

FRED W. RIGGS

Political Science Department
University of Hawaii

MODES OF ETHNICITY

0. Contexts for understanding ethnicity

Considerable misunderstanding in the discussion of modern ethnic processes can be attributed to the prevalence of different contexts for thinking about ethnic phenomena and problems. My thinking on this subject is based primarily on the experience of compiling a conceptual glossary for „ethnicity research“ (A 1).¹ The paper makes no attempt to offer new data or to document its proposals. Rather, it is a kind of mapping exercise. My goal is to suggest a way of interpreting the many diverse concepts found in research on ethnicity so that they can become mutually intelligible. After revision on the basis of comments from readers, illustrative documentation may be added and, if the results seem useful to ethnicity researchers, the next might then be published.

0a. Contextuality. In the American literature ethnicity is associated with contrasts between members and non-members of a given culturally defined community. The term „minority“ is often used as a synonym, thereby implying the existence of a „majority“. In this sense, the existence of an ethnic group often reflects attitudes and behaviours of non-members as much as it does the self-identification of members. Some authors go so far as to insist that it is always the attitudes of outsiders that lead to the development of ethnic identity.²

1. INTERCOCTA GLOSSARY: CONCEPTS AND TERMS USED IN ETHNICITY RESEARCH. Published under the Auspices of the International Social Science Council, Committee on Conceptual and Terminological Analysis, with the financial assistance of UNESCO. (privately printed and distributed from the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii). Code numbers for concepts defined in this glossary are given, in brackets, after technical terms used in this paper. Concepts not included in the glossary are marked with a bracketed asterisk: (*).

2. The concept of an „American Indian“, is instructive. It was created by Europeans when they falsely identified the peoples of the New World. The original inhabitants thought of themselves only in terms of innumerable „tribal“ names and could scarcely conceive of themselves as a single community – certainly they had many very different cultures. Only after they became a recognized „minority“ in their own lands when European settlers swamped them, did they become „ethnized“ and learn to think of themselves as „Indians“. Similarly the contemporary notion of „blacks“ in America is a product of their oppression by a predominantly „white“ society. As these examples suggest, an ethnic community may actually contain many different cultures amalgamated under a single heading.

By contrast, in the European ethnographic tradition, it is more customary to identify culturally defined communities as independent entities that can be studied apart from their social environment. Most of them have a long history and well-established self-identity. Their cross-cultural interactions are, of course, recognized but they are given lower priority. Nevertheless, in both approaches there is interest in problems that arise whenever a cultural community exist as a sub-system within a larger society.

Here I shall emphasize both the „endo-perception“ (HED 1) based on how members of an ethnic community view themselves and the „exo-perception“ (HEM 1) which characterizes the opinions of outsiders. In other words, ethnicity involves a contextually defined fractional community that is viewed by others, and views itself, as culturally and socially distinctive. Although ethnic communities normally do have their own cultural identity and may be studied as closed systems, „ethnicity research“, as I understand it, treats them as open systems involved in relationships with outsiders.

Ob. Modernity. The basic modern norm of „equality“ applies to these relationships and provokes anger when it is violated. By contrast in pre-modern societies inequality was accepted and hierarchic values prevailed. Thus under the rule of empires, where sovereignty was viewed as a royal property, everyone was treated as a „subject“ and conquered peoples were enslaved or treated as serfs. No matter how much they resented oppression or struggled for liberation, they could scarcely do so in the name of equality because the notions of popular sovereignty, of citizenship and of social justice had no standing in the philosophies that prevailed in those times.

No doubt traditional values and social structures remain in the world today, but for the most part the assumptions of „modernity“ prevail everywhere — namely notions of citizenship and the sovereignty of the people rather than of the rulers. This is true, I think, in both capitalist and socialist countries, as it is throughout the third world. It supports a broad distinction between „modern“ and „traditional“ forms of ethnicity. In this paper I shall focus attention on modern ethnicity, although a few comments on traditional modes will be appended. Most writers on ethnicity have modern ethnicity in mind although, understandably, historians give more weight to pre-modern formations.

Oc. Revisionist/Defensive Dimension. Another important dimension of variation applies to all modes of modern ethnicity. It concerns the degree to which ethnic communities feel satisfied or dissatisfied with the status quo. When they are dissatisfied they promote fundamental changes and adopt a wide variety of strategies, ranging from peaceful non-violent protest to revolutionary struggles and terrorism. We may classify all of these demands for change as „revisionist“.

By contrast, ethnic communities are sometimes satisfied with the status quo and struggle to maintain and consolidate it, or to protect it from attack. Again, the methods of struggle may range from peaceful cultural and political action, as by encouraging assimilation or tolerating cultural diversity, to violence directed at the suppression of minorities — e. g. in pogroms, ethnocide, and even genocide. It is useful to view them together as examples of a „defensive“ orientation. Admittedly this term is not precise but others like „protectionist“ or „conservative“ appear even less suitable. We need to distinguish the peaceful/violent dimension that characterizes different ways of acting from the goals to be attained: i. e. whether to maintain and

consolidate the existing power structure, or to bring about fundamental changes sought by those not in power. I shall use the „defensive/revisionist“ dichotomy to refer to the latter dimension.

In the rest of this paper I shall suggest a taxonomic framework for understanding the diverse contexts of ethnicity, emphasizing those that are modern while paying marginal attention to others that are traditional. I shall try to identify both revisionist and defensive attitudes in each case, and also explain the types and significance of „non-ethnic minorities“. The following six basic rubrics will be considered:

1. Basic Modes: Primary Ethnicity
2. Basic Modes: Secondary Ethnicity
3. Compound Formations
4. Non-ethnic Minorities
5. Traditional Formations
6. Marginal Contexts

1. Basic modes: primary ethnicity

A fundamental distinction can be made between the ethnic situation that prevails in the Old World (Europe, Asia and Africa) and what prevails in the New World (North and South America, Australia and New Zealand). In the Old World context we usually assume the existence of *homelands* (PA 2) as a focus for both ethnographic and ethnic research. Most discussion of „nationalism“, for example, presupposes a homeland. In the New World context, however, homelands are not usually presupposed. By contrast, where immigrant minorities are widely *dispersed* (PIP1) throughout a population, and there are no well defined homelands, interest typically focuses on problems of assimilation vs. retention of distinctive cultural features; problems of fair treatment vs. discrimination.

A distinction is sometimes made between „political“ and „cultural“ ethnicity. It is easy to see the political aspects of nationalism and its cultural aspects are less conspicuous, yet surely there. By contrast, where no homeland is involved and „nationalism“ appears to be an empty notion, cultural aspects are more self-evident, yet political aspects are also present. The political/cultural distinction, therefore, scarcely enables us to make the contextual contrast between homeland and non-homeland based ethnicity.

At a simple terminological expedient, I shall refer to homeland based nationalist movements and phenomena as „*primary ethnicity*“. By contrast, where no homeland is in mind — of course immigrants have their ancestral homelands outside the country to which they have migrated — it is convenient to speak of „*secondary ethnicity*“. (For an earlier use of these terms see the ANNEX) After deeper investigation we may find more satisfactory terms for this distinction, and I welcome any suggestions for preferable terms. Meanwhile, however, I shall use these terms on a provisional basis. Please remember that the geographical dichotomy has many exceptions: primary ethnicity can be found in the New World, especially among its original inhabitants, Native Americans or Australian Aborigines, for example. Similarly, secondary ethnicity can be found in the Old World — Algerians in France, Indians in England, peoples of Curacao and Suriname in the Netherlands, Turkish workers in Germany and Switzerland, etc.

1a. Primary Ethnicity the words „nation“ and „nationalism“ apply only to primary ethnicity. However, they have acquired a wide variety of meanings depending on their revisionist or defensive orientation. In the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, for example, as equalitarian ideas spread among the various Slavic peoples (Czechs, Slovaks, Croats, Slovenians, Serbs, Macedonians, Greeks, etc.) nationalism came to refer to revisionists movements designed first to secure cultural autonomy (especially for different religious preferences and language practices) and later to secure political independence as new „nation states“. In this perspective it is appropriate to speak of „*ethnonationalism*“ (KU 25).

By contrast, in Western Europe, especially in England and France, nationalism assumed more defensive orientation, not only to safeguard the full independence of established national states, but also to assimilate conquered minorities and convert them to the dominant mode of life. In this sense also American „nationalism“, as expressed in the „melting pot“ ideal, involved the intention of the dominant English-speaking community to consolidate a new nation by assimilating all of the immigrant minorities into a common „American way of life“. This concept might be referred to as „state-nationalism“ or even as „patriotism“(*).

When discussing nationalism, therefore, we should distinguish between its defensive and its revisionist forms. It is futile to insist that „nationalism“ should be used for only one of these forms when, clearly, the term often applies, paradoxically, to both.³

3. For a discussion of the diverse meanings of „nation“ see my „What is Ethnic? What is National? Let's Turn the Tables,“ *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*. At one extreme, Philip White argues that „nation“ should be used only in the sense of a nation-state, as in the United Nations, whereas Karl Aun holds that it can properly be used only in its cultural ancestral sense of an ethnonation. These two usages represent dialectically contrasting perspectives of the defensive vs. the revisionist ethnonation.

After completing the first draft of this paper in June 1988 I discovered the great work by Emerich K. Francis, *Interethnic Relations: An Essay in Sociological Theory*. (New York: Elsevier, 1976), 432 pages. In it he put forward two similar concepts which he also called „primary“ and „secondary“ ethnicity. Because his analysis elaborates and usefully supplements material in my paper, I am reproducing several pages from Francis' book in which his concepts are explained and used in a series of propositions. This material is taken from the final chapter which contains a systematic set of definitions and propositions based on the empirical data and case studies presented in the earlier chapters.

The main difference between Francis and myself is a matter of emphasis. I stress the geo-political factors which generate primary and secondary ethnicity, whereas he uses the typical consequences of these dynamic elements as a basis for his classification. The distinction becomes evident in Francis' Proposition 51, where he asserts that „annexation or collective transfer are more likely to lead to the formation of primary ethnic groups,“ and „migration“ to the development of secondary groups. I have, instead, defined primary groups as those with an ancestral homeland, and secondary groups as those resulting from migration. I view the consequences of these formative processes as highly probable but not necessary.

Because of his emphasis on consequences, however, Francis defines „primary ethnic groups“ as those which „continue to function in the host society as closed subsocieties...“ (Def. 46); whereas he identifies „secondary ethnic groups“ as „subgroups of the host society whose members participate directly... in some dimensions...“ (Def. 45). Because the correlation between causes and consequences is very high, it may make little practical difference which of these definitions are used. My own preference, however, is to say that when annexation or collective transfer (primary

1b. Levels. It is important, moreover, to identify different levels of „nationalism“ depending on the objective situation of ethnic communities. At the lowest level we find some primary communities that do, indeed, have deep historical roots for their culture (language, religion, history) but have become so overwhelmed by a dominant society that they no longer constitute a majority in their original „homeland“.

An interesting example may be found in my home state of Hawaii. The original Polynesian inhabitants, in almost total isolation from the outside world, developed a remarkably sophisticated culture of their own. This culture has now been swamped by intruders from the outside world and they now constitute a minority dispersed among a much larger population of non-Hawaiians. In this context, some Hawaiian activists demand the restoration of their ancient rights and privileges, perhaps on the analogy of those American Indians in the U. S. mainland who have, by treaty, been able to exercise some degree of authority within ancestral lands reserved for their exclusive use, i. e. as „reservations“. They often identify themselves as members of the „Hawaiian Nation“.

However, many Hawaiians do not see this goal as very realistic or desirable. Instead, they demand some degree of cultural autonomy and political privileges within the framework of a broader American society. They have already achieved an important step in this direction through the creation, by constitutional amendment, of an Office of Hawaiian Affairs within the State of Hawaii. It is governed by an elected council all of whose members must be Hawaiians, and only ethnic Hawaiians can vote for candidates to serve on this council. No doubt many unresolved questions and disputes have arisen, but nevertheless the Hawaiians have achieved a measure of recognition as a special people with privileges not available to any other minority in Hawaii.

We may refer to any such people who claim such special privileges as a „subnation“ (ST 1) and when such claims are recognized they become an „autonomous subnation“, or „ethnic autonomy“ (ST 6). Many subnations, however, have much more status and dominate a political jurisdiction which is their homeland. The clearest examples are found in „multi-nation states“ (SOM 6): Germans, French and Italians in

ethnicity) has occurred, the formation of „closed subsocieties“ usually results, whereas when migration leads to the appearance of (secondary) ethnic groups, then incomplete „participation“ in the life of the host society normally results.

Although the primary/secondary distinction can help us to clarify a host of conceptual and terminological problems involved in research on ethnic processes and problems, it appears not to have been picked up in the current literature – at least, I have not run across it except in one book, J. Krejci and V. Velimsky, *Ethnic and Political Nations in Europe*.“ (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981). They refer to Francis' distinction as „heuristically fruitful“ (p.), but rely mainly on the distinction between „cultural“ and „political“ nations attributed to F. Meinecke. Actually, Francis offers a very similar distinction which he refers to as „ethnic“ vs. „demotic“ nation. Both types of „nation“ occur, of course, in the context of primary, but not of secondary, ethnicity. I might add that important categories identified in my paper, notably „compound formations“ and „non-ethnic minorities“, are not covered, as such, in the treatise by Francis although, no doubt, some of his empirical data in fact refer to phenomena that belong to these categories.

Switzerland, for example, or Armenians, Estonians, Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks in the U. S. S. R. We may refer to them as „dominant subnations“ (ST 2). The term „ethno-nation“ has been used for this concept but since it also has several other meanings, it is equivocal and can be used unambiguously only if the context clearly shows which of its senses the author has in mind.

No doubt many dominant subnations are content with the status quo and adopt a protectionist or defensive attitude. I do not know enough about the local situation to be sure, but I would suspect that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenians could be classified in Yugoslavia. However, in some cases dominant subnations are dissatisfied and become revisionist, perhaps demanding full independence as a state-nation. A good example is the Francophone community in Quebec. Although they completely dominate their provincial government, there is a powerful Quebecois movement demanding full independence. So far as I know, there are no established terms to make this distinction. If we wanted to make it in order to analyze the causes of the difference, we might distinguish between „defensive“ and „revisionist“ subnations.

When an ethnic community dominates a state that is recognized by the United Nations, it is frequently referred to as a „nation“. However, as noted above, subnations have also appropriated this term for themselves, and it is most often used in the popular sense of a „state“ or, redundantly and ambiguously, a „nation-state“. We might most clearly indicate what we have in mind by using a term like „state-nation“*. This term could be interpreted unambiguously to mean an ethnonation, like the Danes, Japanese, French, or Poles, who dominate an independent state in the world community.

A state composed of only one ethnic community is called a „mono-ethnic state“ (SID 1). The ideal of a state-nation presupposed that it is also a monoethnic state. To maintain such an ideal, some countries — Japan, for example — make it almost impossible for anyone who is not of Japanese ancestry to become a Japanese citizen. Nevertheless, many non-Japanese do reside in Japan. By contrast, although France is clearly a state-nation, it has so many ethnic minorities that it can scarcely claim to be a mono-ethnic state. In fact, virtually all countries in the world today are „multi-ethnic states“ (SID 3).

When a single ethnic community (subnation) dominates a state-nation, we might call the polity an „ethnostate“ (SIM 3). The dominant ethnonation in such a country may actually constitute only a small part of the population. To take an extreme example, consider the Union of South Africa which is dominated by a small Afrikaner minority that oppresses many ethnic communities within its boundaries. In a case like this, the subordinated nations hope to come to power as a majority. Of course fear of this eventuality drives the dominant community to extreme measures, including its abhorred „apartheid policy“ (SE 85).

Consider also countries like Ethiopia, which is dominated by its Amharic minority, Burma by its Burmese community, and the Sudan by its Arabic speaking Muslims. In each of these cases minority nations are engaged in chronic revolt, demanding autonomy, independence, or boundary changes — they cannot, as in South Africa, hope to dominate the state, nor achieve real equality of status in a „convictional state“ (SIM 1). The „dominant nation“ (ST 2) in an ethnostate typically has a protectionist orientation, seeking to safeguard its power and to assimilate or destroy the minority nations that challenge its pre-eminence. By contrast, of course, the

subordinated subnations are typically revisionist and seek fundamental changes designed to establish autonomy, independence, or annexation to a different state of which they constitute an enclave.

1c. Colonies. Although in today's crowded world no „empty“ lands open to settlement can be found, it is historically relevant to mention a kind of primary ethnicity that might easily be confused with the secondary type. This involves the settlement of frontier territories by „colonist“ (*). Although they are migrants, they have no intention of assimilating to another culture. If, perchance, aboriginal inhabitants already occupy the frontier zone, they simply push them aside or destroy them, preempting their lands. Their goal is to expand the frontiers of the homeland.

However, especially when the frontiers were discontinuous with the homeland, new „nations“ typically came into existence and, eventually, sought their independence. The American example is well known: 13 British colonies in North America declared their „independence“ in 1775 and, after a war of secession, created the United States. Other British colonies were founded in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and are now independent countries in the Commonwealth. Similarly, during the 19th century, Spanish colonies in Latin America successively detached themselves from their homeland, synthetically creating new „nations“.

Of course, there are marginal cases. British colonists in Uganda and Southern Rhodesia were unable, finally, to dominate or displace the indigenous inhabitants and they have now become, themselves, subnations in these newly independent countries. The future of South Africa remains highly problematical, but it is difficult not to believe that, in the long run, the white South Africans will also become an ethnic minority in that troubled land. Comparable struggles are taking place in New Caledonia today between French colonists and the native population. In these cases, we might speak of „transplanted primary ethnicity“(*). Here we see how recent nations have been formed, by contrast with the normal situation in which ethnic homelands have ancient foundations.

An even more exceptional phenomenon involved the Zionist movement that led to the settlement of Jewish colonists in Palestine. In this case, exceptionally, the colonists had no homeland, but sought to create (or re-create) one. After they had established Israel as a state and a national homeland, they proceeded to conquer adjacent lands that were to have been reserved for the development of a Palestinian homeland. The current troubles in the occupied territories manifest, in a classic form, the demands of an ethnonation for political independence.

2. Basic modes: secondary ethnicity

Let us now consider the parallel manifestations of secondary ethnicity. Again, a major distinction can be made between the secondary ethnic communities who are *revisionist*, protesting their status and agitating for change, as contrasted with those that are *protectionists* because they are fully satisfied with the status quo. American students of ethnicity are preoccupied with problems involving revisionist ethnic communities. Because the United States is largely populated by immigrants and the descendants of immigrants, it is extremely multi-cultural. The dominant cultural

community for a long time was „Anglo American“, and immigrants of non-Anglo origins rose socially and politically only when they accepted the values and way of life of this community.

Immigrants communities were torn between conflicting goals. Some sought to retain their ancestral culture and a kind of subnational autonomy but the majority chose to assimilate. However, for various reasons, they often found that assimilation was blocked, often by resistance from the dominant Anglo community. They saw themselves as members of a lower class subject to discrimination and oppression. Revisionism, therefore, normally took the form of demands for equality of opportunity and „affirmative action“ to give them the opportunity to rectify past injustices and attain all the privileges of equal citizenship. Sometimes, however, it also took the form of demands for cultural autonomy in a way that resembles that of sub-nations, as mentioned above. This has produced movements to legitimize multi-culturalism, with separate schools, churches, minority language mass media, and a host of ethnic organizations. The interdisciplinary field of „ethnic studies“ has developed in the United States with a primary focus on the problems leading to these protest movements.

By contrast, members of immigrant communities who assimilate to the dominant Anglo-American way of life and became successful economically, socially and politically, have little reason to protest the status quo. Nevertheless, many of them still feel a sentimental attachment to their original homeland outside the United States. To celebrate their origins and to achieve a sense of special status and identity, they often support cultural activities such as festivals, dances, language study, sports events, and religious ceremonies. These activities are so devoid of protest and controversy that they attract little interest among students of ethnicity and tend to be ignored. Nevertheless, in a comprehensive analysis of modes of ethnicity, these defensive forms of secondary ethnicity should not to be overlooked.

2a. Motives for Immigration. An important reason for differences in the attitudes toward assimilation of immigrant communities can be found in the original reasons for their migration. Most came as hopeful immigrants, seeking a better life in the hostlands to which they have come. Although the majority were eager to assimilate to the dominant culture in order to enhance their prospects for living a good life, some came as political or religious refugees expecting to establish small enclaves of cultural autonomy where they could perpetuate their own preferred lifestyle. A classic case in America involves the Amish peoples. The Russian Old Believers have also established themselves in scattered communities around the world. They cling tenaciously to their traditional life-styles and resist efforts to bring them into the mainstream of American life.

By contrast with voluntary immigrants, many came unwillingly as victims of the slave trade. It was inherent in their status that they should be oppressed and angry about their depressed status in the New World. Others came as convicts sentenced to exile: the most notable case was that of Australia. Many immigrants from Asia to America during the 19th century came under short-term contracts as plantation workers or members of labor gangs. Their experience was intermediate between that of the immigrants and the slaves.

Minority status in America was, of course, as much affected by the attitudes of non-members as by the motives of the immigrants. Thus, whereas Europeans found assimilation quite possible, especially by the second generation, those who came from

Africa and Asia suffered racial discrimination that hampered their ability to assimilate for many generations.

I cannot elaborate a typology for all the types of secondary ethnicity found in the New World. Hopefully these familiar examples will provoke further analysis with a view to establishing categories of comparability from which studies can be made that will enhance our ability to theorize and to predict the forms of behavior typical of the secondary modes of ethnicity. At least it helps us understand the contrasts to be found between dispersed immigrant communities, some of which are quite defensive in their postures whereas others are strongly revisionist.

Moreover, one typically finds a great many „ethnic organizations“ (NEN 3) within the same secondary ethnic community. They often express mutually contradictory attitudes and goals, covering the full gamut from revisionist to defensive. This heterogeneity of attitudes found within secondary ethnic communities contrasts significantly with the greater homogeneity of perspectives found among members of subnations subject to the primary modes of ethnicity.

2b. Old World Manifestation. Although primary ethnicity is the dominant mode in the Old World and absorbs most of the attention of ethnicity researches in these countries, often working under the heading of „nationalism“, secondary ethnicity also occurs in this area. In the metropolises of empires, for example, one finds many former subjects of their dependent territories who have immigrated on a more or less permanent basis. Because of the shortage of unskilled laborers in Western Europe, a considerable number of „guest workers“ have been imported from Mediterranean countries. Although the subnations of the USSR typically have their own republics and autonomous regions as homelands, there are several recognized nationalities that lack them: the Germans and the Gypsies, for example. We should, I think, recognize them as manifesting secondary modes of ethnicity.

Within multi-national states, moreover, there is a good deal of internal migration so that some members of each ethnic community can be found outside of their homelands. One thinks, in the Soviet case, of Georgians and Armenians living in the RSFSR, and of Russians living outside of this republic. The same phenomenon is replicated in other countries — consider, for example, the case of the Sikhs in India, many of whom live outside their homeland in the Punjab. The situation of these peoples as migrant minorities differs significantly from that of the subnations who seek autonomy or even independence. They have no choice but to accept permanent status as a minority in their „hostlands“ (PA 4).

Different terms have been used for these dispersed minorities, e.g. „ethnic minority“, „ethnic group“, and „national minority“ (ST 8). Unfortunately these terms are equivocal and often have other meanings. I have suggested „marginalized nationality“ but this term may be too narrow insofar as it implies subordinated status. In fact, members of a dispersed minority, especially when they come from a pre-eminent homeland, may be especially privileged as guest residents. Sometimes this has grave political repercussions. For example, in Nigeria many Ibos living outside of their homeland in the Eastern Region (Biafra) occupied privileged posts in the North. They were ultimately driven out in 1966 after thousands had been massacred. We do need a better term: perhaps „dispersed minority“ (*) could be used, reserving „marginalized minority“ for those in a subordinated position, and „privileged minority“ for those

occupying high status position. However, as the Ibo case illustrates, the status of a dispersed minority can suddenly and tragically change from privileged to marginalized status.

Not all migrants view themselves as permanent parts of a larger society. Among them we might mention the colonists (see #1 c above) who seek, originally, to extend the boundaries of their homeland, displacing the original inhabitants of the lands where they settle. Although they might be viewed as „immigrants“, we understand them better as newly formed subnations, under the mode of primary ethnicity.

Other migrants are better thought of as constituting „non-ethnic minorities“ – see #4 below. Still others fall into a marginal category – e.g. officials administering conquered territories – see #6 below. I think they ought not to be analyzed under the heading of secondary ethnicity, even though their presence is based on migration from a homeland. Before discussing these phenomena, however, let us look at some of the „compound formations“ (*) which combine features of primary and secondary ethnicity.

3. Compound formations

The identification of primary and secondary forms of ethnicity provides only a starting point. However, this start enables us to sort out various combined or *compound* types of ethnic community.

Sometimes primary and secondary orientations co-exist in the same community. For example, among the Hawaiians there are some who speak of the „Hawaiian Nation“ and promote restoration of a condition in which Hawaiians would, again, dominate and prevail in the Hawaiian Islands. However, in view of their minority status as a small fraction of the population, a larger number of Hawaiians accept the fact that they have become inescapably a part of contemporary American society, as though they were somehow „immigrants“ in their own land. Because they feel underprivileged and abused, they demand assistance in developing themselves as fully equal Americans – a typically secondary revisionist orientation. However, there are also some Hawaiians – no doubt a minority of them and they are the more successful ones – who make no such demands but, nevertheless, revel in their cultural heritage, study the Hawaiian language and traditions and enjoy its music, dances, and aesthetic achievements – hence a secondary defensive mode.

Much more often the primary and secondary modes are compounded in a territorial sense – i.e. part of an ethnic community lives securely in a homeland, while others are dispersed as migrant minorities in different hostlands. This type of *compound formation* arises when members of a primary ethnic community emigrate from their homeland and settle elsewhere as members of a secondary ethnic community. It would be surprising if they lost contact with their relatives and friends in the homeland, or if they did not try to retain much of their ancestral culture. Of course we can focus on each segment of such a compound as separate primary and secondary communities. However, it is also useful, I think, to conceptualize them as a whole because their parts do influence each other in many complicated ways, and we can understand these variations more easily when we have a concept for the compound as a whole.

3a. *Relation to States.* A fundamental distinction between types of compounds can be made on the basis of the contemporary global system of sovereign states. Some compounds are *intra-state* (*) and others are *trans-state* (*). A good example of an intra-state compound might be the Georgians, most of whom live in Soviet Georgia, but many can also be found scattered, as a small minority, in other parts of the Soviet Union. The notion of a *trans-state ethnic community (TEC)* (NEK 5) may be illustrated by the Ukrainians, most of whom live in the Ukrainian S.S.R. but many have also migrated to live elsewhere, especially in North America. To avoid a cumbersome phrase for this concept, which will be used quite often here, I shall use the convenient acronym, „TEC“. Of course any given TEC may also contain an intra-state compound: for example, Soviet Armenians form an intra-state compound in the Soviet Union, and they also belong to a global Armenian TEC. We may refer to members of a compound community residing in their homeland as a „*home community*“ (PIK) and those who have left it to live elsewhere in hostlands as „*dispersed communities*“ (PIP 1). Typically members of a dispersed community constitute dispersed minorities in their hostlands.

Many variables can be applied to the study of compound ethnic communities, including both the intra-state and trans-state varieties. Here I shall limit my remarks to TECs because their involvement in the politics of international relations makes them especially interesting. We should distinguish between the ethnic and state linkages found in TECs. „*Ethnic linkages*“ (OU 1) involve relations between a home community and its dispersed members. By contrast, „*state linkages*“ (*) involve relations between governments and the components of a TEC.

Linkages can be positive or negative. When positive, they involve mutual support and cooperation, when negative, mutual antagonism. They can also be neutral, involving little positive or negative affect, in which case they tend to dissolve and become meaningless. Of course different members of a TEC may express contrasting attitudes: let us call them „*polarized*“ (*) when strongly positive and negative linkages are found in the same TEC. By contrast, when virtual unanimity among members of a TEC, their views are „*congruent*“ (*). Positive congruence means that good relations exist between the home and dispersed communities of a TEC; negative congruence means that members of a dispersed community agree in rejecting their homeland.

The political status of a homeland strongly influences the character of relationships in a TEC. If the homeland is a mono-ethnic state – the ideal type of a „*nation state*“ – attitudes in the dispersed community and homeland toward each other are likely to be „*consistent*“ (*), i.e. the same toward both the state and the home community. However, when a homeland belongs to a subnation in a multi-ethnic state, attitudes found in its dispersed community are often „*inconsistent*“, usually positive toward the homeland but negative toward the state containing the homeland. When such feelings are strong, they lead to „*transnational ethnic struggles*“ (*) – see #3b.

Sometimes a TEC contains more than one homeland. A classic example involves nations that have been artificially divided as a result of international politics: North and South Korea; East and West Germany; Western and American Samoa; Poland during its period of partition, from the late 18th to the early 20th century. They have been called „*multi-state nations*“ (SUM 2). Dispersed members of such a TEC may, ambivalently, have positive attitudes toward one part of a dismembered homeland and negative attitudes toward another. In rare cases a „*stateless TEC*“ (SUD 3), containing no homeland, may be able to create or recreate one. The Jewish Diaspora and the birth of Israel after the second World War provides the most familiar example.

3b. Transnational Ethnic Struggles. I cannot hope to categorize all the many types of TEC, but a few words may be devoted to a particularly important current and controversial type involving „transnational ethnic struggles“. I am currently planning a roundtable on this phenomenon to be held in London during the next conference of the International Studies Association, in March 1989. The idea covers revolutionary or nationalist movements within a homeland when they receive support from members of its dispersed community. For example, the Tamil in south India; Sikhs struggling for political independence in India receive help from Sikhs living outside of India; Palestinians struggling to create an independent homeland receive support from Palestinians living in exile; the Irish Republican Army, striving to change the status of Ulster, receives support from Irishmen living in the United States. There are many other examples, and there are important differences among them, but they share significant features.

The frequency and violence of transnational ethnic struggles has been increasing in recent years. The phenomenon is scarcely new, but the intensity and strength of these struggles appears to be growing. Why should this be so? To answer this question we need to pay more attention to the phenomenon of TECs. Surely the size and number of TECs is increasing in today's global system. The dispersal of populations has been facilitated by modern transportation and relatively open boundaries. Modern communications enable members of a TEC to keep in touch with each other. Growing political and economic grievances in a homeland provoke emigration.

Although most emigrants are preoccupied with the effort to solve the problems facing them in the hostlands to which they have migrated, some remain closely linked to their original homeland and they may choose to support the activists in these homelands who are seeking radical change. Even if they opt for assimilation in their hostlands, they may find themselves frustrated by non-acceptance and barriers such as differences of language, religion and cultural norms. Out of such frustrations they may look back to their homeland and become involved in its struggles. Although primarily interested in assimilation, they may also, ambivalently, agree to support activists in their own homeland. Consequently, even though they do not personally become activists, they may give financial and moral support, establish training camps and refuges, supply weapons, etc.

Moreover, activists who suffer repression in their homelands often find safety and „breathing space“ abroad, where they also secure help from sympathetic fellow ethnics. Most governments, preoccupied with domestic problems, pay little attention to the activities of minority groups involved in transnational ethnic struggles, thereby giving them a relatively free hand to do as they wish. Although there are many case studies of this phenomenon, it has not attracted much systematic attention. Once we recognize it as an important mode of compound ethnicity, I expect that it will attract a growing volume of research interest.

4. Non-ethnic minorities

We often use the word „minority“ as a synonym for „ethnic group“. However, in a discussion of modes of ethnicity it is important to point out that not all minorities have the properties associated with ethnicity. We can simplify the analysis of ethnic processes by excluding them from our treatment. However, they are intrinsically

important and interesting, and they do belong to the broad discipline of ethnography, if not to its subfield of ethnicity research. This discussion of modes ethnicity can be strengthened by pointing out some non-ethnic categories, thereby clarifying our focus on what is properly ethnic.

4a. Primordial Cultures. If the sense of a minority being part of a larger society is viewed as the distinctive feature of ethnicity, then we can see that even today there remain in some countries isolated primordial cultures that live in their traditional habitat with virtually no outside contact. The traditional work of ethnology and cultural anthropology involved close study of such isolated cultural communities. They still provide an important field of study for ethnography but, I think, they do not belong to the field of research on ethnicity.

However, it must be added that increasingly even the most isolated primordial or tribal societies have come into contact with the outside world. Because of such contacts they become ethnicized. As this process takes place, the traditional sphere of ethnographic research merges, by imperceptible stages, into the newer sub-field of ethnicity research. The existence of this distinction is clearly made in the organization of this ICEAS, where a separate series of symposia on ethnicity has been organized separately from the rest of the congress where subjects of ethnological but non-ethnic interest are also attended to.

4b. Sojourners. There is another, very modern, type of non-ethnic minority which I shall refer to as „sojourners“ (*). These are temporary visitors from one country who live in another. They retain their original citizenship, frequently visit their homeland and maintain strong economic and social ties with it. The most conspicuous type of sojourner is the tourist who simply passes through a host country. The phenomena and problems associated with tourism are attracting more and more attention because of their economic and environmental significance. However, they do not belong to the field of ethnicity research.

Much more importantly, there are now a host of business men, diplomats, military personnel, journalists, missionaries and contract workers of all kinds who live abroad for relatively long periods of time. Although they may have a major impact on the country where they live, they are not studied under the heading of ethnicity. I recall making a bibliographic search for references dealing with minorities in Thailand only to discover that, although there is a substantial literature on its Chinese, Indian and Muslim minorities, virtually nothing has been written about its American and European minorities who, nevertheless, have had a profound influence on the country, and also display extremely interesting subcultural features. Because these communities are not classified as „ethnic“, I believe, they have eluded study as a cultural group or „minority“.

It is important to distinguish among sojourners between those in a privileged position and those who feel oppressed. More attention has been paid to the latter category. Erico Yamamoto, whose dissertation I helped to supervise, has written a fascinating account of the early Japanese contract workers in Hawaii. They thought of themselves as sojourners who would return home after completion of their contracts. Later on, however, some of them decided to remain in their hostland and, at that time, the process of ethnocization began to occur. Similarly, many of the contemporary „guest workers“ who have moved to Europe from Mediterranean countries under

temporary contracts have decided to remain, thereby forming ethnic communities. In contemporary Saudi Arabia, by contrast, a large part of the population consists of contract workers who are not permitted to remain. Thus government policy prevents the development of ethnic communities among these minority workers.

An important distinction may be made between „*home-based sojourners*“ (*), whose income is derived from sources in their homelands, and „*host-based sojourners*“ (*), whose income arises from their activities in a hostland. Diplomats, military officers, journalists and missionaries belong to the former category, business men and contract workers to the latter. However, the distinction is not always clear. Foreign business men working for transnational corporations have a kind of ambivalent status. Although they derive their income from activities based in the land where they are guests, they may receive their salaries from the overseas headquarters of the companies that employ them. Foreign students, similarly, are frequently supported by their home institutions or families, but they often also receive subsidies in their hostlands. Although most such students eventually return home, a substantial number decide to remain and become ethnicized in the lands where they have studied.

An important distinction can also be made between the status of sojourners. Many are more privileged than the average person in their hostlands. However, others are exploited and poor. This category includes plantation workers and contract laborers who are imported, on a temporary basis, to serve the needs of the host country. In Saudi Arabia a majority of the population are now sojourners working under short-term contracts. Although they may not enjoy the working conditions, a high level of compensation induces them to accept such assignments.

The homeland orientation of sojourners is usually enhanced by the policies of their home governments which often intervene on their behalf when they are abused — or thought to be abused. This creates a type of „*anchored-TEC*“ (*) in which the members of a given ethnic community dispersed outside the homeland, as sojourners, do not experience ethnicization within the context of the hostlands where they live. For this reason, perhaps, they should not even be thought of as TECs.

Sojourners should, nevertheless, be studied in the context of TECs. Whenever sojourners experience misfortunes or mistreatment, their home governments may sharply intervene. During the classic age of imperialism, many such interventions occurred. The unequal treaties imposed on China during the nineteenth century offer many examples. In some cases, no doubt, the sojourners themselves acted in such a way as to provoke hostilities and thus to provide a pretext for foreign intervention. By contrast, sojourners who are especially privileged include those played dominant roles as imperial conquerors, administrators, and business men — see# below. Their attachments to imperial homelands were especially strong.

5. Traditional formations

This paper has focused attention on modern forms of ethnicity, where the underlying notion of equality provides a context for evaluating relations between different cultural communities. By contrast, traditional societies presupposed hierarchies in which the oppression of subordinated castes, slaves, sefrs, etc. was rationalized as part of the natural order of things, and often had religious sanctions. No doubt analogies can be drawn between the pitiful situation of subordinated communities in traditional societies and that status of ethnic communities in the world today.

However, in my opinion the analysis of ethnicity becomes confused whenever we try to mix together the treatment of subordinated groups in pre-modern and modern societies. No doubt research on these communities should be an important theme within the disciplines of history and ethnography. However, the field of ethnicity research has plenty to do within the context of modern societies where the norms of equalitarianism prevail. The field simply becomes overloaded when it also attempts to deal with inter-group relationships in pre-modern societies. Of course, one might add that a full understanding of contemporary ethnicity does require, as this paper has attempted to show, a deep historical understanding of the origins of its various modes.

I should also admit that the distinction between pre-modern and modern contexts is much more difficult to draw in the Old World than in the New. In the former it is natural for European ethnographers to start with primordial communities and ancient civilizations, gradually expanding the scope of inquiry to include ethnic relations. It focuses then on primary ethnicity and especially on ethno-social organisms (ESOs) in which the distinction between primordial cultural identity and contemporary ethnic identity is easily obscured because no sharp lines can be drawn between different stages which gradually merge into each other. The distinction is much easier to draw in the New World where these lines are much more sharply drawn.

6. Marginal contexts

Although the general distinction between modern and pre-modern modes of ethnicity seems clear enough, the boundary between these categories is fuzzy, and some marginal types are worthy of special attention. They also generate, incidentally, special kinds of pseudo-TEC patterns.

The first type seems to lack a generic term. I shall refer to them as the „*sahibs*“ (*) an Indian word for Europeans applied, generally, in dependent territories to imperial officials or masters. These are members of a dispersed community who serve their homelands as rulers in a conquered domain. Although many of them did in fact settle in the lands they ruled, their primary loyalty and linkages remained with their homelands. Today this type of sojourner has almost vanished, but a residual group of „*expatriastes*“ (*) remains in some countries. Their lowered status and more permanent residence — often involving intermarriage — has resulted in a tenuous form of ethnicization. At least, it would be interesting to include them under the heading of ethnicity research.

A different kind of quasi-sojourner resulting, in the main, from imperialism involves the widespread migration of traders and merchants from one third world country to another. In pre-modern societies we often find niche based communities where ethnic specialization of function was viewed as mutually beneficial. One example is the Chinese Muslim community. During the 19th century, they became traders within the empire, mediating between sheep herders in Tibet and Western merchants in the Chinese cities under domination of the Western powers. Because this arrangement was mutually beneficial to the Chinese and the Muslims, it became quite stable and well institutionalized.

By contrast, in many contemporary third world societies alien merchants serve important entrepreneurial functions, but they are cross-pressured by severe contradic-

tions between their own aspirations and their precarious status as virtual hostages of the dominant ethnic community. Familiar examples include the Chinese in Southeast Asia, Indians in East Africa, Lebanese in West Africa, the Jews in many countries. They become what I call „*pariah entrepreneurs*“ (*). Although permanently settled as members of a minority group, they retain strong international ties which help them succeed as entrepreneurs.

However, their status as outsiders or aliens and discriminatory laws against them prevent their assimilation and keep them in a politically subordinated and volatile position. The Chinese in Thailand have been much studied ethnographically, as an almost closed community. However, their traditional culture has been affected so much by their precarious status and transnational linkages that it is better to view them as an ethnic minority. However, their ethnicity is strongly qualified by their precarious status, which justifies their treatment as a quasi-sojourner mode of ethnicity. In the extreme case of Indians in Uganda, they were suddenly uprooted during the tyrannical regime of Idi Amin, at which time some returned to India, but most emigrated to England.

Some relatively modern institutions also have a quasi-traditional character. For example, in the United States nineteenth century political machines served as a transitional institution. They created patronage/client systems which mediated between immigrants and the state. Thus they afforded a kind of modern niche for immigrant groups. Although they were associated with corruption and favoritism, they also helped ethnic minorities accept the frustrations involved in their subordinated status.

Modernization and the spread of social welfare programs have dissolved political machines and exposed minority peoples to the state bureaucracy in an impersonal universalistic mode. Since they are often unable to understand how to cope with bureaucratic procedures, this has led to considerable frustration, bitterness and, I believe, the proliferation of revisionist ethnic organizations.

In traditionally oriented hierarchic (feudal?) societies, symbiotic relationships between higher and lower status roles were stable and offered stability due to the inheritance of roles from parents to children. In modern equalitarian industrialized societies, by contrast, increasing social mobility means that children often follow different occupations from their parents. As a result, niche-based minority status becomes very problematic, leading to instability and social disruption. This may accentuate the importance of TECs since frustrated individuals who would normally prefer to assimilate turn, instead, to their homelands as an alternative route to personal achievement and security.

The mapping of primary and secondary modes of ethnicity, an understanding of the differences between modern and pre-modern modes, between defensive and revisionist orientations, between non-ethnic and ethnic formations, and recognition of various types of compounds between the primary and secondary modes should help us identify and place particular cases in contexts which will enhance comparability and promote the development of a genuinely scientific approach to ethnicity research.

EXCERPT FROM E. K. FRANCIS, INTERETHNIC RELATIONS. N. Y. Elsevier, 1976. pp. 396-400

b. Formation, Maintenance, and Dissolution of Ethnic Groups

The laws governing the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of ethnic groups differ according to their type.

Members of ethnic groups participate indirectly in the host society by virtue of their direct participation in the ethnic group. They may also participate directly in the host society in some dimensions. In this respect a basic distinction exist between **primary** and **secondary** ethnic groups.

Definition 45. By „secondary ethnic groups“ we understand subgroups of the host society whose members participate directly in the host society in some dimensions, particularly on the level of *commercium*, but indirectly through the mediation of the ethnic group in other dimensions, particularly on the level of *commensalitas* and *connubium*.

By „connubium“ we understand the rediness to establish affinal kinship ties through inter-marriage.

By „commensalitas“ we understand convivial activities, such as visiting, eating and feasting together, and associating for games and entertainment. Commensalitas also presents the most

By „commercium“ we understand a purely functional cooperation for practical ends as pertaining mainly to the economic sphere.

Proposition 50. When individual ethnic suffer deprivations because of differential treatment in the host society, they tend to form and maintain secondary ethnic groups to compensate for these deprivations. To this end, separate institutions are created and upheld that exercise partial social control over the group members.

Definition 46. By „primary ethnic groups“ we understand viable corporate units which, after their transfer from the parent to the host society, tend to continue to function in the host society as closed subsocieties able to satisfy the basic social needs of their members. Participation of their members in the host society accordingly tends to be indirect in all dimensions.

Proposition 51. Whereas migration is more likely to lead to the formation of secondary ethnic groups, annexation or collective transfer are more likely to lead to the mergece of primary ethnic groups.

Annexation or collective transfers are likely to involve viable regional subsocieties. Under modern conditions, migration generally involves individuals or small groups. „Collective transfer“ implies that viable societal units are being transferred bodily together with their property and institutions and/or, upon arrival, are permitted to reconstitute themselves as a viable subsociety after their traditional pattern.

Proposition 52. Economic factors tend to be of paramount importance in the formation of secondary ethnic groups; political factors in the formation of primary ethnic groups.

Proposition 53a. The formation of secondary ethnic groups begins with the creation of new institutions of their own. As they have no chance of achieving political autonomy and/or economic autarchy, their efforts are concentrated on satisfying the more intimate social needs of their members and on establishing social controls with regard to *commensalitas* and *connubium*.

Proposition 53b. Primary ethnic groups start the process of adaptation to the host society with a full set of institutions necessary for their functioning as a viable subsociety. They tend to lose these gradually, first in the political sphere then in the economic sphere.

Proposition 54a. Members of secondary ethnic groups are not so much concerned with the preservation of their separate collective identity as with the enjoyment of social rewards on equal terms with the charter members of the host society. (cf. **Proposition 36**).

Proposition 54b. Members of a primary ethnic group are mainly concerned with its maintenance, which depends on the strength of separate institutions and on the preservation of distinctive characteristics. They do not clamor for equal treatment with the majority of the host society, but for the recognition of their separate collective identity (cf. **Proposition 35**).

Proposition 55. Members of a secondary ethnic group are more inclined to assimilate to the host society than are members of a primary ethnic group, unless they are prevented from doing so by lack of acceptance on the part of the natives and/or by social controls that the ethnic group is exercising over its members.

Proposition 56. The social controls exercised by secondary ethnic groups over their members tend to be more feeble than those exercised by primary ethnic groups because of the more comprehensive institutions at their disposal.

Proposition 57. The removal of disabilities, economic advancement, and the toleration of cultural and/or somatic distinction tend to promote the dissolution of secondary ethnic groups. In the case of primary ethnic groups, however, provisions for the prevention of discrimination tend to increase the probability of their maintenance.

Proposition 58. Secondary ethnic groups are likely to be formed and maintained under the following conditions:

1. There must be sufficient opportunities of communication between dispersed ethnics and sufficient freedom of movement to permit the concentration of a relatively large number of them in one locality.
2. Communication with the parent society must be restricted, and the chance of returning home must be limited, so that the ethnics can find satisfaction of their basic needs only within the host society.

(Four other „conditions“ suggested by Francis are omitted here)

Proposition 59. Differences in the ethnic origin and the specific culture content of the host and the parent society have no significant influence on secondary ethnic-group formation.

Proposition 60. Whenever members of a parent society are transferred as individuals into a host society that is not isomorphic with the parent society with regard to essential elements of the social structure, then – under the conditions of free mobility – the transferees will not be able to take their place directly in the host society, and will therefore tend to form a secondary ethnic group.

Proposition 61. Whenever members of a parent society are transferred as individuals into a host society that is isomorphic with the parent society with regard to essential elements of the social structure, then – under the condition of free mobility – the individuals transferred will be able to take their place directly in the host society, and thus no secondary ethnic group will be formed.

Proposition 62. Whenever large groups of transferees are being subjected to special regulations by the authorities of the host society, limiting their free mobility, the probability increases that they will form separate ethnic or pseudoethnic groups, even if they would otherwise be able to take their place directly in the host society.

Proposition 63. After a secondary ethnic group has been dissolved by virtue of losing its members to the host society, the former members and/or their descendants still tend to be socially identified with the ethnic group. The dissolution of a secondary ethnic group thus is most likely to lead to its transformation into an ethnic category.

Proposition 64. Provided that the host society is of the modern type, lack of isomorphism most commonly occurs when the parent society is of the agrarian type.

Migrants to urban industrial section of a modern society are frequently recruited from rural sections either of their own society or of other modern societies that have preserved a premodern, usually agrarian character, or from foreign countries of the agrarian type.

Proposition 65. The resistance put up by agrarian societies (or agrarian sections of modern societies) against the pressures of nationalization and industrialization that threaten their traditional way of life tends to be expressed in ethnic terms.

Proposition 66. Industrialism tends to weaken ethnic solidarities; agrarianism tends to preserve them, in case of conflict even to strengthen them.

Proposition 67. The chances that transferees are integrated collectively into the host society and that form a relatively closed and self-sufficient ethnic group increase if their parent society is of the agrarian type.

Proposition 68. Primary ethnic groups tend to emerge and to maintain themselves in a modern society under the following conditions:

1. Parent and host society are sufficiently heteromorphic with regard to essential elements of their structure, so that their respective members can be readily differentiated in ethnic terms.
2. The population transferred from the parent society and/or significant sections of the host society resist the direct integration of the transferees into the host society.
3. The population transferred is sufficiently large and cohesive to be able to reconstitute itself as a relatively closed and viable subsociety of the host society.
4. The host society has the capacity (mainly economic) of accommodating the new addition to its population as a segregated collectivity within its boundaries.

Proposition 69. A primary ethnic group is most likely to emerge and maintain itself if it is of the agrarian type; for in this case, it is in the best position of satisfying basic economic and social needs with a minimum of reliance on the resources of the host society (cf. **Proposition 66**).

Proposition 70. Partial acculturation to the host society need not bring about the dissolution of a primary ethnic group — in fact, it may help to maintain it — as long as the traits of the host culture are accepted collectively.

Proposition 71. Primary ethnic groups are less likely to be dissolved through loss of members than to be transformed into secondary ethnic groups through the gradual loss of separate institutions, and especially through the modernization of the economy.
institutions, and especially through the modernization of the economy.

Proposition 72. When primary ethnic groups are granted generous protection against the loss of their demographic and cultural substance, they are likely to give up resistance against economic change and thereby to expose themselves to those processes that transform them into secondary ethnic groups.