

The Germanistic Society plans to issue a series of pamphlets to appear from time to time, dealing with the war in Europe and its underlying causes. The Society has solicited contributions from various writers and historians. The pamphlets are to serve the cause of truth, to correct misrepresentations.

What are the various causes of Conflict? Conflict arises due to various reasons. Malthus, the eminent economist says that reduced supply of the means of subsistence is the root cause of conflict. According to him, conflict is caused by the increase of population in geometrical progression and the food supply in arithmetical progression. According to Charles Darwin, the biological principles of "Struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest" are the main cause of conflict. Sigmund Freud and other psychologist hold the view that the innate instinct for aggression in man is the main cause of conflict. Thus, various causes lead to conflict. The main cause of conflict may be briefly stated as follows: In society, men are not alike in their nature, attitudes, ideal, interest and aspirations. Due to this difference, they fail to accommodate themselves which may lead to conflict among them. Culture is the way of life of a group. It differs from society to society. The culture of one group differs from the culture of the other group. These cultural differences among the group, sometimes cause tension and lead to conflict. The clash of interests of different people makes conflict inevitable. The interests of the workers clash with those of employers lead to conflict among them. Conflict also arises due to the difference between rates of social change. The conflict between the old and new generations is owing to social changes. Conflict is an expression of social disequilibrium. Types of Conflict

George Simmel has mentioned four types of conflict: According to Simmel, war represents a deep seated antagonistic impulse in man. It is a worst type of conflict which aims at the destruction of the opponent. When all the efforts to resolve the conflict between two nations fail, war finally breaks out as it is the only alternative to the peaceful means of solution. It is an intra- group conflict. It takes place among the members of the same group. The degree of feud varies in groups. Litigation is a judicial form of conflict. People take recourse to legal means in the courts of law to protect their right to possessions. This type of conflict is more objective in nature. When individuals fight not for their personal gain, but for some ideal, it is called the conflict of impersonal ideals. In such a conflict, each party attempts to justify truthfulness of its own ideals. For example, a political party always tries to prove that its ideals are better than that of the other political parties. There are eminent sociologists like Gillin and Gillin and others who have pointed out five forms of conflict namely, personal, racial, political, and international and class conflict.

Types of conflict

1 Personal Conflict: Personal conflict occurs on personal level. It arises when the ideals and aims of two individuals clash with each other. The fight of the students for the office of the Secretary of college Union provides a bright example of Personal Conflict. Racial conflict is mostly due to the physical differences. Some races consider themselves superior to other races and there are also races which feel that they are inferior to other. The feeling of superiority or inferiority is the root cause of racial conflict. Conflict between the Whites and Negroes in the U. Political conflict arises when different political parties with their own ideologies try to achieve their interest. The main cause of this kind of conflict is power which they want to capture. The conflict between different political parties is an example of this type of conflict. International conflict occurs among the different nations of the world. It may take place for political, religious economic, ideological or for any other reasons. The conflict between India and Pakistan is an example of such type of conflict. Class conflict takes place among classes with their differing interests. In the feudal society there was conflict between the landlords and the peasants. The capitalist society is characterised by the bourgeoisie and proletariat. In addition to the conflicts discussed above there are a few other forms of conflict. They are stated below:

Conflict may be personal as well as corporate. Personal conflict takes place within the groups. It arises on account of various motives, envy, hostility, treachery etc. The group does not derive any benefit from this kind of internal conflict. Corporate conflict occurs among the groups within a society or between two societies. Race-riots, communal riots, war between nations are some of the examples of corporate conflict. Conflict may be latent or overt. Sometimes individuals or groups do not want to express their feeling of conflict due to some

reasons. This unexpressed conflict is known as the latent conflict. In other words, Social tension and dissatisfactions, before their expression in the form of hostile action, are two important kinds of latent conflict. On the other hand, the overt conflict is the conflict expressed by a part or parties. Latent conflict becomes overt conflict when an issue is declared and when hostile action is taken. The war between India and Pakistan is an example of overt conflict.

Chapter 2 : Thirty Years' War - HISTORY

This is a list of conflicts in Europe ordered chronologically, including wars between European states, civil wars within European states, wars between a European state and a non-European state that took place within Europe, and global conflicts in which Europe was a theatre of war.

Visit Website Indians were also a key factor in the imperial rivalries among France, Spain, and England. Meanwhile, the English and their trading partners, the Chickasaws and often the Cherokees, battled the French and associated tribes for control of the lower Mississippi River valley and the Spanish in western Florida. More decisive was the French and Indian War. Particularly serious was the near-annihilation of Gen. But with English minister William Pitt infusing new life into the war effort, British regulars and provincial militias overwhelmed the French and absorbed all of Canada. Visit Website But eighteenth-century conflicts were not limited to the European wars for empire. In Virginia and the Carolinas, English-speaking colonists pushed aside the Tuscaroras, the Yamasees, and the Cherokees. In , an Ottawa chief, Pontiac, forged a powerful confederation against British expansion into the Old Northwest. Most of the Indians east of the Mississippi River now perceived the colonial pioneers as a greater threat than the British government. Thus northern tribes, especially those influenced by Mohawk chief Thayendanegea Joseph Brant , generally sided with the Crown during the American War for Independence. Leger in upstate New York. Western Pennsylvania and New York became savage battlegrounds as the conflict spread to the Wyoming and Cherry valleys. Strong American forces finally penetrated the heart of Iroquois territory, leaving a wide swath of destruction in their wake. The Americans resumed the initiative in , when Clark marched northwest into Shawnee and Delaware country, ransacking villages and inflicting several stinging defeats upon the Indians. To the south, the British backed resistance among the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Choctaws but quickly forgot their former allies following the signing of the Treaty of Paris. By setting the boundaries of the newly recognized United States at the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes, that treaty virtually ensured future conflicts between whites and resident tribes. Yet resistance to white expansion in the Old Northwest continued as a Shawnee chief, Tecumseh , molded a large Indian confederation based at Prophetstown. While Tecumseh was away seeking additional support, William Henry Harrison burned the village after a stalemate at the Battle of Tippecanoe in . Indian raids, often encouraged by the British, were influential in causing the United States to declare war on Great Britain in . Several hundred American prisoners were killed following a skirmish at the River Raisin in early . But Harrison pushed into Canada and won the Battle of the Thames, which saw the death of Tecumseh and the collapse of his confederation. In the Southeast, the Creeks gained a major triumph against American forces at Fort Sims, killing many of their prisoners in the process. Andrew Jackson led the counterthrust, winning victories at Tallasahatchee and Talladega before crushing the Creeks at Horseshoe Bend in . Alaska and Florida were also the scenes of bitter conflicts. Native peoples strongly contested the Russian occupation of Alaska. The Aleuts were defeated during the eighteenth century, but the Russians found it impossible to prevent Tlingit harassment of their hunting parties and trading posts. But the Seminole Indians and runaway slaves refused to relocate, and the Second Seminole War saw fierce guerrilla-style actions from to . Osceola, perhaps the greatest Seminole leader, was captured during peace talks in , and nearly three thousand Seminoles were eventually removed. The Third Seminole War stamped out all but a handful of the remaining members of the tribe. In the United States, the removal policy met only sporadic armed resistance as whites pushed into the Mississippi River valley during the s and s. The acquisition of Texas and the Southwest during the s, however, sparked a new series of Indian-white conflicts. On the Pacific Coast, attacks against the native peoples accompanied the flood of immigrants to gold-laden California. Disease, malnutrition, and warfare combined with the poor lands set aside as reservations to reduce the Indian population of that state from , in to 35, in . The army took the lead role in Oregon and Washington, using the Rogue River , Yakima , and Spokane wars to force several tribes onto reservations. Sporadic conflicts also plagued Arizona and New Mexico throughout the s as the army struggled to establish its presence. On the southern plains, mounted warriors posed an even more formidable challenge to white expansion. Strikes

against the Sioux, Cheyennes, Arapahos, Comanches, and Kiowas during the decade only hinted at the deadlier conflicts of years to come. The Civil War saw the removal of the Regulars and an accompanying increase in the number and intensity of white-Indian conflicts. Disputes on the southern plains culminated in the Sand Creek massacre, during which John M. In Minnesota, attacks by the Eastern Sioux prompted counterattacks by the volunteer forces of Henry H. Sibley, after which the tribes were removed to the Dakotas. The conflict became general when John Pope mounted a series of unsuccessful expeditions onto the plains in Regular units, including four regiments of black troops, returned west following the Confederate collapse. Railroad expansion, new mining ventures, the destruction of the buffalo, and ever-increasing white demand for land exacerbated the centuries-old tensions. The mounted warriors of the Great Plains posed an especially thorny problem for an army plagued by a chronic shortage of cavalry and a government policy that demanded Indian removal on the cheap. Using a series of converging columns, Philip Sheridan achieved more success in his winter campaigns of 1868, but only with the Red River War of 1874-75 were the tribes broken. But arable lands and rumors of gold in the Dakotas continued to attract white migration; the government opened a major new war in 1876. A series of army columns took the field that fall and again the following spring. By campaigning through much of the winter, harassing Indian villages, and winning battles like that at Wolf Mountain, Nelson A. Miles proved particularly effective. Another outbreak among the Sioux and Northern Cheyennes, precipitated by government corruption, shrinking reservations, and the spread of the Ghost Dance, culminated in a grisly encounter at Wounded Knee, in which casualties totaled over two hundred Indians and sixty-four soldiers. Less spectacular but equally deadly were conflicts in the Pacific Northwest. In a desperate effort to secure a new reservation on the tribal homelands, a Modoc chief assassinated Edward R. Canby during an abortive peace conference in 1855. Also unsuccessful was armed resistance among the Bannocks, Paiutes, Sheepeaters, and Utes in 1860. To the far southwest, Cochise, Victorio, and Geronimo led various Apache bands in resisting white and Hispanic encroachments, crossing and recrossing the border into Mexico with seeming impunity. Only after lengthy campaigning, during which army columns frequently entered Mexico, were the Apaches forced to surrender in the mid-1880s. The army remained wary of potential trouble as incidental violence continued. Yet, with the exception of another clash in 1890 during which protesters temporarily seized control of Wounded Knee, the major Indian-white conflicts in the United States had ended. Militarily, several trends had become apparent. New technology often gave the whites a temporary advantage. But this edge was not universal; Indian warriors carrying repeating weapons during the latter nineteenth century sometimes outgunned their army opponents, who were equipped with cheaper but often more reliable single-shot rifles and carbines. As the scene shifted from the eastern woodlands to the western plains, white armies found it increasingly difficult to initiate fights with their Indian rivals. To force action, army columns converged upon Indian villages from several directions. This dangerous tactic had worked well at the Battle of the Washita but could produce disastrous results when large numbers of tribesmen chose to stand and fight, as at the Little Bighorn. Throughout the centuries of conflict, both sides had taken the wars to the enemy populace, and the conflicts had exacted a heavy toll among noncombatants. Whites had been particularly effective in exploiting tribal rivalries; indeed, Indian scouts and auxiliaries were often essential in defeating tribes deemed hostile by white governments. In the end, however, military force alone had not destroyed Indian resistance. Only in conjunction with railroad expansion, the destruction of the buffalo, increased numbers of non-Indian settlers, and the determination of successive governments to crush any challenge to their sovereignty had white armies overwhelmed the tribes. Eric Foner and John A.

Chapter 3 : Syria: The story of the conflict - BBC News

the-causes-of-the-european-conflict by John W Burgess emeritus professor of constitutional law calendrierdelascience.comly dean of the faculties of political science.

Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. The Empire was a fragmented collection of practically independent states with an elected Holy Roman Emperor as their titular ruler; after the 14th century, this position was usually held by a Habsburg. The Austrian House of Habsburg, who remained Catholic, was a major European power in its own right, ruling over some eight million subjects in present-day Germany, Austria, Bohemia and Hungary. A vast number of minor independent duchies, free imperial cities, abbeys, bishoprics, and small lordships of sovereign families rounded out the Empire. Lutheranism, from its inception at Wittenberg in 1517, found a ready reception in Germany, as well as German-speaking parts of Hussite Bohemia where the Hussite Wars took place from 1419 to 1434, and Hussites remained a majority of the population until the Battle of White Mountain. The preaching of Martin Luther and his many followers raised tensions across Europe. In Northern Germany, Luther adopted the tactic of gaining the support of the local princes and city elites in his struggle to take over and re-establish the church along Lutheran lines. The Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse and other North German princes not only protected Luther from retaliation from the edict of outlawry issued by the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V, but also used state power to enforce the establishment of Lutheran worship in their lands, in what is called the Magisterial Reformation. Church property was seized, and Catholic worship was forbidden in most territories that adopted the Lutheran Reformation. The political conflicts thus engendered within the Empire led almost inevitably to war. Rebellions of Anabaptists and other radicals[edit] Further information: The first large-scale violence was engendered by the more radical element of the Reformation movement, who wished to extend wholesale reform of the Church to a similar wholesale reform of society in general. It consisted of a series of economic as well as religious revolts by Anabaptist peasants, townsfolk and nobles. The conflict took place mostly in southern, western and central areas of modern Germany but also affected areas in neighboring modern Switzerland, Austria and the Netherlands for example, the Anabaptist riot in Amsterdam [13]. At its height, in the spring and summer of 1574, it involved an estimated 100,000 peasant insurgents. Contemporary estimates put the dead at 10,000. This played a major part in the rejection of his teachings by many German peasants, particularly in the south. Here a group of prominent citizens, including the Lutheran pastor turned Anabaptist Bernhard Rothmann, Jan Matthys, and Jan Bockelson "John of Leiden" had little difficulty in obtaining possession of the town on January 5, 1574. He legalized polygamy and took sixteen wives, one of whom he personally beheaded in the marketplace. Community of goods was also established. After obstinate resistance, the town was taken by the besiegers on June 24, 1574, and then Leiden and some of his more prominent followers were executed in the marketplace. The Catholic cantons in response had formed an alliance with Ferdinand of Austria. After numerous minor incidents and provocations from both sides, a Catholic priest was executed in the Thurgau in May 1575, and the Protestant pastor J. Keyser was burned at the stake in Schwyz in the Canton of Schwyz, and marched to Kappel at the border to Zug. Open war was avoided by means of a peace agreement Erster Landfriede that was not exactly favourable to the Catholic side, which had to dissolve its alliance with the Austrian Habsburgs. Tensions remained essentially unresolved. Switzerland was to be divided into a patchwork of Protestant and Catholic cantons, with the Protestants tending to dominate the larger cities, and the Catholics the more rural areas. In 1653, tensions between Protestants and Catholics re-emerged and led to the outbreak of the First War of Villmergen. The Catholics were victorious and able to maintain their political dominance. The Toggenburg War in 1705 was a conflict between Catholic and Protestant cantons. According to the Peace of Aarau of 11 August and the Peace of Baden of 16 June 1713, the war ended with the end of Catholic hegemony. The Sonderbund War of 1845 was also based on religion. Schmalkaldic War and Second Schmalkaldic War Destruction of the fortress above the village of Godesberg during the Cologne War, 1597; the walls were breached by mines, and most of the defenders were put to death. Engraved by Frans Hogenberg, a Dutch engraver and artist of the 16th century. Following the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, the Emperor

demanded that all religious innovations not authorized by the Diet be abandoned by 15 April. Failure to comply would result in prosecution by the Imperial Court. In response, the Lutheran princes who had set up Protestant churches in their own realms met in the town of Schmalkalden in December. Here they banded together to form the Schmalkaldic League (German: Schmalkaldischer Bund), an alliance designed to protect themselves from the Imperial action. Its members eventually intended the League to replace the Holy Roman Empire itself, [21] and each state was to provide 10,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalries for mutual defense. In the Emperor, pressed by external troubles, stepped back from confrontation, offering the "Peace of Nuremberg", which suspended all action against the Protestant states pending a General Council of the Church. The moratorium kept peace in the German lands for over a decade, yet Protestantism became further entrenched, and spread, during its term. The peace finally ended in the Schmalkaldic War (German: Schmalkaldischer Krieg), a brief conflict between and between the forces of Charles V and the princes of the Schmalkaldic League. The conflict ended with the advantage of the Catholics, and the Emperor was able to impose the Augsburg Interim, a compromise allowing slightly modified worship, and supposed to remain in force until the conclusion of a General Council of the Church. However various Protestant elements rejected the Interim, and the Second Schmalkaldic War broke out in 1547, which would last until 1552. German princes could choose the religion (Lutheranism or Catholicism) of their realms according to their conscience. The citizens of each state were forced to adopt the religion of their rulers (the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*). Lutherans living in an ecclesiastical state under the control of a bishop could continue to practice their faith. Lutherans could keep the territory that they had captured from the Catholic Church since the Peace of Passau in 1552. The ecclesiastical leaders of the Catholic Church (bishops that had converted to Lutheranism) were required to give up their territories. Religious tensions remained strong throughout the second half of the 16th century. The Peace of Augsburg began to unravel as some bishops converting to Protestantism refused to give up their bishoprics. This was evident from the Cologne War (1583), a conflict initiated when the prince-archbishop of the city converted to Calvinism. This prompted intervention by Duke Maximilian of Bavaria on behalf of the Catholics. By the end of the 16th century the Rhine lands and those of southern Germany remained largely Catholic, while Lutherans predominated in the north, and Calvinists dominated in west-central Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. The latter formed the League of Evangelical Union in 1624. His lands would therefore fall to his nearest male relative, his cousin Ferdinand of Styria. Ferdinand, having been educated by the Jesuits, was a staunch Catholic. Beginning as a religious conflict between Protestants and Catholics in the Holy Roman Empire, it gradually developed into a general war involving much of Europe, for reasons not necessarily related to religion. The war marked a continuation of the France-Habsburg rivalry for pre-eminence in Europe, which led later to direct war between France and Spain. Military intervention by external powers such as Denmark and Sweden on the Protestant side increased the duration of the war and the extent of its devastation. In the latter stages of the war, Catholic France, fearful of an increase in Habsburg power, also intervened on the Protestant side. The sack of Magdeburg in 1631. Episodes of widespread famine and disease devastated the population of the German states and, to a lesser extent, the Low Countries and Italy, while bankrupting many of the powers involved. In the territory of Brandenburg, the losses had amounted to half, while in some areas an estimated two thirds of the population died. The population of the Czech lands declined by a third. For decades armies and armed bands had roamed Germany like packs of wolves, slaughtering the populace like sheep. One band of marauders even styled themselves as "Werewolves". The war had proved disastrous for the German-speaking parts of the Holy Roman Empire. Germany lost population and territory, and was henceforth further divided into hundreds of largely impotent semi-independent states. The Imperial power retreated to Austria and the Habsburg lands. The Netherlands and Switzerland were confirmed independent. The peace institutionalised the Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist religious divide in Germany, with populations either converting, or moving to areas controlled by rulers of their own faith.

Chapter 4 : History Interpretation as a Cause of Conflicts in Europe

Causes of Conflict Between Native and European Americans Essay Sample. Disrespect was a major cultural difference. From the beginning of the relationship between Native and European Americans, the European Americans(Europeans) repeatedly dishonored the treaties which they agreed to uphold.

Uganda Rising , Mindset Media, Colonialism, in the traditional sense, ended as European countries started fighting over themselves over the world the World Wars and in effect, weakened themselves in the process allowing the United States and Soviet Union to eventually gain in immense power. They would spend another 50 years continuing that fight. Colonized people, the world over, saw their chance to break free as they realized that Europe was not invincible or as civilized as they claimed. Britain could no longer hold on to India, for example. In Africa, a sense of local patriotism or nationalism took deeper root among African intellectuals and politicians. Some of the inspiration for this movement came from the First World War in which European countries had relied on colonial troops for their own defence. Many in Africa realized their own strength with regard to the colonizer for the first time. At the same time, some of the mystique of the invincible European was shattered by the barbarities of the war. However, in most areas European control remained relatively strong during this period. History of Africa , Wikipedia The natural struggle to rebuild is proving difficult Some have commented that pointing to colonialism is not an excuse as many African countries have had decades to try and resolve this. The implication of the argument is that the effects of centuries of colonialism, in effect, are supposed to be overcome in just a few short years. Yet, as Richard Robbins, professor of anthropology suggests, if countries like Canada have been struggling with accommodating different groups, then in Africa the problem is more complex: We must remember that the European agreements that had carved up Africa into states paid little attention to cultural and ethnic boundaries and ethnic groups had little opportunity or need to form political alliances or accommodations under repressive colonial rule. Consider the extent to which the Second World War of just 6 years duration has pervaded the consciousness of our developed world for 2 generations and imagine how 4 centuries of enslavement might have seized the entire social and cultural ethos of an undeveloped continent. Rebuilding from decades and centuries of this has been a tough struggle. Consider the following from a speech by Bob Gelfand: To establish a type of nationwide government, [European] colonial administrators effectively set about inventing African traditions for Africa, that would make the process more acceptable to the indigenous population. The most far-reaching inventions of tradition in colonial Africa occurred when the administrators believed they were respecting age old African custom whereas a commentator notes What were called customary law, customary land-rights, customary political structure and so on were in fact all invented by colonial codification. By creating an image of Africa steeped in unchanging tradition the colonizers condemned the continent to live in a reconstructed moment of its past. A vast continental theme park "Africa-land, that hindered development for decades. But perhaps the most pernicious of the traditions which the colonial period bequeathed to Africa was the notion of Tribalism. Just as every European belonged to a nation, every African must belong to a tribe, a cultural unit with a common language, a single social system and established customary law. In Zambia the chief of a little known group once remarked, My people were not Soli until when the Bwana D. The concept of the Zulu as a discrete ethnic group did not emerge until These were the dangerous sands upon which the colonialists imposed a new political geography. However once in motion, the process was enthusiastically reinforced by the Africans themselves. Tribes became the object of passionate African imagination. Some chroniclers have endowed their tribes with a retrospective primordial essence. Rather like Yeats did with the similarly disenfranchised Irish. To counter this tribalism some African leaders proclaimed the single party state to be the only means to control the excessive, ethnically based competition for the global goods of modernity " education, health, and the eradication of poverty. Competitive democracy they said would only lead to penury. Yet one-party rule unrestrained by the moral check of shared community had the same result. It proved to be a mask for oppression, ethnocracy and kleptocracy. Of the African leaders overthrown between and two-thirds were murdered, jailed or slung into

exile. Up until 59 African leaders were toppled or assassinated. Only three retired peacefully and not one was voted out of office. No incumbent African leader ever lost an election until Bob Geldof, Why Africa? Bob Geldof Speaks at St. Vast plantations and cash crop-based, or other extractive economies were set up throughout. Thus has colonialism had a major impact on the economics of the region today. Various commentators, mostly from the third world observer that colonialism in the traditional sense may have ended, but the end results are much the same. An interview with former Tanzania President, Julius Nyerere captures some of this: I was in Washington last year. At the World Bank the first question they asked me was how did you fail? I responded that we took over a country with 85 per cent of its adult population illiterate. The British ruled us for 43 years. When they left, there were 2 trained engineers and 12 doctors. This is the country we inherited. When I stepped down there was per-cent literacy and nearly every child was in school. We trained thousands of engineers and doctors and teachers. So I asked the World Bank people what went wrong. Because for the last ten years Tanzania has been signing on the dotted line and doing everything the IMF and the World Bank wanted. Enrollment in school has plummeted to 63 per cent and conditions in health and other social services have deteriorated. I asked them again: These people just sat there looking at me. Then they asked what could they do? I told them have some humility. Humility " they are so arrogant! Independence made it cheaper for them to exploit us. While the previous links can provide far more details, consider the following overview from Bob Geldof: The invisible hand of the market will of itself sort out any inequities in this system allowing for the appropriately correct level of development to any particular producer. As a result in Africa, existing patterns of farming were wiped away and huge plantations of single non-native crops were developed, always with the need of European processing industry in mind. There was a global transfer of foreign plants to facilitate this " tea, coffee, cocoa, rubber etc. And with the erosion came steadily decreasing quantities of already scarce local food grown on marginal lands by labourers working for pitiful wages. This concentration on a few major cash crops or the extraction of an important mineral source left the countries on independence incredibly vulnerable to dramatic fluctuations in the prices of those commodities on the world market. Adam Smith also suggested that the market was free within reason. It could never be laissez faire. Indeed he suggested infant economies be protected from the chill winds of the financial gales as we did in our development but prevented in others. Limited rights to land also prevents a chance for successful development, as Oxfam details. A, the Soviet Union and others supported various regimes and dictatorships. Some possibly promising leaders in the early days of the independence movements throughout the Third World were overthrown. There was disregard from the major powers as to how this would affect the people of these countries. The proliferation of small arms in the region when the Cold War ended has helped fuel many conflicts. Africa has become an attractive and profitable dumping ground for nations and arm manufacturers eager to get rid of weapon stocks made superfluous by the end of the Cold War or by technological developments. Corporate Interests, Exploitation, Corruption and Other Issues As the companies duel, countries and communities often find themselves in the crossfire. The easy access to natural resources to maintain and fuel rebellions combined with corporate interests makes for a nasty combination. A World Bank report notes that politics and poverty cause civil wars, not ethnic diversity. It also points out that in Africa, failed institutions are also a cause. It adds that where there is ethnic diversity, there is actually less chance for civil wars, as long as there is not just a small number of very large ethnic groups, or ethnic polarization. In that, they also pointed out similar causes to the above, when looking at the wider issue of economic problems as well as political: It is undeniable that there has been poor governance, corruption and mismanagement in Africa. However, the briefing reveals the context " the legacy of colonialism, the support of the G8 for repressive regimes in the Cold War, the creation of the debt trap, the massive failure of Structural Adjustment Programmes imposed by the IMF and World Bank and the deeply unfair rules on international trade.

Chapter 5 : What are the various causes of Conflict ?

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Their differences made it difficult for each group to understand the other, culturally and spiritually. A lack of common lifestyle elements and the inability to verbally communicate meant that issues arose. These issues often resulted in violent conflicts. This land belonged to the Eora Indigenous people, who were curious about the new arrivals, just as the Europeans were curious about them. At first the Indigenous groups kept their distance from the newcomers and the two groups managed to co-exist on the land with little conflict. He was hoping to improve relationships between them and the Europeans. Bennelong became a confidant of Philip and they each taught the other about their different cultures. Philip allowed Bennelong to stay in the settlement when he wanted to, and he slowly integrated into the new European culture. Bennelong also travelled to England with Philip when he retired. Bennelong returned 18 months later, much changed and greatly influenced by the English culture he had encountered on his journey. He found it difficult to return to his old life and became involved in crime. Early Europeans in Australia also developed relationships with Indigenous people in the hope that they would teach them about the Australian landscape. Many Indigenous people became guides for the new Europeans. They showed the newcomers the country, their tracks, how to find water and bush food, and which areas were good for camping. The newcomers saw Australia as uninhabited land that needed to be used. They also believed that it was their right to impose their lifestyle onto the new country and the people they met. This resulted in bad feelings between the two groups, as the Indigenous people became angry about the way the land was being used. The Indigenous people did not know who the British people were and so they reacted with aggression in an attempt to make them leave, so as to protect their land. Over time, the Indigenous people realised the strength and weapons the British had, and fled from the area Sydney. Some Indigenous groups did attempt to include the newcomers into their way of life. However, the visitors had their own ideas and ways of life and they failed to take on traditional ways. Escaped convicts were the exception. Many ran into the bush trying to get away from the Europeans. Many convicts were taken in by Indigenous groups, who were pleased to involve these foreigners. Indigenous people had strong belief systems, which included sharing, respecting the land, respecting sacred places and respecting each other. The behaviours of the early Europeans not sharing, being selfish and using the land in a disrespectful manner led the Indigenous people to believe they were greedy, selfish and lacked respect, especially towards the land. The Indigenous people from around Sydney, the Eora group, could not understand the way the Europeans used and destroyed the land. This resulted in many conflicts. Incidences of violence in the Sydney area Sydney was the location of the first settlement in Australia and was also the location of many conflicts between Europeans and the Eora group. Many conflicts related to the land and how it was being used by the Europeans. Eora warriors, led by a man named Pemulwuy, fought for the land and the Europeans retaliated on a much larger scale. Many deaths resulted from these conflicts. The Eora men would retaliate again by using the weapons they had. The use of fire destroyed much of the European settlement farms, houses, small towns, crops, livestock and people. Warriors were imprisoned if they were captured. As the settlement grew into the Blue Mountains, more conflicts erupted as more Indigenous groups became angered by the destruction of land and sacred sites. Unfortunately these conflicts resulted in injuries, destruction and death. Violent incidents in later colonies Violent conflicts also continued in later colonies. Settlers to the island were quick to develop and use as much land as possible on the island. Conflict with the Indigenous peoples of the area was constant and many deaths resulted throughout the years. During Governor Arthur devised a plan to round up and capture all the Indigenous people men, women and children in the south-eastern area of Tasmania. He led soldiers, who walked in a line through the bush, for seven weeks searching for Indigenous people. They found two people during the time, but tensions continued to worsen on the island. Eventually many of the Indigenous people were moved to the Flinders Island settlement, where the

population dwindled until they were sent back to Tasmania in 1800. The Myall Creek massacre occurred in 1828 after the spearing and death of two white men. Settlers believed the Indigenous groups were responsible and became angry. The angry men armed themselves with guns and weapons and travelled to the closest Indigenous campsite, which was in Myall Creek. They captured 28 people men, women and children who were then taken to a remote location. The 28 people protested their innocence but the men did not believe them and killed them all. These sorts of incidents had happened previously but without interference from the authorities. The Myall Creek massacre was different and the men responsible were put on trial for the crime. They were found guilty of murder and hanged. This was a first, and showed other people that crimes against Indigenous people were not going to be tolerated.

Chapter 6 : World War I for Kids: Causes of WW1

Disrespect was a major cultural difference. From the beginning of the relationship between Native and European Americans, the European Americans(Europeans) repeatedly dishonored the treaties which they agreed to uphold.

Warfare[edit] Religious fighting and warfare spread with Protestantism. The radical new doctrine in Germany brought other simmering social tensions to a boil; peasant revolts flared in , resulting in chaos and bloodshed across Austria, Switzerland and southern Germany. Wealthy landowners were the target of downtrodden rebels demanding social equality and sharing of wealth in common. Armies loyal to ruling princes suppressed the revolt, and the leaders were executed. This resulted in the acceptance of toleration of Lutheranism in Germany by Catholics. When a new ruler of a different religion took power, large groups had to convert religions. Most people found this to be realistic, and the process did not end until In northern Europe north Germany, Netherlands, and France , the middle class tended to be Protestant, which corresponded with their work ethic and philosophy. Peasants readily converted religions in order to obtain jobs. French War of Religion[edit] In France, religious civil war took place from to between Catholics and Protestants. The crown usually supported the Catholics but occasionally shifted sides, while the nobility was divided among the two camps. The three leading families in the nation competed for control of France. These families were the Valois family, which was currently in power and was Catholic, the Bourbon family, which consisted of Huguenots French Protestants , and the Guise family, who was also Catholic. Ultimately, the Bourbon family won the war, but its leader Henry of Navarre was unable to be crowned because the strongly Catholic city of Paris shut itself down. Henry put Paris under a year of siege before finally deciding to convert to Catholicism himself in The civil war in France was ended by the Edict of Nantes in , which reaffirmed that Catholicism was the official religion in France, but also granted a significant degree of religious and political freedom to Protestants. Spanish Conflict with the Dutch[edit] In , on the Assumption of the Virgin day, a group of Calvinists in the Netherlands stormed Catholic churches, destroying statues and relics in a town just outside of Antwerp. The high nobility pleaded with him for more tolerance but some of them were put to death for their insolence. One of the underlying reasons was that Philip wanted to establish an absolute monarchy in the Netherlands and the religious issue gave him a way to put pressure on the parliament. William of Orange escaped to Germany from where he tried to incite a rebellion from onwards but with little success at first. In the coastal regions got hit by a weather-related disaster, the All Saints flood that left many regions devastated and the Spanish authorities showed little compassion. William of Orange, then encouraged Sea Beggars, or pirates, to invade the ports of the coast. In the small town of Brielle was taken by what were no more than outlaws, greeted enthusiastically by the population. The town declared itself for the prince of Orange and this example was followed by a number of other towns in the relatively inaccessible provinces of Holland and Zeeland. William of Orange, or William the Silent. Philip sent Spanish troops in response. They took Naarden and Haarlem and inflicted horrible suffering on the population. Other towns proved far harder to take and this caused Philip to run out of money. Antwerp was by far the richest city at the time and the influential merchants got the parliament to convene and raise money to pay off the marauding mercenaries. By doing so the parliament basically took over control from the king in far Madrid and this was the last thing the king wanted. He sent more troops with an ultimatum to the parliament to surrender or else and appointed the Duke of Parma as the new governor of the Netherlands. In , the southern ten provinces of the Netherlands, which were Catholic, signed the Union of Arras, expressing loyalty to Philip. During that same year, William of Orange united seven northern states in the Union of Utrecht, which formed the Dutch Republic that openly opposed Philip and Spain. In , the Spanish army was sent to retake the United Provinces of the Netherlands, or the Dutch Republic, who had just declared their independence. On July 10, , William of Orange was assassinated, and after his death, the Duke of Parma made progress in his reconquest, capturing significant portions of the Dutch Republic. However, England, under the leadership of Elizabeth I, assisted the Dutch with troops and horses, and as a result Spain was never able to regain control of the north. Spain finally recognized Dutch independence in Philip devised a plan to invade England. The four components of this plan

were to bring a large army into the Netherlands under the lead of the Duke of Parma and get them prepared to invade England. Although on 29 July, Pope Sixtus V had granted Papal authority to overthrow Elizabeth, who had been declared a heretic by Pope Pius V, and place whomever he chose on the throne of England. First, the Duke of Medina-Sardonia was appointed leader of the operation. He had no naval experience and was fatalistic. Moreover, the Duke of Parma refused to cooperate, as he wanted to be the commander. As a result, he did not assemble enough vessels. In addition, during the preparations, Sir Francis Drake of England raided the city of Cadiz and sank 30 Spanish vessels and burnt barrel staves, resulting in the food for the armada becoming spoiled. Finally, the invasion consisted of ships, resulting in difficult communications. The Attack[edit] The Armada arrived in late July of 1588, and was spotted immediately by English lookouts. At this time, the Duke of Parma still needed a few more days to prepare the troops. On July 20, Admiral Howard of England devised a plan using fireships, or ships filled with combustibles, to attack the Spanish fleet. These attacks resulted in the Spanish fleet cutting its anchors. On July 29, the major confrontation took place, called the Battle of Gravelines. The Spanish tactics were outdated - they were to sail in close, fire one volley at the English ships, and then proceed to board the English vessels. However, the English navy had devised new tactics, using smaller, more maneuverable ships with longer range, movable cannons. But this new tactic was not decisive, because little damage was done to ships in formation. On the other hand all attempts to leave the formation led to immediate destruction by combined fire of the English ships. When the English fleet was able to scatter the Spanish formation with burners, the Armada decided to retreat. This, coupled with the so-called "Protestant Wind" that blew the Spanish ships through the English Channel, resulted in the Spanish defeat. On May 28, 1588, the Armada had set sail with 130 ships and 30,000 men. Many ships sank along the Irish coast, about 10,000 men died from starvation and others were executed in Ireland by English authorities. Results of the Spanish Armada[edit] The Spanish fleet was able to recover from this defeat in numbers, but morale was shattered. The events marked the rise of English naval power. In addition, they resulted in Dutch independence since Spain could not defeat England. The Decline of Spain[edit] It is a common misconception that the failure of the armada resulted in the decline of Spain. After the failed invasion of England, Spain soon began to enter a period of decline. This occurred for a number of reasons. The Counter-Reformation had drained considerable Spanish resources. Moreover, many of the resources of the Spanish colonies had been exhausted. Finally, inbreeding caused inept leadership in the monarchy. In the end it was no more a war of religion. The war was essentially a fight between the two powers to determine which would become the main power in Europe. Indeed, Richelieu openly funded Protestant groups in his fight against Austria. Finally, the princes had been seizing Church land, angering Charles V. Bohemian Phase [edit] Protestant Bohemians rebelled for religious freedom and independence from Hapsburg rule. After ruthless retaliation by Ferdinand, Bohemia was completely converted to Catholicism and defeated. Catholic general Albert Wallenstein was hired to defeat Protestant forces and restore Catholic land lost. As a result of Austrian victories, Ferdinand II issues the Edict of Restitution in 1624, ordering that no longer could Protestants seize and secularize Catholic land. Again, Austria is victorious, and Denmark is relatively easily defeated. Austria ultimately defeated Sweden, and it looked like peace was likely. The Edict of Restitution was thus withdrawn. In 1648, with all sides exhausted, a final series of peace treaties were prepared. The settlement would serve as a model for resolving conflict among warring European nations, as it represented the first time a diplomatic congress addressed and resolved a dispute. This was the first time that all parties were brought together at once rather than two or three at a time. Beneficiaries of the Treaty of Westphalia[edit] France, now the dominant power in Europe, surpassing Spain and Austria. Dutch and the House of Orange. Spain and the Holy Roman Empire finally recognized their independence, and for the next 60 years, were the leaders in trade, shipping, and a major economic powerhouse in Europe. They earned independence from the Holy Roman Empire. They now controlled the Baltic Sea and became the most powerful nation in the north. Prussia and the Hohenzollerns. The princes now won sovereignty and could select Calvinism for their states. Losers at Westphalia[edit] Spain and the Spanish Hapsburgs. The Spanish lost colonies and territorial possessions, resulting in a loss in income. Germany was kept disunited and was divided into hundreds of individual, sovereign states governed by princes.

Chapter 7 : Ukraine conflict: Why is east hit by conflict? - BBC News

The Causes of Conflict. The first step in dealing with conflict is identifying the specific cause of the conflict. There are several common causes of conflict.

This week in our series we tell about the conflicts among the nations in Europe during the eighteenth century and how they affected North America. France was powerful in the northern and central areas. Britain controlled the east. All three nations knew they could not exist together peacefully in North America. The situation could only be settled by war. The powerful European nations already were fighting each other for control of territory and riches all over the world. These small wars continued for more than one hundred years. France, its colonists and their Indian allies fought against Britain, its colonists and their Indian allies. The war began with conflicts over land. French explorers had been the first Europeans in the areas around the Great Lakes and the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. France had sent traders and trappers to these territories and had established trading centers there. Britain claimed the same land. When the king gave land in North America to someone, the land was considered to extend from the east coast to the west coast -- although no one knew where the west coast was. The land along the east coast had become crowded, and settlers were moving west. And Indians became worried that they would lose the use of their land. The Indian tribes might have been able to resist the people moving west if they had been united. But their own conflicts kept the tribes apart. When Britain and France started fighting each other, some Indians helped the British. Others helped the French. The French settlers lived mainly in what was called New France. Today it is part of Canada. Life there was different from life in the British colonies to the south. For example, there was no religious freedom. So, many French people who belonged to Protestant groups settled in the British colonies. These French Protestants were known as Huguenots. France also did not like the fact that the British paid the Indians high prices for animal furs. France was more interested in the fur trade than in settling the land. One of the French trading centers was built in the area where the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is today. The French called it Fort Duquesne. The British claimed it was in Virginia and "therefore" - that the land belonged to them. In seventeen fifty-four, the governor of Virginia sent a twenty-one-year-old colonist named George Washington to tell the French to get out. The French refused to leave Fort Duquesne. So Washington and one hundred fifty men attempted to force them out. They attacked a group of Frenchmen and killed ten of them. The French and Indian War had begun. The British general expected to fight the way battles were fought in Europe. There, troops lined up on open fields and fired their weapons as they marched toward each other. The French and Indians did not fight this way. They hid in the woods. They wore clothing that made them difficult to see. They shot at the British from behind trees. The British had more troops than the other side. But the French and Indians won the battle of Fort Duquesne. General Braddock was killed. Most of the French and Indian War was fought along two lakes in an area of what is now New York state, near the border with Canada. One was Lake George. The other, Lake Champlain north of Lake George. It reaches almost all the way to the city of Montreal in Canada. These lakes provided the best way to move troops and supplies during the French and Indian war. Few roads existed in North America at that time. The military force, which controlled the lakes and rivers, controlled much of North America. The French had military bases in the cities of Quebec and Montreal. The area between them became the great battleground. Fighting increased after the British defeated the French near Lake George in the final months of seventeen fifty-five. The French then built a new base to control Lake Champlain and the surrounding area. The French base was at the southern end of Lake Champlain. They built a strong camp or fort. They called it Fort Carillon. The fort would control Lake Champlain and the area needed to reach the northern part of Lake George. The fort was designed to provide a strong defense against attack. The French built two big walls of logs, several meters apart. The area between the walls was filled with dirt. Later, a strong stone front was added. Troops inside the walls were well protected. The British built a similar fort at the southern end of Lake George. They called it Fort William Henry. France sent one of its best military commanders to take command of its troops in America. His name was the Marquis de Montcalm. General Montcalm attacked several British forts in seventeen fifty-seven. The

British commander was forced to surrender. General Montcalm promised that the British troops would be treated fairly if they surrendered. But the Indian allies of the French did not honor the surrender agreement. They began to kill British soldiers and settlers. No one is sure how many people died. It could have been more than one thousand. General Montcalm was the French commander. Fort Carillon was strong enough that the smaller French force was able to defeat the larger British force. The British withdrew, but attacked again the next year. This time the British commander was General Jeffery Amherst. The British defeated the French. They changed the name of Fort Carillon to Fort Ticonderoga. It became an important military center in the French and Indian War. The Battle for Quebec was the turning point in the conflict. Britain and France signed a treaty to end the war in seventeen sixty-three. The British had won. They took control of the lands that had been claimed by France. Britain now claimed all the land from the east coast of North America to the Mississippi River. Everything west of that river belonged to Spain. France gave all its western lands to Spain to keep the British out. Indians still controlled most of the western territory, except for some Spanish colonies in Texas and New Mexico. Today, you can still visit the two forts that were so important in the French and Indian War. Not much remains of the original buildings. However, both have been re-built using the original designs. The area surrounding both forts is very beautiful, including the two lakes, Lake George and Lake Champlain. Many people travel to this area to enjoy the outdoors. Few people who visit this calm and peaceful area stop to remember the terrible fighting that took place there two-hundred fifty years ago. The events following the French and Indian War will be our story next week. You can find our series online with transcripts, MP3s, podcasts and pictures at voaspecialenglish.com.

Chapter 8 : European History/Religious Wars in Europe - Wikibooks, open books for an open world

The 20th century is notorious for numerous ethnic and territorial wars and conflicts, the growth of extreme nationalism and racism both in Eastern and Western Europe.

Visit Website This effectively calmed simmering tensions between peoples of the two faiths within the Holy Roman Empire for more than 60 years, although there were flare ups, including the Cologne War and the War of the Julich Succession Visit Website Still, the Holy Roman Empire may have controlled much of Europe at the time, though it was essentially a collection of semi-autonomous states or fiefdoms. The emperor, from the House of Habsburg, had limited authority over their governance. The so-called Defenestration of Prague fenestration: Soon, armies for both sides were engaged in brutal warfare on multiple fronts, in present-day Austria and in the east in Transylvania, where Ottoman Empire soldiers fought alongside the Bohemians in exchange for yearly dues paid to the sultan against the Poles, who were on the side of the Habsburgs. Even with help from soldiers from Scotland, however, the armies of Denmark-Norway fell to the forces of Ferdinand II, ceding much of northern Europe to the emperor. Gustavus Adolphus But in , Sweden, under the leadership of Gustavus Adolphus, took the side of the northern Protestants and joined the fight, with its army helping to push Catholic forces back and regain much of the lost territory lost by the Protestant Union. With the support of the Swedes, Protestant victories continued. However, when Gustavus Adolphus was killed in the Battle of Lutzen in , the Swedes lost some of their resolve. Using military assistance of Bohemian nobleman Albrecht von Wallenstein, who provided his army of an estimated 50, soldiers to Ferdinand II in exchange for the freedom to plunder any captured territory, began to respond and, by , the Swedes were vanquished. With religious and political tensions in the latter regions remaining high, fighting continued. French Involvement The French, though Catholic, were rivals of the Habsburgs and were unhappy with the provisions of the Peace of Prague. Thus, the French entered the conflict in However, at least initially, their armies were unable to make inroads against the forces of Ferdinand II, even after he died of old age in However, the French recovered, and fighting between the French-Protestant alliance and the forces of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire were at a stalemate for the next several years. In , the Portuguese began to revolt against their Spanish rulers, thereby weakening their military efforts on behalf of the Holy Roman Empire. Two years later, the Swedes re-entered the fray, further weakening Habsburg forces. That year, Denmark-Norway took up arms again, this time fighting on the side of the Habsburgs and the Holy Roman Empire. Over the ensuing years, the French army had several notable victories, but also suffered significant defeats, particularly at the Battle of Herbsthausen in Also in , the Swedes attacked Vienna, but were unable to capture the city from the Holy Roman Empire. By this time, only the Austrian territories remained under the control of the Habsburgs. Weakened by the fighting, for example, Spain lost its grip over Portugal and the Dutch republic. The peace accords also granted increased autonomy to the former Holy Roman Empire states in German-speaking central Europe. This radically altered the balance of power in Europe and resulted in reduced influence over political affairs for the Catholic Church, as well as other religious groups. What happened in the Thirty Years War?

Chapter 9 : List of conflicts in Europe - Wikipedia

This week in our series we tell about the conflicts among the nations in Europe during the eighteenth century and how they affected North America.

The main value of history is a possibility for the human beings of the present to make conclusions from the experience of the past. There were certain periods in European history that happened to be full of bloodshed. A persistent re-division of territories in the past caused conflicts between whole nations and countries. It often happens that the same historical facts are being interpreted by different groups of people - mostly ethnic, religious, etc. The 20th century is notorious for numerous ethnic and territorial wars and conflicts, the growth of extreme nationalism and racism both in Eastern and Western Europe. Some recent manifestations of these are ethnic cleansings and bloody wars in the republics of former Yugoslavia, the collapse of the Soviet Union followed by wars in the republics of the Southern Caucasus Nagorny Karabakh, Southern Ossetia, Abkhazia, Moldova Transnistria and the Russian Federation Chechnya, etc. The historical aspect became one of the main factors in the ethno-political Georgian-Abkhazian conflict, too. Both sides speak about the factor of historical justice and cannot reach a consensus when they discuss a possible conflict resolution. The Georgians say that during many centuries the Georgian state system was spread in the territory of Abkhazia. The Abkhazians stress those historical periods when Abkhazian political units were independent from the Georgian centers Middle Ages. Some Georgian human rights activists call it "an intellectual mistake" to consider the history as the main criterion during the discussions of problems about the administrative-territorial arrangement of Georgia. What is done cannot be undone. The society that does not want to understand and accept its own past is condemned to repeating it some time in the future. Therefore, it endangers the fate of future generations. This experience can be used by other countries to overcome lingering hatred and murderous past or to get rid of the remnants of its totalitarian past by Russia, for example. Often attempts at history revision are characterized by such tendencies as attributing heroism, claiming an older statehood than it actually is, exaggerating the political and social development of ethnicities, self-overestimation at the expense of the neighbours, creating a chain of great national heroes. An extinct conflict should not be hyperbolized and poeticized. Thus, for example, a heroic interpretation of the Nagorny Karabakh conflict in Azerbaijan and Armenia interferes with achieving a compromise. The same situation is with the parties in the Yugoslav wars. Changing the way of history teaching in schools was an obligatory precondition for Bosnia to join the Council of Europe and the process in this sense has started with omitting some of the disputable contents in schoolbooks. Nevertheless, children in Bosnia and Herzegovina still learn differently about the same historical events depending whether they are Croats, Serbs or Bosniacs. The education reform in the country is ongoing with the support of the OSCE. According to the theory of narcissism Erich Fromm people are inclined to consider in the most positive way an "imagined community"- mostly nation - they belong to. Today we witness a process of transformation when history as a field of knowledge and as a study subject develops into the history of ethnicities, while ethnicities in their turn replace classes, and "national liberation movement" supersedes class struggle. In national and regional historical descriptions the topic of heroic spirit and victimization take more and more meaning, especially in CEE, former Soviet Union, and also in countries such as Spain and Ireland. With the collapse of the Communist block and formation of new states people, faced with co-existence of old and new ideologies, including national ones, frequently resort to previous notions of their identity. It is common knowledge that national heroes tend to be closely connected with nationalism: Interpretation of national heroes constantly changes: Also the same "national heroes" can be claimed by different ethnic groups, insisting that the hero was born or had lived, or "had the mentality" of their territory. A good example of such a "national hero" can be Marshal Ion Antonescu, dictator in Romania and ally of Hitler from 1940 to 1944, whose criminal acts are being justified by a certain part of the population today. They emphasize that he killed "Jews who were engaged with Communists and partisans", he was also able to overcome an economic crisis in Romania and, as a Marshal, he tried to return the lost Romanian provinces. Today there is no true information about Antonescu in many school textbooks on history both in Romania and

Moldova. The books contain either a "neutral" narration or even a positive evaluation of the politician. Otherwise, in other countries, e. Besides, in many history textbooks in Romania and Moldova not a single word is written about the Holocaust, and even students who graduated from the History Departments often cannot give its definition. Another example is Mustafa Kemal who is considered to be the symbol of modern Turkey. He was given the title of "Ataturk", which means the Father of all Turks. In Turkish textbooks he is presented as a saint and role model for everybody to follow. Kemal also tried to westernize Turkey: He implemented educational reforms, prevented Turkish economy from destruction, and did other positive things. At the same time he is seen by Greeks and Armenians as a person who started the first campaign against Christians and Greeks. According to Greek textbooks, out of the , Greeks, , were killed and the rest fled to all parts of the world. The Turkish government denies having killed a single Christian, and instead claims merely relocating them. Today the figure of Ataturk is one of the issues that cause contradictions between the Armenians and the Turks. They were praised for "patriotic educating of the young people". Recently, after the accession to the European Union, in Estonia a state-level decision was made to erect a monument for an SS colonel, criminal of the Second World War of Estonian origin. At the same time, the role of Stalin is still praised in some parts of Russian society, in spite of his well-known ethnic cleansings and killings. But there are people who can be truly called as heroes and their real contributions to human society do not create any misunderstanding. They turned from national heroes to truly international heroic figures. Sometimes the national hero controls and leads the media machine of which Hitler could be an example. Or, due to a sensational aspect of media activities, a national hero is created. Mass media often play a critical part in conflict initiation and its fading. They can also provoke a bloody war, as it happened in former Yugoslavia, since they were instrumentalised by the lords of war like Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman. Some of the persons indicted for war crimes by the International Tribunal in the Hague are still free like Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, who claimed in the media, upon committing massacre in Srebrenica in , that "this was revenge for the battle for Kosovo", which happened in ! Just several days after the murder of a German diplomat in Paris, Jewish pogroms were planned and organized throughout Germany. Many Jews were killed and many were taken imprisoned; the night of 9th November became a symbolic beginning of the Holocaust. At present there are many discussions about freedom of speech and limits where this freedom should be stopped not to provoke hatred. Especially does the latter concern the countries of CEE, in which, on the one hand, people have suffered from totalitarian regimes and, on the other, journalists feel full freedom and see no limits to it. Certainly, free speech is one of the most important preconditions of democracy. There can be no free society if the press is controlled by the government or is manipulated by powerful vested interests. However, freedom of speech also presupposes a strong feeling of social responsibility on the part of mass media, particularly editors and reporters who have to measure the effects of what they say and under what circumstances they do it. Plenty of press people do not feel responsibility for the effect of their words and may not resist being manipulated or driven by a party, group or other forms of outside pressure. Moldova can be an example in that case, when journalists try to accuse the government of violations of the freedom of speech. When in fact the government started to follow country legislation by implementing different legislative measures to reduce antisemitism, racism and hatred against minorities in media. Monitoring hate speech In the s the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, together with other NGOs from the Balkan countries, implemented the project called "Hate Speech in the Balkans"; in a respective book was published - "Hate speech" in the Balkans. The project is meant to continue the investigation of "hate speech" phenomenon directed against: This was one of the best projects in that field and became an example for other human rights groups in different countries. How they can hate others, if they do not know them? Stereotypes have deep roots and are widely spread. The Greeks lived under the Ottoman Empire about years, which means that they can consider Turkey as an enemy. Because of this blind following of historical stereotypes in the determination of a nation status, it is complicated for both nations to initiate a dialogue. In its turn, for the press it is much easier to support the established negative opinion about other people. Personal views of these people return to the society through their articles. A low level of general tolerance and respect in society is a reason why journalists and editors practice this. In that period the degree of mutual hatred that lasted over a

hundred years reached its peak. The negative stereotypes were reinforced by literature and history writings. Terror in Kosovo started neither in nor in , but as early as Before the explicit fight started, there had been a long period of hatred when the Serbs were taught about the Albanians in the negative ways and vice versa. Therefore, we can speak of over a hundred years of mutual psychological misunderstanding resulting with hatred and divisions. The historical burden of the conflict became an integral part of the public life, educational system, and mass media of both states. A new generation of Azerbaijani and Armenian citizens grew up feeling hatred toward each other. Just recently one of the offices of this organization in Azerbaijan was attacked by a group of aggressive young people. The textbooks and historical books, which were published in these states during the last 15 years, present two contradictory views on the history of this region, on the relations between the two peoples from ancient times, and especially on the roots of the conflict.

Stereotypes in history books Recently a group of Ukrainian scientists carried out an empiric research of the formation of negative stereotypes as reflected in schools concerning the Crimean Tartars. Within the framework of the research the scientists also analysed all the textbooks and reference books on Ukrainian history as well as Russian and Ukrainian literature recommended by the Ministry of Education of Ukraine for use in secondary schools with both Ukrainian and Russian as languages of instruction. They analyzed texts describing ethnic or national groups in general and their particular representatives. The analysis undertaken revealed that schoolchildren receive rather biased information about certain ethnic groups, including the Crimean Tatars. In the case of the Crimean Tartars they are in fact limited to the events of a definite historic period with the marked opposition of Ukrainians and Tartars. As a consequence, the relevant texts are emotionally coloured and contain a powerful negative charge. Thus, for example, the author of a history book writes about the struggle of the Ukrainian people with the Mongols and Tartars in the 13th and 14th centuries, drawing numerous examples: After the Mongol-Tartar invasion Kievan Rus fell into decay. The Khan forced the principalities to pay tribute and demanded obedience: History without conquered or conquerors

The High Anthropological School in Moldova realizes a long-term project "History without conquered or conquerors". The goal of the project is on the basis of modern scientific research, cultural and popular scientific activities to create a reconciled image of Moldovan-Turkish relations as the foundation for the mutual understanding in present and future. History teaching has been one of the priorities for the Council of Europe since s: It considerably determines the destiny of peoples and states as well as the possibility of integration processes in Europe. As a result of radical changes in both Eastern and Western Europe after , the interest in history learning and teaching increased, which made historians face the necessity of serious revision of the already shaped historical concepts. The Council of Europe appealed to history professionals asking them to follow three main principles: The project initiated by the Council of Europe on "Learning and Teaching about the History of Europe in the 20th Century" adopted an interdisciplinary and pan-European stance, which stressed the importance of social, scientific, cultural and oral history.