



Comparative Civilizations Review

Volume 41
Number 41 *Fall 1999*

Article 2

10-1-1999

Editor's Note

Joseph Drew

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

Recommended Citation

Drew, Joseph (1999) "Editor's Note," *Comparative Civilizations Review*. Vol. 41 : No. 41 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol41/iss41/2>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

EDITOR'S NOTE

JOSEPH DREW

During the period leading up to our transition into the year 2000, a time which has yielded many retrospective descriptions of the outgoing century and millennium, we have been presented with some analyses which have chosen to highlight progress, while others have concentrated on regress.

As we comparative civilizationalists look at recent strife, especially in the Balkans and Eastern Europe generally, but elsewhere as well, we cannot fail to conclude that difficult relations amongst ethnic groups or nationalities have constituted a major feature of the 20th Century. Indeed, in the rise and fall of empires, ideologies, and novel forms of government, intractable social problems of intergroup relations, whether expressed politically and militarily, have persevered throughout the past 100 years.

In his magisterial work, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Karl Polyani argued that one hundred years of peace ended with World War I. A century-long political, social, and economic understanding lasted from 1815 to 1914, he wrote. Long-surviving empires clashed and were reduced to rubble by the Great War, however. With the ending of World War I came a new political dispensation; included were the rise of new states. For, as inspired by President Woodrow Wilson and as expressed in the Versailles Peace Treaties, nationalities previously encapsulated in such extensive empires as the Austro-Hungarian, the Ottoman, and the Russian had earned the right, with the world's official approval, to declare themselves as the basis upon which new political states should arise. As a result, smaller states based upon ethnicity and self-determination would henceforth be an increasing presence in our era.

There have been many positive results of the creation of new, smaller states which rest upon a majority or ethnic group, now styled "the nation." Political activists, inspired by thinkers from Mazzini, Curzon, and Mill onward, leaders from Renner to Herzl

to Nkrumah, have sought to build new national states within the territory empires were giving up. Rarely — the work of Gandhi and Mandela comes to mind — do the early builders of contemporary states emphasize the need to create the new polity upon a multinational, multiethnic foundation. Generally, the inspiration has been freedom for the old ethnic group, now the new nation.

With the destruction of major empires, and the demise of colonialism, freedoms newly achieved — expressed dramatically through the raising of a new flag at the United Nations — are welcomed by most observers. It is only later discovered that among the people now scattered untidily about are many who, while suddenly contained within the new state's borders, are no longer merely co-equal subjects of a distantly located crown. They have become tolerated minorities in the new state.

Moreover, when these newly-minted minority group members are ethnically associated with majorities in other new states in the region — states which may be representative of other civilizations (depending on our definitions of that word) as well — trouble is bound to ensue. Further, attempts to patch the ethnicities together under a single state once again are likely to fail; Yugoslavia, Nigeria, Cyprus, Bosnia, perhaps even Czechoslovakia showed that.

As a result, one phenomenon we have witnessed this century has been population exchange, a variant of the much older population transfer. European in origin, and very much a product of our outgoing century, population exchange has brought the voluntary and involuntary exchange of millions in an attempt to "right history", to bring it around to where it ought to have been. It figured as a key element in the early settlement of disputes in the Mediterranean, the Balkans, and Asia.

Yet population exchange as a means to peace has hardly been mentioned in recent discussions about Bosnia or Kosovo, perhaps because it would seem, on first blush, to be associated with that pernicious recent term, "ethnic cleansing." Therefore, it is important to note that definitions of such terms as "nation", "nationalism", "immigrant", "disloyal nationality", "exile", and "refugee" must precede any analysis of population exchange.

Reciprocal transfers of people began in ancient days, and the Assyrians apparently practiced it; Charlemagne tried it out in an

attempt to preserve a corner of his empire. The modern practice of population exchanges, however, was first proposed as an instrument of statesmanship by Georges Montandon, of the Paris School of Anthropology, in 1915. He argued the principle that state frontiers should follow ethnic criteria and that, therefore, some ethnic groups should be transferred within these frontiers to secure the stability of states. A memorandum on the subject was distributed to diplomats at the 1916 Lausanne Conference of Nationalities; his title, roughly translated, was "National Frontiers: Objective Determination of the Basic Conditions Necessary to Achieve a Lasting Peace."

The first interstate treaty to employ the concept of population exchange was the Convention of Adrianople. Hammered out by Bulgaria and Turkey in November of 1913, following the Peace Treaty of Constantinople, this authorized the voluntary exchange of Bulgarians and Moslems, as well as their property, within a fifteen kilometer zone along the newly drawn frontier between the two new countries. A total of 93,000 people were involved; 44,764 Bulgarians moved from Turkish Thrace and 48,570 Moslems left the territory of the newly-created Bulgaria to enter Turkey.

A second major exchange was negotiated in 1914. This was the Greco-Turkish Agreement of 1914. Sanctioning an already ongoing process, the agreement exchanged Greeks leaving Thrace in Turkey for Moslems from villages in Macedonia and Epirus, in northwest Greece.

In 1920, Bulgaria and Greece agreed to another exchange, and it led to the movement of about 30,000. The most important population exchange treaty of this sequence was signed at Lausanne between Greece and Turkey in 1923, as a major war between them was concluding. Over 1,500,000 moved to new homes as the unfriendly neighbors sought to solve "the problem of minorities" while handling the allied problems of liquidating property claims and indemnifying the migrants. The effects of the exchange were long-lasting and had implications for both Greek and Turkish society throughout the century.

Finland and the U.S.S.R. exchanged populations following the "Winter War" of 1940, when eastern Finland was taken by the Soviets. An extensive series of population exchanges was insti-

tuted between Romania and Hungary; from 1940 to 1943, 218,900 Romanians moved into Romania from Northern Transylvania and simultaneously, 160,000 Hungarians from Southern Transylvania moved to Hungary.

The largest exchange of populations in world history occurred in South Asia. Many Muslims moved from the newly-declared Republic of India as Hindus and Sikhs resettled there from homes in the area of British India about to become Pakistan. Although the exchange was not formalized in written documents, the two new countries allowed it to occur and institutionalized the ramifications through new legislation.

While the concept of formal population exchanges and the related idea of "mother countries" were attacked vigorously by a number of scholars, the Allies, in the Potsdam Declaration of 1945, saw population transfers — if not full exchanges — as an instrument for final peace settlements.

As we confront many of the seemingly intractable problems of state and society which have arisen in the outgoing century, those which engulfed innocent civilians and disrupted the lives of millions, the process of population exchange becomes again a possible way to save the peace. When civilizational clashes are to a greater or lesser extent involved, the possibility must be examined even more carefully. Are human rights violated through state-sanctioned exchanges? Are individuals seen as mere appendages of states? How much coercion may be exercised? Should sanctions be employed? How shall adjudication of material claims be undertaken? Is state sovereignty always beneficial?

My guess is that ethnic conflict exacerbated by the existence of nation states will not disappear anytime soon. Perhaps scholars and diplomats in the next century will turn once again to the possibility of the formal and voluntary exchange of people as a rational solution to real human tragedy.

Washington, D.C.

Answers to ISCSC Quiz One

In the last issue of the journal, the Editor's Note ran a quiz. There were 25 questions; each question was worth four points. No contestant wrote in and earned a passing score; there is no problem of "grade inflation" at the ISCSC. However, Prof. Matt Melko, present for the announcement of the answers at the Annual Meeting of the ISCSC in St. Louis, gave oral answers from the floor and appeared to be correct in almost every instance.

The correct answers are as follows:

1. Winter 1979
2. Four Kavolis
3. Lowell Edmunds, Vytautas Kavolis, Edmund Leites, and David Kopf
4. Michael Palencia-Roth
5. No. 7 Fall, 1981
6. William E. Naff
7. Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris; Dickinson College; the Benjamin Nelson Memorial Foundation
8. Jean Claude Martzloff
9. Benjamin Nelson
10. No. 9 Fall, 1982
11. Latin America
12. David Richardson

13. Bulletin
14. David Wilkinson
15. None. All were represented
16. Imogen Seger Coulborn
Ann McBride-Limaye
17. Chase-Dunn reviewed Melko and Scott
18. Lewis Mumford
Hampton University
May 1988
Urbana, Illinois
Michael Palencia-Roth
Roger Williams Wescott, First Vice President
Korsi Dogbe, Second Vice President
19. Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo
20. Corinne Lathrop Gilb
21. No. 19 Fall, 1988
22. Dorothy M. Figueira
23. Russia, Australia, Ireland, Hong Kong
24. Issue No. 35 \$25 per year Winter, 1997
25. Issue No. 8 Spring, 1982