

**DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS WITHIN  
THE PROCESSES OF GLOBALIZATION AND EUROPEAN  
INTEGRATION**

**ДЕМОКРАТИЈА, ЧОВЕКОВИТЕ ПРАВА И ЕТНИЧКИТЕ КОНФЛИКТИ  
ВО РАМКИТЕ НА ПРОЦЕСИТЕ НА ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈА И  
ЕВРОПСКАТА ИНТЕГРАЦИЈА**

**Prof. Dr. Zlatko Isakovic Professorial Fellow, Institute for European Studies,  
Belgrade, and Full Professor, Department for Diplomacy and International  
Relations, Section of Political Sciences, Faculty of the Humanities, University  
in Novi Pazar, Department in Belgrade, Serbia.**

**e-mail: zizlatkoi@gmail.com**

**ABSTRACT:**

The aim of this paper is to elaborate relationships between democracy, human rights and ethnic conflicts within the process and globalization and European integration. The first part is devoted to analysis of the assumed preventive and resolving impacts of democracy (and human rights respect) on the ethnic conflicts.

The second part elaborates the well known more or less negative impacts of the ethnic (and some other) conflicts (particularly violently escalated ones) on the democracy and respecting human rights within the mentioned context of globalization.

The main predicted conclusion could be that if a system cannot be qualified as democratic one and respectful for human rights, appears the complex dilemma. Namely, the dilemma is what should come first: developing democracy (and respecting human rights) or eliminating ethnic conflicts and/or preventing their escalations/deescalating them. It will be also presented various theoretical and practical answers and solutions of this dilemma within the process of globalization and European integration. In addition, a few open questions related to the process of globalization as possible source of conflicts, human (in)security, etc.

**Keywords:** Democracy, human rights, ethnic conflict, globalization

**АПСТРАКТ:**

Целта на овој труд е да се осврне на односите меѓу демократијата, човековите права и етничките конфликти во рамките на процесите на глобализацијата и европската интеграција. Првиот дел е посветен на анализата на преземените превентиви и влијанието на решенијата на демократијата (и почитување на човековите права) на етнички конфликти.

Вториот дел ги обработува добро познатите, помалку или повеќе негативни влијанија на етничките (и некои други) конфликти (особено оние со насилни ескалирања) на демократијата и почитувањето на човековите права во рамките на споменатиот контекст на глобализацијата.

Главниот заклучок би можел да биде во насока, доколку системот не може да се оквалификува како демократски и таков кој ги почитува човековите права, појавува комплексна дилема. Имено, дилемата е она што треба да дојде прво: развој на демократијата (и почитување на човековите права) или елиминирање на етнички конфликти и/или спречување на нивното ескалирање/деескалирање. Исто така, ќе бидат презентирани разни теоретски и практични одговори и решенија на оваа дилема во рамките на процесот на глобализацијата и европската интеграција. Покрај тоа, елаборирани се неколку отворени прашања поврзани со процесот на глобализацијата, како можен извор на конфликти, човековата (не) безбедност, итн.

**Клучни зборови:** демократија, човекови права, меѓуетнички конфликти, глобализација.

**INTRODUCTION**

According to definitions of *democracy*, it is a rule of majority and a procedure used for the non-violent elimination of political, ethnic, economic and other *conflicts*<sup>3</sup> and discrepancies in interests, i.e. positions in society. Very rear ethnic and other conflicts can be solved by democratic or other means. This is a part of human nature.

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

---

<sup>3</sup> See conflict definitions: Galtung, J. (1990) "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", in Vasquez J. A. (ed.) *Classics of International Relations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, p. 247; Wiberg, H. (1998) "Identifying Conflicts and Solutions", *Review of International Affairs*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1070-71, p. 176; Michell, C. R. (1981) *The Structure of International Conflict*, New York, St. Martin's Press, p. 29.

transition toward democracy (i.e. its general pattern). The democracy has its formal and substantive meaning and dimension.

The political systems constitute democracy that is a *sui generis* political model influenced both by their legacies and by weaknesses and strengths of historical and modern features of democracy, including their nationalistic, even chauvinistic and other elements. The *human rights* situation after the end of the Second World War has been featured by their gross and other violations in the world and entering into force the International Covenants in 1976. In addition, several other international acts on human rights were adopted in UN, EU and elsewhere in the world. However, the third generation of human rights (composed of so-called solidarity rights including the right to peace) has not been usually included among internationally recognized human rights yet. (Isakovic, Z, 2002). The numerous human rights bodies established under the UN umbrella, within EU, etc. have their weaknesses, particularly the lack of any enforcement or mandatory power (with some exceptions). (Kindred, H et al., 2000).

The nature of *globalization* theoreticians define in the various ways. In this work it is observed as the process of emerging global rule.<sup>4</sup>

Many theoreticians disagree in defining globalization. Its nature they express in the following ways:

1. the process of diffusion driven by the new information and communication technologies, i.e. shortly "ICT revolution";
2. the new form of imperialism emerging after the end of the Cold War;
3. the new ideology, in which case it is called globalism rather than globalization;
4. the process of international integration of markets, goods, services and capital;
5. the process that "can foster a standardization of cultural expressions around the world" etc. ...).

In theoretical and practical regard, the power ability contains the main following components: inner and outer.

The international relations disappear and the rules governing them are becoming global relations thanks and during the process of globalization.

I would also suggest explaining more on globalization.

---

<sup>4</sup> See more details: Isakovic, Z. (2000) *Introduction to a Theory of Political Power in International Relations*, Aldershot, Ashgate, pp. 137, 242, and 245; *Encyclopædia Britannica* (2008) Ultimate Reference Suite CD; Kegli, Č. V. Jr., Vitkof, J. R. (2004) *Svetska politika: trend i transformacija*, Beograd, Centar za studije Jugoistočne Evrope, Fakultet političkih nauka i Diplomatska akademija Ministarstva spoljnih poslova Srbije i Crne Gore, str. 401; Stojanović, R, (1982) *Sila i moć u međunarodnim odnosima*, Beograd, Radnička štampa, pp. 26-9.

*European integration* – having one of its main sources in the conflict resolution attempt (Nakarada, R., 2006) – is also in the process of transition from international organization to state organization. The process will be lasting until the EU adopts and begin to apply its constitution.

Clear manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism are generators and indicators of ethnic conflicts. This belief is further corroborated by the global economic crisis as well as inclination toward establishing ethnically and in tribal regard pure states or 'states', confinement to one's own borders, national particularism, selfishness, xenophobia or hegemonism, domination, authoritarian rule over other nations or parts of them, etc.

This paper is a scholarly attempt to explore the relationships between democracy, human rights and ethnic conflicts within the processes of European integration and globalization. Unfortunately the publishing space is limited.

## DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ETHNIC CONFLICTS

The collapse of what was called "communism" (or, more precisely 'communism', since basic economic preconditions were not fulfilled) and the re-emergence of a number of small, at least to some degree multiethnic or multitribal and easy to manipulate states or 'states' having rather poor democratic traditions (partly thanks to the fact that many of them were born in the war conditions) have represented earthshaking events. They have heavily influenced the re-emergence of numerous ethnic conflicts and tensions within the states as well as in inter-state relations.

Interethnic relations in many states, regions and continents are burdened by the presence of strong ethnic stereotypes (representing an important base for ethnic mobilization) and the bitter historical legacies in society in general including in what is called civil society (associations, political parties and trade unions). (Basic, G. 1996). In some cases within the interethnic relations, one could discover marks of their authoritarian past.

Sometimes, even democracies considered as old and mature corroborate by their undemocratic practices thesis that no one is perfect. In any case, one can make assessments about whether a process of genuine democratization is under way, and how it can affect elimination and/or preventing escalation of ethnic conflicts in societies by "managing", "mitigating", "regulating", "mediating", "transformation", "resolving", its "marginalization", etc. (Isakovic, Z. 2000:4).

In 1995 Lijphart stressed that the fulfillment of stable democracy and consociation needs cooperation between élites belonging to different groups, and the possibility that organizations and individuals of different ethnic groups affiliate themselves and cooperate beyond borders of their respective federal or ethnic units. The developments in ex-Yugoslavia and processes in other countries demonstrated that "political élites monopolize

the mediating role between the groups, and reduce the possibilities of direct cooperation between citizens and organizations from the areas they have the control over. It is said that élites support heterogeneity of the society as a whole, i.e. between the ethnic groups, but act very energetically in order to impose homogeneity within the groups they control (Elazar)". (Stanovčić, V. 1996).

In 1991, one predicted that – although democracy will win – many countries would be faced with significant challenges during the democratization process. It is considered that ethnic terrorism and violence in general will be continued in decreasing parts of the world and number of countries. (Fukuyama, F. 1991:659-663), (Hobsbawn, E. J. 1995:164).

There is the open question of the extent to which democratic and human rights devoted countries could support others in the globalised world. There are the numerous open questions boiling down to whether force can be used for an export of democracy or 'democracy'. (Barzun, J. 1987), (Gillies, D. and Schmitz, G. 1992). In that way, democracy (thanks to the process of globalization) could become conflict generator and thus global problem instead of a world benefit. As the a several presidential and other elections repeatedly demonstrated, nobody is perfect as far as democracy is concerned (Isaković, Z. 1998) and thus cannot have, pretend or claim the monopoly in this regard.

As it was mentioned, the EU was created as conflict resolution institution. In cases of Cyprus Transylvania and some other, it became the institution for conflict settlement. New conflict emerged in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Macedonia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Egypt, Syria, and others.

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

One can define features of democratic state's engagement in the process of conflict escalation. First, the states are vulnerable to foreign and/or local propaganda and political pressures linked to conflict. The conflict parties are tempted by the mediator's vulnerability. They perceive the conflict as own opportunity for launching a propaganda war over the issue of the mediator. In addition, the mediator's suitability to remain efficient and accepted is reduced by the one party's victory in that war. The vulnerable mediator is more likely to allow their initiatives to be conditioned by political and propaganda pressures exerted on them than by the successful mediation requirements. (Isakovic, Z. 1999).

Democratization has a potential to assist mitigate ethnic conflict. However, in some cases such a potential has been wasted, as the transition towards democracy produced a fertile ground for ethnic animosity, hatred and political demands of power-thirsty domestic and foreign political leaders and forces. Democratic turnabouts allowed

many ethnic tensions including conflicts, but because democracy was fragile and young, it had not been able to manage them peacefully and properly.

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

Finally, security should be maintained by the experts and democratic procedures associated with diplomacy and conflict resolution, and not only by police, soldiers and armaments. Otherwise, armies and polices could follow the unfortunate destiny of the Second Yugoslavia and its army, but in some cases having much poorer resources.

## **ETHNIC CONFLICTS AND THE DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

In some cases – perceived widely as disputes democracy vs. authoritarian rule – it was later shown that, in fact, there were border conflicts. In that way, a struggle for democracy could serve as an excuse for conflict escalation, territorial expansion and for camouflaging own authoritarian rule. At the other side, as Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Henry Hugh Shelton told the Senate Armed Services Committee, May 3, 2001, "terrorists are adaptive adversaries who constantly look for ways to strike where their victims are most vulnerable". Terrorist could feed authoritarian and terror rulers and *vice versa*.

In some situations, at least a fragile and temporary peace it was possible to be established by force and it seems to be a more efficient way when ethnic conflicts are removed by even illusory arguments in the narrow or proper meaning of that term. *"Conflict-resolution is not about harming or killing people. It is about killing problems and harnessing the human and circumstantial attraction to violence. Violence is always part of the problem, never the solution"*. (Øberg, J. 1994:140).

In the case of some conflicts the most appropriate way seems to be, at least theoretically, when all not directly engaged actors have the role of conflict mediator as a complex *consortium* or *enterprise*, trying to employ their democratic, human rights or other advantages, and to avoid their temptations or handicaps and weakness. However, some politicians of some of the conflicts parties use more arguments, and some more force as an argument.

The (quasi)ethnic and similar conflicts have created major challenges for the some countries in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The UN and other major world actors have been insufficiently

capable for creating ethnic conflicts analysis, which could be used for peacefully preventing conflict escalation and deescalating them.

It seems that the result of the debate whether democracies wage wars or not could depend on accepted definitions of both the democracy and the war. One could consider democracies could begin wars, but do not wage wars as in these circumstances the democracies actually become temporary (to extends wars could be perceived as transient phenomena) constitutional dictatorships featured by some characteristics common with permanent dictatorships. Hence the Dimitrijević's conclusion that "notwithstanding the democracy of the system, all nuclear states are actually dictatorships at these 'moments of truth', because one individual decides on life or death, thereby expressing all his traits, including permanent or temporary insanity". (Dimitrijević, V. 1985:212).

The crucial question is how to prevent or eliminate escalation of existing ethnic conflicts in order to provide democratic power a chance to assert itself? The advantages of the development of civil society and democratization in general may be used as a platform for conflict elimination depending of, among other circumstances, the forms which escalation of ethnic conflict may take. The more violent conflict escalation is the advantages seem harder to use, including eliminating the conflict in a peaceful way. Examining this thesis, in this paper will be analyzed the cases of terrorism and terror as means used for achieving the goals for which armed force would otherwise have to be employed.

The chief weapon of both terrorism and terror is causing fear "created for a political goal, it is linked to maintaining or seizing power. Both terror and terrorism have dual targets, dual addressees: the victim of the violence and the threat recipient. Finally, both terror and terrorism are in discord with certain norms of political behavior, which are different in case of terror and in case of terrorism, because, as a rule, terror is an action taken by those possessing legislative power, while individual terrorists are non-sovereign ... private individuals, differently subjected to a legal order". One author by definition eliminates governmental violence (terror, which can be observed as a form or cause of ethnic or other conflicts) as a form of terrorism as the state has a legitimate violence monopoly. Even here, there are differences between situation, types, tactics, activities, degree to which social, psychological, etc. dimensions are important. (Merkl, P. H. 1986). In both cases the mass production of fear is justified by superior principles and goals utilized as a means for ruling over society.

Some communications are possible to be established by choosing the time, place, means and some other modalities and circumstances of action and by the (un)selective choice of physical victims, and all this does not to be sufficient for reflecting the terrorists' political, ideological and other goals and values in greater detail. If these efforts would be exhausted in violence, the terrorists' message utilized to generate fear would be lost.

Terrorists' resort to additional propaganda and other communications to win publicity and announce their goals among the intimidated people often is practiced via mass media. Their messages are used as amplifiers or resonators of intimidating messages that is often obvious in the instances portraying the terrorists as "extremely efficient", "omnipotent men-machines", even "ready to do anything", etc.

The intimidated people and others try to gather as much information as possible attempting to secure them, out of sensationalism or curiosity. It is difficult to achieve longer-lasting secrecy of data on terrorists' actions - including the very fact that they were committed, particularly if they themselves want publicity, and particularly if the acts were committed in public, in presence of groups of people, etc. There is controversial assumption that terrorist acts would not be conducted if the terrorist knew those acts could not win publicity and on the attitude that there would be no terrorism without contemporary globalized communications. (Schmid, A. P., and de Graaf, J. 1982:15)

However, journalists - particularly in democratic systems - are usually not willing to accept outside censorship of their reports. In addition, application of contemporary technology for combating terrorism could jeopardize and violate certain human rights (such as the right to receive and convey information).

Terrorist (and terror) acts are among first class negative sensations with extreme high attraction for people. Thanks to this, most newsmen are ready to publish any news devoted to every terrorist (and terror) act.

Journalists (as well as governments) qualify some terrorists by words having positive connotations (independence or freedom fighters, dissidents, resistance movements, etc.), and some terrorists are called criminals, gunmen, terrorists, mercenaries, even communists, etc. This provoked one author to try to create a neutral definition of the terrorism as the utilization of force or its threat supposed to achieve a political goal by producing fear, frustration or uncertainty. (Mozaffari, M. 1998:182).

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

Between the avoiding being the mouthpiece of terrorists and commitment to inform the public on their acts, there is a broad area that may contain a rather large space for journalists' inclination for sensationalism, bureaucratic arbitrariness in determining what will, and what will not be published and the terrorists' strivings to gain publicity. Thus, the mentioned stand does not adequately resolve the problem of the position of the media toward the terrorist and similar acts, in the first place because it seems to be too general. "Theoretical thought is faced with the insoluble riddle of valuing contemporary forms of

terrorism. Due to its proneness to the same factors imposing double standards on the media, it, too, can fall prey to them. If departing from the position that there should be full understanding of terrorism, theoretical thought risks to clash with moral and humanistic values, because terrorist methods are directed against them. If, however, science departs from the position that every existing order is justified, it risks fully turning into apologetics and abandoning the critical distance and option of revolutionary change. This temptation is attractive as well, again, because of the difficult evaluation of means used in terrorism". (Radojković, M. 1988:47-50).

The dilemma on the media attitude on violence has not been resolved as people are still not ready to condemn any violence, notwithstanding in which circumstances it was committed, who is committing it and what are her/his motives and goals, who its victims are, etc. Even in societies with long democratic traditions and that can be perceived as democratic ones, escalated ethnic or other conflicts make all sides to (try to) restrain democracy and/or reduce substantive (the role of media as a way for introducing political debate), formal (the freedom of expression, etc.), and democratic practice and principles and the certain human rights.

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

A fearful situation – which within conditions of ethnic conflicts stimulates ethnonational mobilization and division – cannot be assessed as favorable for the development of democracy, human rights, European integration and globalization. The kind of democracy which may appear within such conditions could be similar to that existing in some of the old Greek city-states exclusively reserved for the ruling class of citizens, and not accessible for slaves. In many parts of the globalized or 'globalized' world there are no slaves any more but there are national and other divisions.

Present globalized economic crisis, and particularly recession (possible decline of production, GNPs, earnings, and employment) and a assumed lowering of degree of socio-political cohesion in the world probably will contribute to the nervous way in which terrorists, states and other ethnic and conflict actors will (re)act even in situations in which a goal could be reached by means other than violence. What the predominant group/state sees as "law and order" may be seen as deliberate discrimination by others; and what the former sees as peaceful assimilation and/or globalization may look like (planned) ethnocide or imposition of own system and culture in the eyes of others. (Wiberg, H. 1995:49). However, the more the conflict sides use terror(ism) the more they will be lacking socio-

political cohesion bringing additional readiness to utilize terror(ism), lack of the cohesion, etc. What can help sides in world, regional and local (intra-state) conflicts is a stable and socio-politically united (globalized) society and (global) state.

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

## CONCLUSIONS

In the case of the relationships between democracy, human rights and ethnic conflicts within the processes of globalization and European integration there are not simple solution and advises. The world is complex and there is no cure for this problem or 'problem'. There will be the end of the world if we would be all the same.

There is the thesis that the relationship is two-sided: democracy and human rights have the potential to help eliminate or at least mitigate ethnic tensions and conflicts, but democracy and human rights could create a fertile climate for biases, hatred and thus conflicts. There are possibilities of conflict elimination within the context of democracy and *vice versa* (in some way, their relations could be compared with those between water and fire).

What it could be done in the processes of European integration and globalization in order to promote democracy and human rights? First, most promising seems to be the mentioned consociation type of democracy. Second, the democratic oriented forces should acknowledge and recognize the ethnic diversity existing in the state along with the fact that nobody is perfect. Third, they also have to discover a way – commonly perceived to be fair – to accommodate the interests of different groups and their human and other rights.

On the one hand, the democracy provides a propitious setting for allaying ethnic problems, preventing their transformation to conflicts that should be avoided and/or their escalation, and on the other hand – successful democracy needs national unity as the basic precondition. Another precondition for democracy, respecting human rights and for dampening or preventing ethnic conflicts is at least some economic prosperity, which could be also harder reached and maintained in conflict situations and the present world economic crisis.

Conflicts (and particularly escalated ones) along with some governments (particularly terror ones) are (among) worst enemies of human rights and democracy. Thus, violating human rights and democratic rules governments could use their chance by escalating or provoking ethnic or other conflicts escalation by the other sides in purpose to hide their own role in the violating the rights and the rules.

In general, national unity can hardly be fulfilled due to the existing ethnic conflicts, particularly in multiethnic societies elsewhere. Even in societies that can be considered as democratic ones and with long democratic traditions, escalated ethnic conflicts have lead their parties to restrain democracy and reduce and suspend democratic principles and human rights, and limit the functioning power of their democratic institutions and processes. In this way, ethnic conflicts, and especially escalated ones, have negative impacts on democracy and human rights, and at least partly disable the democratization and human rights development process. The more conflicts, the harder it is to achieve democracy and human rights protection and even more so to experience them. An analogous conclusion can be created for the relationships between ethnic conflicts (especially escalated ones), and globalization as well as the European integration process.

Democracy includes mass manipulation, which is regularly easier in young than in mature and old democracies. In a society in transition, the manipulation could be directed toward many issues including even the very idea of democratic society. Simultaneously, acceptance of its imperfection is regarded as a strong side of democracy. However, *ethnic mobilization (an ethnic conflicts escalation conditio sine qua non) could become possible with democratization, but the mobilization could threaten and in good part destroy democracy itself.*

*'Protecting' or protecting themselves in armed conflicts (all states, movements, and other actors defend and wage just wars at least according their public statements) democracies spoil themselves, particularly if warfare lasts a longer period of time.*

Majority nations will not be secure unless the individual and collective human rights of the minorities will be protected to a feasible and necessary degree. "As soon as minorities become majorities, new minorities appear. If the present number of nation-states is doubled, the number of minority problems may also be (roughly) doubled". (Eriksen, H. T. 1992:221).

Within these conditions, minorities should be deprived only of the democratic right to self-determination interpreted as the right to secession. Majorities should be deprived only of the 'right' to violate and imperil minorities' human and democratic rights, which are the safeguards and guaranties of minorities' dignity and distinct identity. In this way, the majorities' states could protect their territorial integrity and they could (at least in some cases) gradually lose their reputations of the "powder kegs" or similar. For this reason, the

countries need stable democracies, systems of human rights, which are protected by law along with traditional and other habits and developed economies. (Isaković, Z. 1994:35).

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

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

The conflicts can be observed as parts of the process of globalization which seems to be a source of conflicts as well as cooperation. The processes of globalization, regionalization, national and tribal homogenization, and world segmentation (in numerous cases in keeping with the ancient Roman saying "divide and rule") apparently represent fertile ground for the emergence of comparatively numerous and diverse conflicts both within societies and in emerging global relations.

As it was shown, the economic (and political) crisis and conflicts in EU could have probably negative impacts on other countries, democracies, and conflicts in them and with the other countries and actors and *vice versa*.

In addition, there is the dilemma *does the globalised world needs both peace and respect for human rights or just one of them* thanks to the possibility that the definition of peace could include respect for (some of) the human rights. The dilemma can be avoided or resolved in one of the inclusions:

- Of peace within the categories of human rights or
- Of respecting human rights within notions of peace.

If such inclusions are not acceptable, at least in situations in which they are in collision, then one must decide which one of them is more important. In that case, an additional dilemma could appear: *does any violation of one of the two phenomena or their segments represent sufficient reason for sacrificing the other phenomena or its segments? Although the general theoretical conclusion could be that people(s) should not have to choose between human rights and peace, in real life situations there is sometimes a choice to make.* (Isakovic, Z. (2000:12).

## LITERATURE

1. Caplan, R. (1998) "International diplomacy and the crisis in Kosovo", *International Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 74
2. Dimitrijević M. (1985) *Strahovlada – Ogled o ljudskim pravima i drzavnom teroru*, Beograd, Rad
3. Duverger, M. (1972) *The Study of Politics*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company
4. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 2008 Ultimate Reference Suite CD
5. Eriksen Hylland, T. (1992) "Ethnicity and Nationalism: Definitions and Critical Reflections", *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, Vol. 23, No. 2
6. Fukuyama, F. (1991) "Liberal Democracy as a Global Phenomenon", *PS: Political Sciences and Politics*, Vol. 24. No. 4
7. Galtung, J. (1990) "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", in Johan A. Vasquez (ed.), *Classics of International Relations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall
8. Gillies, 'D., and Schmitz, G. (1992) *The Challenge of Democratic Development*, Ottawa, 'The North-South Institute
9. De Nevers, 'R. (1993) "Democratization and Ethnic Conflict", *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 2
10. Basic, G. (1996) "The Post-Communist National State and Ethnic Minorities – The Case of the Second Yugoslavia", *Munchner zeitschrift fur Balkankunde*, Munchen, Slavica Verlag
11. Hobsbawn, E. J. (1995) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 – Programme, Myth, Reality*, second edition, New York, Cambridge University Press
12. Kindred, H., et al. (2000) *International Law: Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied in Canada*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., Toronto, Emond Montgomery
13. Isakovic, Z. (2002) "Democracy, Human Rights and Ethnic Conflicts in the Process of Globalisation", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 3
14. Isakovic, Z. (2000) "Democratization, Democracy and Ethnic Conflicts in the Balkans", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 9
15. Isakovic, Z. (2000) *Introduction to a Theory of Political Power in International Relations*, 'Aldershot, Ashgate
16. Isakovic, Z. (1999) "Diplomacy and the Conflict in Kosovo – Notes on Threats and Fears", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 10
17. Isaković, Z. (1998) "Ljudska prava vezana za ispovedanje vere i etnički odnosi u Makedoniji i na Balkanu", Silvo Devetak (ed.), *Ohraniti sanje: Prispevki z druge mednarodne conference/okrogle mize "Vloga verskih skupnosti v mirovnem procesu in pri odpravi posledic vojne na področju nekdanje Jugoslavije*, Rogaška Slatina, 1997, Maribor, ISCOMET and ECERS,

18. Isakovic, Z (2000) "Peace and/or Human Rights?", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 12
19. Isaković, Z. (1994) "Položaj Makedonije u balkanskom okruženju", *Međunarodna politika*, No. 1024
20. Kegli, Č. V., Jr., Vitkof, R. (2004) *Svetska politika: trend i transformacija*, Beograd, Centar za studije Jugoistočne Evrope, Fakultet političkih nauka i Diplomatska akademija Ministarstva spoljnih poslova Srbije i Crne Gore
21. Lutovac, Z. (1997) "Options for Solution of the Problem of Kosovo", *Review of International Affairs*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1056
22. Nakarada, R. (2006) "Evropska unija kao mirovni projekat", *Sociološki pregled*, Vol. XXX, No. 4
23. Merkl, P. H. (ed.) (1986) *Political Violence and Terror: Motifs and Motivations*, Berkeley, University of California Press
24. Mozaffari, M. (1988) "The New Era of Terrorism: Approaches and Typologies", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 23, No. 4
25. Øberg, J. (1994) "Conflict-Mitigation in Former Yugoslavia - It Could Still Be Possible," in Radmila Nakarada (ed.), *Europe and Disintegration of Yugoslavia*, Belgrade, Institute for European Studies
26. Pugh, M. (2000) "'Protectorate Democracy' in South-east Europe", *COPRI Working Papers*, No. 10
27. Michell, C. R. (1981) *The Structure of International Conflict*, New York, St. Martin's Press
28. Radojković, M. (1988) *Terorizam i sredstva komunikacija*, Gornji Milanovac, NIRO Dečje novine
29. Schmid, A. P. and de Graaf, J. (1982) *Violence as Communication*, London, Sage
30. Senghaas, D. (1988) *Zivilisierung wider Willen. Der Konflikt der Kulturen mit sich selbst*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main
31. Barzun, J. (1987) "Is Democratic Theory for Export?", *Ethic and International Affairs*, Vol. 1
32. Simic, P. (1993) "Instant Publicity and Foreign Policy", *Media Studies Journal*
33. Stanovčić, V. (1996) "Vladavina prava i suživot etničkih grupa", *Status of Minorities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*, Collection of Papers Presented at the Scientific Meeting Held on January 11, 12, and 13, 1995, Belgrade, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
34. Stojanović, R. (1982), *Sila i moć u međunarodnim odnosima*, Beograd, Radnička štampa
35. Wallace, P. (1996) "The Costs of Partition in Europe: A South Asian Perspective", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 55, issue 4

36. Wiberg, H. (1998) "Identifying Conflicts and Solutions", *Review of International Affairs*, Vol. XLIX, No. 1070-71
37. Wiberg, H. (1995) "Former Yugoslavia: nations above all", in Bogdan Góralczyk, Wojciech Kostecki, Katarzyna Zukrowska (eds.), *In Pursuit of Europe - Transformations of Post-Communist States, 1989-1994*, Institute of Political Studies, Warsaw, Polish Academy of Sciences
38. Wiberg, H. (1994) "Making Peace in former Yugoslavia: Problems and Lessons", in James Calleja, Håkan Wiberg & Salvino Busuttil, in collaboration with Sanaa Osseiran & Peri Pamir (eds.), *The Search for Peace in the Mediterranean Region. Problems and Prospects*, Mireva Publishers, Valetta