

Nationalism: A Chronological Reading

Kenan Koçak¹

ORCID: 0000-0002-6422-2329

DOI: 10.55256/TEMASA.1138839

Abstract

As it is not possible to name any particular founders or pioneers in nationalism studies, instead of primordialist and modern interpretations, this paper reads nationalism in chronological order by dividing them into four sections. The first section focuses on how nationalism started to be defined as a concept by referring to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Sturm und Drang movement, Immanuel Kant's definition of freedom, the importance given to language by Johann Gottfried Herder and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's social contract, whereas the second one deals with the awakening of nationalism with reference to the French Revolution, John Stuart Mill's seeing nation as a portion of mankind, Ernst Renan's definition of the nation as a spiritual thing, and Marxism's undefinition of the term. The third section discusses the acceleration of nationalism studies by mentioning Carlton J. H. Hayes' classification of modern nationalism, Hans Kohn's classification of nationalism into western and non-western and Edward Hallett Carr's division of the history of international relations into three periods, and the last section analyses the period when nationalism studies is at its peak by giving references to the definitions of nationalism by Ernest Gellner as political principle, Elie Kedourie as an invented doctrine, Anthony David Smith as an ideological movement, Eric Hobsbawm as invented tradition, Benedict Anderson as imagined communities and Michael Billig as banal.

Keywords: Nationalism, Nation, Nationalism Studies, Chronological Reading.

Milliyetçilik Kuramları: Kronolojik Bir Okuma

Öz

Milliyetçilik çalışmalarında belirli bir kurucu veya öncü isim vermek mümkün olmadığından, bu makale primordialist ve modern yorumlar yerine milliyetçiliği dört bölüme ayırarak kronolojik sırayla ele almaktadır. Birinci bölüm Johann Wolfgang von Goethe ve Sturm und Drang akımına, Immanuel Kant'ın özgürlük tanımına, Johann Gottfried von Herder'in dile verdiği öneme ve Jean-Jacques Rousseau'nun toplum sözleşmesine atıfta bulunarak milliyetçiliğin bir kavram olarak nasıl tanımlanmaya başladığına, ikinci bölüm ise Fransız Devrimi'ne, John Stuart Mill'in milleti bir parça insanoglu olarak görmesine, Ernst Renan'ın milleti manevi bir şey olarak tanımlamasına ve Marksizm'in terimi tanımlamamasına atıf yaparak milliyetçiliğin uyanışını ele alır. Üçüncü bölüm, Carlton J. H. Hayes'in modern milliyetçilik sınıflandırmasından, Hans Kohn'un milliyetçiliği batılı ve batılı olmayan olarak ikiye ayırmasından ve Edward Hallett Carr'ın uluslararası ilişkiler tarihini üç döneme bölmelerinden bahsederek milliyetçilik çalışmalarının hızlanmasını tartışır. Son bölüm Elie Kedourie'nin icat edilmiş doktrin, Ernest Gellner'in politik ilke, Anthony David Smith'in ideolojik bir hareket, Eric Hobsbawm'ın icat edilmiş gelenek, Benedict Anderson'un hayali cemiyet ve Michael Billig'in banal olarak ele aldığı milliyetçilik tanımlarına atıfta bulunarak milliyetçilik çalışmalarının zirvede olduğu dönemi analiz eder.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Milliyetçilik, Millet, Milliyetçilik Çalışmaları, Kronolojik Okuma.

¹ Assist Prof Dr, Erciyes University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature. kenankocak@erciyes.edu.tr

Introduction

The Roman lyric poet Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65 BC-8 BC), also known as Horace in today's world, wrote in the third book of his *Odes* (23 BC):

To die for native land is sweet and fitting:
 death pursues the man who flees and does
 not spare the hamstrings and the trembling
 back of youth avoiding battle.²

In spite of the fact that Horace penned such a solid patriotic stanza, he did not mean to increase nationalistic feelings since it was nearly 1800 years before such a term used to describe nationalism for the first time. In order to understand nationalism, it would be best to begin by explaining the key terms such as nation, nationality, nationalism, and ethnicity. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines these above-mentioned terms as follows:

nation: a large body of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language inhabiting a particular state or territory.

nationality: the status of belonging to a particular nation.

nationalism: patriotic feeling, principles, or efforts.

ethnicity: the fact or state of belonging to a social group that has a common national or cultural tradition.³

Nationalism, as a theory, does not have any peculiar founders or pioneers. “Unlike most other isms, nationalism has never produced its own grand thinkers: no Hobbeses, Tocquevilles, Marxes or Webers.”⁴ And it will be in vain to seek any kind of founders of nationalism studies because “we shall not learn too much about nationalism from the study of its own prophets.”⁵ Despite the fact that it is possible to approach nationalism in two complementary ways, such as the primordial, or evolutionary in other words, and modern interpretations, this paper will chronologically read how various names have defined the term nationalism. This paper also addresses related issues such as philosophical approaches to nation and nationalism, nationalist movements and national identity in its study of nationalism. In its chronological reading, this paper traces the important names and movements, and academic studies that contribute to the understanding of nationalism in chronological order.

² Horace, *The Odes of Horace*, trans. Jeffrey H. Kaimowitz. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008), 91. The original Latin version of the stanza is as following:

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori:
 mors et fugacem persequitur uirum
 nec parcat inbellis iuuentae
 poplitibus timidoue tergo.

³ *Oxford English Dictionaries*, <https://www.oed.com/>

⁴ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 2006), 5.

⁵ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983), 125.

1. The Conceptualization of Nationalism

1.1. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and *Sturm und Drang*

Though it is impossible to know when nationalism was born, some scholars track it to the eighteenth century, to German Romantics. Elie Kedourie tends to look for its roots in somewhat earlier, in the *Sturm und Drang*⁶ movement of German proto-Romanticism of the 1760s to early 1780s, because according to him who is the pioneer of this era, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) was a source of admiration for the Romantics except for his idea of the individual. At the time, Germans did not have a common nationality, and the ramifications of *Sturm und Drang* were international. This period is the forerunner of Romantic Nationalism, which mostly traces nationalism in a nation's language, culture and folklore. The main difference of these two periods is that “the romanticist [...] was drawn longingly towards a community of like-minded individuals who would live a full life according to their innermost emotions.”⁷

1.2. Immanuel Kant and the Definition of Freedom

In the search for the earliest explicit conceptualization of nationalism, the other possible source would be the Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) whose definition of freedom was a basis for further ideas such as those relating to a republic and government.⁸ According to Kant, “Man [...] is free when he obeys the laws of morality which he finds within himself and not in the external world” which is phenomenal:⁹

The freedom of the individual, which is his self-realization, lies in identifying himself with the whole, belonging to which endows him with reality. Complete freedom means total absorption in the whole and the story of human freedom consists in the progressive struggle to reach this end.¹⁰

For sure, it is possible to argue that Kant's definition of freedom led to the idea of self-determination, which later nations would fight for.

1.3. Johann Gottfried von Herder and the Importance of Language

Another Prussian/German philosopher Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) is one of the contributors to the theory of nationalism. For him, “the human being is the most miserable of beings,”¹¹ and he can be aware of himself only through language because “all conditions of awareness in him become linguistic; his chain of thoughts becomes a chain of words.”¹² Man shares his thoughts through the language with a community in which he learns this language. Hence, a society, in other words a nation, becomes alive in which he sings

⁶ The term *Sturm und Drang* (Storm and Stress) is a “short-lived but important movement in German literature of the 1770s. An early precursor of Romanticism, it was passionately individualistic and rebellious, maintaining a hostile attitude to French Neoclassicism and the associated rationalism of the Enlightenment.” Chris Baldick, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 246.

⁷ Hans Kohn, “Romanticism and the Rise of German Nationalism,” *The Review of Politics* 12, no: 4 (1950): 443-444.

⁸ Kant rejects the external world in defining freedom and this rejection also means refusing to be ruled without consent of man.

⁹ Quoted in Elie Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 15.

¹⁰ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 30.

¹¹ Johann Gottfried von Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, trans. and ed. Michael N. Forster. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 127.

¹² Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, 131.

“ballads of their fathers, songs of the deeds of their ancestors.”¹³ Gradually, language sharpens the distinctions among nations by “national hatred”¹⁴ in which a nation does not want to share anything common with its “hostis.”¹⁵ Herder exaggerates his definition of language so that he equals it even to race: “For language was actually the ‘characteristic word of the race, bond of the family, tool of instruction, hero song of the fathers’ deeds, and the voice of these fathers from their graves.”¹⁶ Herder, with numerous others, it should be said, was thus helping to prepare the way for the new discipline of comparative philology that would flourish from the 19th century onwards. Interestingly, though he strongly promoted the use of German while provocatively attacking local use of French, Herder detested Prussian nationalism and absolutism.

1.4. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Social Contract

In the chronological order of the creation of the term nationalism, the next important milestone would be the Genevan philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) who proposed solutions for disorders and inequalities of his society. Although Elie Kedourie does not give so much importance to him by saying “Rousseau, then, does not provide a complete and rounded theory of the state, a theory which embraces first and last things, and which can proceed only from a unified and systematic vision of the universe,”¹⁷ in my opinion, Rousseau should be regarded as one of the most significant contributors to the definition of nationalism with his thoughts on equality, freedom, citizenship, patriotism, state and society. According to him, in modern society, “man faces a problem [...] that [...] he is free from in the state of nature,”¹⁸ and he needs to be protected by the general will against “the possible tyranny of will by his fellowmen.”¹⁹ For him, there are two wills: the will of everyone, which is interested in private interest, and the general will which is concerned with the common interest.²⁰ In order to live in a society, man needs to become a citizen. Therefore, he exchanges “independence for dependence, and autarky for participation”²¹ under a social contract in which he loses “his natural freedom and an unlimited right to anything by which he is tempted and can obtain; what he gains is civil freedom and the right of property over everything that he possesses.”²²

2. The Awakening of Nationalism

2.1. The French Revolution and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen

Though he died eleven years before it began, Rousseau was one of the most important contributors to the ideology of the French Revolution (1789-1799) which has in large measure shaped the concepts of nationhood

¹³ Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, 147.

¹⁴ Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, 152.

¹⁵ Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, 152. Hostis means foreigner, enemy.

¹⁶ Herder, *Philosophical Writings*, 153.

¹⁷ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 33.

¹⁸ Frederic M. Barnard, “Patriotism and Citizenship in Rousseau: A Dual Theory of Public Willing?,” *The Review of Politics* 46, no: 2 (1984): 245.

¹⁹ Barnard, “Patriotism and Citizenship in Rousseau: A Dual Theory of Public Willing?,” 245.

²⁰ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, trans. Christopher Betts. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 66.

²¹ Barnard, “Patriotism and Citizenship in Rousseau: A Dual Theory of Public Willing?,” 245.

²² Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, 59.

and nationalism. This revolution also took its inspiration from the Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès (1748-1836). Written and published in January 1789, his pamphlet *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers État?* (What is the Third Estate?) became the manifestation of the revolution which declared that all citizens, including primarily the hitherto downtrodden common people, should share the right to govern with its famous three questions and answers:

1. What is the Third Estate? – Everything.
2. What, until now, has it been in the existing political order? – Nothing.
3. What does it want to be? – Something.²³

The third estate means here nothing else but the *nation*. For the French Revolutionaries, it is possible to say that nation did not mean any race, class or language. The Nation was “a body of associates living under a common law represented by the same legislature.”²⁴ In practice, however, for Sieyès, the nation of France was defined by its working class (the proletariat in Marxist terms), whose economic and social contribution supported the whole of society. He argued that the Third Estate, i.e. the common people of France, would be better off without the *dead weight* of the privileged orders or classes.

The gist of the French Revolution is encapsulated in its motto: *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* which mean Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. During the revolution, on 26 August 1789, actually drawing on Rousseau’s *Social Contract*, the National Constituent Assembly adopted the *Déclaration des droits de l’homme et du citoyen* (The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen), which is a fundamental document of the revolution. This declaration, which in its original form consisted of 17 articles (reduced from 24 in the draft version), was supranational in intention in that it did not cover only the French people; it was for the whole of humanity and has since been accepted as a contribution to the development of human rights. From the first three articles, it is possible to argue that this declaration makes a nation able to demand indispensable rights such as freedom, equality, and sovereignty.

2.2. John Stuart Mill and a *Portion of Mankind*

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) was a British political philosopher who was mainly interested in social and political theory, liberalism and political economy. He also wrote about nationalism. According to him, a nation is a portion of mankind, and nationality is a feeling caused by a variety of factors (ethnic, linguistic, religious, and above all, historical):

A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a Nationality if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others—which make them cooperate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be governed by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively. This feeling of nationality may have been generated by various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of identity of race and descent. Community of language, and community of religion, greatly contribute to it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history, and consequent community of recollections; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past.²⁵

²³ Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, “What is the Third Estate?” in *Political Writings*, trans. and ed. Michael Sonenscher (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003), 94.

²⁴ Sieyès, “What is the Third Estate?” 97.

²⁵ John Stuart Mill, “Nationality” in *Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the Present: A Reader*, ed. Stuart Woolf (London: Routledge, 1996), 40.

2.3. Ernst Renan: What is a Nation?

Following Mill's footsteps and in pursuit of a better definition of the term nation than that offered by Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) in his anti-Semitic *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Urteile des Publikums über die Französische Revolution* (Contributions to the Correction of the Public's Judgment concerning the French Revolution) of 1793 and his *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (Addresses to the German Nation) of 1808, in one of his famous Sorbonne lectures in 1882 Ernest Renan (1823-1892) asked: *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?* (What is a nation?). In this lecture he rejected the nation's previous definition as "a dynasty, representing an earlier conquest, one which was first of all accepted, and then forgotten by the mass of the people."²⁶ He says that nation is not connected to ethnographic considerations because "there is no pure race and that to make politics depend upon ethnographic analysis is to surrender it to a chimera."²⁷ He does not take language into consideration as a necessity to create a nation as a person can "have the same thoughts, and love the same things in different languages,"²⁸ and religion, by its own, is not enough to constitute a modern nation because religion is "an individual matter; it concerns the conscience of each person."²⁹ He does not consider a nation as a community of interest, instead, he claims that "nationality has a sentimental side to it; it is both soul and body at once."³⁰ He does not find geography sufficient enough to create a nation, as it only divides nations with rivers and mountains. Renan sees nation as "a soul, a spiritual principle."³¹ This feeling is two things that make up this spiritual principle. One is in the past; the other is in the present. One is to have a shared rich heritage of memories; the other is the will to come to a common decision in the present, to live together, to continue to develop their undivided heritage.³²

2.4. Marxism and The Black Hole

It is not possible to give a precise definition of nationalism in Marxist ideology because Karl Marx (1818-1883) never deals with it deeply and leaves a "black hole"³³ as a heritage to the followers of his movement. For Renan, the "theory of Nationalism represents Marxism's great historical failure"³⁴ because it is inadequate as an explanation of the phenomenon. To be fair, *pace* Renan, it has been claimed by some Marxists that, for all their advocacy of the international class struggle, Marx and Engels did contribute to the development of left-wing nationalism—which first came to prominence with French Jacobinism and has subsequently assumed various forms ranging from Gandhian national socialism and pan-Arab nationalism to Stalinism and Titoism—by tacitly supporting proletarian nationalism as a means to obtaining proletarian rule over a nation before achieving an international proletarian revolution. According to Nimni, though Marx and Engels saw the origins of the nation state and national identity as bourgeois in nature, both believed that the creation of the centralized state as a result of the collapse of feudalism and the creation of capitalism had created positive social conditions

²⁶ Ernest Renan, "What is a Nation?" in *Becoming National: A Reader*, ed. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 46.

²⁷ Renan, "What is a Nation?," 48.

²⁸ Renan, "What is a Nation?," 50.

²⁹ Renan, "What is a Nation?," 51.

³⁰ Renan, "What is a Nation?," 51.

³¹ Renan, "What is a Nation?," 52.

³² Renan, "What is a Nation?," 52.

³³ Shlomo Avineri, "Marxism and Nationalism," *Journal of Contemporary History* 26, no: 3 (1991): 638.

³⁴ Tom Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain* (London: New Left Books, 1977), 329.

to stimulate class struggle.³⁵ Marx and Engels (1820-1895) thought that a “modern nation could exist only in the context of a capitalist economy, and originated in the process of transition from feudalism to capitalism.”³⁶ They call this modern nation “an historical phenomenon that has to be located in a precise historical period,”³⁷ and value nationalist movements according to how far they profit society.

In Marxist thought, one of the controversial points is nations’ self-determination. Lenin (1870-1924) sees this determination as to the formation of an independent national state: “we must inevitably reach the conclusion that the self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, and the formation of an independent national state.”³⁸ Stalin (1878-1953) also utters his thoughts on this issue. Firstly, he defines the term ‘nation’ as “a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture.”³⁹ His idea of self-determination differs from Lenin’s: “The right of self-determination means that a nation can arrange its life according to its own will. It has the right to enter into federal relations with other nations; it has the right to complete secession.”⁴⁰

In Marxism’s black hole, another name celebrated for writing his thoughts on nationalism is that of the Austro-Marxist Otto Bauer (1881-1938). He believes that every nation has unique character completely dissimilar to Renan’s:

If we take any German to a foreign country, if we place him, say, among the English, he will immediately be conscious of the fact that he is among people different from himself, people with a different way of thinking and feeling, people whose reactions to the same external stimuli are quite different from those he finds in his usual German environment. For the moment, we will call the complex of physical and intellectual characteristics that distinguishes one nation from another its natural character.⁴¹

According to him, a nation is “a community of fate”⁴² as “the character of human beings is never determined by anything other than their fate; the national character is never anything other than the precipitate of a nation’s history.”⁴³ In this *community of fate*, people survive by interacting and communicating thanks to mass media which hides national codes in it. As individuals are “the product of nation,”⁴⁴ a whole community can absorb these hidden codes: “[they] read similar newspapers, [...] are subjected to the same media, see similar TV programmes, take part in the same elections, and are subjected to the same forms of propaganda.”⁴⁵

³⁵ Ephraim Nimni, *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis* (London: Pluto Press, 1991), 21.

³⁶ Cited in Ephraim Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” *Capital & Class* 9, (1985): 60.

³⁷ Cited Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” 62.

³⁸ Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “The Rights of Nations to Self-Determination” in *Marxist.org*, accessed June 15, 2022, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/self-det/ch01.htm>

³⁹ Cited in Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” 73.

⁴⁰ Cited in Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” 73.

⁴¹ Otto Bauer, *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*, ed. Ephraim J. Nimni, trans. Joseph O’Donnell. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 20.

⁴² Bauer, *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*, 35.

⁴³ Bauer, *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*, 35.

⁴⁴ Cited in Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” 77.

⁴⁵ Cited in Nimni, “Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism,” 77-78.

3. The Acceleration of Nationalism Studies

3.1. Carlton J. H. Hayes and Classification of Modern Nationalism

After the First World War (1914-1918), nationalism studies gained acceleration. The American historian Carlton J. H. Hayes (1882-1964) was one of the leading theorists of nationalism in that period. For him, nationalism and patriotism were two separate things. While patriotism is “love of one’s country,”⁴⁶ which is “a peculiarly natural and ennobling expression of man’s primitive sentiment of loyalty,”⁴⁷ nationalism means “a proud and boastful habit of mind about one’s own nation, accompanied by a supercilious or hostile attitude toward other nations.”⁴⁸ According to Hayes, there are five different classifications of modern nationalism: Humanitarian, Jacobin, Traditional, Liberal, and Integral.

Humanitarian Nationalism is Hayes’s term for the ideology of “18th century nationalist thinking humanitarians”⁴⁹ because thinkers of that period were at the same time “nationalists’ and adherents of humanity.”⁵⁰ And there are three main philosophers of this nationalism: Henry St John, the First Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751), Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Johann Gottfried von Herder. Hayes terms the second type of nationalism as Jacobin Nationalism. Based on Humanitarian Nationalism, this type has, according to Özkırımlı, four characteristics, its exponents being “suspicious and quite intolerant of internal dissent; relying on force and militarism to attain its ends; fanatically religious; and characterized by missionary zeal.”⁵¹ Jacobin Nationalism is the forerunner of left-wing nationalism which depends on equality, popular sovereignty, and national self-determination. Left-wing nationalism has been seen in authoritarian forms like in The Arab Socialist Ba’ath Party in Syria, and Tito’s Yugoslavia which is “a nation of many nations.”⁵² Traditional nationalists do not take reason or revolution as reference; instead, they give importance to history and tradition. For them, according to Kemilainen, God is the creator and leader of all nationalities, and there is no need to discuss the origins of nations.⁵³ Edmund Burke (1729-1797), Louis Gabriel Ambroise, Vicomte de Bonald (1754-1840) and Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829) are the most important figures of this type. Liberal Nationalism is positioned somewhere between Jacobin and Traditional Nationalism. For Kemilainen, this type of nationalism wants to “redraw the political map of the world so that each nationality should have an independent state of its own.”⁵⁴ Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), Karl Theodor Welcker (1790-1869), François Guizot (1787-1874) and Guiseppe Mazzini (1805-1872) are famous thinkers of this form of nationalism which develops the thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Ernest Renan and John Stuart Mill. Finally, Integral Nationalism puts “national interests above those of the individual and those of humanity, refusing cooperation with other nations.”⁵⁵ Hayes

⁴⁶ Carlton J. H. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 274-275.

⁴⁷ Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism*, 275.

⁴⁸ Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism*, 275.

⁴⁹ Aira Kemilainen, *Nationalism: The Problems concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification* (Jyvaskyla: Kustantajat Publishers, 1964), 166.

⁵⁰ Kemilainen, *Nationalism: The Problems concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*, 166.

⁵¹ Umut Özkırımlı, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 38.

⁵² Cited in Vjekoslav Perica, *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 98.

⁵³ Kemilainen, *Nationalism: The Problems concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*, 170.

⁵⁴ Kemilainen, *Nationalism: The Problems concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*, 172.

⁵⁵ Özkırımlı, *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, 40.

derives this type from the writings of Charles Maurras (1868-1952), Auguste Comte (1798-1857), Hippolyte Adolphe Taine (1828-1893) and Maurice Barrès (1862-1923).

3.2. Hans Kohn: Western / Non-western Nationalism

Another historian and political theorist who classifies nationalism is the naturalized American Jew Hans Kohn (1891-1971). He draws attention to the importance of history in the formation of nationalism by saying that “nationalism is not a natural phenomenon, not a product of *eternal* or *natural* laws; it is a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a certain stage of history.”⁵⁶ He sees nationalism as “a state of mind, an act of consciousness, which since the French Revolution has become more and more common to mankind.”⁵⁷ Kohn studies nationalism in two groups: Western and Non-western.⁵⁸ Why he distinguishes the west from the non-west is that in the western world, “the rise of nationalism was a predominantly political occurrence; it was preceded by the formation of the future national state,”⁵⁹ while in non-western world “nationalism arose not only later, but also generally at a more backward stage of social and political development.”⁶⁰ In non-western countries, nationalism was explicitly manifested in a culture which was “the dream and hope of scholars and poets, unsupported by public opinion—which did not exist, and which the scholars and poets tried to create—a venture in education and propaganda rather than in policy-shaping and government.”⁶¹

3.3. Edward Hallett Carr and Three Periods of the History of International Relations

Like the two above-mentioned thinkers, the British historian Edward Hallett Carr (1892-1982) classifies nationalism chronologically. He believes that the definition of the term nation is a prerequisite for an understanding of nationalism. For him,

The nation is not a “natural” or “biological” group – in the sense, for example, of the family. It has no “natural” rights in the sense that the individual can be said to have natural rights. The nation is not a definable and clearly recognizable entity; nor is it universal. It is confined to certain periods of history and to certain parts of the world.⁶²

According to him, “the modern history of international relations divides into three partly overlapping periods, marked by widely differing views of the nation as a political entity.”⁶³ The first period “begins with the gradual dissolution of the mediaeval unity of empire and church and the establishment of the national state and national church.”⁶⁴ In this period, “the person of the sovereign”⁶⁵ was identified with the nation itself. “International relations were relations between kings and princes; and matrimonial alliances were a regular

⁵⁶ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945), 6.

⁵⁷ Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*, 10-11.

⁵⁸ Kohn means France, England, Netherlands, United States, British Dominions and Switzerland by Western world, and Central and Eastern Europe and Asia by Non-western world.

⁵⁹ Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*, 329.

⁶⁰ Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*, 329.

⁶¹ Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*, 329-330.

⁶² Edward Hallett Carr, *Nationalism and After* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1945), 39.

⁶³ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 1.

⁶⁴ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 2.

⁶⁵ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 2.

instrument of diplomacy.”⁶⁶ “National economic policies of the period”⁶⁷ aims “to augment the power of the state, of which the sovereign was the embodiment”⁶⁸ rather than “to promote the welfare of the community and its members.”⁶⁹

The second period is that running from the Napoleonic Wars (1803-1815) to 1914 and is “the most orderly and enviable of modern international relations”⁷⁰ whose “success depended on a remarkable series of compromises which made it in some respects the natural heir, in others the antithesis, of the earlier period.”⁷¹ In this period, many empires collapsed into small countries owing to the spread of the idea of nationalism. For Carr, the third period starts after 1870 and reaches its culmination after 1914. In this period, nationalism grows catastrophically, and internationalism goes bankrupt. Carr underlines three main causes that provoked that: “the bringing of new social strata within the effective membership of the nation, the visible reunion of economic with political power, and the increase in the number of nations.”⁷² Additionally, Carr says that two standpoints, those of idealism and of power, are the biggest threats to today’s nation-state, whose future depends on achieving a balance between the two because it is the nation-state’s failure to provide military security or economic prosperity that has to some extent brought into question the moral underpinnings of nationalism.⁷³

4. The Climax of Nationalism Studies

4.1. Elie Kedourie and Nationalism as an Invented Doctrine

In 1960, Elie Kedourie (1926-1992), an Iraqi Jewish origin British historian who was specialized in the Middle East studies, described *nationalism* as “a doctrine invented in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century.”⁷⁴ This view claims that it gives a criterion for determining the population unit sufficient to form its own government, using the power of the state legitimately, and regulating the community of states properly.⁷⁵ Kedourie thinks that modern nationalism’s roots are in the French Revolution as it “created new classes of society which had never dreamt of exercising power,”⁷⁶ and these classes could not take advantage of the transmission of “political habits and religious beliefs from one generation to the next.”⁷⁷ This led to the sons’ rejection of their fathers and their way of life. The society suddenly seemed to the young people so harsh, so narrow, so deprived of spiritual peace, and so incapable of ensuring the dignity and success of the individual

⁶⁶ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 3.

⁶⁷ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 5. In other words merchantilism.

⁶⁸ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 5.

⁶⁹ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 5.

⁷⁰ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 6.

⁷¹ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 6.

⁷² Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 18.

⁷³ Carr, *Nationalism and After*, 38.

⁷⁴ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 1.

⁷⁵ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 1.

⁷⁶ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 87.

⁷⁷ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 94.

that they began to challenge all the thoughts, traditions and customs that had shaped the society for centuries.

78

After the French Revolution, the young revolutionary movements of the 19th and 20th centuries all around the world preferred to name themselves as *young* groups (the Young Arab Party, Young Italy, Young Egypt, the Young Turks,)⁷⁹ to show their newness and hatred against the elders because such movements appeared a need which, to put it simply, is to belong to a society that is solid and loyal to each other. Such a need is naturally satisfied through family, neighbourhood and religious community. In the last 150 years, these institutions all over the world have had to endure the blows of violent social and intellectual changes. It is not surprising that nationalism was practised in its most vigorous form in countries where such institutions showed little flexibility and were not sufficiently prepared to withstand the harsh attacks they were subjected to.⁸⁰ Kedourie also writes that the members of these young revolutionary movements persistently thought a better world could be built thanks to literature and philosophy, but the young members confused dream with reality.⁸¹

4.2. Ernest Gellner and Nationalism as Political Principle

The Judeo-British-Czech social anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1925-1995) does not think nationalism as natural as Kedourie does, and believes that it is a central mistake to do so.⁸² Gellner argues that nationalism is a “political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent.”⁸³ According to him, nationalistic feeling should be distinguished from the political movement which can be an inspiration: “Nationalist sentiment is the feeling of anger aroused by the violation of the principle or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by its fulfilment. A nationalist movement is one actuated by a sentiment of this kind.”⁸⁴ He argues that nations’ creations take longer periods, and he asks this question: “do nations have navels?”⁸⁵ and answers it like this: “some nations possess genuine ancient navels, some have navels invented for them by their own nationalist propaganda, and some are altogether navel-less.”⁸⁶

For Gellner, education is a vital point in shaping national identities since “the culture in which one has been taught to communicate becomes the core of one’s identity”⁸⁷ and he draws attention to the importance of a high culture on which he builds his nationalism theory. The main misleading point of nationalism, and even its own mistake, is thinking it as the forcible imposition of high culture in a society in which subcultures dominated the lives of the majority, and in some cases, all of the people in the past. In other words, “it means that generalized diffusion of a school-mediated, academy-supervised idiom, codified for requirements of reason-

⁷⁸ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 95.

⁷⁹ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 96.

⁸⁰ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 96.

⁸¹ Kedourie, *Nationalism*, 98.

⁸² Ernest Gellner, *Thought and Change* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), 150.

⁸³ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 1.

⁸⁴ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 1.

⁸⁵ Ernest Gellner, *Nationalism* (London: Phoenix, 1997), 92.

⁸⁶ Gellner, *Nationalism*, 96.

⁸⁷ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 61.

ably precise bureaucratic and technological communication.”⁸⁸ Nationalism is above all the establishment of an anonymous, impersonal society of interchangeable atomized individuals held together by such a common culture as mentioned above, instead of the complex structure of local groups based on folk cultures that were previously reproduced in their own way by small groups at the local level.⁸⁹

4.3. Anthony David Smith and Nationalism as an Ideological Movement

Gellner regards nationalism as a *political doctrine*, for his former student Anthony David Smith (1939-2016) it is an “ideological movement”⁹⁰ because it attains and maintains “autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential nation.”⁹¹ Smith defines nationalism in four steps:

- 1.) The world is divided in to nations, each with its own individuality, history and destiny.
- 2.) The nation is the source of all political and social power, and loyalty to the nation over rides all other allegiances.
- 3.) Human beings must identify with a nation if they want to be free and realize themselves.
- 4.) Nations must be free and secure if peace and justice are to prevail in the world.⁹²

As he sees the modernist approach as a “failure to pay attention to the cultural and symbolic elements that play so important a part in the formation and shape of nations and nationalisms,”⁹³ he thinks that modern nations have their roots in pre-existing ethnic components and names his perspective *ethno-symbolism*.

Ethno-symbolists’ goal is to “trace the role of myths, symbols, values and memories in generating ethnic and national attachments and forging cultural and social networks.”⁹⁴ Therefore, according to Smith, a nation is “a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members.”⁹⁵

Smith divides the ethnic community into two types: vertical and lateral. whereas the vertical type of *ethnie* covers “other social strata and classes [which] were not underpinned by cultural differences: rather, a distinctive historical culture helped to unite different classes around a common heritage and traditions, especially when the latter were under threat from outside,”⁹⁶ lateral *ethnie* is generally “composed of aristocrats and higher clergy, though it might from time to time include bureaucrats, high military officials and the richer merchants.”⁹⁷

⁸⁸ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 57.

⁸⁹ Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 57.

⁹⁰ Anthony David Smith, *National Identity* (London: Penguin, 1991), 73.

⁹¹ Smith, *National Identity*, 73.

⁹² Smith, *National Identity*, 74.

⁹³ Anthony David Smith, *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach* (London: Routledge, 2009), 135.

⁹⁴ Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 224.

⁹⁵ Smith, *National Identity*, 14.

⁹⁶ Smith, *National Identity*, 53.

⁹⁷ Smith, *National Identity*, 53.

Smith knows very well the impossibility of a general or unique model for nationalism. According to him “chameleon-like, nationalism takes its colour from its context,”⁹⁸ and defines nationalism in several ways as shown below:

- 1.) The whole process of forming and maintaining nations or nation-states.
- 2.) A consciousness of belonging to the nation, together with sentiments and aspirations for its security and prosperity.
- 3.) A language and symbolism of the nation and its role.
- 4.) An ideology, including a cultural doctrine of nations and the national will and prescriptions for the realization of national aspirations and the national will.
- 5.) A social and political movement to achieve the goals of the nation and realize its national will.⁹⁹

4.4. Eric Hobsbawm and the Invention of Tradition

Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012) defines *nationalism* and *nation* as “invented traditions.”¹⁰⁰ Hobsbawm sees invented tradition as “a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past.”¹⁰¹ With these invented traditions, rulers could maintain their authority.

Hobsbawm states that there are three important innovations “in terms of the invention of tradition”:¹⁰² “the development of a secular equivalent of the church—primary education [...], the invention of public ceremonies, [...] the mass production of public monuments.”¹⁰³ He says that the modern nation embodies all these innovations. He sees nationalism as “a principle”¹⁰⁴ like Gellner. According to him, there is no point in “discussing nation and nationality [...] before the rise of modern territorial state.”¹⁰⁵ Following the footsteps of Gellner, he says that “nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way round.”¹⁰⁶ Lastly, his prediction made in 1990 about the future of nationalism is also important as he predicts that nationalism “nationalism will decline with the decline of the nation-state,”¹⁰⁷ if that does not happen, being British, Irish, Jewish, or a mix of all these would appear as the only way people can define their identity; however, there would be many other ways that people use for this purpose when appropriate.¹⁰⁸

⁹⁸ Smith, *National Identity*, 79.

⁹⁹ Smith, *National Identity*, 72.

¹⁰⁰ Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions” in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.

¹⁰¹ Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” 1.

¹⁰² Eric Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914” in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 271.

¹⁰³ Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914,” 271.

¹⁰⁴ Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 9.

¹⁰⁵ Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 9.

¹⁰⁶ Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 9.

¹⁰⁷ Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 192.

¹⁰⁸ Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, 192.

4.5. Tom Nairn and Nationalism as Janus

It would be wrong not to mention the Scottish political theorist Professor Tom Nairn (1932-) whose contributions to nationalism studies are invaluable. He is, paradoxically, not in favour of theorizing nationalism because this brings two important faults: “One is a tendency to treat the subject in a one-nation or one-state frame of reference, the second is to take nationalist ideology far too literally and seriously.”¹⁰⁹ As a Marxist himself, he admits that Marxism was unsuccessful to comment on nationalism theory and thinks that this failure was inevitable as “Marxism did not possess the power to foresee this development or the eventual, overall shape which capitalist history would assume.”¹¹⁰ Nationalism is generally about the world political economy created “in the era between the French and Industrial Revolutions and the present day.”¹¹¹

According to Nairn, it is possible to find the origins of nationalism in “the uneven development of history since the eighteenth century,”¹¹² and are “in fact a by-product of the most brutally and hopelessly material side of the history of the last two centuries.”¹¹³ This capitalist development shows “the shambling, fighting, lop-sided, illogical, head-over-heels fact, so to speak, as distinct from the noble uplift and phased amelioration of the ideal.”¹¹⁴ The notion of even-development that was initiated by some West-European states was thought to be “straightforwardly followed, and the institutions responsible for it copied – hence the periphery, the world’s countryside, would catch up with the leaders in due time.”¹¹⁵ However, the result was the opposite:

Instead, the impact of those leading countries was normally experienced as domination and invasion. The spirit of commerce was supposed to take over from the traditional forms of rapine and swindle. But in reality it could not. The gap was too great, and the new developmental forces were not in the hands of a beneficent, disinterested elite concerned with Humanity’s advance.¹¹⁶

Nairn asserts that it is impossible to argue that any nationalism is good or bad and says that nationalism has two faces like the Roman god Janus “who stood above gateways with one face looking forwards and one backwards. Thus does nationalism stand over the passage to modernity, for human society.”¹¹⁷

4.6. Benedict Anderson and Imagined Communities

In 1983 the Irish American political scientist and historian Benedict Anderson (1936-2015) released one of the most-quoted books in nationalism studies, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. He sees nationalism and nationality as “cultural artefacts of a particular kind.”¹¹⁸ In order to understand these terms correctly, one should consider “carefully how they have come into historical being, in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they command such profound emotional

¹⁰⁹ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 93.

¹¹⁰ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 331.

¹¹¹ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 332.

¹¹² Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 333.

¹¹³ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 336.

¹¹⁴ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 337.

¹¹⁵ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 337.

¹¹⁶ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 338.

¹¹⁷ Nairn, *The Break Up of Britain*, 348- 349.

¹¹⁸ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 4.

legitimacy.”¹¹⁹ According to Anderson, these artefacts are the products of the late eighteenth century as a result of a spontaneous distillation process that took place at the intersection of different historical forces; [...] once created they become modular and thus can be grafted onto very different social geographies with different degrees of consciousness, contain or be contained by different political and ideological clusters.¹²⁰

As other theorists do, he starts by defining the term *nation* as “an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”¹²¹ “It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”¹²² This also explains the limited nature of the concept of nationhood. The imagined sovereignty of a nation is created by a desire for freedom in an age of growing worldwide awareness of religious pluralism or scepticism. A nation is an imagined community which is deep and “it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.”¹²³

Benedict Anderson says that it is possible to find nationalism in a community’s cultural roots “by aligning it, not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which—as well as against which—it came into being.”¹²⁴ He gives two examples from the history for these cultural systems: the religious community and the dynastic realm, which both “in their heydays, were taken-for-granted frames of reference, very much as nationality is today.”¹²⁵ This imagined religious community declined mainly for two reasons. The first one was “the effect of the explorations of the non-European world, which mainly but by no means exclusively in Europe abruptly widened the cultural and geographical horizon and hence also men’s conception of possible forms of human life.”¹²⁶

The second was the “gradual demotion of the sacred language itself.”¹²⁷ Latin was the only language taught until the sixteenth century, when more and more books started to be written in other languages.¹²⁸ When people thought the nation to be possible, sacred communities, languages and royal dynastic lineages were declined. The concept of simultaneity was changed from coincidence in sacred eternity to coincidence in a secular scientific timeline. The importance of this transformation for the birth of the imagined community of the nation is evident in two forms of writing which first appeared in the eighteenth century in Europe: “the novel and the newspaper.”¹²⁹ By creating a novel with a plot that includes four characters – a man, a wife, and a mistress who has a lover – a writer shows that it is possible for the wife and mistress, and the man and the lover to live in a society without knowing each other despite being somehow connected.

¹¹⁹ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 4.

¹²⁰ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 4.

¹²¹ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.

¹²² Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6.

¹²³ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 7.

¹²⁴ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 12.

¹²⁵ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 12.

¹²⁶ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 16.

¹²⁷ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 18.

¹²⁸ Kenan Koçak, “The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism” (PhD diss., University of Glasgow, 2015), 78.

¹²⁹ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 16.

Benedict Anderson also claims that the development in printing promoted the spread of nationalist feelings. By 1500, almost twenty million books had been printed, and by 1600, it reached two hundred million.¹³⁰ In order to reach monoglots, publishing houses released cheaper editions, which caused three important factors that contributed to “the rise of national consciousness.”¹³¹ First, Latin was “removed from ecclesiastical and everyday life”¹³² thanks to the Humanists who published out the literature of pre-Christians and disseminated it. “Second was the impact of the Reformation, which, at the same time, owed much of its success to print-capitalism.”¹³³ Martin Luther’s Protestantism led to the creation of many printed books read by “new reading publics – not least among merchants and women, who typically knew little or no Latin – and simultaneously mobilized them for politico-religious purposes.”¹³⁴ The third factor which contributed to the rise of nationalism was that some monarchs started to use vernacular languages for their administration.¹³⁵ These languages, which were codified and standardized through printing, “laid the bases for national consciousnesses.”¹³⁶

Nationalist movements rose at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and this caused “increasing cultural, and therefore political, difficulties for many dynasts [i.e. rulers, though the difference with dynasties is minimal] [...] which had nothing to do with nationalness.”¹³⁷ Therefore, they chose vernacular languages as the language of their states and this created official nationalism which is “a means for combining naturalization with retention of dynastic power, in particular over the huge polyglot domains accumulated since the Middle Ages.”¹³⁸

4.7. Michael Billig and Banal Nationalism

The Judeo-British social psychologist Michael Billig (1947-) approaches nationalism in a new way with a criticism of its association “with those who struggle to create new states or with extreme right-wing politics.”¹³⁹ He thinks that “the crises do not create nation-states as nation states”¹⁴⁰ since nationalism manifests itself daily by producing “a whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices [...] in a banally mundane way.”¹⁴¹ For this very reason, he uses the term *banal nationalism* to “cover the ideological habits which enable the established nations of the West to be reproduced.”¹⁴²

Billig is in favour of Anderson’s idea of the *imagined community* and argues that this *banal nationalism* is produced daily because of the contribution of both politicians and newspapers. With the help of the developments in technology, politicians are now accessible icons, and they now act like celebrities. “Their faces reg-

¹³⁰ Koçak, “The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism,” 78.

¹³¹ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 39.

¹³² Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 39.

¹³³ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 39.

¹³⁴ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 40.

¹³⁵ Koçak, “The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism,” 79.

¹³⁶ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 44.

¹³⁷ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 83.

¹³⁸ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 86. Anderson borrows *official nationalisms* from Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1977), 148.

¹³⁹ Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London: Sage Publications, 1995), 5.

¹⁴⁰ Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 6.

¹⁴¹ Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 6.

¹⁴² Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 6.

ularly appear in the papers and on the televisions screens.”¹⁴³ Today they also appear on newspapers’ websites, and their social media accounts like Twitter, Facebook and Instagram. As they generally are good at public speaking, they act like very patriotic people to evoke nationalistic feelings among the people (and in particular, the electorate) by using keywords such as *we, us, our*, to mean the nation. As politicians do, newspapers also use the first-person plural, which integrates readers and writers of the newspaper in a nation.¹⁴⁴ Most newspapers give a separate section to their national *home news*, and “daily, we, the regular readers, flick our eyes over the directing signs. Without conscious awareness, we find our way around the familiar territory of our newspaper”¹⁴⁵ and assimilate ourselves in the notion of nationhood.

Nevertheless, Billig argues, thanks to conditioning and technological advances in the postmodern era, it is becoming increasingly difficult for nation-states to preserve their sovereignty in the face of superpowers’ supra-national cultural identity. For this reason, Billig claims that nationalism has changed its function.¹⁴⁶ However, Billig argues that conditioning and technological advances in today’s world make it increasingly difficult for nation-states to maintain their authority in the face of the supranational cultural identity of superpowers. For this, Billig says that nationalism is not a force to create and reproduce nation-states, instead, “it is one of the forces which is destroying nations.”¹⁴⁷

Conclusion

As seen above, it is not possible to define nationalism in a single and particular way. When Quintus Horatius Flaccus said he found it sweet and fitting to die for his native land, he was not aware of such a thing as nationalism. It is, for sure, impossible to mention a fixed date for the birth of nationalism; some scholars, including Elie Kedourie, point to the German Romantics of the eighteenth century. Arguably, Kant’s definition of freedom led to the idea of self-determination, which later nations would fight for. Whereas Johann Gottfried von Herder believes that language creates distinctions among nations, Jean-Jacques Rousseau mentions the need for a social contract under which man gets civil freedom. Eleven years after the death of Rousseau, The French Revolution of 1789 enabled nations to demand fundamental rights such as freedom, equality, and sovereignty. British political philosopher John Stuart Mill views the nation as a portion of mankind and nationality as a feeling, whereas for Ernst Renan, a nation is a spiritual thing. Marxism fails to define nationalism precisely. Charlton H. Hayes offers five classifications of modern nationalism: Humanitarian, Jacobin, Traditional, Liberal, and Integral, and Hans Kohn divides nationalism into two groups: Western and Non-western. Edward Hallet Carr sees the nation as a political entity and divides the modern history of international relations into three partly overlapping periods. According to Elie Kedourie, nationalism is a doctrine invented in Europe, but for Ernest Gellner, unlike Kedourie, nationalism is not natural and argues that nationalism is a political principle which holds the political and the national unit congruent. Anthony David Smith, who is the supervisee of Gellner, sees nationalism as an ideological movement because it is the achievement and maintenance of autonomy, unity and identity for the benefit of the population that some members consider a real or potential country. Hobsbawm defines nationalism and nation as invented traditions. Tom Nairn does not find it possible

¹⁴³ Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 96.

¹⁴⁴ Koçak, “The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism,” 81.

¹⁴⁵ Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 119.

¹⁴⁶ Koçak, “The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism,” 81.

¹⁴⁷ Billig, *Banal Nationalism*, 139-140.

to label any nationalism as completely bad or good and likens it to the Roman god Janus who has two faces. Benedict Anderson's definition of a nation is similar to Renan's as Anderson defines the nation as an imagined political community in which members of even the smallest nation do not know other fellow members. Lastly, for Michael Billig, nationalism is manifested daily in a banally mundane way by producing a whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices.

Nevertheless, although it is hard to define what a nation or nationalism is, there are some very similar, or even identical, approaches to it despite centuries between their definitions. German romantics look for a "community of like-minded individuals who would live a full life according to their innermost emotions," John Stuart Mill views the nation as a portion of mankind united around a common sympathy, Renan sees the nation as a soul, a spiritual principle which shares a rich heritage of memories, Otto Bauer considers nation as a community of fate in which people survive by interacting and communicating thanks to mass media which hides national codes in it, Kohn draws attention to a shared history in the creation of a nation, for Gellner, individuals held together by such a common culture create a nation, according to Smith, a nation is "a named human population sharing a historic territory, common myths and historical memories," Hobsbawm thinks that a nation requires certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, Benedict Anderson's nation is an imagined community in which "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them," for Billig a nation produces "a whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices [...] in a banally mundane way." To sum up, it can be reasonably argued that a nation's quintessence is to be found in its culture because everything that creates one's national identity is hidden in the culture s/he lives.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. Ed. London: Verso, 2006.
- Avineri, Shlomo. "Marxism and Nationalism," *Journal of Contemporary History* 26, no: 3 (1991): 637-657.
- Baldik, Chris. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Barnard, Frederic M. "Patriotism and Citizenship in Rousseau: A Dual Theory of Public Willing?," *The Review of Politics* 46, no: 2 (1984): 244-265.
- Bauer, Otto. *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*. Edited by Ephraim J. Nimni, Translated by Joseph O'Donnell, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications, 1995.
- Carr, Edward Hallett. *Nationalism and After*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd, 1945.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- . *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.
- Hayes, Carlton J. H. *Essays on Nationalism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions" in *The Invention of Tradition*, Edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . "Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914" in *The Invention of Tradition*, Edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 263-307. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Horace. *The Odes of Horace*. Translated by Jeffrey H. Kaimowitz. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008.
- Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*. 4th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Kemilainen, Aira. *Nationalism: The Problems concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*. Jyväskylä:

- Kustantajat Publishers, 1964.
- Koçak, Kenan. "The Representation of Middle East Identities in Comics Journalism." PhD diss., University of Glasgow, 2015.
- Kohn, Hans. "Romanticism and the Rise of German Nationalism," *The Review of Politics* 12, no: 4 (1950): 443-472.
- . *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. "The Rights of Nations to Self-Determination" in *Marxist.org*, Accessed June 15, 2022. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/self-det/ch01.htm>
- Mill, John Stuart. "Nationality" in *Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the Present: A Reader*, Edited by Stuart Woolf, 40-47. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Nairn, Tom. *The Break Up of Britain*. London: New Left Books, 1977.
- Nimni, Eprahim. "Great Historical Failure: Marxist Theories of Nationalism," *Capital & Class* 9, (1985): 58-83.
- . *Marxism and Nationalism: Theoretical Origins of a Political Crisis*. London: Pluto Press, 1991.
- Özkırımlı, Umut. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 2000.
- Perica, Vjekoslav. *Balkan Idols: Religion and Nationalism in Yugoslav States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" in *Becoming National: A Reader*, Edited by Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, 42-55. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Translated by Christopher Betts, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1977.
- Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph. "What is the Third Estate?" in *Political Writings*, Translated and Edited by Michael Sonenscher, 92-162. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003.
- Smith, Anthony David. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- . *National Identity*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- . *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- von Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Philosophical Writings*. Translated and edited by Michael N. Forster, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.