

REORDERING THE WORLD

*Geopolitical Perspectives
on the
Twenty-first Century*

edited by

George J. Demko
Dartmouth College

and William B. Wood
*Office of the Geographer
U.S. Department of State*

Westview Press
Boulder • San Francisco • Oxford

(794)

concept of the state is being challenged by several key trends: growing economic interdependencies among states; the development of transportation, communication, and information technologies that facilitate international linkages; the rise of substate nationalism; and the growth of an extrastate corporate culture. As those challenges become more apparent, the conceptual hegemony of state sovereignty is likely to come under more critical scrutiny. Though the legacy of the Peace of Westphalia remains very much with us, its future is increasingly clouded.

Notes

1. Jean Gottmann, *The Significance of Territory* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1973).
2. Peter J. Taylor, "Contra Political Geography," in *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* (forthcoming 1994).
3. Alan J. Day, ed., *Border and Territorial Disputes*, 2d ed. (Harlow, England: Longman Group, 1987).
4. Alexander B. Murphy, "Historical Justifications for Territorial Claims," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 80, no. 4 (1990), pp. 531–548.
5. Andrew F. Burghardt, "The Bases of Territorial Claims," *The Geographical Review*, vol. 63, no. 2 (1973), pp. 225–245.
6. Herman Van der Wusten, "The Geography of Conflict Since 1945," in *The Geography of Peace and War*, D. Pepper and A. Jenkins, eds. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), pp. 13–18.
7. Stephen D. Krasner, "Sovereignty: An Institutional Perspective," *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 21, no. 1 (1988), pp. 66–94.
8. Lung-Chu Chen, *An Introduction to Contemporary International Law: A Policy Oriented Approach*, vol. 204 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
9. *Ibid.*
10. B.G. Ramcharan, "Strategies for the International Protection of Human Rights in the 1990s," *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 13 (1991), pp. 1655–1669.
11. Alexander B. Murphy, "Emerging Regional Linkages Within the European Community: Challenging the Dominance of the State," in *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* (forthcoming 1994).

THIRTEEN

The Fourth World: Nations Versus States

BERNARD NIETSCHMANN

IN THE EARLY 1980s, new perspectives and theories emerged to explain persistent global patterns of ethnocide and ecocide that resulted from attempts by 168 international states to occupy, suppress, and exploit more than 5,000 nations. These ideas came to be known as the Fourth World theory or the Fourth World perspective, referring to the 5,000 to 8,000 ancient but internationally unrecognized nations of the Fourth World that predate and continue to resist the spread of the modern state. Fourth World theory was developed by a diverse group of individuals—activists, human rights lawyers, and academics but principally leaders of resisting nations—who shared information, ideas, and resistance strategies in meetings and by photocopy, mail, telephone, fax, computer modem, and computer bulletin boards.

Unlike the traditional geopolitical research and writing of academics, politicians, and journalists, Fourth World analysis cannot be accessed by a library card. This is because: (1) Fourth World theory seeks to change the world, not just describe and publish an article about it; (2) Fourth World advocates rely on the electronic circulation of firsthand information; and (3) it is counterproductive to discuss plans, strategies, and an overall theory that are aimed at resisting and reversing the territorial and political occupation of nations by states.

Nations and Peoples

The fundamentally different starting point of Fourth World analysis is that it describes and maps geography, history, and politics based on the world's 5,000 nations, instead of focusing on states, regions, blocs, and superpowers as traditional analyses do. This produces a dramatically distinct, "ground-up" portrait of the significance and centrality of people in most world issues, problems, and solutions. Traditional studies interpret the world as enclosed by a fixed, legal network

of some 191 international states that relegate people to the nationless status of ethnic groups and minorities. Fourth World analysis, by contrast, examines how colonial empires and modern states invaded and now occupy most of the world's 5,000 legitimate nations and peoples. It also explores how this destructive expansion jeopardizes the world's biological and cultural diversity and ultimately re-bounds to break down and break up states.

To understand this different geopolitical perspective, it is necessary to carefully examine the meaning and use of several basic political terms: *nation*, *state*, *nation-state*, *a people*, and *an ethnic group*. The misuse of these and related terms distorts and obscures the identity, geography, and reasons behind most wars, refugee flows, genocide, and human rights violations as well as much of the environmental destruction. In almost every textbook, academic or newspaper article, and TV or radio news program, the terms *state*, *nation*, *nation-state*, *people*, and *ethnic group* are misused without regard to common usage either among the world's distinct peoples or in the world's dictionaries. *Nation*, *state*, and *nation-state*, for example, are used interchangeably even though their origins, geographies, histories, and structures are very different.

Nation

The term *nation* refers to the geographically bounded territory of a common people as well as to the people themselves. A nation is a cultural territory made up of communities of individuals who see themselves as "one people" on the basis of common ancestry, history, society, institutions, ideology, language, territory, and, often, religion. A person is born into a specific nation by being born a Kurd, a Basque, or a Tibetan, for instance. An outsider cannot become a Tibetan by moving to Tibet. Nor can an outsider become Basque by learning to speak Basque, by moving to Euzkadi and becoming a citizen of Spain, or by being born in Euzkadi: To be Basque is to be born Basque. Thus, a nation is both the cultural homeland of a people and a people who have a cultural homeland. Furthermore, a nation is self-identifying: If Spain and all the other states in the world did not recognize or even mention Catalonia, it would still exist and persist as it has for hundreds of years. The existence of nations is ancient; they came into existence slowly and usually do not celebrate a date or year when they were created. Having developed in every region and on every continent, there are currently some 5,000 to 8,000 nations, of all shapes and sizes.

A nation, then, is a community of self-identifying people who have a common culture and a historically common territory. And because no group of people has ever voluntarily given up its territory, resources, or identity, a nation is the world's most enduring, persistent, and resistant organization of people and territory. The majority of the territory and resources of continents, islands, and coastal and continental shelf waters have long been claimed and used by nations.

A People

Like a nation, a people is self-defined. A people considers itself to be distinct from other peoples, adjacent or far, who may, in turn, recognize the difference. A people is characterized by: a common history, a common geographical location and territory, racial or ethnic ties, cultural or linguistic ties, religious or ideological ties, a common economic base, and a sufficient number of individuals to maintain a common identity. Every people is a nation.

States and Ethnic Groups

The modern state is an outgrowth of European kingdoms, overseas colonialism, and the division of large colonial empires into smaller and smaller neocolonial pieces.

The term *a state* is used to define a centralized political system within international legal boundaries recognized by other states. Further, it uses a civilian-military bureaucracy to establish one government and to enforce one set of institutions and laws. It typically has one language, one economy, one claim over all resources, one currency, one flag, and sometimes one religion. This system is imposed on many preexisting nations and peoples.

A state is a legal creation that comes into existence on a specific date, giving every person and all peoples within the new artificial boundaries a fresh international identity: Soviet, Bangladeshi, Yugoslavian, and so on. (Somehow, the founders of the United States neglected to create an accurate name for the new country: *American* applies to the hemisphere, not to a citizen of the United States. Spanish, not English, has an appropriate term: *estadounidense*, "United-tatesian.") Having gone to bed "Nicaraguan" one night in 1960, members of the Miskito nation living north of the Río Coco (Wangki) woke up "Honduran" the next day because the International Court of Justice ruled on a boundary dispute between the two states. Similarly, in a story on the rise and fall of states in Europe, the *New York Times* gave an account of what happened to one man in the Hungarian region of Eastern Europe: "Mr. Csukas's life story encapsulates the shifting fortunes of Hungarians living on the border of what was, before 1918, one of Europe's bigger nations. He has been a citizen of five different countries, but has never left the narrow strip of rural villages along what is now the border between Hungary and Slovakia."¹

Imposed upon unconsenting nations, states then create a new history and geography to make it appear that their birth and expansion predate, preclude, and prevent all preexisting national claims to territory, people, or resources. The main goal is to create the illusion that the nations are under state authority. Nowhere are states depicted as recent intrusions whose authority derives from force (two-thirds of the world's states use their armies against people they claim as citizens), intimidation (the most widespread and numerous human rights

violations are committed by states against nation peoples), and “statespeak” (states train academics, journalists, and government people to think, speak, and write correctly about the state—any state). For example, in the text that accompanies *The Times Atlas of China*, Tibet is not described as being occupied by Han China; instead, the Tibetans are said to “occupy” a region of China. Nor is Tibet described as having been militarily invaded by China in 1950; rather, we are told that Tibet was finally brought under firm Chinese central control after the rebellion of 1959, and in 1965 the Tibet Autonomous Region was set up to administer the area. Similarly, in *A Map History of China*,² Brian Catchpole writes the following in a chapter on “The Minority Peoples”:

Scattered across China are millions of people belonging to fifty-one nationalities. Most of them live in the frontier regions which are vital to China’s security. China needs to be sure of the loyalty and cooperation of these people and is anxious to integrate them fully into the People’s Republic. This is why China fosters the growth of cooperatives and communes among people who until recently were primitive hunters, herdsmen or “slash-and-burn” farmers, and why she strives to make them literate and capable of exploiting to the full the industrial and agricultural potential of their homelands.

A Fourth World translation of this quote might read a bit differently:

The Han have extended and expanded the state of China to enclose, divide, and fragment more than 150 non-Han peoples and their nations. Many of these nations are in state border regions and have been divided and occupied by China, India, the USSR, Vietnam, Burma, Mongolia, and other states. Han China has sent its army and assimilation experts to force these nations to give allegiance and transfer sovereignty to Beijing. This is why Han China uses cooperatives and communes to replace the economies and communities of non-Han peoples, such as the Kazakh, Kirghiz, Tibetan, Uighur, Tadzhik, Miao, Lisu and Lahu, and to exploit and plunder their homelands.

All states attempt to erase the histories and geographies of the peoples they occupy: New names for new state peoples are invented, new maps are made, and new histories are written. These new “scripts” are then given to the schools and media to re-educate the various groups, teaching them that they are now “one people” living in “one nation.”

Though most states assert that they are a single nation with a single common people, some 95 percent of the the world’s 191 current states are multinational, that is, composed of the peoples and territories of many nations, sometimes without their consent. These states assert sovereignty over the 5,000 or more nations and peoples on earth as well as all the continents, 40 percent of the oceans, and even the reaches of the atmosphere. Compared to nations, these states are new, and they range in size from Nauru with a population of 10,000 and Belize and the Bahamas with some 200,000 each to Indonesia, which stretches across 3,000 miles, 13,700 islands, and 250 nations and has the world’s fourth-largest population.

A nation-state is rare. Only a few—less than 5 percent—of the world’s states are nation-states, where well over a majority of the population is a single people. A common people with a common identity, a common territory, and a government that is internationally recognized is a nation-state. Thus, Iceland and Portugal are nation-states. Most states are multinational, such as Nigeria with 450 nations, Ethiopia with 90, and India with 350.

States try to become nations through nation-building programs based on political, cultural, and territorial integration and development and education. They try to create a common unity through the creation of common symbols, such as a flag, national anthem, history, and school-map geography. To help accomplish this, all states have institutions (schools, universities, and media) that reproduce histories and school-map geographies to create a sense of common fate and destiny for a common people. When Italy was first unified in the mid-nineteenth century, Italian nationalist statesman d’Azeglio remarked, “We have made Italy, now we have to make Italians.”

When states themselves speak of nation-building, however, what they actually mean, in most cases, is state-building by destroying nations (see Table 13.1). One of the most common state-building tactics is the creation of terms to describe the new state peoples and preexisting nation peoples. For example, when a state is created (most often by war, expansion, occupation, legacy of colonialism, or breakup of a larger state), new terms are invented to refer collectively to all distinct peoples within an internationally recognized territory. These are official identities that have to be taught by central government institutions—like nation identity, which is learned through culture, family, and language

TABLE 13.1 Terminology of “Nation-building” and Fourth World Translation

Terminology of Nation-building by Nation-destroying States	Fourth World Translation
an ethnic group	a state-occupied people and homeland
an ethnolinguistic group	a nation stripped of all but language
a people	a state people instantly created
a nation	an ideal of multinational states
nation-building	state-building by nation-destroying
political integration	invasion
state economy	systematic plunder of nations
economic development	occupation and resource plunder
assimilation	ethnocide
nation-building	nation-destroying
peasants	unnamed members of an unnamed nation
separatists	a nation that never joined a state
rebels	a large group of armed nation people
terrorists	a small group of armed nation people
national liberation	colonialism by non-Europeans
national security	state military occupation of nations
the national interest	the state interest

and which may disappear overnight (as happened to Soviet, Czechoslovak, and Yugoslav state identities but not to Russian, Ukrainian, Slovak, and Bosnian nation identities).

Almost no nation people in the world calls itself by the terms used by most academics, journalists, and state government and military leaders: *ethnic groups, minorities, peasants, tribes, herders, agriculturalists, lower class*, or, simply, *a group, a population, or the poor*. From the Fourth World perspective, all these terms have the common purpose of supporting the state by suppressing the nation. They do not identify any nation people, they do not identify any nation place, and they do not identify any nation activity.

All nation peoples have a name for themselves and their territories, and most seek self-determination and resist incorporation into one or more states. Therefore, states invented a terminology to try to render invisible the independent and autonomous peoples and nations that were being invaded and incorporated as state citizens and state lands. However, totally different histories, geographies, and problems are revealed by using terms like *Karen* instead of *a Thai hill tribe*, *Tigreans* instead of *Ethiopian peasants*, *Palestinians* instead of *an Israeli ethnic group*, *Kurds* instead of *mountain Turks*, *Yapti Tasba* instead of *eastern Nicaragua*, or *West Papua* instead of *Irian Jaya*.

In the international context, a people has rights to self-determination, sovereignty, and national territory (UN Resolution 1514). But because almost all states are formed over unconsenting peoples and nations, recognition of them as a people would jeopardize state territorial claims. Therefore, the world's nation peoples are almost universally referred by generic, faceless, and placeless names.

If nation peoples take up arms against a state invasion and occupation, they will be referred to as *rebels, separatists, extremists, dissidents, insurgents, terrorists, fanatics, mercenaries*, or *Communists* but almost never by their real names and real places. For example, what nation peoples were fighting in the 1980s and early 1990s in southern Sudan, Kashmir, Burma, Iraq, Turkey, Angola, and West Papua?

Fourth World analysis, writings, and maps replace the missing identities, geographies, and histories of the world's peoples and nations that make up the usually hidden "other side" in the invasions and occupations that produce most of the world's wars, refugees, genocide, human rights violations, and environmental destruction.

Ethnic originally meant "heathen" or referred to nations that were neither Jewish nor Christian. Today, the word is widely misused to mean any nonwhite people who are not in power. In common usage, *ethnic group* implies a people who are *outside* their original country and are in another people's country, who maintain their identity, and who are a *group* within a state that they do not govern. Tibetans in India or Nepal might be called an ethnic group, but in Tibet they are *a people*, not an ethnic group or a "national minority." Similarly, a people within its homeland is a people, not an ethnic group. An ethnic group within its own nation is a contradiction in terms.

During the 1984 peace negotiations in Bogotá, Colombia, Sandinista com-

mander Luis Carrión asked resistance leader Brooklyn Rivera if the Miskito would accept special status as a Nicaraguan ethnic group. Rivera replied, "Ethnic groups run restaurants. We are a people. We have an army. We want self-determination."³

Ethnic groups are placeless minorities within a state. According to the United Nations Human Rights Sub-Commission, a *minority* is defined as a group numerically smaller than the rest of the population of a State, in a nondominant position, whose members—being citizens of the State—possess ethnic, religious, or linguistic characteristics differing from those of others in the population and who show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity directed toward preserving their culture, tradition, religion, and livelihood.

Nothing is mentioned in this state-based definition of *a minority* (the state term for a people and its nation) of the people's history of independence, self-government, tradition of nationhood, and desire to preserve control over its own territory, resources, affairs, and freedoms. According to the United Nations and almost all individual states, nation peoples are but minorities (or ethnic groups) that may keep their folklore while the state takes their land, resources, and freedom. This is why almost no nation people living within their homeland, even if it is occupied, accept being called an ethnic group or minority. (See Table 13.2.)

TABLE 13.2 *Some Differences Between States and Nations*

	<i>Nation</i>	<i>State</i>
DEFINITION	Those of a common culture and homeland who have evolved into a territorially based and self-defined identifying people with shared aspirations	A military and civilian bureaucratic authority to represent a body of diverse people within the borders established by territorial expansion, wars, or treaties
LATIN WORD ORIGIN	<i>Natio, nacio</i> : born into a place (<i>Nat-ive</i>)	<i>Status Rei Publicae</i> (Roman Legal Code); later <i>Stato</i> (Machiavelli).
BOUNDARIES	Cultural	Political-military (legal)
COMPOSITION OF POPULATION	A single nation	Multinational
ORIGINS	Historical, "evolutionary"	Datable and designed (constitutional)
RECOGNITION	Self-identifying, taught within culture	By other states (legal), taught within schools/media
MEMBERSHIP	Kinship, culture	Citizenship
COHESION	Culture, custom	Ideals, laws, force
GROUP MOVEMENTS	Nationalism (the recognition and defense of one's homeland)	Patriotism (loyalty to the state)

SOURCE: Rich Griggs, "The 130 Nations of Europe," *Research and Exploration*, vol. 10, no. 1 (February 1994).

- Oren Lyons is a faithkeeper of the Onondaga Nation, a member nation of the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations) Confederacy. He offers an interesting perspective on these issues: “We are the original people on the land. We are the land keepers. We are not a minority within our own nations, within our own lands. One must understand that terminology is very important. How you address yourself is very important to them. If you try and change your terminology, you will find out how important it is. So we must speak of ourselves as a people. . . . If you fall into the category of ‘tribes’ or ‘bands,’ a gaggle of geese, a herd, a group . . . you’re more than that. It’s important not to call Indians ‘bands.’”⁴

Types of Nations

Political science and political geography focus, in large part, on states: types, differences, systems of governments, spatial dimensions of politics, and geopolitics. Fourth World theory focuses on nations: what they are, where they are, their geopolitics, and their different types. Distinguishing nation types is an important developing area of Fourth World theory. With some 5,000 nations in the world today, there obviously must be a variety of types. To be sure, nations could be studied and understood in terms of their cultural, political, and economic systems (of which there are many hundreds of types, with some having promise of wider application) and in terms of the geopolitical significance of their resources, strategic locations, and emerging “green cartel.” However, at this point in analyzing nations, research on the Fourth World has categorized them all in terms relating to the state. (See Table 13.3.)

State-building: The Theory of the Repressive State

The vast majority of all nations existed before all states. This means that thousands of nations and associated peoples and cultures were already distributed over the earth’s space before states were invented. Given that almost all territory was already occupied, states could only gain a foothold and eventually expand (state-building) by somehow taking over the territories and populations of nations.

A few of the thousands of existing nations sought to become more powerful and richer by expanding and taking over other nations in order to form empires and satellite colonies and eventually to consolidate the occupied territories and peoples as new states.⁵ State-building was based on three strategies: (1) convince nations to voluntarily give up their independence and submit themselves to being ruled by outsiders; (2) invade, occupy, and then acculturate (or deculturate) nations so that they identify with state-manufactured identity and culture; and (3) invade, occupy, and repress resistance by genocide, ethnocide, ecocide, or

TABLE 13.3 *Types of Nations*

Autonomous nations	Nations that have endured long-standing state attempts at cultural and territorial assimilation and whose autonomy is recognized by the state, e.g., Catalonia, Kuna Yala
Enduring nations	Nations that have endured long-standing state attempts at cultural and territorial assimilation and have achieved a partial or limited autonomy, e.g., Saamiland, Yapti Tasba
Renasant nations	Historical nations that are becoming stronger by cultural renaissance and political movements seeking greater political recognition, e.g., Scotland, Wales
Remnant nations	Long-dormant nations (low levels of cultural activity) that have weak, incipient national movements, regenerating because of the example of neighboring nations
Nation cores of states	Most states have and are run by nation cores that become both the point of expansion and the hegemonic culture of the idealized nation-state, e.g., England/UK, Russia/USSR, Castile/Spain, Java/Indonesia, Han/China
Irredenta	Parts of nation cores of states lost to states by treaty or war. In some cases, groups within the “broken piece.” Nations see themselves being ruled by the “wrong” state, e.g., Northern Ireland
Recognized nations	Nations that endured state occupation and won independence, e.g., Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Eritrea
Fragmented nations	Many nations are occupied by two or more states, which often hinders political mobilization and territorial reconsolidation, e.g., Kurdistan is occupied by 5 states, Saamiland by 4, and Kawthoolei (in Burma) by 2
Militarily occupied nations	Many nations have all or part of their territories militarily occupied by one or more states, e.g., the northern one-third of the Miskito nation is occupied by Honduras, and the southern two-thirds have partial autonomy
Armed resistance nations	Of the world’s 120-some wars (as of April 1993), 80 percent involved Fourth World nations resisting state military forces, e.g., Kawthoolei versus Burma, West Papua versus Indonesia, East Timor versus Indonesia, Chittagong Hill Tracts versus Bangladesh, Saharawi Republic versus Morocco

forced removal or displacement. Historical sociologist Charles Tilly succinctly characterizes state-building when he writes: “War made the state and the state made war.”⁶

State-building is part of a worldwide process that appears to follow a progression of chronological and spatial stages. All of these begin at different times and take place at different rates with individual states. Thus, at any given time, the many stages of state-building appear to exist simultaneously.

To help clarify this geographic-historical concept of process, let us first consider coral reefs. Similar to stars, mountains, deserts, and states, the creation of a coral reef is a large-scale historical-geographical process that includes varied stages that can be studied to unravel and explain the sequence of the process itself. For example, aboard the HMS *Beagle* in 1936, Charles Darwin studied coral reefs and proposed in his "Subsidence Theory" (1841) that the presence of different types of shallow-water coral reefs in the deep ocean could be explained by the subsidence of volcanic islands and the upward growth of corals (from reefless volcano to fringing reef to atoll). Darwin reasoned that all of the island-reef types he observed were part of a single, geographic-historical process. Harvard professor Steven Jay Gould writes of Darwin's coral reef study:

His book is about coral but it is also about historical reasoning. . . . Since large-scale processes begin at different times and proceed at diverse rates, the varied stages of different examples should exist simultaneously in the present. To establish history in such cases, we must construct a theory that will explain a series of present phenomena as stages of a single historical process. The method is quite general. Darwin used it to explain the formation of coral reefs. We invoke it today to infer the history of stars. Darwin also employed it to establish organic evolution itself. Some species are just beginning to split from their ancestors, others are midway through the process, still others are on the verge of completing it.⁷

My own "theory of the repressive state" suggests that "state-building" by nation-destruction—like the formation of stars, deserts, or coral reefs—proceeds through various stages, many of which may exist simultaneously. Most state governments share and replicate state-building strategies. Because the common underpinnings of such strategies are force and tyranny, most are repressive and are reeled out with but minor variations (Table 13.4). The theory postulates that since no nation voluntarily gives up its independence, state-building proceeds through various military and legal mopping-up stages. Thus, if one studies what is happening between states and nations at any one time (e.g., the interactions in 1993 between 191 states and 5,000 or more nations), the series of present phenomena can be understood as stages of a single historical geographic process. This has immense potential for the defense of nations and for an understanding of the buildup and breakup of states. For example, for their 1981–1989 defensive war against the Nicaraguan state, the Miskitos' Misurasata and Yatama armed resistance forces studied several Fourth World wars, including Kawthoolei versus Burma (1948–), Eritrea versus Ethiopia (1961–1991), West Papua versus Indonesia (1962–), East Timor versus Indonesia (1975–), and the Saharawi Republic versus Morocco (1975–). From these and other similar conflicts, a chronological and spatial model was constructed of common state strategies for invasion, occupation, and justification. Construction and analysis of the model and theory helped the Miskito resistance to anticipate and prepare for Nicaraguan state-building strategies and to accelerate their military and political strategies for autonomy. In 1982, Miskitos were arrested and killed by the Sandinistas for demanding autonomy; by 1987, the Sandinistas were forced to include autonomy

TABLE 13.4 *The Repressive State: A Historical-Geographic Sequence of State-building (abbreviated from a fifty-stage model)*

Stage 1:	Establish a geographic-historical reason for the state to expand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manifest destiny • the targeted nation is a "natural" part of the state • the state must have a "pathway to the sea" or "security over its international borders"
Stage 2:	Establish the infrastructure for invasion and annexation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build roads, airfields, and communication lines • offer and send in technical assistance • send in missionaries and academics • offer jobs in exchange for helping develop natural resources (oil fields, mining of minerals, forestry, hydroelectric power)
Stage 3:	Create a justification for the invasion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the people are starving • terrorists or drug traffickers are operating in the area • the area is being used as a base for attacks against the state • the new road, dam, mine, oil field, or forestry project is threatened • the local people have requested help from the state army • the local people are but wandering, primitive groups and really have no capacity to efficiently use the resources or to develop themselves
Stage 4:	Invalidate under the mantle of liberation and development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the underdevelopment will be ended in the region • the region will be freed from colonial or neighboring-state domination • the region's impoverished people will be developed, given medical and educational services, and set free from the yoke of misery and poverty
Stage 5:	Dismantle and replace the nation's social, economic, political, religious, and educational leadership, institutions, and structures with those of the state
Stage 6:	Move in state citizens and international companies and ask international organizations to pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occupation by resettlement programs for state peoples • exploitation of natural resources • "protection" of natural resources ("national parks")
Stage 7:	Condemn the first signs of political resistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resistance is due to tribalism, ethnic hatred, racism • resistance is due to the region having a retarded history, being backward
Stage 8:	Denounce the first signs of armed resistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • instigated by a neighboring enemy state • caused by mercenaries, bandits, terrorists, Communists • caused by "the new Communists": drug traffickers or fundamentalist Moslems • caused by the CIA (the KGB is no longer strong enough to be blamed)
Stage 9:	Put nation peoples into the state armies and into the occupation government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempt to blur the "we versus them" conflict • break cultural ties when nation people get shot at by nation people
Stage 10:	If armed resistance has any meaningful successes, crack down on the civilians in the occupied nation—the "rice-or-bullets policy" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • burn communities and crops • create curfews and identity cards

(Continues)

TABLE 13.4 (Continued)

- control access to and distribution of food and medical supplies
- use arbitrary brutality to terrorize people into submission
- arrest and imprison leaders and kill their followers
- force nation people to flee (often backfires because as international refugees, nation peoples may be able to inform the world and to support resistance)

Stage 11: Create a plausible reason for or plausible denial of “the troubles”

- the half-lie: tell the truth about what is known, lie about the rest
- it is the enemy; the state is protecting the people
- the enemy has agents and friends in the international press
- exactly what happened may never be known

Stage 12: Relocate civilians into state camps

- isolate civilians from supporting armed resistance (food, information, shelter, recruits, morale)
- divide nation into state-controlled zones and free-fire zone
- locate state camps away from international borders
- refer to the state camps as economic development and new communities

Stage 13: Develop “talk-and-shoot” strategy

- offer amnesty to resistance leaders and their forces
- create a bogus “we are you” agenda
- admit some “excesses” and promise a new deal
- upgrade military with more helicopters and better communications
- reorganize traditional military forces into smaller “guerrilla-hunter” units that track down and eliminate nation resistance forces—tell the world peace is at hand

Stage 14: Call for a vote to legitimize the occupation

- this is to be done when state has moved a numerical majority into the occupied nation
- could be a vote or a UN-supervised referendum

Stage 15: Settle down for decades of low-intensity resistance

- the state will maintain an expensive military occupation
- the resistance will try to economically bleed the state by three strategies: (1) continue small ambushes and sabotages that force the state to keep a large and expensive military in the field; (2) destroy or disrupt all state economic exploitation of nation resources; and (3) through external political and environmental activism, block state receipt of “development” (occupation) funds from international sources

E p p p

in the Nicaraguan constitution; and in 1990, the Miskitos elected a Miskito government for the autonomous Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte (RAAN) area.

State-Nation Conflicts

States and nations represent two seemingly irrepressible forces in collision: states, with their large armies, expansionist ideologies and economies, and international state-support networks, and nations, with their historical and geographic tenacity anchored by the most indestructible of all human inventions—place-

based culture. After many years of geographical conflict, the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union have lessened the superpower control that once repressively “stabilized” many world regions. As a result, many nations are now moving to disentangle themselves from state occupation. These efforts form the conflicts of the 1990s and those to come in the first decade of the new millennium. Judging from conflicts in the recent past, the wars for self-determination that will be waged in the next two decades will take millions of lives and produce millions of refugees.

State versus nation conflicts since World War II have produced the most numerous and the longest wars, the greatest number of civilian casualties from state-directed genocide, the greatest number of refugees, and the fewest peaceful solutions (Table 13.5).

Despite the fact that most of the world’s wars, refugees, and genocide are the result of conflicts over territory and resources between states and nations, they generally do not come under international laws, rules, instruments, conventions, or agreements. States make international laws. It is no wonder, then, that attempts to protect some nations by amending the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949 (the “rules of war” that resulted from the atrocities committed against civilians and prisoners of war in World War II), were voted down. From the point of view of the state, only “terrorists” resist state takeover.

Without new international laws and policies regarding nations, much of the world will continue to look on, revolted but paralyzed, as the deaths from state-nation conflicts mount.

TABLE 13.5 *Human Dimensions of the State Wars Against the Fourth World*

1993 wars ^a	State versus nation	97
	State versus state	1
	State versus insurgency	15
	Nation versus nation	6
	Nation versus insurgency	3
		<u>122</u>
Average duration of wars, 1945–1993	State versus state	2.8 yrs.
	State versus nation	10.2 yrs.
1993 refugees	Nation and state refugees recognized by the UNHCR	18,000,000 (est.)
	Nation and state refugees not recognized by the UNHCR	<u>18,000,000 (est.)</u> 36,000,000 ^b
State-directed genocide against nation peoples, 1945–1993	73,500,000 deaths, 81% of all genocide	

^aUpdated from calculations in Bernard Nietschmann, “The Third World War,” *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 3 (1987).

^bOf which some 20 million are from nations.

State Breakdown and Breakup

More than 90 percent of all states that have ever existed have broken up. And modern states and their territories are still breaking down and breaking up: In 1945, there were 72 states and colonies; by mid-1993, the total had risen to 191, with the new ones mainly coming from the breakup of European state colonies (in Africa, South and Southeast Asia, the Pacific, and the Caribbean) and the breakup of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Ethiopia.

Breakdown and breakup are natural parts in the life cycle of a state. As artificial creations, most states are but fragile, centralized, and expansionist empires imposed on unconsenting nations and held together by laws, force, and patriotic symbols. States break down when they become stretched too far, both economically and geographically: The political and economic costs of the occupations exceed the returns, and the empire becomes too expensive to maintain. For example, if one nation resistance person with an AK-47 automatic rifle and 500 rounds of ammunition (\$500) shoots off one 30-round clip (\$10.00), the occupation state may respond by buying a \$1.2-million-dollar Mi-25 helicopter gunship and spending \$4,000 to put it in the air for a few hours.

The common strategies of state-building by nation-destroying sows the seeds for the state's eventual breakdown or breakup. As states become overextended militarily or economically, they become even more restrictive, repressive, and environmentally destructive, hastening their demise. Indeed, as Leopold Kohr notes, the sheer size and complexity of many states dooms them to breakdown.⁸ Kohr's very simple yet powerful idea—and the theme of his book—is that when something is wrong, chances are it is too big to operate well. Arnold Toynbee has shown that collapse invariably results from "forcible political unification in a universal state," and Lewis Mumford argues that the consolidation of nations under a central government in large cities was accompanied by the creation of empires, classes, slaves, protests, disorder, repression, environmental ruin, and the waging of more and bigger wars. To interrupt this destructive cycle, Kohr recommends small, democratic, autonomous regions. In place of France, Germany, Russia, and Italy, he suggests forty or fifty Venezias, Lombardies, Savoyes, Burgundies, and Estonias.

Kohr's vision, more than fifty years old, is coming true as European states break down and break up. In Europe, two simultaneous forces impinge upon the state and the notion of state sovereignty: the creation of the European Community—with no borders or passports and a single currency—and, with the exception of Bosnia, the successes of Europe's 100 nations that, for the most part, are centers of economic booms and political stability.

Indeed, when states are faced with internal disintegration due to political unrest, economic stagnation, and environmental devastation, they usually select solutions that often hasten breakdown. They may expand further (e.g., the USSR's movement into Afghanistan, Argentina's into the Falklands, Morocco's into Saharawi Republic); apply more repression (e.g., Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Guatemala,

and Sri Lanka in the 1980s and Burma in the 1980s and 1990s); loosen up economic control but maintain the political and military occupation of nations (e.g., the USSR in the late 1980s); try to decentralize as little as possible within the existing state system (e.g., Canada and Quebec and home rule for indigenous peoples in the north); or develop a new method of international governance based on federations or confederations of nations that run their own affairs domestically and loosely unite to run the affairs of regions (trade, pollution, communications, defense, and illegal drugs).

Russia, China, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Afghanistan, and South Africa are examples of multinational state empires that may be too large, too environmentally destructive, and too repressive and occupy too many nations to avoid or prevent breakdown and breakup.

Cultural and Biological Diversity

The diversity of life on the planet consists of both biological diversity—the variety of species, genes, and environments—and cultural diversity—the variety of peoples, knowledge, and landscapes. Cultural and biological diversities are the building blocks of life. And where there is a concentration of nation peoples (cultural diversity), there is typically a concentration of species, genes, and ecosystems (biological diversity). For example, a poster-size map published by the National Geographic Society and entitled "The Coexistence of Indigenous Peoples and Natural Environments in Central America," dramatically shows that this region's remaining tropical forests are almost exclusively in the territories of indigenous nations, which compose some 40 percent of Central America's area and 25 percent of its population.⁹ The geographic overlap of nations and biological diversity appears to be a general worldwide pattern. Indeed, the vast majority of the world's 5,000 nations are centers of surviving biological diversity and ecological variety.

Because most nation peoples depend upon local biological resources that occur within their historical, traditional territories, they have evolved lifeways generally adapted to sustaining environments and conserving biological diversity. This is called the theory of Fourth World environments: Where there are nation peoples with an intact, self-governed homeland, there are still biologically rich environments. A physical map of the world aptly demonstrates this, showing that the still-forested areas of the world are areas lived in by nation peoples. The converse is equally striking: State environments—where the non-nation peoples live—are almost always areas of destructive deforestation, desertification, massive freshwater depletion and pollution, and large-scale reduction of genetic-biological diversity.

From the Fourth World perspective, the world's states are but internationally recognized governments that begin without environments or resources; it is the preexisting nations that have the land, freshwater, fertile soils, forests, minerals, fisheries, and wildlife. As such, most states exist only by the invasion and takeover

(called nation-building, political integration, or economic development) of unconsenting nations' environments and resources. Following an ideology of centrifugal expansion to fuel unchecked growth, many states commonly use environmental and resource-destroying methods and often military force to extract the biological wealth and suppress the culture of nations.

The history and geography of state expansion versus nation resistance have produced two remarkably different kinds of environments in the world. First, there are *state environments*, dominated by new state cultures and state peoples—usually characterized by large and dense numbers, environmentally unsustainable centrifugal economies, biological impoverishment, and, most often, razed landscapes. Second, there are *nation environments*, historically populated by nation peoples and characterized by ecologically adapted, centripetal cultures and economies, surviving biological richness, and variegated, healthy landscapes.

Seeing that biodiversity is not evenly distributed over the earth's surface but concentrated in certain areas due to geographic factors (range of topography, latitude, and isolation), biologists identified twelve "megadiversity" states where some 60 to 70 percent of the world's biodiversity is found. However, the Fourth World perspective requires that this interpretation be rethought: Biodiversity occurs in the nations claimed by the states, not in the states; if biodiversity were under state control, it would be gone. (See Table 13.6.)

From the First and Third World state perspective, the 2,310 nations—46 percent of the world total—and all the biodiversity within these twelve states' territories are state citizens and state resources, respectively, to be centrally governed and exploited. From the Fourth World perspective, however, states are expansionist and destroy nature and nations, and the central governments in these particular states—from Australia to Zaire—all have track records of destruction. The

TABLE 13.6 *The Coexistence of Biological Diversity and Nations*

"Megadiversity State"	Number of Occupied Nations
Australia	250
Brazil	210
China	150
Colombia	60
Ecuador	35
India	380
Indonesia	670
Madagascar	20
Malaysia	20
Mexico	240
Peru	65
Zaire	210
Total	2,310

SOURCE: Alan Thein Durning, "Guardians of the Land: Indigenous Peoples and the Health of the Earth," *Worldwatch Paper no. 112* (Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Institute, 1992).

exceptionally high cultural and biological diversity in these and other areas exists in spite of, not because of, state rule.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, signed by about 150 countries at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and by the United States in 1993, promotes plans to manage and protect global biological and environmental resources. To be sure, these are worthy and important goals, but most agreements have been made without consulting any of the nations whose lands and waters contain the vast bulk of surviving biodiversity, whose cultures contain the knowledge and experience to maintain biodiversity, and whose peoples have protected biodiversity. The First and Third World perspective is that the states will decide how best to use and protect biodiversity for development, relegating nations to the status of local communities that may be asked for assistance. In contrast, the Fourth World perspective is that the biodiversity that remains within nation territories should be protected and managed for the benefit of nations, not states: The biodiversity does not belong to the states, who would only destroy it by expansionist consumption.

The new environmentalism recognizes that one of the best ways to protect the world's surviving biodiversity is to support nation rights, territories, and self-determination. The next advances in conservation will be accomplished by ensuring nation self-determination.

Nation Self-Determination

Because they are occupied parts of states, nations will not be "given" self-determination. Self-determination is something that is taken, not given; it is achieved by economic, political, and military force, not by the goodwill of state governments. A wide array of nation self-determination movements exist globally, and many nations have achieved various measures of self-determination within their territories (Table 13.7).

Though many nations recently have become independent, such as the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, the self-determination goals of most

TABLE 13.7 *Nations Exercising Self-Determination Within Autonomous Areas*

The Inuit in Nunavut (Northwest Territories, Canada)
The Dene and Metis people in northern Canada
The Inuit in Kalaallit Nunaat (Greenland)
The Miskito in Yapti Tasba (RAAN, northeastern Nicaragua)
The Kuna in Kuna Yala (Caribbean coast of Panama)
The Bontoc and other Cordillera nations (North Central Luzon, Philippines)
The Naga in Nagaland (northeast India)
The Catalans in Catalonia (northeast Spain)
The Basques in Euzkadi (northwest Spain)
The Faeroe Islanders, Faeroe Islands (Denmark)
The Corsicans, Corsica (France)

others is to achieve self-rule within their territories and then work out other political arrangements with either the old state or a new state made up of a federation of nations. Meanwhile, these new "nation states" are creating tensions with "nonnatives" who may have resided in them for several generations.

It is apparent, then, that a new political architecture is developing globally, formed from the cultural boundaries of nations. States come and go—nations remain.

Notes

1. *New York Times*, January 25, 1993.
2. Brian Catchpole, *A Map History of China* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1982).
3. Bernard Nietschmann, "The Third World War," *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 3 (1987), p. 4.
4. Oren Lyons, "When You Are Talking About Client Relationships, You Are Talking About the Future of Nations," *Rethinking Indian Law* (New York: National Lawyers' Guild, Committee on Native American Struggles, 1982), p. iv.
5. Also identified as the process of nationalism, this is a complex and long-term endeavor.
6. Charles Tilly, "Reflections on the History of European State Making," in *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Charles Tilly, ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), p. 42.
7. Stephen Jay Gould, *Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes* (New York: Norton, 1983).
8. Kohr stated this in his 1941 essay "Disunion Now: A Plea for a Society Based on Small Autonomous Units," included in the 1957 reprint of *The Breakdown of Nations* (New York: E. P. Dutton).
9. "The Coexistence of Indigenous Peoples and Natural Environments in Central America," map published by *Research and Exploration* (Summer 1992).

FOURTEEN

The United Nations and NGOs: Future Roles

CHRISTINE DRAKE

IN THE RAPIDLY CHANGING WORLD following the end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet Union, new states are being created at an unprecedented rate, and old ethnic and economic tensions are erupting into new conflicts. At one level, regional associations are being strengthened as countries agree to give up some of their sovereignty to create larger economic and political groupings. Paradoxically, though, nationalistic feelings are becoming much stronger, and tensions among peoples, ethnic groups, tribes, and even clans are boiling over into open conflict. National boundaries have become more permeable, and national sovereignty less sacrosanct. Some even argue that in today's increasingly interdependent world, the nation-state concept—upon which the present international world order is based—is an anachronism and a hindrance to world peace and to solving many global problems. To progress toward the resolution of conflicts, identity and loyalty to ethnic and national units must increasingly be redirected toward regional and international entities.

Changes are also occurring among country blocs. Throughout most of the history of the United Nations, the growing number of member countries aligned themselves with either the United States and its allies or the Soviet bloc, despite the facade of the Nonaligned Movement (NAM, or Group of 77), which claimed neutrality but included such obviously partisan countries as Cuba, South Yemen, and Vietnam. Since the end of the Cold War, the Soviet bloc has all but disappeared, and increasingly, the world seems to be aligning itself along a north (developed)–south (developing) division. The power and wealth found overwhelmingly on the side of the north have a profound impact on the working of the UN. In the General Assembly, where each country has an equal voice (and vote), the north is completely dominated by the south. But the General Assembly has no direct law-making authority, and its resolutions are nonbinding, taking

Chapter 13

- Barsh, Russell. "The Ethnocidal Character of the State and International Law." *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4 (1989), pp. 1–30.
- Blaut, James. *The National Question: Decolonizing the Theory of Nationalism*. London: Zed Books, 1987.
- Bodley, John H. *Victims of Progress*. 3d ed. Mountain View, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing, 1990.
- Bodley, John H., ed. *Tribal Peoples and Development Issues: A Global Overview*. Mountain View, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing, 1988.
- Bugajski, Janusz. *Fourth World Conflict: Communism and Rural Societies*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
- Burger, Julian. *The Gaia Atlas of First Peoples*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1990.
- . *Report from the Frontier: The State of the World's Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 1987.
- Cabral, Amílcar. "National Liberation and Culture," in *Return to the Source*, Amílcar Cabral. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973.
- Chaliand, Gérard, ed. *Minority Peoples in the Age of Nation-States*. London: Pluto Press, 1989.
- Chisholm, Michael. "Cultural Diversity Breaks the Mold." *Geographical Magazine* (November 1990), pp. 12–16.
- Clay, Jason. "What's a Nation?" *Mother Jones* (November–December 1990), pp. 28, 30.
- Connor, Walker. "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?" *World Politics*, vol. 24 (1972), pp. 319–355.
- d'Encausse, Carrere. *The End of the Soviet Empire: The Triumph of Nations*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.
- Grundy-Warr, Carl, and Richard N. Schofield. "Man-Made Lines That Divide the World." *Geographical Magazine* (June 1990), pp. 10–15.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, and James R. Scarritt. "Ethnic Warfare and the Changing Priorities of Global Security." *Mediterranean Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1989), pp. 82–98.
- Johnston, R.J., D.B. Knight, and E. Kofman, eds. *Nationalism, Self-Determination and Political Geography*. London and New York: Croom-Helm, 1998.
- Knight, D.B. "The Dilemma of Nations in a Rigid State-structured World," in *Pluralism and Political Geography: People, Territory and State*, Nurit Kliot and Stanley Waterman, eds.. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- . "Self-Determination as a Geopolitical Force," *Journal of Geography* (July–August 1983).
- Kohr, Leopold. *The Breakdown of Nations*. New York: Dutton, 1957.
- Mandelbaum, Michael. *The Rise of Nations in the Soviet Union: American Foreign Policy and the Disintegration of the Soviet Union*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1991.
- Manuel, George, and Michael Posluns. *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- McLaughlin, Jim. "The Political Geography of Nation-Building and Nationalism in Social Sciences." *Political Geography Quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 4 (1986), pp. 299–329.
- Nietschmann, Bernard. "The Miskito Nation and the Geopolitics of Self-Determination." *Journal of Political Science*, vol. 19 (1991), pp. 18–40.

- . *The Unknown War: The Miskito Nation, Nicaragua and the United States*. New York: Freedom House Press, 1989.
- Schechterman, Bernard, and Martin Slann. "The Ethnic Nationalist Dimension in International Relations." *Journal of Political Science*, vol. 19 (1991).
- Shah, Sonia. "The Roots of Ethnic Conflict." *Nuclear Times* (Spring 1992), pp. 9–15.
- Weyler, Rex. *Blood on the Land*. New York: Vintage Books, 1984.

Chapter 14

- Bennett, A. Leroy. *International Organizations: Principles and Issues*. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1988.
- Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. *Report on the Work of the Organization from the Forty-sixth to the Forty-seventh Session of the General Assembly*. New York: United Nations, 1992.
- Falk, Richard A., Samuel S. Kim, and Saul H. Mendlovitz, eds. *The United Nations and a Just World Order*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
- The Interdependent*. New York: United Nations Association of the USA, published quarterly.
- Irvin, Linda, ed. *Encyclopedia of Associations and International Organizations*. Detroit: Gale Research, 1992.
- Renner, Michael. *Critical Juncture: The Future of Peacekeeping*. Worldwatch Paper 114. Washington, D.C.: Worldwatch Institute, May 1993.
- Riggs, Robert E., and Jack C. Plano. *The United Nations: International Organization and World Politics*. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1988.
- Rosenau, James N. *The United Nations in a Turbulent World*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1992.
- United Nations. *The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace-keeping*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 1990.
- UN Observer and International Report*. New York: Tres Publications, published monthly.

Chapter 15

- Bergsten, C.F. "The United States and the World Economy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 460 (1982), pp. 11–20.
- National Science Foundation. *Division of Science Resources Studies Report NSF 92–306*. Washington, D.C.: NSF, March 20, 1992.

Chapter 16

- Berman, K. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air*. London: Verso, 1982.
- Bryant, R. *International Financial Intermediation*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1987.
- Castells, M. *The Information City*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Claassen, E.-M., ed. *International and European Monetary Systems*. London: Heinemann, 1990.
- Corbridge, S., R. Martin, and N. Thrift, eds. *Money, Power and Space*. Oxford: Blackwell, forthcoming 1994.