Reviewing the Theories of Nationalism: Historicizing, Classifying and Inquiring the Conceptualization

Ö. Senan Arslaner[a] iD

[a] Independent researcher, Istanbul-Turkey.

ABSTRACT

As neoliberalism ended class-based politics, which was a strategic priority for capital, the relations with the economic system no longer determined the political preferences. Instead, identities have become one of the main axes of political competition in identity politics. Relatedly, nationalism has come to the fore, especially after the 1990s. One of the factors affecting this was globalization, which puts nation-state sovereignty on the target board to remove all obstacles in front of financial capital. As a reaction, initiatives to strengthen state sovereignty have searched the ground for implementation, reminding the economic nationalism discourse of the 1960s and 1970s. Secondly, while the newly independent nation-states that emerged with the collapse of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia consolidated their authority, the ethnic conflicts they encountered inflamed nationalism. Third, the rise of international migration has "otherized" some groups, especially Muslims, for Western political orders -contrary to the appeal of cultural pluralism- and increased nationalist reflexes. In this context, it has become vital to examine how the concept of nationalism has been approached theoretically. In this review article, the debate on nationalism dwelled on the framework of the developments that led to the emergence of nations and *nationalism*s. This framework also included the definitions of nation and nationalism.

Introduction

With the transition to neoliberalism in the post-1980 period, putting an end to class-based economic approaches has become a strategic priority for capitalists. In this period, economic-based politics has left its place in identity-based politics (Konuralp and Biçer, 2021, p. 656; Yalman, 2010, p. 107). Identity, which has turned into one of the main axes of political competition, is produced and transformed by combining various elements, such as nationality, race, class, religion, gender, and language (Konuralp, 2019, p. 134; Özdil, 2021). Nationalism has further come to the fore, especially after the 1990s, in this dynamic social construction process emerging from complex and intertwining elements. The most influential factor in this process was the globalization efforts, which opposed the nation-state sovereignty and aimed to remove all obstacles in front of financial capital. However, this globalization effect triggered nationalism after the 1990s. First, like the economic nationalism rhetoric of the pre-1980 period—as seen in the Brexit example—this orientation was immediately reacted by the activities intending to strengthen state sovereignty (Konuralp and Adaş, 2018). Second, while the newly independent nation-states emerging after the collapse of the USSR and Yugoslavia established their authority, their internal ethnic conflicts have spurred nationalism. Third, the acceleration of international migration has "otherized" some groups, especially Muslims, to Western political orders—contrary to the claim of cultural pluralism—and increased nationalist reflexes.

CONTACT Ö. Senan Arslaner ✉ senan.arslaner@gmail.com

Therefore, it is essential to examine how the concept of nationalism, a crucial object of inquiry in political science, is handled theoretically and historically to demonstrate its multidimensionality and dynamism. The current study will evaluate the nationalism debates within the theories of nationalism and the developments leading to the birth of nationalism based on the definitions of nation and nationalism.

Defining "The Nation"

At the beginning of humanity, there was no concept of a "nation." Throughout the history of civilization, the people struggling for life banded together to create their future based on shared goals and ideas and formed communities for shelter, nutrition, and security needs.

The most fundamental factor in human existence is the struggle for survival, comprising nutrition, protection, and reproduction activities (Savrun, 2018, pp. 4-5). In small hunting-gathering societies, men and women had particular roles. On the other hand, prominent people became leaders in these societies. With the agricultural revolution, these leaders began to have the authority to supervise the division of labor and product exchange between communities. Thus, the first villagers appeared. In the villages, while the ordinary people worked in agriculture, the primary duty of the leaders was to protect the settlement from external threats. As a result of these developments, these small communities, considering their shared interests, have developed and turned into city-states and tried to gain domination over each other. Among them, the Roman Empire has a distinguished place in history. The Romans established the Roman Empire by bringing together the city-states of different religions, languages, and races. Although the Roman Empire expanded to dominate three continents in the Mediterranean and was then divided into two by the Migration of Tribes, it continued its existence for many years and left its mark on history.

To understand the word "nation" better, it is first necessary to look at its history and conceptual transformations. Liah Greenfeld (2016, pp. 20-27) emphasizes the following significant points in the development process of this word: The origin of the word "nation" comes from the Latin word "*natio*," which means "something born." When it first appeared, it had a derogatory meaning in the Roman Empire and denoted foreign groups from the same geographical area whose social status in society was below that of Roman citizens. In medieval universities, the word "nation" described students from the same geographical region or speaking the same language. This word began to gain different meanings as graduate students came to the fore in public debates and supported each other. Now, the word nation has gained a sense that expresses the communities' ideas, views, and purpose by going beyond the definition of people from the same region and speaking the same language. Since the end of the thirteenth century, universities also actively took a role by sending representatives to the decision-making processes of critical religious issues discussed in church councils. Since these decision-making people were representatives of both religious and secular groups, the word "nation" now described them too. In this period, the "nation" bore a new meaning used to describe the representatives of the political and cultural elites. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the "nation" was used for the country-people in England and remarkably transformed by gaining the same meaning as the word "folk." With this significant transformation, the concept acquired its current meaning and ignited the fuse over the age of nationalism. Whereas the "folk" described the people in a particular region, which was characterized as "commoners" or "crowd," using the word "nation" with the identical meaning to the "folk" revealed the equality of people and the conception of national identity. Two centuries after this significant transformation, the word "nation" began to be used for people whose countries differed from other countries in the territory, population, and ethnicity. This new concept has given the word "nation," meaning "unique sovereign people," and almost obscured all previous meanings.

Although the concept of nation has an old history, it has acquired its current meaning in modern times (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, p. 314). According to the nationalist discourses that emerged in line with

the context of the word "unique sovereign people," the nation should have political sovereignty (independence), and its values and interests should be superior to all other values and interests. These characteristics appeared as loyalty and commitment characteristics of the community only in the nineteenth century.

The definition of the "nation" includes objective and subjective factors (Smith, 2013, pp. 23-24). The objective factor covers a community of people shaped in a particular country, language, culture, and economic life and accumulated in historical processes. The subjective factor covers a given political society of people that emphasizes the national belonging formed by the dominant, limited, imagined sensitivities, attitudes, and perceptions. While highlighting the objective and subjective factors in the definition of the nation, as agreed by many researchers, it should also be emphasized that the nation is not a state or an ethnic community. A "nation" is not a "state" because it is a community of people defined by objective and subjective factors. A "state," on the other hand, is a political organization that has legal authority and dominance over a particular area with its institutions. The state has the right to deport lawfully through its institutions. A nation differs from an ethnic community through the objective factor because it is a community of people with a common country, namely their homeland. An ethnic community might not need a territory or historical tie and may even lack a folk culture.

The "nation" realized that Europe, where it gained the concept of "unique sovereign people," is a "power" with its change, development process, and objective and subjective factors. This awareness paved the way for determining its future by taking the steps of a new awakening. Now its next target was to gain political influence in the state administration. The political birthday of the nation concept was the French Revolution of 1789, which displayed the political consciousness of the people's communities and the power of this consciousness (Renner cited in Hobsbawm, 2006, p. 125).

While the "nation" concept—covering the "unique sovereign people" concept which had gained as a result of the semantic change process in the West—was celebrating its political birthday with the French Revolution, it ignited the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.

At this point, it will be illuminating to refer to the Ottoman-Turkish case in terms of defining the nation. Distinctively, the state defined the nation concept in the Ottoman period according to religious content. All religious communities were distinct "*nations*" (Özdil, 2021b). Each nation appointed its religious leaders with the approval of the Ottoman sultans. Under the central government control, each nation would regulate all official affairs, such as education, social security, marriage, divorce, and inheritance, through the authority granted to the heads of religion. Communities with different languages, beliefs, and cultures living under the rule of the Ottoman Empire for centuries started to revolt. They then turned into nation-states with the influence of the concepts of nation, freedom, equality, and fraternity that emerged with the French Revolution.

The "nation" definition of the Ottoman Empire and the state administration based on this definition were among the reasons for its disintegration. The Republican definition of the concept of "nation" is seen in the book on civic knowledge for the citizens, written by the founder of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (1881-1938) himself, and compiled by Prof. Dr. Afet Inan. According to this, "The people of Turkey who founded the Turkish Republic are called the Turkish nation" (İnan, 2020, p. 18). Based on Atatürk's expression, the Turkish nation can be defined as people who have a sense of belonging and are bound by citizenship in the secular order with no discrimination based on religion, language, or race.

Defining "The Nationalism"

Nationalism is a movement that paves the way for today's nation-states by influencing multi-national states. Devotion, love, respect, and closeness to a nation or its interests make up the essence of nationalism. In his study on the Turkish social democratic movement pioneer, Bülent Ecevit's nationalism, Konuralp (2013, pp. 9-12) defines nationalism as a feeling where the love for homeland

and nation meld. In this context, this feeling influences the political and economic decisions that individuals will make of their own free will. As long as the mind governs this feeling, brotherhood and fair sharing values come to the fore in the lands. The most obvious examples of this feeling have been seen in Turkish society during the Dardanelles War, the Independence War, and the Cyprus Peace Operation. The Turkish people struggled to survive in these wars, integrated with the homeland and nation love, and did not covet or interfere with the rights or interests of any nation but fought to protect its legitimate rights and interests.

Other than the psycho-political aspect of nationalism, some material grounds paved the way for new management understandings of modern societies. For example, the main reason for the emergence of nationalism might be the contemporary management, life, and production styles introduced by the central administration, which approached all segments of the society equally and responded to their needs instead of the scattered and fragmented structures in the pre-nation-state era (Baydur, 2001, p. 35).

Regarding the ideological aspect supporting the nationalist psycho-political atmosphere, the elites appeal to the masses and mobilize them by articulating conservatism, liberalism, socialism, fascism, etc. In this respect, exploring the concept of ideology in social sciences is necessary. Literally, ideology means the science of thought. The concept was first used by the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) in 1796 by combining the Latin words "idea" (thought) and "logy" (science) (Vatandaş, 2020, p. 85).

> From a social-scientific viewpoint, an ideology is a more or less coherent set of ideas that provides a basis for organized political action, whether this is intended to preserve, modify or overthrow the existing system of power relationships. All ideologies, therefore, (1) offer an account of the existing order, usually in the form of a "worldview," (2) provide a model of the desired future, a vision of the Good Society, and (3) outline how political change can and should be brought about. Ideologies are not, however, hermetically sealed systems of thought; rather, they are fluid sets of ideas that overlap with one another at several points. (Heywood, 2011, p. 71)

Ideologies, however, are not constant and invariable thought systems; they vary and conflict with one another at certain times. At the "fundamental" level, ideologies resemble political philosophies, while they take the form of political movements at the "practical" level (Heywood, 2011, p. 71).

Nationalism is an emotional concept, and its essence is loyalty. For this reason, it is a weak movement in terms of theory but powerful in terms of politics (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, pp. 309-310). Nationalism creates effects not only through nationalist ideas but also through the discourses of elite groups such as writers, politicians, litterateurs, journalists, historians, and educators of those periods. The nationalism idea can be filled with any ideology the conditions of the period require and easily added to other ideologies such as conservatism, liberalism, socialism, fascism, etc. The elite group penetrating the society and causing people to lose their ability to decide of their own free will can lead their nation to irreparable results with the discourses of prioritizing and marginalizing (Konuralp, 2013, p. 12). This is because this nationalism-added ideology can trigger expansionism and aggression. One of the most devastating examples of this was Adolf Hitler, the pioneer of Nazism (National Socialism) in Germany.

Nationalism manifests itself in how it is perceived (Köktürk, 2016, pp. 48-49). The ideological perspective to which it is articulated can turn it into a modern, progressive evolutionary, or expansionist and aggressive movement. Society is affected similarly by how this perception is created, and "good" nationalism or "bad" nationalism emerges.

Influential Factors in the Rise of Nationalism

With the end of a long and stagnant medieval era in the west, the renaissance was a new period in which radical changes were experienced (Baydur, 2001, p. 37). This period paved the way for people to transform thought into knowledge by evaluating doubts, contradictions, truth, and mistakes. With rationalism, reasoning came to the fore and abolished religion-based philosophy. During this period,

naturalism, the concept of nature, began to be freely spoken, and nature was no longer explained by supernatural domain but by causality. With the freedom of thought and belief, secularism inhibited religion from being a reference point (Konuralp, 2016). The concept of individualism emerged, and human beings' feelings, thoughts, actions, and free will were discovered.

Western culture witnessed extraordinary events in the second half of the seventeenth century (Macit, 2018, pp. 224-225). The lifestyle shaped by dogmatic principles so far was now evolving under the guidance of reason and experimentation. Science came to the fore with all aspects, providing reliable knowledge through questioning methods. The individual, building this transformation, paved the way for his enlightenment, took daily life out of the orbit of religion and traditions, and transformed it into a lifestyle based on thinking, experimentation, and science through radical changes.

Peasants ignited the change in agricultural class relationships by revolting against the landlords who exploited them (Savrun, 2018, p. 6). These developments, which started in Britain in the seventeenth century, first showed their results in America. With the support of the French army, thirteen colonies led by French officers won the independence war against the British Empire in 1776. Later, in 1789, the French people united with the French officers and soldiers. They played a role in the independence of the American colonies and realized an unprecedented revolution in world politics. This process, which sprouted in England, demonstrated its results in France as a public movement that shook the world and deeply affected it. The change spread to all levels of society. The idea declared its freedom in the human brain, where it had been imprisoned (Baydur, 2001, pp. 41-42). Latin, the common language, was abandoned, and nations began to freely use their language in literature, art, and science. Industry provided mechanization, and mechanization provided commercial development. Thus, societies considerably progressed in literacy and urbanization in line with these developments. Urbanization changed the social structure. The new and powerful class, namely the bourgeoisie, which was not noble but "literate," wanted to participate in political life. The expansion of commercial life triggered the bourgeoisie to share its ideas and ideals for participating in the management of society on every occasion. These discourses caused the democracy demands and nationalism to gain momentum.

The French Revolution of 1789, which changed the entire functional structure of the French state, was a public movement that deeply affected world politics and societies. The most significant difference between the French Revolution and all other social actions or coups in Europe was that the sovereignty passed from dynasty to nation (Aydın, 1993, p. 61). It may change if the nation does not adopt the governing political power. This new understanding that questioned the legitimacy concept threatened all other monarchial governments in Europe and caused some crises in their administrative structures because they began to lose their influence on society, especially in soldier recruitment and tax collection (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, pp. 325-326). The new and powerful literate class, namely the new elite, began questioning the legitimacy and state administration under absolutist monarchies. The privileged noble class was no longer wanted in the state administration, and these educated new elites demanded the right to participate and share power. The French Revolution triggered the transformation of the states under these absolutist monarchies into nation-states.

The modern state is a political organization with its institutions having legal authority and dominance within particular borders and a government that treats all society members within these borders equally and fulfills their needs. In terms of political science, the functional system of the modern state is based on a dual structure. It tries to meet society's demands, whereas it tries to dominate and control by perceiving society's behaviors. Nationalism emerges in this double structure of the modern state. Democracy, justice, and democratically elected government legitimize and identify the contemporary state with the nation. Hence, nationalism emerges from a nation's feeling of loyalty, love, respect, and closeness towards a state built on this functional structure.

Hence, nationalism emerged simultaneously, becoming a nation-state on the European continent (Baydur, 2001, pp. 35-37). The dispersed and fragmented western feudalists and the

authoritarian or theocratic eastern empires were incompatible with the modern nation and nationalism conceptualizations. Literacy and urbanization triggered by the impact of the knowledge and the industrial revolution also developed trade. These developments have revealed the "national economy" where production and trading sectors competed. Nationalism liberated this growing economy from the local domination of princes and the mystical influence of churches, creating a single authority with geographical boundaries. This national unity would also have a social philosophy, thus a national culture. The main objectives of nationalism were the national economy, national administration, and national culture. Nationalism, with these primary objectives, led peoples who could not become a nation to the consciousness of being a nation and founded a bridge to the nation-state loyalty (Dural, 2011, pp. 65-202). The basis of the national consciousness is the desire to be governed by a central government chosen by the nation instead of the privileged class that decides the people's destinies. Here, the new sovereignty concept spurred by nationalism is a virtue to be fought for and defended by all nations.

According to Geary (2017, p. 27), three stages exist in the contribution of the rising nationalism to the nation-state formation: In the first phase, a prominent enlightened group studies the community's history, culture, and language. The second phase is disseminating the information obtained by this research group to a patriotic group and the community. In the third stage, the movement that appears in the community perceiving the difference, becoming conscious, and desiring to become a nation reaches its zenith by spreading to the whole society.

The desire to become a nation-state is considerably significant for people who have reached the consciousness of being a nation. Michael Billig (2002, p. 36) states that the most striking example of this desire is the state established by thirteen colonies under the leadership of George Washington as a result of their war of independence against British colonialism. Similarly, on the same continent, other states were founded by other peoples waging independence wars to get rid of colonization under the leadership of Simon Bolivar. However, why did thirteen colonies gather under one rule and become the United States of America while other peoples founded five separate states: Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Colombia? These thirteen colonies could have established individual states. The answer to this question is a sense of belonging. While thirteen colonies formed a state with the idea of "one nation under God," the others began their nation-states with different senses of belonging.

These different senses of belonging are related to the understanding of nationality. Nationality is religious, linguistic, cultural, traditional, political, and historical belonging to the state (Baydur, 2001, pp. 52-53). The choice of nationality, namely, a sense of belonging, is a choice. Intellectual and emotional aspects come to the fore among the factors affecting this choice (Köktürk, 2016, p. 55). Consciousness is an individual's attitude toward a concept or phenomenon or a concrete or abstract goal. This attitude enables the individual to get in touch with his objective and draw a direction for himself. Man always wants to be in relations rather than being alone and finds a place for himself in this system of relations. Responsibilities and duties bring a commitment to society, and this commitment develops a sense of belonging. According to Köktürk (2016, pp. 85-86), the individual's belonging to a community is seen in two ways, natural and functional-systematic. First, all individuals live and die doing their daily duties required by the society's culture in which they were born. These people being the community members continue their lives with a natural sense of belonging. Second, the individuals feel liabilities as members of the society they live. With this responsibility, they acquire some available positions by educating themselves. They lead their lives with a practical sense of belonging that imposes liabilities on them and knowing what they can do. This awareness allows individuals to choose their nationality if they wish. Therefore, national belongingness is not a static choice.

Similarly, nationalism is a dynamic movement that affects nation-conscious societies desiring to be a "nation-state." According to Anthony D. Smith (2013, pp. 125-126), the critical milestones in the

historical process of nationalism are as follows: In the late eighteenth century, the nationalist movement aroused with the partitions of Poland, the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and the reaction to the invasions of Prussia, Russia, and Spain by the French army under Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821). After forty years, from 1810 to 1820, the nationalist movement accelerated in South America under the leadership of the Hispanic hybrids called Criollos and Europe in Serbia, Greece, and again in Poland. In 1848, the first great nationalist movement was seen in Europe. Germany was united under Prussia, Italy under the Piedmontese state, and Hungary under the Habsburg monarchy. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, nationalism waves showed their effect among the Romanian, Bulgarian, Lithuanian, Finnish, Norwegian, Czech, and Slovak peoples in Eastern and Northern Europe and among the Japanese, Indian, Armenian, and Egyptian peoples outside Europe.

In the twentieth century, nationalist movements began in Asia among Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Burmese, Javanese, Filipinos, Vietnamese, and Chinese peoples; and in Africa among Nigerian, Ghanaian, and South African peoples. Between 1930 and 1940, the nationalist movement affected almost all regions worldwide. In these years, the world witnessed both Nazism resulting in the genocide in the Second World War and the anti-colonial libertarian nationalism in Africa and Asia. Between 1960 and 1970, however, nationalism manifested itself as a separatist movement in particular regions of settled nation-states, such as Flanders, Québec, Scotland, Basque, Corsica, etc., under the name of ethnic autonomy. After 1991, the nationalist movement awakened with disintegrating USSR. The former Soviet republics that made up the USSR created their states with nationalist discourses. In the last decade of the twentieth century, the whole world witnessed the tragedy of ethnic nationalism. Undesirable events and wars occurred in the Middle East, the Indian Subcontinent, Africa, Rwanda, the Caucasus, and Yugoslavia.

To sum up, nationalism covers a feeling that integrates the love for homeland and nation and is a movement triggered by modernist and progressive thought. The origins of the nationalism idea go back to the end of the eighteenth century. Some authors insisted that French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) and German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) formed the basis of nationalist thought, whereas some others believed that the founders were German philosophers Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 12-30). The pre-twentieth century studies had often addressed nationalism with its good and bad aspects. This period's works had no regular or theoretical research framework but rather philosophical or moral subjects. Scholars with different ideologies interpreted nationalism in line with their perspectives under the shadow of political concerns. In the 1920s and 1930s, the idea of nationalism was considered a subject of social sciences. Between 1920 and 1930, American historian Carleton Hayes (1882-1964) and in the 1940s, American philosopher and historian Hans Kohn (1891-1971) conducted academic studies examining nationalist ideas in-depth. Until the 1960s, the works on nationalism increased rapidly with the dissolution of the colonial empires. The modernization school, which influenced social sciences in the 1960s, caused nationalist thought to be perceived as a product of modernization or part of the modernization process. Many nationalism experts, researchers, and writers consider the 1980s a milestone in nationalist thought. In that period, nationalist thought became the topic of discussion, and interconnected studies and studies with different perspectives gained significant momentum. In this period, some nationalism experts like Czech-born British philosopher and anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1925-1995), British historian Eric J. Hobsbawm (1917-2012), and British sociologist Anthony D. Smith (1939-2016) produced theoretical works on the nationalist idea. Apart from these authors, many others have contributed to nationalist thought with their studies.

Since the French Revolution, the world's political geography has oriented toward the independence of nations. After the First World War, political agreements or disagreements between states ended under the shadow of the nation and nationality concepts (Kedourie, 2017, pp. 9-11). In international political relations, the words "state" and "nation" are habitually voiced in the same

meaning. The United Nations, a supra-state organization, almost confirms this habitual discourse by using the name "United Nations" instead of "United States." Nationalism can be seen as the most effective unifying force among all ideologies and religions in today's world order. Nationalist thought pushed different social structures worldwide into unity and solidarity with a sense of belonging, allowing each society to create the most appropriate social design under the influence of its history, past, and culture. However, nationalism can turn into a contemporary and progressive idea with a rational perspective; on the other hand, it can transform into an expansionist and aggressive trend through the discourses of ideology where it is added. Hence, it has entered the field of interest of numerous writers, scientists, critics, philosophers, and historians and has caused their positive and negative criticisms. This study examines the nationalism concept under four periods, as categorization used by a scholar of nationalism, Umut Özkırımlı (2017, p. 32): the birth and development of nationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; nationalism in academic studies between 1918-1945; the development of nationalism theories between 1945-1990; the discussions on the nationalism's new dimensions from 1990 to the present.

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: The Birth and Development of Nationalism

It would be appropriate to separately examine the birth of nationalism in the eighteenth century and the development of the nationalism ideas in the nineteenth century.

The Birth of Nationalism in the Eighteenth Century

The origins of nationalism go back to the end of the eighteenth century. According to some nationalism researchers, French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) and German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) were the founders of the nationalist thought, but according to some others, German philosophers Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) were (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 12).

British political scientist and historian Elie Kedourie (1926-1992) argues that although Kant did not work on nationalist thought, he formed its basis. Kant conducted a study distinguishing morality from knowledge. This study distinguished between the world of phenomena and the individual's inner world. According to this distinction, ethics should be related to the individual's inner world, and knowledge should be associated with the outer world. He said that reaching virtue and freedom was only possible by acting according to the universal law of the inner world. Kant summarized his theory with "a good will; a free and autonomous will." He stated that the highest reflection of free and autonomous will in politics was the "right to self-determination," and thus, the most valuable form of government was the republic. On the other hand, Kant criticized the philosophers' attempts to explain the moral rules with the laws of physics, saying that such a discourse would reveal either an indefensible dogmatism or an extreme skepticism because of opposition. Kant claimed everyone knew morality and freedom well, felt deeply, behaved as necessary, and acted according to this consciousness (Kedourie, 2017, p. 36).

Czech-American philosopher and historian Hans Kohn (1891-!971) says that Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) formed the basis of nationalist thought with his non-exclusive, spiritual revival thought (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 36). Fichte did not divide the world into Germans or non-Germans, but only those who believed in the people's freedom or those who did not. He defined those who believed in the freedom of humanity as German or "real-nation," no matter to which nation they belonged, no matter where they were born, no matter which language they spoke. However, he defined those who did not believe in humanity's freedom as foreigners, even if their ancestors were German for generations. The basis of Fichte's nationalism idea was a cosmopolitan society believing in individual liberation and creating universal belonging. According to him, the German nationalist

had to apply this principle to German society first and then spread it to the whole world. The most important examples of Fichte's nationalist thoughts were his several speeches delivered to university students while Berlin was under French occupation (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, p. 333). Fichte called the German nation an "exceptional" and "exclusive" society and underlined that it had a unique character. Its primary purpose was to educate the community, starting with the youth, and ensure the German nation's integration. With these speeches, Fichte emphasized that education was as significant as nationalism. In his speeches, he tried to express that the common aspects of the German nation were culture and language.

According to the French anthropologist Louis Dumont (1911-1998), the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), who argued that the first stage of the nation was a common language and that language and thought had the same implications, was the founder of the nationalism idea (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 37). Herder stated that being human meant having a language, and a language was first learned in the family that was the smallest group of a nation. Herder expressed that every society had a different language, so a different mentality, and each community had diverse cultural characteristics. Herder called on European scientists to reveal the origins of their cultures by studying their own cultures (Thiesse, 2010, p. 158). Giving particular importance to folk songs, he said that folk songs were the nation's treasure and that folk songs revealed the culture of a nation or the ancestor's lifestyle, joy, and sadness. Herder underlined that the political administration created by a nation was legitimate and argued that societies integrated and formed after wars were artificial and could not form a nation. Herder's approach has been a reference for many scientists working on national identity in the European continent.

The French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) contributed considerably to nationalist thought. Kedourie, on the other hand, suggested that Rousseau's influence was not much because he had no systematic writings on nationalist thought. However, Rousseau's "General Will" significantly influenced nationalist ideas. Rousseau was among the most important representatives of the modern democratic state idea with his *Social Contract,* in which he positioned the people's sovereignty against the king's sovereignty. People's sovereignty idea has given the democracy idea great prestige. Rousseau suggested that a state governed by the right laws and where equality and justice were perfectly applied would transform its citizens into perfect individuals. His following question is prominent, expressing his thoughts on this subject in his work *Confessions*: "How should a government be formed to make a people the most virtuous, the most enlightened, the wisest, in a word, the best people?" (Rocker, 2019, pp. 193-194). Rousseau emphasized that if one group influenced another group in social life, it would create a significant problem in society (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 39-40). The best way to prevent this was citizenship rights, showing each individual was a part of that society. Under the central administration, management that approaches all society segments equally, responds to their needs, and can protect them against each other paves the way for citizens to integrate with the community. This integration provides a feeling of commitment and belonging in society. This feeling causes the individual to act by considering the interests of the whole society, not private interests. The general will replaces the individual will. According to the historian, critic, and writer Frederic M. Barnard, Rousseau claimed that citizenship and patriotism would only emerge within a nation-state. In his works, Rousseau said that patriotism was an emotion, a love, a sympathy, arising from the individual's inner world automatically. At the same time, citizenship was a belonging generated by the mind and consciousness. Rousseau emphasized that the essence of citizenship was belonging and that patriotism complemented citizenship and gave it a qualification. He stated that the combination of patriotic feeling and civic consciousness was excellent.

The Development of Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century, in which nationalism was examined especially by ethics and philosophical aspects, is called the Age of Nationalism. In this century, there were two approaches applied in

nationalism studies (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 40). The first was the positive approach of historians, and the second was the critical approach of Marxists, who accepted nationalism as a temporary stage. In this study, it is impossible to list all authors who contributed nationalism-related works in this century, so we will only mention a few leading authors. The study will make no classification, only give examples of historians expressing positive or negative reviews on nationalist thinking.

French historian Jules Michelet (1798-1874) emphasized that the French Revolution was a significant public movement starting the era of brotherhood between societies. He regarded the nation, in which free will prevailed, as the guarantee of individual freedom (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 42). According to Michelet, a new era began with the nation concept, which emerged under the equality, fraternity, and freedom of people gathered around a single table where the distinction between rich-poor, noble-peasant, Catholic-Protestant ceased (Smith, 2001, pp. 35-36). In this new era, peace and tranquility brought patriotism. Patriotism provided integration and commitment to society. Social commitment created a sense of belonging, and thus the patriotism growing from the inner world of the individuals emerged. This love for the homeland caused the individual to act by considering the society's interests, not his interests, and as a natural result, the "General Will" replaces the "Individual Will." Influenced by the thoughts of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Michelet claimed that patriotism was above all religions and was the motivating spiritual force behind modern Europe.

German historian Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-1896) underlined in his works that there was no power beyond the state and attributed the unity of the state to nationality (Özkirimli, 2017, pp. 41-42). For Treitschke, nationality was above all values, including democracy. On the other hand, patriotism meant having the consciousness of cooperation within the political formation, respecting the successes of all past generations, and telling these successes to future generations. Treitschke considered only large and powerful nations to be "True Nations." He defined the real nation as each nation's desire to establish a state and tendency to integrate all peoples under the same umbrella.

The French historian and philosopher Ernest Renan (1823-1892) mainly studied *What is a Nation* at the Sorbonne University conferences in 1882. Renan emphasized that the nation was a soul, a spiritual principle (Smith, 2001, p. 36). He said this soul and spiritual unity emerged from a common heritage and the will to live together. Renan likened the nation to the individual and claimed it was the last state of a long transformation formed by perseverance, sacrifice, and devotion. He also underlines that the heroism of ancestors and a glorious history witnessed by examining the past form the basis of being a nation. Renan expressed his famous formula by saying that an individual would not act without thinking: "Being a nation is a daily consensus, a plebiscite" (Breuer, 2017, p. 93). Renan suggested that being a nation required one more condition: "Essential in creating a nation is to forget about some things." The French would not become a nation by constantly recalling the Saint Bartholomew massacre in which Protestants were the victims (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, p. 319).

When mentioned of the German historian Heinrich von Treitschke and the French historian and philosopher Ernest Renan, it is necessary to include the problem of the Alsace-Lorraine region, which reveals the thought differences in nationalist ideas between both these scholars and other French and German historians.

Researchers working on nationalism discuss two types of "nation" (Dieckhoff, 2010, pp. 83-84-152). The first is the political, French-style nation approach, which has its origins in the philosophers of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, based on a certain degree of volunteerism. The political nation is a progressive and democratic understanding of a nation based on a constitution, a common political history, and rational and free will. The second is the organic-cultural nation approach, a German-style nation understanding based on German romanticism. The cultural nation is a conservative and sentimental approach reflecting a common culture, a collective feeling, and a natural unity. These two different understandings brought French and German historians against each other, especially in the 1870s, about possessing the Alsace-Lorraine region. The German historian Heinrich von Treitschke, claiming that the people of this region were objectively ethnic

Germans, emphasized ethnic and linguistic criteria. The French historian and philosopher Ernest Renan, who approached subjectively, drew attention to the need for the consent and decision of the people of this region to maintain a together-life based on spirits, national culture, and historical memories (Smith, 2013, p. 58).

According to the British philosopher John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), one of the most prominent thinkers of Anglo-liberalism (Nimni, 2016, p. 177), societies with a shared history, language, religion, and ethnic similarity constitute a nationality. He claimed that this closeness allowed societies to cooperate and gather under one umbrella. Mill pointed out that such a social structure created a homogeneous community speaking a common language, having a common thought and a public opinion. He stated that societies speaking different languages would have diverse ideas. As a result, they would form distinct public opinions, and he especially underlined that different communities could not understand each other's thoughts or feelings because of their different languages.

For this reason, Mill claimed states had not to be multinational but nation-states (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 42-43). Mill emphasized diversity in common cultures and stated that the existence of free institutions in the multinational countries created by differences would be controversial. He argued that governments, on the other hand, could not produce a common thought and solution because they could not understand the feelings and emotions of the society formed by different cultures (Nimni, 2016, p. 177). Mill also emphasized that those who desired to govern society would be the people with the same thoughts and feelings, and these people would seek the support and integration of people with the same culture (Hobsbawm, 2006, p. 35).

British historian Lord Acton (1834-1902) was among the historians who criticized the studies of nationalism. Lord Acton, almost pointing out the works of Mill, firstly criticized a homogeneous community and the management approach formed by this community (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 43). Lord Acton claimed that over-insistence in creating a homogeneous nation would ignite the fuse of revolutionaries who wanted to seize the state administration or those who desired to drag the state into a despotic administration (Smith, 2001, pp. 37-38). A state that could not make different cultures happy and keep them under its rule would create its own chains and take steps that endanger themselves in the long run, such as assimilation, neutralization, pacification, or deportation. To prove this claim, Lord Acton gave the example that the Austrian Empire, which had a multinational government understanding, was superior to France, a nation-state.

In the new production model of the Industrial Revolution age, labor became the theme of the new social order, and the working class became the leading actor (Bekmen, 2018, pp. 166-168-169). The Industrial Revolution has not only changed the production model but has also changed social life. The industrial revolution transformed workplaces into factories, a new societal phenomenon, into centers where labor was purchased and paid for. The labor force now relieving from feudal relations and quitting agricultural production-related family and village solidarity changed its structure. The increasing mechanization rate in production almost completely replaced skill and craftsmanship and paved the way for workers' dispossession. The new production model-induced changing lifestyle paved the way for workers, the leading actors in the labor market, to get dispossessed and be forced to quit their social relations. Dispossession meant moving the working class to live addicted to the wage for survival. Apart from the technological change, the most consequential effect of the Industrial Revolution is undoubtedly the creation of a working class.

Most of the thinkers who criticized the nationalist movement were under the influence of Karl Marx (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 44). German philosophers Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) criticized nationalism in their *Communist Manifesto,* stating that workers had no homeland, so something that they did not possess could not be seized from them (Birnbaum, 2010, p. 108). They attached no importance to the concept of nationality because they approached collective movements by considering production. Marx and Engels ignoring the feeling of "nation love," identified those who acted in national concerns as illiterates. Drawing attention to the class differences brought about by the industrial revolution in social life, they said that when the class conflict ended,

the struggle, problems, and interest relations among nations would also end. They claimed that to conclude the class differences, the proletariat had to take over the political power and build itself as a nation because the proletariat itself was national. In a speech in 1847, Engels said, "the nationalities of people uniting… will be forced to dissolve under this unity, and thus nationalities will disappear, as will vanished classes and strata." This expression clearly states that the future social life will be nationless, classless, and religionless. Marx and Engels harshly criticized that national divisions were a sham and that they destroyed an environment in which people could define themselves correctly. They emphasized that people could not know themselves by belonging to a class, an ethnic community, or a religion. They claimed humanity would find its true essence in a social environment without self-limiting intermediate class, religion, and nation categories (Gellner, 2016, pp. 24-25). In line with all these thoughts, Karl Marx showed a clear stance against nationalism with the following words:

> The nation of the worker is neither French nor English nor German; his nation is labor, free slavery, self-huckstering. His government is neither French nor English nor German; his government is the capital. The air he breathes is neither French nor German nor English; it is factory air. The land that belongs to him is neither French nor English nor German; it lies a few meters below the ground. (Guibernau, 1997, p. 19)

Otto Bauer (1881-1938), a leader of the Austrian Social Democratic Party, made one of the most influential nationalism studies of the era with his work called *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie* and sought to develop a theory among Marxists (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 51). Bauer called the nation a "community of destiny." According to him, the most valuable indicator of being a "community of destiny" was the unique character of each society shaped by their shared history and culture. He emphasized that this distinct character was more prominent than other class connections and earthly factors (Smith, 2001, p. 41). Bauer, who gave lectures at the Arbeiterschule in Vienna, drew attention to universal socialism. He claimed that, when applied correctly, socialism and nationalism would be in perfect harmony (Anderson, 2001, pp. 14-15). He argued that capitalism ruthlessly cut off workers both from their original culture and, in the Industrial Revolution, the factories deprived them of national cultures, driving them into ignorance. Otto Bauer underlined that the main aim of socialism was to bring the entire working class out of this circular darkness into the light.

Nationalism in Academic Studies Between 1918-1945

It would be impossible for the current study to handle all the productive authors of this period in which the nationalism idea was the subject of academic research. Hence, only some of the leading authors were covered.

Between 1918-1945, with the influence of academic research, nationalism began to be examined with an objective perspective and in a more comprehensive framework. Two types of studies were prominent in this period. The first type of the studies did not deal with nationalism in detail. It only analyzed the development process and summarized the historical background and pre-nation structuring. These studies claimed that social movements, which started when traditional institutions failed to keep up with the modernization age, re-established national unity. These storytelling-style studies, not asking "why" and "how" questions, told the histories of particular nationalism types. In the second type of nationalism studies, on the other hand, some researchers determined the types of nationalism with the typologies they developed (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 57-58). Typology refers to classifying the same level and interrelated concepts and findings (Konuralp, 2013, p. 39).

The typologies of the American historian Carleton Hayes (1882-1964), the American philosopher and historian Hans Kohn (1891-1971), and the American historian and writer Louis Snyder (1907-1993) stand out among the studies conducted in this period.

Carleton Hayes was the first research historian known to attempt to determine the types of nationalism in this period (Smith, 2001, p. 42). Hayes aimed to divide nationalism into definite types

by emphasizing diversification. Hayes dealt with nationalism with purely social distinctions - humanistic, traditional, Jacobin, liberal, economic, integral (the version that equates the state with the nation, also called integrative) and determined a typology against the complexity of nationalism.

The dual typology developed by Hans Kohn was among the most prominent studies in the second period, when the idea of nationalism was the subject of academic research. Kohn carried out this work during the Second World War. During this period, he examined the nationalist thought in European societies in-depth and analyzed it more comprehensively. Kohn classified nationalism into two types based on geography: Western and Eastern. He stated that western type nationalism was liberalism-based, and eastern type nationalism was authoritarian-based (Buçukcu, 2020, p. 98). In this dual typology, examining social structures, Kohn identified a rational, pluralistic, optimistic, namely, a "voluntary nationalism" in the Western-type nationalism approach, with the rising middle class in England, France, and America. In Russia and Asian countries, he identified an emotional and authoritarian, namely, an "organic nationalism" based on the socially declining middle class and lower aristocrats and intellectuals (Smith, 2001, p. 42). (Smith, 2001, p. 42). Kohn (1944, p. 16), seeing nationalism and nationality as closely related, described nationalism as follows:

Nationalism is a state of mind, permeating the large majority of a people and claiming to permeate all its members; it recognizes the nation-state as the ideal form of political organization and nationality as the source of all creative cultural energy and economic well-being. The supreme loyalty of man is, therefore, because of his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare.

Louis Snyder came to the fore as a researcher who developed two different typologies in this period in which the idea of nationalism was the subject of academic research. In his first work, he developed a typology that divided nationalism into historical periods with the effect of the rise of fascism. These were: (i) 1817–1871: Unifying Nationalism, (ii) 1871-1900: Separatist Nationalism, (iii) 1900–1945: Aggressive Nationalism, (iv) Post-1945 Contemporary, Universal Nationalism.

In his second work, Snyder developed a geographical typology. While elaborating on the types of nationalism in his geographical typology, he also emphasized that all other studies were Eurocentric. These were: growing European nationalism; racist black nationalism in Africa; political-religious nationalism in the Middle East; messianic nationalism in Russia; melting pot type nationalism in the USA; anti-colonial nationalism in Asia; populist nationalisms of Latin America" (Smith, 2001, pp. 44-45).

1945-1990: The Development of Nationalism Theories Through Debates

The current study could not cover all the productive authors of this period when the thoughts on the nationalist idea developed with debates. Therefore, the study mentioned some leading authors only.

The dissolution of colonial empires resulted in the establishment of new states, and this transformation process led to a rapid increase in studies on the idea of nationalism. Nationalist thought, which was in an intense and productive period, had now become a discussion topic, and studies with the same or different perspectives had gained considerable momentum. These developments and the modernization school influencing the social sciences caused a perception about the nationalist thought to be a product of modernization or part of the modernization process. In this modernization-influenced period, when the idea of nationalism was developed through discussions, the studies on nation-building came to the fore. The studies examined the development of society, dividing them into three phases. The first stage was the traditional society, the second stage was the transition period, and the third stage was the modern society. Among these researchers, American academic writer Daniel Lerner published a work describing the changes and social development process in the Balgat district of Ankara. In the dead-end of the traditional structure, the

society created the new architecture by embracing its essence and could alleviate its pain and problems, albeit a little, with nationalism, a collective movement in this transition period. These studies, also having a functionalist perspective, stated that nationalism emerged as a savior in times of crisis in social life (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 60-61).

In this period, when the scholarly debates further developed the idea of nationalism, some researchers emphasized the use of mass media to spread the idea to societies. The Czech-American political scientist Karl W. Deutsch (1912 1992) was the most prominent among these researchers. Deutsch examined the effect of innovations introduced by the industrial revolution and the developing technologies on nation-building via statistical data. Deutsch stated that the spread of nationalism occurred when the opinion leaders informed all society members about every development and reached every individual in the society. He claimed that the progress and success of the national feelings that emerged in this process could be determined quantitatively (Jaffrelot, 2010, p. 30). The spread and penetration of nationalism in the society through urbanization, employment in the industry and service sector, newspaper readers, students, immigrants, and other workers facilitated the establishment of nations (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 62). In his work, Deutsch emphasized the difference between traditional and industrial society and the effect of mass media on igniting the social movements in industrial society (Jaffrelot, 2010, p. 31). A crucial finding of Deutsch (1966, p. 105) regarding the nationalist mobilization was: "'Nationalities turn into nations when they acquire the power to back up their aspirations."

In this period, when the idea of modernization-influenced nationalism was developed with discussions, the studies of Czech-born English philosopher and social anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1925-1995) were among the most prominent research. Gellner identified modernity as a distinctive form of social organization and culture and nationalism as a natural part of modernization. Gellner disapproved of the evolutionist perspective, which argued that modern societies were influenced or shaped by the old societies that survived until today (Gellner, 2008, p. 26). In line with his studies on the relationships between cognitive perception, oppression, and production in society, he thought human development consisted of three periods: hunter-gatherer, agricultural, and industrial (Gellner, 2008, p. 19).

For Gellner, the industry was a breaking point in human development. He argued that the transition from a pre-industrial society to an industrial society was a radical change. Gellner suggested that nation-state building materialized at the point nationalist ideas and feelings met with the industrialization triggered by reason and science, which were the breaking point of human development; namely, the industry was a fundamental factor that directed nationalist movements (Gellner, 2008, p. 28). Gellner stated that in the agricultural era, social culture was dominated by traditions, that is, high cultures. These high cultures, which permeated the society in general, had almost authority in the society's administration. From time to time, they strengthened the central state, competed with the central government, and even acted as a representative when the central government weakened. In the industrial era, the high cultures formed by the traditions also underwent a considerable change, and rule-makers replaced them. The dominance of literacy in society paved the way for communication with neat sentences; signs and implications left social life through writing. The high culture of the industrial age needed political support and protection. Here, the need for every high culture to have a state, preferably its own, meant the emergence of nationalist movements (Gellner, 2008, pp. 130-131).

According to Gellner, geographical boundaries were the reality of the modern world. Economic rationality was the vital element of the political system formed within these borders drawn by nationalist movements. The nation-state meant protecting a social culture and new fragile economy under a single authority with clear geographical boundaries. The modern nation that created the nation-state and the modern state without a privileged class was an institution that approached all members of the society living within its borders equally and responded to their needs (Gellner, 2008,

p. 203). Gellner, who thought that nationalism that invented nations was a natural part of the modernization process, conveyed this view as follows: "(…) modernists like me believe that the world was created approximately at the end of the eighteenth century and that nothing before this date had the slightest impact on the issues we have faced" (Smith, 2017, pp. 16-30).

Between 1945-1990, the number of studies seeking answers to "why" and "how" questions increased. Despite the debates yielded by different perspectives, all researchers now agreed that nations and nationalism were concepts that belonged to the modern age. According to this view, researchers recognized that nationalism created nations, not vice versa. Handling this modernization-influenced period in which the idea of nationalism was developed with discussions, the current study could not mention all researchers' nationalist thoughts on nation-building. However, referring to Anderson (2001, p. 25), Calhoun (2007, pp. 28-29), Konuralp (2010), and Özkırımlı (2017), the current paper presents some researchers' nationalism perspectives as follows: political characters (Breuilly); retained ethnic identities (Geertz, 1963; Smith, 1986; Hutcheson, 1994); political and cultural changes produced by industrialization (Gellner, 1964, 1983); an integrated economy, and separatist reactions to economic inequality in the state (Hechter, 1975); status concerns and resentments of new elites who claim to be different from the former aristocracy or their neighbors (Greenfeld, 1992); the invention of an ideology to legitimize states in capitalist economic relations (Hobsbawn, 1990); reinforcing the centralization and unification efforts that accompany state-building (Tilly, 1975, 1990; Mann, 1993, 1995); ideological classification (Anderson, 1983); currents of thought (Kedourie, 1960).

Debates Carrying the Thought of Nationalism to New Dimensions from 1990 to the Present

From 1990 to the present, the scientific debates transformed the Nationalism idea into new dimensions. Research on the birth and origins of nationalism has now focused on changing world conditions. The nationalism arguments in this period included the topics such as the penetration of globalization to every country, the establishment of many new states with the collapse of the Soviet Union, post-colonial societies that gained their independence with nationalist movements, women ignored in nationalist movements, and postmodern expansions that brought ethnic minorities to the fore. According to the Polish sociologist and philosopher Zygmunt Bauman (1925–2017):

> ...postmodernity was modernity reaching its majority. It was modernity looking at itself from the outside, not from the inside, taking an inventory of gains and losses, a self-psychoanalyzing, discovering hidden intentions, and realizing that they were incompatible, even mutually destructive. Postmodernity was modernity confronting its own impossibility. It was self-controlled modernity that consciously excluded what it did unconsciously. (Cited from Bauman, Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 236)

In his book, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World,* Indian scholar Partha Chatterjee drew attention to the different state formations in the post-independence period in Asia, Africa, and Central and South America. Using the distinction between problematic and thematic planes, Chatterjee aimed to reach the inner structure of nationalist discourse and the relationship between its theory and practice. He also argued that this distinction would provide a basis for critical analysis of the complex relationship between nationalist thought and colonialism discourse as follows:

> This critique is not one which stems from an alternative theory claiming to provide better answers to the problems which nationalism poses for itself. Rather, the object is to look into the manner in which those problems were posed by nationalist thought. In a sense, therefore, we too will need to locate texts in their own historical contexts, an interpretative procedure which some recent historians of political thought have recommended in opposition to the view that the classic texts of politics can be read as part of some timeless discourse of human wisdom. But we will need to do more. We will not attempt to suppress the marks of our own engagement in a political-ideological discourse. The critical analysis of nationalist thought is also necessarily an intervention in the political discourse of our own time. Reflecting on the intellectual struggles of nationalist writers of a bygone era, we are made aware of the way in which we relate our own theory and practice; judging their assessment of political possibilities, we begin to ponder the possibilities open to us today. Thus, the analysis itself becomes politics; interpretation acquires the undertones of a polemic. In such circumstances, to pretend to speak in the 'objective' voice of history is to

> dissimulate. By marking our own text with the signs of battle, we hope to go a little further towards a more open and self-aware discourse. (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 52)

Nationalism was also discussed in terms of gender within postmodernity. Until this new era in which the idea of nationalism emerged in new dimensions, the women's role was insufficiently emphasized in nationalist movements. Israeli sociologist Nira Yuval Davis and Cypriot-born sociologist Floya Anthias noted the share and participation of women in nationalist thought and how they took place in the national plan. In this approach, women were "biological producers," "reproducers of the boundaries of ethnic/national communities," "transmitters of ethnic/national culture," "representatives of ethnic/national differences," and "direct participants in national struggles" (Coşar, 2016, pp. 102). This approach underlined the role of women in the nation-state-building process and the importance of women's freedom and effectiveness in the social structure of the nation-state (Coşar, 2016, pp. 101-103).

The British social psychologist Michael Billig (2002) brought a different perspective to this period with the concept of "banal nationalism." Billig explained the concept of banal nationalism as constantly reminding of national identity in society without them noticing. These reminders could cover numerous examples such as the flags waving in public buildings, the national symbols on the coins constantly used, the word "we" used by politicians in their discourses, the state flags sewn on the official or unofficial uniforms, mass media program titles such as "homeland news" or "weather in our country." Billig claimed that although the nationalism concept has been investigated from different perspectives, this form of nationalism, a custom and constant part of daily life, was ignored and not investigated. However, every day, society is reminded that it is a nation by using flags, national symbols, national banknotes, and mass media; and every individual composing the nation is made to feel many national values in their daily life. This feeling shows the depths and functioning of national identity. Banal nationalism touching the people's everyday lives by reminding and evoking also affects the society with the concept of "we." The word "we" also yields "they," that is, "foreigners," and the constant use of the word in daily life in the mass media or political discourses in the political environment reveals the concept of "homeland." Homeland is not only a geographical region; it is home to live in and a particular settled place worth sacrificing one's life. Commonly "us" defines "society," and "us" is positioned in a "homeland" in the world of nations. "Being a nation" is reminded by using many commonplace expressions in routine life. These prosaic expressions are "thoughtless" reminders about being a nation in settled states and are the most crucial indicators that national identity is never forgotten (Billig, 2002, pp. 18, 200-201).

Theories of Nationalism

After becoming the subject of academic research, many approaches and discussions were produced within nationalism thought. Between 1918-1945, with the influence of academic research, nationalist thought began to be examined with an objective point of view and explored in a more comprehensive framework. During this period, studies described intra-communal movements establishing national unity and typologies specifying different nationalism types. Between 1945 and 1990, the dissolution of colonial empires and the establishment of new states caused a rapid increase in studies on the nationalism idea. In this period, in which modernization-influenced nationalism was developed with scholarly discussions, the studies on nation-building came to the fore. In the post-1990 period, with the idea of nationalism gaining new dimensions through the ongoing debates, research now began on the changing world conditions. The studies in this period examined the impact of globalization, the establishment of new states, post-colonial societies that gained independence, the role of women in nationalist movements, and postmodern expansions that highlighted ethnic minorities. The idea of nationalism entering the academic world has paved the way for a comprehensive investigation from an unbiased perspective. Now, the idea of nationalism was a topic in "for" and "against"

studies. Craig Calhoun (1997, p. 21) described the differences in researchers' approaches to nationalism as follows:

> At the level of practical activity, there are many diverse nationalisms; the idea of nation is integral to many different aspects of how we understand the world, to sharply contrasting state policies, and to widely varying social movements. Explanations of each case must draw on at least partially different variables rooted in specific histories and other causal factors such as the politics of state elites or the dynamics of social movements. Structural factors, from the growth of state power to the globalization of capitalism, may create conditions that nationalist discourse is used to grasp. But the use of the discourse of nationalism is partially autonomous from these specific instances and contributing factors and links otherwise disparate phenomena in significant ways.

Research and discussions on the "birth and development of nationalism" and "changing world conditions" revealed different classifications in scholars' approaches. Researchers particularly attempted to distinguish their work that reflects their own perspectives from other researchers. This effort caused various definitions, ideas, and classifications. In this direction, it is possible to classify nationalism theories within the framework of essentialist and constructivist approaches.

Essentialist Approach

The essentialist approach is the perspective that reflects the defining essence of the community by reducing the diversity in a community to a single criterion. The essentialist approach, which argues that the community essence is a priori, first focuses on the essence of individuals, not on how individuals' nationality, gender, and race characteristics overlap, conflict, or reinforce with other categories (Calhoun, 2007, p. 25). This approach assumes that individuals have a single nationality just like a single gender; identity categories clearly separated from each other, such as ethnicity, gender, and race, reflect the differences in societies, and there is no possibility of "transition" between these categories, which show the differences of individual identity. This definition provides us with the primordialist perspective and the Ethno-symbolist perspective as the subtitles of the essentialist approach. The primordialist perspective states that the national essence, which has sometimes fallen into the background with the events experienced in historical processes, has always existed, and therefore, national identity is our natural part. The Ethno-symbolist perspective also claims that preserving the essence of myths, symbols, and traditions for centuries forms ethnic culture, which is the basis of today's national culture. The common point of researchers adopting the primordialist perspective, which is a sub-heading of the essentialist approach, is that nations are natural structures. The common point of researchers who adopt an Ethno-symbolist approach developed in response to primordialist and modernist approaches is the importance the nations attach to their ethnic cores (Özdil, 2021a, p. 119; Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 79, 256-257). The essentialist approach accepts that culture and, accordingly, identities exist before social formations and states and that nations have a primordial essence and authentic cultural traditions. It argues that nationalist thought and discourse take all their power and influence from these nation characteristics. According to this point of view, it is the nations that create nationalism (Kerestecioğlu, 2018, pp. 312-313).

Primordialist Perspective

British historian Edward Shils used the term "primordialist" for the first time when addressing family relationships in his article published in 1957. Shils underlined the bond between family members and pointed out that this bond was not because they were in constant communication with each other. He argued that this blood relationship among family members created a unity that could not be expressed in words. Shils stated that blood relation was primordial, that is, it was the first created and therefore always existed (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 80).

Nationalist thought researchers have, in line with their own viewpoints, classified the work of nationalism experts who adopt the primordialist perspective. For this reason, the classifications of the primordialist view, like the approaches to nationalism, also differ from each other. The current study

examined primordialist perspectives under sociobiological and sociocultural headings and presented a sample of prominent studies of researchers adopting the primordialist approach.

A prominent researcher of the sociobiological point of view, Belgian-born sociologist and anthropologist Pierre van den Berghe (1933-2019), regards nations and ethnic groups as broader kinship relationships and attributes this situation to the genetic reproductive impulses of individuals. With endogamy and nepotism, a desire to maximize the gene pool creates extended families, while extended families create ethnic groups, and ethnic groups create nations. Cultural symbols, language, religion, clothes, and traditions complete the perspective that nations derive from a biological basis (Smith, 2017, p. 20). Many researchers preferred the sociobiological viewpoint in the 1990s when the idea of nationalism gained new dimensions. A prominent one among these researchers was the Scottish-born political scientist James Kellas (1936-2015). As a result of his research, Kellas concluded that the population did not trust strangers, disliked them, and preferred their own kind and explained his analysis as follows: "We are born with genetic qualities and instincts from which we can never escape, even if we have been trained in many different ways" (Jaffrelot, 2010, p. 73).

The sociocultural perspective emphasizes the belief in the "firstness" of elements, such as language, religion, and social habits. It is believed that these elements are "the ones first created" and distinguish individuals, ethnic groups, or nations from others. The American anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1926-2006) produced an outstanding study on the sociocultural perspective. He stated that the basis of the social existence of ethnic groups and nations was a priori cultural tie and that many people's sense of self depended on blood, language, locality, religion, or social habits. Geertz says that primordial links derive their power from perceptions and beliefs and that these perceptions and beliefs stem from community members who regard primordial ties as a priori (Smith, 2013, pp. 78-79).

Özkırımlı has analyzed the primitive point of view under three headings: perennialist, biological, and cultural. According to the perennialist point of view, a nation is a community of people who share a common land, language, and culture. Perennialist researchers argue that the existence of these communities, which has continued for centuries, constitutes modern nations. They state that the reason for the long-term continuation is the unchanging national essence, even if the form has changed. For this reason, they claim that it is possible to see nations in ancient times, the Middle Ages, and the modern ages and that the primary features that make up the nation in the historical process do not change regardless of different governments and technological developments. These periods cannot destroy the national essence; what should be done is awaken the nations and rekindle the fire of nationalism. The Australian-born political scientist Kenneth Minogue (1930–2013) uses the analogy of the "sleeping beauty" to describe this view: "nation is the sleeping princess, and nationalists are the prince who will wake the princess with his kiss" (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 85).

The Ethno-symbolist Perspective

The dissolution of colonial empires and the establishment of new states rapidly increased the studies between 1945 and 1990 on the idea of nationalism. Nationalist thought was now a topic of discussion, and various "for" and "against" studies gained considerable momentum. Researchers focused on nation-building studies during this period when the modernization-influenced nationalism idea was discussed. The ethno-symbolist approach was also born as a reaction to modernization-influenced nationalism studies and criticized these studies. According to ethno-symbolists, pre-modern ethnic communities formed the basis of today's nations. The common point of researchers who adopted this point of view was the importance they attached to the nations' ethnic origin. Ethno-symbolists explained the formation of modern nations by examining their ethnic backgrounds, and they researched the development process over an extensive period. They argued that ethnic communities that form the basis of nations were fundamentally the same but different in development level. They

preserved their essence for centuries, despite the changes and transformations experienced in historical processes such as ethnic identities, migrations, wars, and inter-communal marriages (Özkırımlı, 2017, p. 204). While ethno-symbolist researchers accepted that nationalism was the product of the modern age, they claimed that myths, symbols, and traditions had preserved their essence for centuries, forming ethnic culture, and this ethnic culture was the basis of today's national culture. The point at which the Ethno-symbolist researchers differed from the primordialists was their thinking that nationalism was the product of the modern age, and the point where they differed from the modernist researchers was the modernists' perspective of ignoring ethnic origin. The paper presents two prominent studies among researchers adopting the ethno-symbolist approach.

British sociologist Anthony D. Smith (1939-2016) was among the leading researchers of the ethno-symbolist approach. Smith claimed that there was a strong link between pre-modern ethnic communities and nationalism and that the origins of nations were ethnic consciousness. Although he claimed that the ethnic communities that formed the roots of the nations were ancient, he accepted that the idea of nationalism as a political movement just started in the eighteenth century. Smith (1986, p. 16), especially emphasizing the myths and symbols of ethnic communities, explained that these cultural traditions preserved their essence for centuries:

> [Because] ethnicity is largely 'mythic' and 'symbolic' in character, and because myths, symbols, memories and values are 'carried' in and by forms and genres of artifacts and activities which change only very slowly, so ethnie, once formed, tend to be exceptionally durable under 'normal' vicissitudes, and to persist over many generations, even centuries, forming 'molds' within which all kinds of social and cultural processes can unfold and upon which all kinds of circumstances and pressures can exert an impact.

Smith likened nationalism to a chameleon and developed a dual typology of nationalist movements. He divided nationalism into two categories as, territorial and ethnic nationalism, and again divided these into two subcategories as pre-independence and post-independence movements. Pre-independence territorial nationalist movements are anti-colonial, and these develop to establish a new nation-state on the colonial lands. Post-independence territorial nationalist movements, on the other hand, attempt to unite and integrate different ethnic groups settled on formerly colonial lands under the umbrella of a new nation-state. Pre-independence ethnic nationalist movements are seen as separatist and diaspora nationalism and aim to separate from the existing political unit to establish a new nation-state based on ethnicity. Post-independence ethnic nationalist movements, on the other hand, are irredentist and pan nationalists that aim to expand by annexing the lands where their cognates of the same ethnic origin are settled outside the borders of the new nation-state (quoted by Konuralp from Smith, 2013, pp. 56-57).

Nations Before Nationalism, written by the American political scientist John Armstrong (1922-2010), is among the most important works of the ethno-symbolist perspective. Armstrong emphasizes that the word, sign, language, dress, and architecture constitute the symbolic boundaries of ethnic communities (Smith, 2017, p. 37). According to Armstrong, under the influence of symbols and myths, the feeling of being a "God's chosen people" triggered by faith revealed first ethnic and then nationalist movements in every civilization. He stated that in the historical process, the governments integrated the ethnic groups by adopting these symbols and myths, and then, using the solidarity of this integration, they secured the lands of the permanent settlement by distinguishing between "we" and "they" (Jaffrelot, 2010, p. 75).

Constructivist Approach

The nation-building concept seems to result from nationalist movements. The desire to build a nation-state is crucial for people with the consciousness of being a nation. The nation-state-building process results from nationalist movements that affect a society that has a desire to become a state. Although the constructivists discuss the "why" and "how" questions with different answers, they agree that the concept of nations and nationalism belongs to the modern age. In other words, according to these researchers, nationalism creates nations, but not vice versa.

According to the Czech-born English philosopher and social anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1925-1995), who contributed praiseworthy works to the studies of nationalism, "nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations where they do not exist — but it does need some pre-existing differentiating marks to work on, even if, as indicated, these are purely negative…" (Gellner, 1964, p. 169).

British political scientist and historian Elie Kedourie (1926-1992) believes that nationalism is an invented doctrine:

> Nationalism is a doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It pretends to supply a criterion for the determination of the unit of population proper to enjoy a government exclusively its own, for the legitimate exercise of power in the state, and the right organization of a society of states. Briefly, the doctrine holds that humanity is naturally divided into nations, that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained, and that the only legitimate type of government is national self-government. (Kedourie, 1961, p. 9).

British historian Eric J. Hobsbawm (1917-2012) associates the concept of the nation as a social unit with the modern territorial state, the nation-state:

> Like most serious students, I do not regard the 'nation' as a primary nor as an unchanging social entity. It belongs exclusively to a particular, and historically recent, period. It is a social entity only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state, the "nation-state," and it is pointless to discuss nation and nationality except insofar as both relate to it. Moreover, with Gellner, I would stress the element of artefact, invention, and social engineering which enters into the making of nations. 'Nations as a natural, God-given way of classifying men, as an inherent ... political destiny, are a myth; nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures: that is a reality.' In short, for the purposes of analysis nationalism comes before nations. Nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way round. (Hobsbawm, 1992, pp. 9-10)

Change in Western culture began in the second half of the seventeenth century. Research conducted with experiments guided by the mind provided the opportunity to reach correct and genuine knowledge, replacing the lifestyle shaped by dogmatic principles. The individual had almost built a change by removing the daily life from the influence of religion and traditions. This radical change now paved the way for a way of life based on thinking, experimentation, and evaluation of the results. Literacy, urbanization, and trade developed with the Enlightenment, and the industrial revolution fueled the nationalist movements. These developments put an end to the local domination of the princes and the mystical influence of the churches and allowed the formation of a government under a single authority with clear geographical boundaries. Seeing nationalism as an active movement was simultaneous with the process of becoming a nation-state on the European continent.

Experts who adopted this approach claim that nations belong to the modern age, not to ancient times. These experts explain their views by saying that all nations on earth have developed under the influence of modernization in the last few centuries. The constructivist approach claims that nations are founded by states. This approach bases this claim on the saying of Jozef Pilsudski (1867–1935), who played a significant role in Poland's independence, "It is a state that founds a nation, but not vice versa," and on the saying of Massimo d'Azeglio (1798-1866), who had a crucial influence on the unification of Italy, "We created Italy, now we must create Italians." In addition, the constructivist approach states that it is natural for people to feel a commitment to the societies in which they live and a sense of belonging due to this commitment. Still, this commitment does not explain modern nations because ethnic communities have been changed by migrations, genocides, inter-group marriages, and wars. The change has affected the structure of the society and taken social relations and movements to different dimensions (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 261-262). Social movements are divided into two as ethnic-based and nationalist-based (Roger, 2008, p. 2). Ethnic movements struggle to get more privileges for the interests of the ethnic community within a political structure or to increase its influence in public authority, while nationalist movements lead societies to establish their own national state by creating their own culture, economy, and understanding of political administration.

Nationalist idea researchers have, in line with their perspectives, classified the works of nationalism experts who adopt the constructivist approach. Therefore, classifications of constructivist approach also differ from each other, like nationalist approaches and essentialist approaches. The

current study examines the constructivist approach under three headings: socioeconomic, sociopolitical, and sociocultural perspectives. The study presents a sample of prominent studies among researchers adopting the constructivist approach:

Socioeconomic Perspective

Among the prominent researchers of the socioeconomic perspective, Tom Nairn, a Scottish intellectual with a Marxist perspective, claimed that the causes of nationalism were not the result of variables such as industrialization, urbanization, and literacy that developed with the enlightenment. While expected that all these changes would progress with balanced development and all the effects of the enlightenment age would equally emerge in the world, on the contrary, the capital accumulation brought about by industrialization led to an unequal and unbalanced development and stronger countries' domination of underdeveloped countries. Nairn argues that this unbalanced development gave birth to nationalism and explains this claim: "Capitalism's rapid domination of the world has a historical and social cost. That price is nationalism." With the power created by capital accumulation, an enormous gap has emerged between the industrialized core countries and the underdeveloped peripheries. The elites of the surrounding countries, discovering this difference, recognized that they were quickly being subjugated, and it was necessary to organize their people by awakening them. Now, in underdeveloped countries, under the influence of social history and culture, nationalist movements have started to build the most suitable social structure for the conditions of the day (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 108-110). While Tom Nairn draws attention to the importance of people's consciousness of nation-building, he emphasizes the three phases of the nationalist movement, gaining momentum and forming a nation-state.

Nairn perceives all these processes as dialectical. According to Nairn, the process begins when the core countries with industrialization-led capital power dominate and oppress the underdeveloped peripheral countries. This oppression causes nationalist reactions in these underdeveloped countries, and, eventually, these reactions influence the core countries. While capitalist approaches turn the social structure upside down, they divide societies into layers. Ethnic origin, thought to be forgotten in developed countries, awakens with the ethnic movements triggered by the social awareness in the surrounding countries. Tom Nairn explains this claim as follows:

> It is through nationalism that societies try to propel themselves forward to certain kinds of goals (industrialization, prosperity, equality with other peoples, etc.) by a certain sort of regression—by looking inwards, drawing more deeply upon their indigenous resources, resurrecting past folk heroes and myths about themselves and so on. (Nairn, 1997, p. 348)

It follows that the substance of nationalism is always morally and politically ambiguous. Nationalism can, in this sense, be pictured as the old Roman god Janus, who stood above gateways with one face looking forward and one backward. Nationalism is standing over the passage to modernity: "As humankind is forced through its strait doorway, it must look desperately back into the past, to gather strength wherever it can be found for the ordeal of development" (Nairn, 1997, p. 349).

Tom Nairn described his approach to nationalism, which he built on effects rather than causes, as a sketch. For him, the theory of nationalism was the historical failure of Marxism. He also stated that orthodox Marxists made a mistake by describing the social life not according to ethnic differences but only to class differences. Although there were no necessary conditions to produce a theory of nationalism at that time, he emphasized that a modern nationalism theory should be developed with a Marxist perspective recognizing the social development of the world as a whole (Özkırımlı, 2017, pp. 108-111).

Sociopolitical Perspective

British historian John Breuilly, who made one of the leading studies of the sociopolitical perspective, defined the birth of nations and nationalism under the modern state and emphasized the relationship of the modern state with the society under this roof as an "integrative nationalism." He claimed that even though the nation could be accepted older than nationalism with some cultural details, most of today's nations are "cognitive nations" under the roof of nation-states that emerged from nationalist movements and the desire for self-determination. Supporting this claim with the birth of citizenship, he stated that the society members with the modern state identity differentiated themselves from the others and gave the nation concept its real meaning in the modern period. Breuilly, rejecting those cultural identities were a characteristic of nationalism, argued that the definition of nationalism resulted from political movements in the modern age and explained it as follows:

> People do yearn for communal membership, do have a strong sense of us and them, of territories as homelands, of belonging to culturally defined and bounded worlds which give their lives meaning. Ultimately, much of this is beyond rational analysis and, I believe, the explanatory powers of the historian. (Breuilly 1993, p. 401)

John Breuilly, stating that nationalism should be perceived as a political movement under the influence of modernity, emphasizes that this political mobilization means controlling the modern state. The control of the modern state paves the way for the elite to have a voice in the state administration or to protect it. These political movements, which aim to unite or renew the national state with an alternative order or, commonly, to oppose it within a political structure, emerge with the alienation stemming from the disappointment of educated people, namely elites, who trust the teachings of the state that promises to unite and integrate society under the same roof (Smith, 2013, pp. 73, 105-106, 134).

The modern state is a political organization whose borders are in a particular area, having authority and dominance with its institutions. It is also a government that equally approaches all members of the society living within these borders and responds to their needs. Breuilly states that the state sovereign within the boundaries must also establish its monopoly on the public sphere. The public sphere is the most significant motivation for political power to make all its decisions by considering the public interest. The emergence of the public sphere also means the proportional reduction of the privileged class' private sphere of the pre-modern state. The development of the modern state also produces a political movement that opposes the political power decisions with the claim of public interest. The rapid rise of capitalism in the eighteenth century paved the way for different political communities to have a voice in the state administration. Like governments, political communities getting stronger also started speeches about the active public interest. These communities, stating that the government did not respond and perceive all the needs and behaviors of the society, claimed that the current government was ineffective in protecting the public interest and started a significant opposition. At this point, the political community organized turned into political opposition. They now aspired to the rule of the state to protect the public interest at the highest level. John Breuilly stated that the birth and development of nationalist dynamics was the endpoint where the modern state conflicts have achieved and that all these conflicts emerged with a single spark but differed according to the characters of the parties they pitted against each other. The political power undertakes and controls the administration of the modern state. According to Breuilly, nationalism is a weapon used by the political elite to control, and it derives its strength from the support of society. Nationalist movements present an alternative management approach by taking an opposing attitude towards the current administration that was considered weak in protecting the public interest and unable to unite the society under the same roof. Breuilly claims that nationalism is the most appropriate political behavior for the modern state and its system (Roger, 2008, pp. 129-132).

Sociocultural Perspective

Among the eminent researchers of the sociocultural perspective is the Irish-born political scientist Benedict Anderson (1936-2015). In his book *Imagined Communities* (1983), in which he writes his research and thoughts on the origin and spread of nationalism, Anderson states that categorizing nationalism as an ideology makes the nationalism definition difficult. He defines the nation by suggesting that nationalism should be examined together with cultural phenomena such as kinship and religion, not with facts such as liberalism and fascism: "In an anthropological spirit, I propose the following definition of the nation: The nation is an imagined political community; it is an imagined community which is both 'sovereign' and 'limited' at the same time." The nation is "imagined" because the individuals who make up the societies do not know each other, but each individual is aware of being the nation's member. This nation is imagined as "limited" because even the members of the largest nation on earth know that other nations live outside their borders. Again, individuals who make up the greatest nations do not think or even imagine that all nations on earth will one day adopt their own nation and join. The nation is imagined as "sovereign" because the concept has ended the religion's being a reference point through the "unique sovereign people" definition gained with the semantic change process in the West and through the thought and belief freedom with the influence of the enlightenment age. In short, if a person adopts a belief, he will fulfill the requirements of that belief with his free choice. This status is called freedom, and freedom emerges in a sovereign state with certain geographical boundaries and administration under a single authority. The nation is imagined as a community. Although each state unites and integrates the society under the same umbrella, there may be unhappiness and dissatisfaction of different cultures based on social changes in each nation from time to time, and thus there may be alienation or resentment towards the nation. However, the nation is always considered a deep comradeship, even if there is resentment of different cultures within it. This comradeship has permeated almost all segments of society. This perception emerges as a sense of brotherhood and is the most significant indicator that people are ready to die for their nation (Anderson, 1983, pp. 20-22). Anderson states that the printing press has a decisive role in the emergence of capitalism in these changes that affect the cultures of the societies.

The development of printed publications, especially reading newspapers and novels, has taken the life out of the orbit of religion and traditions and radically transformed it into a lifestyle based on thinking and evaluations. The imagined community now has a new sense of time. In this conception of time, events are arranged in sequential and chronological order. The reader sees and almost experiences both himself and his own nation in the events occurring in a particular society and a period that the printed works mention. These developments in the press and broadcasting enabled a national community speaking the same language to share the same thoughts. This sharing created a unique feeling, revealing a sense of belonging to an imagined community (Jaffrelot, 2010, p. 33). Benedict Anderson exemplifies the imaginary community as follows:

> The obsolescence of the newspaper on the morrow of its printing - curious that one of the earlier mass-produced commodities should so prefigure the inbuilt obsolescence of modern durables - nonetheless, for just this reason, creates this extraordinary mass ceremony: the almost precisely simultaneous consumption ('imagining') of the newspaper-as-fiction. We know that particular morning and evening editions will overwhelmingly be consumed between this hour and that, only on this day, not that. The significance of this mass ceremony - Hegel observed that newspapers serve modern man as a substitute for morning prayers - is paradoxical. It is performed in silent privacy, in the lair of the skull. Yet each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others of whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion. Furthermore, this ceremony is incessantly repeated at daily or half-daily intervals throughout the calendar. What more vivid figure for the secular, historically clocked, imagined community can be envisioned? (Anderson, 1983, p. 35)

Conclusion

Nationalism, which emerged as a trend in the eighteenth century, spread rapidly in the nineteenth century, influenced and reshaped the whole world, broke up empires consisting of communities speaking different languages, and established systems based on nation-state sovereignty. Ethnic

belongingness of people integrated into the national consciousness and fighting for this cause has become sacred. In such a historical development process, especially after the Second World War, nationalism began to be studied as an academic study field by social scientists, and many alternative nationalism theories emerged. This study focuses on the historical and intellectual background leading to the emergence of different nationalism theories.

This study, which aims to give a semantic map of nation and nationalism, is a guide for researchers who will work in the field of nationalism to form their conceptual frameworks, clarify their theoretical approaches, and position their own procedures within the broad families of nationalism theories. In this respect, by explaining the historical contexts and conditions that leading nationalist thinkers and theorists refer to, it has been revealed how and on what grounds the evolution from the primordialist approach to the constructivist approach took place and how the constructivist approach diversified within itself.

Bibliography

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, B. (2001). *Tartışılan Sınırlar Değişen Milliyetçilik.* Ed.: Mustafa Armağan. İstanbul: Şehir Yayınları.

Aydın, S. (1993). *Modernleşme ve Milliyetçilik.* Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

Baydur, M. (2001). *Küresel Dünyada Milliyetçilik.* İstanbul: İrfan Yayımcılık ve Tanıtım Ltd. Şti.

Bekmen, A. (2018). *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler.* Ed.: H. Birsen Hekimoğlu. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Billig, M. (2002). *Banal Milliyetçilik.* İstanbul: Gelenek Yayıncılık.

Birnbaum, P, A. (2010). *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar.* Eds.: Alain Dieckhoff, Christophe Jaffrelot. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Breuilly, J. (1993). *Nationalism and the State.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Breuer, S. (2017). *Milliyetçilikler ve Faşizmler Fransa, İtalya, Almanya Örnekleri.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Buçukcu, Ö. (2020). *Milliyetçilik Tarih, Teori ve Temel Meseleler.* İstanbul: Ketebe Yayınları.

Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Calhoun, C. (2007). *Milliyetçilik.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse.* (1. Baskı) London: Zed Books.

Coşar, S. (2016). *21. Yüzyılda Milliyetçilik Teori ve Siyaset.* Eds.: Elçin Aktoprak and A. Celil Kaya. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Deutsch, K. W. (1966). *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Dieckhoff, A. (2010). *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar.* Eds.: İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Dural, B. (2011). *Pratikten Teoriye Milliyetçi Hareket.* İstanbul: Bilge Karınca.

Geary, P.G. (2017). *Uluslar Miti ve Avrupa Kimliği.* İstanbul: Yazılama Yayınevi Hizmetleri Ltd. Şti.

Gellner, E. (2016). *Milliyetçiliğe Bakmak.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Gellner, E. (1964). *Thought and Change.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Gellner, E. (2008). *Uluslar ve Ulusçuluk.* İstanbul: Hil Yayın.

Greenfeld, L. (2016). *Milliyetçilik: Moderniteye Giden 5 Yol.* İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım.

Guibernau, M. (1997). *Milliyetçilikler, 20. Yüzyılda Ulusal Devlet ve Milliyetçilikler.* İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.

Heywood, A. (2011). *Siyaset.* Ankara: Adres Yayınları.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (1992). *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E.J. (2006). *Milletler ve Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

İnan, A.A. (2020). *Medeni Bilgiler ve M. Kemal Atatürk'ün El Yazıları*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.

Jaffrelot, C. (2010). *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar*. Eds.: Alain Dieckhoff, Christophe Jaffrelot. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kerestecioğlu, İ. Ö. (2018). *19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler*. Ed.: H. Birsen Hekimoğlu. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kedourie, E. (1961). *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson & Co.

Kedourie, E. (2017). *Avrupa'da Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Köprü Kitapları.

Kohn, H. (1944). *The Idea of Nationalism: a Study in Its Origins and Background*. New York: Macmillan.

Konuralp, E. (2009). "*Ecevit's Conception of Nationalism: A Unique Position or Syncretic Vision?" Master of Science Thesis*, Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Konuralp, E. (2013). *Ecevit ve Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Togan Yayınları.

Konuralp, E. (2016). "Transformation of Secularism in Turkey: Debating Post-Secularism under the AKP Rule". *Unpublished PhD Dissertation*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Konuralp, E. (2018). Kimliğin Etni ve Ulus Arasında Salınımı: Çokkültürcülük mü Yeniden Kabilecilik mi?. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 13 (2), 133-146. DOI: 10.17153/oguiibf.400350

Konuralp, E. ve Adaş, S. (2018). Ya Brexit Sonrası? Birleşik Krallık'ın AB'den Kopuş Dönemeci ve Alternatifleri. *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7 (2), 518-540.

Konuralp, E. ve Bicer, S. (2021). Putting the Neoliberal Transformation of Turkish Healthcare System and Its Problems into a Historical Perspective. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 2021, Vol. 53(4) 654–674.

Köktürk, M. (2016). *Millet ve Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Macit, N. (2018). *Türk Milliyetçiliği Kültürel Akıl, İçtihat ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

Nairn, T. (1997). *Faces of Nationalism: Janus Revisited*. London: Verso

Nimni, E. (2016). *21. Yüzyılda Milliyetçilik Teori ve Siyaset*. Ed.: Elçin Aktoprak, A. Celil Kaya. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Özdil, M. A. (2021a). The Effect of Clothing as a Marker on Identity. *Motif Akademi Halk Bilimi Dergisi*, 14 (33), 117-130. DOI: 10.12981/mahder.867867.

Özdil, M. A. (2021b). *Osmanlı Millet Sisteminden Türk Ulusuna Giyim ve Kimlik*. İstanbul: Hiperyayın.

Özkırımlı, U. (2017). *Milliyetçilik Kuramları: Eleştirel Bir Bakış*. İstanbul: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Rocker, R. (2019). *Milliyetçilik ve Kültür*. İstanbul: Kaos Yayınları.

Roger, A. (2008). *Milliyetçilik Kuramları*. İstanbul: Versus Kitap.

Savrun, E. (2018). *Milliyetçilik Tipolojileri*. Ed.: Dr. Hasan Acar. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Smith, A. D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, A. D. (2001). *Tartışılan Sınırlar Değişen Milliyetçilik*. Ed.: Mustafa Armağan. İstanbul: Şehir Yayınları.

Smith, A. D. (2010). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, A. D. (2013). *Milliyetçilik: Kuram, İdeoloji, Tarih*. Ankara: Atıf Yayınları.

Smith, A. D. (2007). *Milli Kimlik*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Smith, A. D. (2017). *Etno – Sembolizm ve Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Alfa Araştırma.

Thiesse, A. (2010). *Milliyetçiliği Yeniden Düşünmek Kuramlar ve Uygulamalar*. Yayına Haz.: Alain Dieckhoff, Christophe Jaffrelot. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Vatandaş, S. (2020). İdeolojinin Doğuşu ve Bilim-Din Ekseninde Konumlanması. *ARTS: Artuklu Sanat ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 4, 76-102.

Yalman, Galip. 2010. *Transition to Neoliberalism: The Case of Turkey in the 1980s*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Notes on Contributor

Ömer Senan Arslaner earned his master's and PhD degrees in Political Science International Relations from Istanbul Yeni Yuzyil University. He is an independent researcher on nationalism studies.

ORCID

Ömer Senan Arslaner   iD   https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7141-7047

Disclosure Statement