty-one, Arabic twenty-one and Portuguese seven.

Many of the states with only one language of government have an abundance of local languages. This is the case with nearly all the states of Black Africa. Why should these local languages not survive as the many languages of the Turkish Empire survived? The prediction of the weakening and disappearance of most of them is based on the assumption that the state will modernize, hence urbanize and industrialize, and will use a state language as an instrument of mass mobilization and integration rather than use it as an instrument of segregation separating a state elite from its local constituencies (Calvet 1974).

When the state is integrative, seeking its legitimacy from the identification of the masses with their governments, and when, additionally, it is democratic, governing less by the manipulation of symbols than by means of explanations and justifications, the need to simplify the linguistic composition of the *polis* increases. In such a state the pressure towards unilingualism is great. At the time of the French Revolution of 1789, the majority of French people did not speak French; a century later most of them did so; and now, after two hundred years, French is spoken by practically all of them. Not all states of Europe have become as unified linguistically as France but they have all moved in the same direction, even Switzerland where the number of local language varieties has been markedly reduced.

The formula of the nineteenth-century school of nationalism, 'one state-one-language-one-nation'—to which 'one-religion' was sometimes added—has increasingly been simplified to a 'one-state-one-language' formula, henceforth made to apply to the multinational as well as to the one-nation state. The English-only movement of the 1980s in the United States is to be explained in part as an anti-foreign reaction, but it is also explainable by the fact that to some of its supporters the rate of Spanish immigration appears to outpace the rate of assimilation (on the relation between these two rates see Deutsch 1953). The insistence on a common language is then seen as a condition for the preservation of a peaceful and equalitarian multi-ethnic society (Schmidt 1989).

Modern states are both assimilators and protectors of languages. They destroy their weaker languages internally and protect their own dominant languages on the international scene.

THE STATE AND LANGUAGE PLANNING

State language planning takes three major forms according to whether the state attempts to affect a language's corpus, status, or usage.

Corpus planning seeks to improve the quality of the language as an instrument of communication. Such a goal was, among others, that of Richelieu when he created the French Academy in 1634, an Academy assigned the task of writing and revising a French dictionary; such was the goal of the Government of Quebec when it created the *Conseil de la langue française* which has among its functions that of improving the quality of the French used in Quebec; such was the goal of the Norwegian state when at various times in the twentieth century it created commissions of linguists whose task was to standardize the two versions of the Norwegian language.

The creation of many new words of science and technology and the need to standardize their meaning and application has created a competition against time that few languages can sustain if they want to be world languages. In an attempt to keep French at the level of English, as well as to facilitate communication between its two official languages, the Canadian federal government has created and maintains a terminology bank of French-English scientific and technological concepts that contains over a million terms in each language, the translation of which is accessible on line by computer from government departments as well as from non-governmental institutions such as universities.

Between the antiquated ways of the French Academy and the computer ways of the Canadian Secretariat of State, there are many means of intervention in corpus planning. Most effective are those forcing schools to use texts and examinations that act as references for the correct forms of speech and writing. Hence the importance, in the United States, of the debate over whether 'Black

English' should be considered as a faulty variant of standard English or accepted as a legitimate form of the language (Sonntag and Pool 1987).

Status planning leads the state to giving legitimacy or dominance to specific languages. High status is typically given to a language by recognizing it as official. That is the case, for example, of English in some American states; of French and English at the federal level in Canada; of French, German and Italian in the Swiss Confederation; of Swedish and Finnish in Finland; of English and Gaelic in Ireland; of French and English in Cameroon, and of French and Dutch in Belgium. Sometimes a lower rank than official is attributed to a language by calling it 'national'. That is the case of Romanche in Switzerland, Bichlamar in Vanuatu, Guarani in Paraguay and Wanda in Rwanda.

More important, however, than any constitutional and legal recognition, is the actual practice regulating language use in schools, in parliaments, in the courts, and more generally in the providing of government information and services. The study of that practice involves considering the rules regarding speaking, writing and understanding (see Laponce 1987).

The Canadian constitution of 1867 gave French-speaking parliamentarians the right to use their language, but their right to be understood was not recognized until immediate translation was introduced in parliament, then in committees, then at cabinet meetings almost hundred years later. Gaelic is deemed to be both the national and official language of Ireland and that country's stamps rarely use any language other than Gaelic, but the discussions at cabinet meetings are entirely in English. Singapore has four official languages that appear on its banknotes—English, Mandarin, Malay and Tamil—but its laws are published solely in English. By contrast the laws of Switzerland are published in German, French and Italian; and in Belgium, as in Canada, the meetings of the cabinet accommodate two official languages by means of immediate translation. Sometimes a defendant before a court of justice is merely given the right to an interpreter; in other cases—for example in Quebec and in New Brunswick—that defendant is given the right to a trial in the official language of his or her choice.

The imposition of a national language as that of the state is often used as a means of state and nation building. In the thirteenth century Alphonso X of Spain required the use of Castilian instead of Latin in the writing of government documents, and three centuries later Francis I of France imposed French on his public servants (Lapierre 1988). But state, if not nation, building is also frequently done by avoiding the use of a native language in the conduct of government. Selecting English in India or French in Senegal as the major or sole language of government had the advantage of not offending the ethnic groups that resent the use of Hindi or Woulof.

In addition to regulating the use of language in parliaments, courts, public schools and bureaucracies, the governments of multilingual societies have occasionally regulated the use of language in what is usually considered to be the

private domain. Indonesia forbids the use of Chinese on commercial signs, and Quebec forbids the use of English on billboards as well as requiring the use of French in the writing of the contracts and internal notices of firms employing more than fifty people (Leclerc 1989).

TERRITORIAL OR PERSONAL SOLUTIONS

When seeking to regulate the contact among languages in non-diglossic situations, the state has the choice of two fundamentally different solutions: *territorial* solutions of the kind used by Belgium and Switzerland; and *personal* solutions of the kind used by Estonia between the two world wars, and used also, to a lesser extent, by Finland and the Canadian federal government.

The classic example of a territorial solution is offered by Switzerland, where language boundaries separate German, Italian and French areas in such a way that unilingualism is the general rule in the operations of local government services, schools and public life. Swiss citizens are free to cross the language boundaries, but if they do they are expected to change language as would the typical immigrant to a foreign country. The political strategy guiding these stringent regulations consists of separating languages as much as possible at the regional level and restricting bilingualism or multilingualism to the central level of government; a strategy that seeks, in other words, to prevent contact in order to prevent conflict. Belgium adopted a similar system by making Flanders Flemish-speaking and Wallonia French-speaking, but it has not been able to apply fully the Swiss model because its capital, Brussels, is a predominantly Francophone city cast in Flemish territory. As an exception to the rule of territorial unilingualism the Belgian capital has been set aside as a bilingual area.

The political justification for the system of fixed language boundaries is given by the following decision of the Swiss Federal Tribunal when it rejected the claim of a businessman who had argued that a local regulation forbidding him to advertise his products in the language of his choice was in violation of the equality clause of the Federal Constitution:

> The linguistic borders of our country, once established, must be considered to be unchangeable. Safeguarding the harmonious relationship among the various segments (ethnic groups) of our country requires that each be guaranteed the integrity of the territory over which its language is spoken and over which extends its culture; and that each be given the right to prevent any encroachment.
>
> (translated from Héraud 1974:247)

In the Swiss case, and to a lesser extent in the Belgian case, the languages are rooted territorially, and are thus given security niches of their own. The power to protect the boundaries so created is given not to individuals but to collectivities–the cantons in Switzerland and, the regions in Belgium (McRae 1975, 1984, 1986).

In marked contrast to the Swiss system, that used by the Baltic countries, notably in Estonia (Aun 1940), between the two World Wars allowed any ethnic group comprising at least 3,000 people to set up a nation-wide community with institutions of its own; institutions with the power to tax its members and to administer its own public and private schools. These nation-wide ethnic governments resembled local governments except in their not being territorially grounded and having extensive language rights, in particular that of selecting the language of instruction in the schools. That system–which had its forerunners in the Polish Jewish kahal and in the millets of the Ottoman empire (Laponce 1960) did not survive the war and has not been imitated.

Between the extremes of the Swiss and the Estonian models, Finland offers the case of partially and temporarily grounded languages. Wherever the Swedish minority accounts for at least 8 per cent of the population of a given commune (the basic unit of local government), the public services are offered in the two official languages, Swedish and Finnish; however, a bilingual district will normally become unilingual Finnish if the Swedish population is shown by the census to have declined below the required minimum. (In the Åaland Islands, however, the Swiss system of territorial unilingualism protects the Swedish minority as a result of the international treaties that regulate the status of that territory.)

The Canadian Federal Government has by and large patterned its language policies on those of Finland rather than those of either Switzerland or Belgium, responding in so doing to the wishes of its English-speaking population but also out of fear that a unilingual French Quebec might be closer to secession than if it remained bilingual. One cannot deny that possibility but, interestingly, the increase in language security of the Quebecois population through the language legislation mentioned earlier (p. 598) was correlated with a lowering of separatist fervour. This appears to confirm that the Swiss strategy of reducing contact between competing languages by juxtaposing unilingual areas rather than merging the languages within the same territory has the desired effect of lowering tensions–at least when the language cleavage is not reinforced by other non-linguistic cleavages that would make the ethnic groups concerned incompatible on too many grounds.

CONCLUSION

The rooting of political into economic analysis, especially Marxian analysis, has frequently led analysts of contemporary societies to view ethnic conflicts, and language conflicts in particular, as outdated conflicts, of a type that would disappear as the state became more modern. In fact, the general lowering of class tensions in most industrial societies after the Second World War has led to reconsideration of this forecast. Like religion, language does not lend itself easily