

**BALANCING IDENTITY AND LIBERTY:
A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF LIBERAL
NATIONALISM**

**KİMLİK VE ÖZGÜRLÜĞÜ DENGESİLEMEK:
LIBERAL MİLLİYETÇİLİĞİN KAPSAMLI BİR ANALİZİ**

Ali ÇİÇEK

*Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi,
Yıldızeli Meslek Yüksekokulu, Pazarlama ve Reklamcılık Bölümü,
Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Programı,
alicicek@mail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-9875-2400..*

Geliş Tarihi: 3 Ağustos 2024; **Kabul Tarihi:** 13 Ekim 2024

Received: 3 August 2024; **Accepted:** 13 October 2024

ABSTRACT

Nationalism studies examine political and cultural nationalism as fundamental frameworks for understanding nation-building and identity formation. Political nationalism emphasizes the importance of sovereignty, self-determination and governance structures that support these principles. In contrast, cultural nationalism focuses on preserving and promoting shared heritage, language and traditions that define a community's distinctive identity. Liberal nationalism, on the other hand, seeks to balance collective identity with the protection of individual rights and freedoms and seeks to harmonize these elements in a democratic context. Leading thinkers such as Yael Tamir, David Miller and Will Kymlicka have engaged in rigorous debates about the merits and challenges of liberal nationalism. These thinkers address the complexities and tensions that arise in different and pluralistic contexts regarding liberal nationalism and explore its potential to promote inclusive and harmonious societies. One critical debate focuses on the applicability of liberal nationalism, particularly in societies with significant ethnic, cultural and religious diversity. This article aims to fill an important gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of liberal nationalism. It compares this ideology with other forms of nationalism,

such as ethnic and civic nationalism, providing a nuanced understanding of its distinct features and potential benefits. The article also assesses the applicability of liberal nationalism through literature reviews. By examining the theoretical foundations and practical implications of liberal nationalism, this study offers a perspective on its role in contemporary democracies. It highlights how liberal nationalism can be a viable framework for nation-building that respects collective identity and individual rights and offers a balanced approach to governance in increasingly diverse societies.

Keywords: Liberalism, Nationalism, Liberal Nationalism, Identity, Liberty.

ÖZET

Milliyetçilik çalışmaları, ulus inşası ve kimlik oluşumunu anlamak için temel çerçeveler olarak siyasi ve kültürel milliyetçiliği incelemektedir. Siyasi milliyetçilik egemenliğin, kendi kaderini tayin hakkının ve bu ilkeleri destekleyen yönetim yapılarının önemini vurgular. Buna karşılık kültürel milliyetçilik, bir topluluğun kendine özgü kimliğini tanımlayan ortak miras, dil ve geleneklerin korunması ve desteklenmesine odaklanır. Liberal milliyetçilik ise kolektif kimlik ile bireysel hak ve özgürlüklerin korunması arasında denge kurmaya çalışarak bu unsurları demokratik bir bağlamda uyumlaştırmaya çalışmaktadır. Yael Tamir, David Miller ve Will Kymlicka gibi önde gelen düşünürler, liberal milliyetçiliğin yararları ve zorlukları hakkında titiz tartışmalar yürütmektedir. Bu düşünürler, liberal milliyetçiliğe dair farklı ve çoğulcu bağlamlarda ortaya çıkan karmaşıklıkları ve gerilimleri ele alırken, kapsayıcı ve uyumlu toplumları teşvik etme potansiyelini araştırmaktadır. Kritik tartışmalardan biri, özellikle önemli etnik, kültürel ve dini çeşitliliğe sahip toplumlarda liberal milliyetçiliğin uygulanabilirliğine odaklanmaktadır. Bu makale, liberal milliyetçiliğin güçlü ve zayıf yönlerinin kapsamlı bir analizini sunarak literatürdeki önemli bir boşluğu doldurmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu ideolojiyi etnik ve sivil milliyetçilik gibi diğer milliyetçilik biçimleriyle karşılaştırarak farklı özelliklerinin ve potansiyel faydalarının incelikli bir şekilde anlaşılmasını sağlamaktadır. Makale ayrıca, liberal milliyetçiliğin uygulanabilirliğini literatür taramaları ile değerlendirmektedir. Liberal milliyetçiliğin teorik temellerini ve pratik sonuçlarını inceleyen bu çalışma, çağdaş demokrasilerdeki rolüne ilişkin bir perspektif sunmaktadır. Liberal milliyetçiliğin ulus inşası için hem kolektif kimliğe hem de bireysel haklara saygı duyan ve giderek çeşitlenen toplumlarda yönetim için dengeli bir yaklaşım sunan nasıl uygulanabilir bir çerçeve olabileceğini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liberalizm, Milliyetçilik, Liberal Milliyetçilik, Kimlik, Hürriyet.

INTRODUCTION

In the study of nationalism, political and cultural nationalism serve as fundamental frameworks for understanding how nations

and national identities are constructed and maintained. Political nationalism focuses on the sovereignty and self-determination of a nation-state, emphasising political unity and governance. In contrast, cultural nationalism centres on preserving and promoting a nation's cultural heritage, language, and traditions. These concepts are integral to the theory of liberal nationalism, which attempts to synthesise elements of both political and cultural nationalism within a liberal democratic framework. Liberalism and nationalism are two powerful and often antagonistic ideologies of modern political theory. While liberalism emphasises individual rights, freedom and universal values, nationalism usually focuses on collective identity, national autonomy and cultural cohesion. Although these two ideas are often thought to conflict with each other, some important thinkers of modern political theory have developed the concept of 'liberal nationalism' by combining these two ideologies.

Liberal nationalism is an ideology that seeks to balance a nation's collective identity and unity with the protection of individual rights and freedoms. Scholars such as Yael Tamir, David Miller, and Will Kymlicka have extensively debated the merits and limitations of this theory, exploring its potential to harmonise national solidarity with liberal democratic values. Despite its theoretical appeal, liberal nationalism faces criticisms regarding its practical applicability and internal coherence, particularly in multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies. With roots in the traditions of Enlightenment, rationalism, liberalism and republicanism, liberal nationalism was developed by early liberal nationalist political thinkers such as Joh Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan and Giuseppe Mazzini. It is a political conception of nationalism that is compatible with the fundamental values of liberalism such as freedom, equality, tolerance, individual rights and democratic governance, that is xenophobic and inclusive rather than exclusive. Both the early liberal nationalists mentioned above and contemporary liberal nationalists such as Yael Tamir, Davil Miller and Will Kymlicka have sought to justify the value of national identity by arguing that individuals need national identity to lead meaningful autonomous lives, and liberal democracies need national identity to function well (Tok, 2013: 266-67).

Liberal nationalism, a relatively new concept, represents a political approach that both protects individual freedoms and acknowledges the importance of national identity. Proponents of this theory argue that national identity plays a significant role in individuals' social lives and self-realization while asserting that this identity does not conflict with liberal values. Liberal nationalism views national identity not as a tool of oppression, but as a fundamental element of individual freedom and democratic participation. Liberal nationalism contends that nationalism is not inherently aggressive or exclusionary; rather, it creates a sense of community in which individuals can better express themselves. According to this understanding, individuals need a kind of common cultural framework to maintain their social lives, and this framework is often provided through national identity. However, this does not mean advocating for an exclusionary nationalism; on the contrary, it demonstrates that national identity can be compatible with individual rights within the framework of liberal values.

The number of studies on liberal nationalism theory is quite limited. Tamir, Miller and Kymlicka are known as contemporary theorists of liberal nationalism theory. The liberal nationalism theory of these authors will be analysed in detail in the following sections of the study. In addition to these authors, *In Defence of Liberal Nationalism*, Lind (1994) argues that the theory of liberal nationalism makes it possible for nation-states to accommodate different ethnic or cultural groups. In this work, Lind emphasises the right of nations to self-determination through liberal nationalism and opposes the domination of one group over another. The simple idea that every nation should have its own state accompanied by the corollary that one ethnic or cultural group should not collectively rule over another has been the most powerful full political force of the past two hundred years as discussed by the author. Lind argues that nationalism remains a powerful political force on a global scale and that every nation should ideally have its own state. Facilitating this is the liberal theory of nationalism. According to Moore (2001), liberal nationalism theory argues that shared national identity promotes liberal justice and democratic governance, enhancing social justice

and citizen participation within representative institutions. The author examines a prominent normative defence of nationalism, which links shared nationality with the attainment of the goods of liberal justice and democratic governance and argues that there is a close relationship between democracy and shared national identity. According to Moor, the two most important contributions of liberal nationalism to political theory are the following: Shared nationality promotes liberal justice and democratic governance and national identity aids representative institutions and citizen participation.

Hechter (2024) points out that the ideology of nationalism can be quite functional and compatible with a democratic political regime if restraining measures are taken. According to him, nationalism is not an ideology that should be rejected wholesale, and it has often followed a synchronous course with democracy and liberalism. Restraining nationalism and synthesising it with liberalism can offer a political system that can yield very positive results in the age of nation states. For this, he proposes policies such as co-socialisation, various arrangements in electoral systems, federation structures, and strong decentralised structures (Hechter, 2024: 203-230). In line with his proposals, Hechter argues that an inclusive nationalism that is compatible with liberal democracy is possible. Although the author does not diagnose the system that prioritises these nationalist-liberal values as liberal nationalism, his ideas contribute to the theory of liberal nationalism.

Tok (2013), in his study titled *Liberal Nationalism*, argues that nationalism and liberalism have struggled together for the establishment of nation states in the historical process, that the nation state, which is a homogenous political unit, provides the political and social conditions in which liberal democracy can function best, and that under these conditions, liberal nationalism theory can successfully synthesise these two seemingly different political currents. According to Tok, liberal nationalism is an understanding of nationalism based on the universal principles of rationalism, progress and individual autonomy, which are the universal principles of enlightenment, and this understanding adopts the existence of fundamental rights and freedoms based on a common humanity (Tok, 2013: 269). Tok is of the opinion that democracy will be of better quality thanks to the homogeneity of

the nation-state in terms of common national language, culture and identity (2013: 283). Therefore, Tok's study argues that liberalism and nationalism can be synthesised, and a successful model can be put forward.

Although there are some sources in the literature that can be seen as a kind of synthesis of liberalism and nationalism and that these two ideologies can be a model in harmony with each other, there is no work that analyses Tamir, Miller and Kymlicka's arguments for liberal nationalism together by using a comparative method, revealing the similarities and differences in the way contemporary thinkers view this concept. Therefore, it has been determined that there is such a gap in the relevant literature. This article aims to fill a gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of liberal nationalism through the lenses of political and cultural nationalism. It will critically examine liberal nationalism's strengths and weaknesses and compare it to other forms of nationalism. It will also explore whether liberal nationalism can be considered a romantic ideal or a feasible political theory. The methodology involves a thorough review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks and an analysis of historical and contemporary examples. The following sections will delve deeper into the typologies of nationalism, the theoretical underpinnings of liberal nationalism, and the ongoing debates about its viability. This structured approach will offer a nuanced understanding of how liberal nationalism operates at the intersection of political and cultural nationalism and its implications for modern democratic societies.

1. NATION, NATIONALISM AND DISTINGUISHING POLITICAL AND CULTURAL NATIONALISM

The concepts of nation and nationalism are central to understanding the dynamics of identity, sovereignty, and statehood. A nation is often defined as a group of people who share common cultural traits, language, and historical experiences. In contrast, nationalism is the ideological movement that seeks to promote and sustain a nation's interests and identity. Nationalism can be broadly classified into various typologies, including political and cultural nationalism, each with distinct characteristics and objectives. The concepts of nation and nationalism have been

extensively studied, yielding a vast body of literature. Since the 19th century, these topics have remained central to academic inquiry, reflecting their enduring relevance and complexity. Prominent thinkers such as John Stuart Mill, Ernest Renan, Ernest Gellner, Anthony Smith, Hans Kohn, Eric Hobsbawm, Elie Kedourie, Benedict Anderson, and Azar Gat have significantly shaped the discourse on nations and nationalism. Their perspectives have been widely accepted and frequently cited, providing foundational insights into the typologies and theories of nationalism. This study also aims to evaluate these thinkers' perspectives on the concepts of nation and nationalism, examining their views through both cultural and political lenses.

John Stuart Mill, a 19th-century English philosopher, defines nation as *a portion of mankind united amongst themselves by common sympathies which did not exist between them and any others* (Smart, 1992). Mill emphasised the importance of shared identity and collective sentiments, which unite people within a nation. He believed that national identity was crucial for political stability and effective governance and argued that a government was more likely to succeed if it governed a nation rather than just a group of people. Mill's conceptualisation of nationalism leans toward civil nationalism, as he focused on the common political and civic values that unite people rather than ethnic or cultural homogeneity (Grader, 1985).

Ernest Renan, a French historian and philosopher, offers a seminal definition of a nation in his 1882 lecture *What is a Nation?* Renan argued that a nation is *a soul, a spiritual principle* formed by a shared legacy of memories and the will to live together. According to Renan, a nation is not based on race, language, or religion but on its people's shared history and collective experiences. He viewed nationalism as civic nationalism, emphasising individuals' voluntary association and consent to form a political community (Renan, 2018). Renan's definition highlights the importance of collective memory and shared aspirations in forming a national identity.

Ernest Gellner, a 20th-century philosopher and social anthropologist, defines nationalism as *a political principle which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent* (Gellner,

2008). Gellner's theory posits that nationalism is a product of modernity, emerging from the need for social cohesion in industrial societies. He argued that nationalism is rooted in the need for a standardised, homogenised culture that facilitates communication and economic development (Hall, 1998). Gellner's perspective aligns more with civic nationalism, as he emphasised the role of state institutions and cultural homogenisation in forming national identity.

Anthony D. Smith, a prominent British sociologist, defines a nation as *a named human population sharing a historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members* (A. Smith, 2013). Smith's ethno-symbolic approach highlights the importance of shared myths, symbols, and historical memories in constructing national identity. He distinguishes between civic and ethnic nationalism, arguing that modern nations often incorporate elements of both. Smith's work emphasises the deep historical roots and cultural dimensions of nationalism, positioning it as both a political and cultural phenomenon (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994; Smith, 2009).

Hans Kohn, a historian of nationalism, distinguishes between Western civic and Eastern ethnic nationalism. Kohn argues that civic nationalism, prevalent in Western Europe, is based on political and legal equality, citizenship, and shared values. In contrast, ethnic nationalism, common in Eastern Europe, is based on common ancestry, language, and culture. Kohn's definition highlights the ideological differences between civic and ethnic nationalism, emphasising the inclusive, democratic nature and the exclusive, ethnocentric nature of ethnic nationalism (Kohn, 1944).

A Marxist historian, Eric Hobsbawm defined nations as *invented traditions* constructed through social engineering and political manipulation (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1992). Hobsbawm argued that nationalism is a modern phenomenon emerging from the socio-economic transformations of the Industrial Revolution. He viewed nationalism as a tool used by elites to create a sense of unity and legitimacy. Hobsbawm's analysis aligns with civic nationalism, as he emphasises the role of state institutions and political processes in constructing national identity (Hobsbawm, 2021).

Elie Kedourie, a British historian, defined nationalism as a political doctrine that holds that humanity is naturally divided into nations, each with the right to self-determination and sovereign statehood (Kedourie, 1993). Kedourie was critical of nationalism, viewing it as a destructive and irrational force. He argued that nationalism often leads to conflict and exclusion. Kedourie's perspective aligns more with civic nationalism, as he emphasised the political dimensions of nationalism and the principle of national self-determination (Kitromilides, 2005; Ozkirimli, 2017).

A political scientist and historian, Benedict Anderson defined nations as *imagined communities* socially constructed through shared experiences and media consumption (Anderson, 1983). Anderson argued that the rise of print capitalism and mass media facilitated the creation of a shared national consciousness. He emphasised the role of cultural and symbolic elements in constructing national identity. Anderson's definition is compatible with both civic and cultural nationalism as it emphasizes the importance of shared experiences and cultural production in the formation of national communities.

Azar Gat, a historian and political scientist, offers an evolutionary perspective on nationalism. He argues that nationalism is rooted in deep-seated human instincts for group solidarity and territoriality and that modern nationalism emerged from combining these ancient instincts with political and economic conditions (Gat, 2012). Gat's perspective bridges the gap between civic and ethnic nationalism, as he acknowledges the role of cultural heritage and political institutions in forming national identity.

These thinkers offer diverse and nuanced perspectives on nation and nationalism. While some, like Mill and Gellner, emphasise the civic and political dimensions, others, like Renan and Smith, highlight the cultural and historical foundations. The ongoing debate among these scholars reflects the complexity of nationalism as a social and political phenomenon, demonstrating its multifaceted nature and the interplay between civic and cultural elements. Understanding these perspectives is crucial for analysing contemporary nationalist movements and their implications for global politics. From this perspective, providing a detailed analysis of political and cultural nationalism will facilitate a better

understanding of the foundational grounds upon which the theorists above base their ideas.

Political nationalism emphasises creating and maintaining a sovereign state for a particular nation. It focuses on political unity, self-determination, and the governance structures necessary to achieve these goals (Çiçek & Taylan, 2023; Spencer, 2014). This form of nationalism is often associated with the establishment of nation-states and the pursuit of political autonomy. Thinkers such as John Stuart Mill and Ernest Gellner have contributed significantly to the discourse on political nationalism, highlighting its role in forming modern states and political identities. In contrast, cultural nationalism prioritises preserving and promoting a nation's cultural heritage, language, and traditions. It is concerned with maintaining a nation's distinct cultural identity, often in the face of external influences and internal diversity. Cultural nationalists argue that a solid cultural foundation is essential for a nation's survival and flourishing (Spencer, 2014). This perspective is evident in the works of Johann Gottfried Herder and Anthony D. Smith, who emphasise the importance of shared cultural symbols and practices in fostering national cohesion.

While political and cultural nationalism are often intertwined, they can be distinguished by their primary focus and objectives. Political nationalism is primarily concerned with the political and territorial aspects of nationhood, advocating for establishing and preserving a nation-state. Cultural nationalism, on the other hand, is more focused on the cultural and social dimensions of national identity, seeking to nurture and sustain a nation's cultural heritage (Uzun, 2020).

These distinctions are not mutually exclusive; they often complement each other. For instance, a political nationalist movement may draw on cultural symbols and traditions to rally support for political objectives. In contrast, a cultural nationalist agenda may seek political recognition and protection for cultural practices and institutions. The interplay between political and cultural nationalism is crucial for understanding the multifaceted nature of national identity and how it can be expressed and sustained.

2. UNDERSTANDING LIBERAL NATIONALISM

Liberal nationalism, a concept developed to reconcile the seemingly contradictory ideologies of liberalism and nationalism, is grounded in the belief that a national community can serve as a context where liberal principles can flourish. Drawing on the works of scholars like Yael Tamir, particularly her books *Liberal Nationalism* (1993) and *Why Nationalism* (Tamir & Rodrik, 2019), this approach posits that national identity and cultural membership are vital for the promotion and sustenance of liberal democratic values. Liberal nationalists argue that a sense of national belonging provides the social cohesion necessary for the functioning of a democratic state, enabling individuals to exercise their rights and freedoms within a stable and supportive community.

Central to liberal nationalism is the notion that national identity does not inherently conflict with liberal values such as individual rights, equality, and democratic participation. Tamir emphasises that when understood as a voluntary affiliation based on shared culture, language, and history, national identity can enhance the civic virtues required for a healthy democracy. This view contrasts sharply with more exclusionary or ethnic-based forms of nationalism, which often prioritise homogeneity and can undermine liberal democratic principles by marginalising or discriminating against those who do not fit the national mould.

One of the critical distinctions of liberal nationalism from other forms of nationalism lies in its inclusive and civic-oriented nature. Unlike ethnic nationalism, which connects national identity to ethnicity, race, or descent, liberal nationalism bases belonging on shared political values and civic participation (Moore, 1999; Tamir, 1993). This civic dimension allows for a more inclusive form of nationalism that accommodates a political community's diversity. Tamir and other proponents argue that this form of nationalism supports liberal democracy by fostering a sense of solidarity and mutual responsibility among citizens, essential for collective decision-making and social justice. Another distinguishing feature of liberal nationalism is its commitment to individual rights and the rule of law. Unlike authoritarian or illiberal nationalisms that may prioritise state power or collective goals over individual freedoms, liberal nationalism insists that national identity must be compatible

with protecting individual liberties. This entails a balance between collective national identity and individual autonomy, ensuring that the state respects and upholds the rights of all citizens, regardless of their background or beliefs. Tamir's work underscores that liberal nationalism seeks to create a political culture where individuals can freely express their identities while contributing to the common good (Tamir, 1993: 11).

Liberal nationalism also differs from other forms of nationalism in its approach to cultural preservation and multiculturalism. While traditional nationalists might resist cultural pluralism, liberal nationalists advocate for multiculturalism that respects and protects cultural diversity within a shared national identity framework. This approach recognises the importance of cultural heritage and the need for minority cultures to thrive within the nation-state, thus promoting social harmony and integration rather than division (Couture et al., 1996). Tamir's writings highlight that a nation can be both culturally rich and unified by common political values and institutions. In addition, liberal nationalism's emphasis on democratic participation and civic education sets it apart from other nationalisms that might rely on coercion or propaganda to maintain national unity. Liberal nationalists argue that fostering a sense of national identity through democratic means—such as inclusive civic education, public deliberation, and participatory governance—ensures that national loyalty is freely chosen and not imposed. This voluntary aspect of national identity aligns with liberal principles of freedom and consent, reinforcing the legitimacy and stability of the democratic state (Kaufmann, 2000; Tamir, 1993).

Moreover, liberal nationalism's vision of the nation-state as a vehicle for achieving social justice and economic equality marks another point of differentiation. While some nationalisms may focus primarily on cultural or territorial claims, liberal nationalism concerns how national identity can support broader social and economic goals. This includes advocating for policies that reduce inequality and promote social welfare, ensuring that all members of the national community have the opportunity to thrive. Tamir's analysis suggests that a just nation is one where national solidarity translates into tangible benefits for all citizens, enhancing

individual and collective well-being (Tamir, 1993; Tamir & Rodrik, 2019). In conclusion, liberal nationalism presents a nuanced and inclusive national identity harmonising with liberal democratic values. Emphasising civic participation, individual rights, cultural pluralism, and social justice offers a compelling alternative to more exclusionary or authoritarian forms of nationalism. Tamir's work provides a robust theoretical foundation for understanding how national identity a source of unity and strength in a diverse and democratic society can be, highlighting the potential for nationalism to support rather than undermine liberal ideals. This theoretical framework invites further exploration and application in contemporary political contexts, where the challenges of globalisation and multiculturalism call for innovative approaches to national identity and civic belonging.

The theories of liberal nationalism proposed by Yael Tamir, David Miller, and Will Kymlicka hold significant importance in the literature due to their innovative integration of liberal values with nationalist principles. These scholars argue that national identity and cultural cohesion can coexist with the liberal commitment to individual rights and equality. Tamir, for instance, emphasises the moral importance of national identity for personal autonomy and collective self-determination, arguing that a sense of belonging to a national community enriches individual lives (Tamir, 1993: 57). Miller asserts that national identity fosters social justice and democratic engagement, enhancing citizens' willingness to support redistributive policies and participate in civic duties (Miller, 1995). Kymlicka, on the other hand, focuses on the role of cultural membership in securing individuals' autonomy and well-being, positing that minority rights within a liberal framework can preserve cultural diversity while upholding liberal democratic values (Kymlicka, 1996: 96-97; Tomasi, 1995).

The theories of Tamir, Miller, and Kymlicka address critical questions about the compatibility of nationalism with liberalism, offering a normative framework that reconciles national loyalty with liberal principles. These scholars respond to the challenges posed by globalisation and multiculturalism, advocating for a form of nationalism that is inclusive and respectful of diversity. Their work is pivotal in providing a theoretical basis for understanding

how national identity can be harmonised with the rights of individuals in a pluralistic society. By doing so, they contribute to contemporary debates on citizenship, multiculturalism, and the role of the nation-state in a globalised world, making their theories essential for scholars and policymakers seeking to navigate the complexities of national identity in modern liberal democracies.

2.1. Yael Tamir's Theory of Liberal Nationalism

Yael Tamir's exploration of liberal nationalism offers an insightful approach to reconciling the seemingly conflicting principles of national identity and liberal democracy. In her foundational work *Liberal Nationalism*, Tamir proposes that national identity is not merely a cultural or political construct but a fundamental element of individual self-fulfilment. She argues that individuals find a significant portion of their identity in their national affiliation, which imbues their lives with a sense of belonging, direction, and purpose (Tamir, 1993: 26). This connection between the individual and the nation is essential, Tamir contends, because it allows people to feel anchored within a broader social context. Without this sense of belonging, individuals may struggle to achieve personal development and a deep sense of fulfilment (Tamir, 1993: 19). Tamir's assertion that national identity is a source of personal and social cohesion underscores her belief that liberalism and nationalism are not mutually exclusive. Contrary to classical liberal thinkers who view nationalism as inherently illiberal and hostile to individual rights, Tamir emphasizes that nationalism, when properly construed, can enhance both individual autonomy and collective well-being. In fact, she posits that a well-constructed national identity, one that is inclusive and respectful of diversity, can bolster the very foundations of liberal democracy (Tamir, 1993: 6). National identity, in this context, is not an impediment to individual freedoms but rather a vehicle through which citizens can develop a sense of solidarity and mutual trust elements that are indispensable for the smooth functioning of any democratic society (Lorberbaum, 1994: 237).

The nation in Tamir's imagination is based on a group becoming self-aware and acting in a *sense of we* (Tamir, 1993: 65). A set of common objective characteristics of a nation such as religion, territory, language are sufficient for a *sense of we*. For this reason, the

members of a nation are thought to constitute a privileged cultural community, a fraternal community that is conscious of its own specific existence. According to Tamir, this fraternity emerges when the national community sees itself as a community of common destiny and origin (1993: 86). Each member of this nation consciously chooses to belong to it, and this plebiscite is renewed every day. This is why nations are considered cultural groups that are the product not only of history but also of human will (Kirloskar-Steinbach, 2001: 109). One of the most striking features of Tamir's theory is her insistence that national identity does not have to conflict with liberal democratic values such as individual rights and freedoms. In her view, these two concepts can and should be harmonized (Perry, 2014: 2). The key, she argues, is to cultivate a form of national identity that is inclusive, open, and based on mutual respect. This kind of national identity does not seek to erase differences or enforce homogeneity but rather to provide a common framework within which diverse groups can coexist and flourish. Tamir envisions a society where individuals enjoy the autonomy to express their personal identities while simultaneously feeling a deep connection to a larger national community. This dual sense of belonging – to oneself and to the nation – is, for Tamir, the hallmark of a healthy and functioning liberal democracy (Tamir, 2019: 425-26).

Moreover, Tamir addresses the long-standing criticisms often levelled against nationalism, particularly the accusation that nationalism is inherently exclusionary and discriminatory. She acknowledges that nationalism has, in many historical instances, been associated with xenophobia, racism, and authoritarianism. However, she argues that these negative outcomes are not the inevitable result of nationalism itself but rather of *illiberal* nationalism – forms of nationalism that are rooted in exclusionary, chauvinistic, or authoritarian ideologies. In contrast, liberal nationalism, as Tamir conceives it, can avoid these pitfalls by adhering to the core liberal principles of justice, equality, and respect for individual rights (Berezin, 2022: 243).

Tamir's liberal nationalism, therefore, represents a significant departure from more conventional, illiberal forms of nationalism that prioritize the nation's interests at the expense of marginalized

or minority groups. She insists that it is possible to foster a sense of national solidarity without resorting to exclusionary practices. For Tamir, the challenge lies in constructing a national identity that is both meaningful and inclusive - one that provides individuals with a sense of belonging while also respecting cultural diversity and promoting social justice (Tamir, 1993: 99-100). This vision of nationalism, rooted in liberal democratic principles, offers a path toward a more cohesive, yet pluralistic, society. A crucial aspect of Tamir's argument is her belief that national identity can serve as a powerful tool for promoting social justice. She contends that a shared national identity can help to bridge the gap between different social, ethnic, and cultural groups, fostering a sense of common purpose and mutual obligation. By encouraging citizens to view themselves as part of a larger national community, liberal nationalism can help to combat social fragmentation and inequality (Tamir, 1993: 11). Tamir is careful to note, however, that this form of nationalism must be constructed carefully, with a firm commitment to the principles of justice and equality. National identity, in her view, should not be used as a pretext for excluding or marginalizing certain groups but should instead be a unifying force that brings people together (Kirloskar-Steinbach, 2001: 112).

Tamir's approach to liberal nationalism also challenges the assumption that nationalism is inherently backward-looking or reactionary. While many critics of nationalism argue that it is a relic of the past, rooted in antiquated notions of ethnic or cultural homogeneity, Tamir sees it as a forward-looking and progressive force. In her view, nationalism can play a vital role in the modern world by helping individuals navigate the complexities of globalization and multiculturalism. By providing a sense of belonging and stability in an increasingly interconnected and diverse world, national identity can help individuals maintain a sense of continuity and purpose in their lives (Tamir, 1993: 29). In contrast to the pessimistic view that nationalism necessarily leads to conflict and division, Tamir offers a more optimistic vision. She believes that liberal nationalism, when properly articulated, can foster a sense of shared identity and mutual respect that transcends the differences between individuals and groups. This, in turn, can promote social solidarity and cohesion, making it easier for liberal

democratic societies to address the challenges posed by diversity and pluralism. For Tamir, the key is to ensure that national identity is inclusive, flexible, and adaptable – capable of accommodating a wide range of cultural, ethnic, and religious differences while still providing a sense of common purpose and belonging (Tamir, 1993: 70).

Another critical element of Tamir’s theory is her emphasis on the role of the state in shaping national identity. She argues that the state has a responsibility to construct and promote a national identity that reflects the values of liberal democracy. This means that the state must actively work to ensure that national identity is inclusive, egalitarian, and respectful of diversity. It must also provide the institutional framework necessary for individuals to express their personal identities while simultaneously fostering a sense of shared belonging (Tamir, 1993: 62). In this way, Tamir sees the state as playing a central role in the construction of a liberal national identity.

Tamir’s theory also has important implications for contemporary debates about multiculturalism and immigration. She argues that liberal nationalism can provide a framework for integrating immigrants into the national community without requiring them to abandon their cultural identities. By promoting a national identity that is inclusive and respectful of diversity, liberal nationalism can help to create a society in which individuals from different cultural backgrounds can coexist and contribute to the common good. This, in turn, can help to address the tensions and challenges that often arise in multicultural societies (Tamir, 1993: 158-63). In summary, Tamir’s theory of liberal nationalism offers a compelling and nuanced argument for the compatibility of national identity with liberal democratic values. She provides a framework for understanding how national identity can contribute to individual and collective well-being without compromising the principles of justice, equality, and respect for diversity. By advocating for an inclusive and respectful approach to national identity, Tamir’s theory addresses many of the criticisms traditionally levelled against nationalism. It provides a vision for a harmonious and cohesive society in which individuals can enjoy

both personal autonomy and a sense of belonging to a larger national community.

2.2. David Miller's Perspective on Liberal Nationalism

David Miller, another critical proponent of liberal nationalism, offers a robust defence of the ideology in his work *On Nationality*. Miller emphasises the importance of national identity for social justice and political stability. He argues that a shared national identity can foster trust and cooperation among citizens, which are essential for the functioning of a liberal democracy. According to Miller, national identity provides a framework for individuals to understand their place in society and their responsibilities towards others (Miller, 1993: 14). David Miller, a pivotal figure in the discourse on liberal nationalism, offers a thorough defence of the ideology through his exploration of the relationship between national identity, social justice, and political stability. In *On Nationality*, Miller argues that national identity plays a fundamental role in fostering trust and cooperation among citizens, both of which are essential for the smooth functioning of a liberal democratic state. Miller's approach highlights the political and moral implications of national identity, stressing that it is not merely a cultural construct but a framework that allows individuals to understand their place within society and their responsibilities toward their fellow citizens (Miller, 1995: 91).

One of the central tenets of Miller's argument is that a shared national identity provides the necessary foundation for social solidarity. He contends that citizens who share a national identity are more likely to trust one another and cooperate in the pursuit of common goals. This sense of mutual trust and cooperation, Miller argues, is indispensable for the realisation of social justice. Without a shared identity that fosters a sense of belonging and mutual obligations, citizens may be less willing to support policies that promote the common good. National identity, therefore, serves as a crucial mechanism for generating the kind of social cohesion necessary for a just and stable society (Miller, 2008). Miller's notion of national identity is deeply intertwined with his broader vision of social justice. He argues that liberal nationalism can provide the ethical foundation upon which a just society can be built. According to Miller, the pursuit of social justice requires a shared sense of

commitment to the common good, which can only be sustained if individuals feel a strong connection to their national community. National identity, in this sense, becomes a moral imperative—it is the source of the mutual obligations that bind citizens together in a shared project of societal well-being. By fostering this sense of shared responsibility, national identity can encourage citizens to support redistributive policies and other measures designed to promote social justice (Miller, 1995: 17-28).

One of the key contributions of Miller's work is his exploration of how liberal nationalism can address the challenges posed by multiculturalism and cultural diversity. In an increasingly globalised and multicultural world, many liberal theorists have expressed concern that nationalism is inherently exclusionary and incompatible with the principles of liberal democracy. However, Miller rejects this view, arguing that a cohesive national identity can, in fact, accommodate cultural diversity. For Miller, the key to balancing cultural diversity and national unity lies in the promotion of common values and principles that all citizens, regardless of their cultural background, can share. This shared framework of values, he argues, is essential for maintaining social cohesion and political stability (Miller, 2008: 3).

Miller's approach to multiculturalism within the context of liberal nationalism reflects a nuanced understanding of the importance of both diversity and unity. While he acknowledges the importance of preserving cultural diversity, he also insists that a shared national identity is necessary for creating a sense of belonging and mutual trust among citizens. Without this shared identity, Miller warns, societies may become fragmented and unable to address the collective challenges they face. Thus, for Miller, liberal nationalism offers a way to balance the realities of cultural diversity with the need for national unity, ensuring that all citizens feel a sense of belonging to the national community (Miller, 1995). Moreover, Miller's theory of liberal nationalism challenges the notion that national identity is inherently parochial or exclusionary. He argues that national identity, when properly constructed, can be inclusive and egalitarian. In his view, the key is to ensure that national identity is based on shared political values rather than ethnic or cultural homogeneity. By promoting a form of

national identity that is rooted in liberal democratic values, such as justice, equality, and mutual respect, Miller believes that liberal nationalism can avoid the exclusionary tendencies that have plagued other forms of nationalism throughout history. This approach, Miller contends, allows liberal nationalism to provide the ethical framework needed to address the complex challenges of cultural diversity and social justice in modern democratic societies (Miller, 2008: 7).

In Miller's framework, the role of the state is crucial in promoting and sustaining a shared national identity. He argues that the state has a responsibility to cultivate a sense of national belonging among its citizens by promoting common values and principles that reflect the ideals of liberal democracy. This involves not only protecting individual rights and freedoms but also fostering a sense of mutual trust and cooperation among citizens. By doing so, the state can help to create the conditions necessary for social solidarity and political stability. Miller's emphasis on the role of the state highlights the importance of institutional support for liberal nationalism, particularly in multicultural societies where maintaining social cohesion can be challenging (Miller, 1995: 87-88).

Miller's defence of liberal nationalism also offers a response to critics who argue that nationalism is incompatible with individual autonomy. He contends that national identity, far from being a threat to individual freedom, can actually enhance personal autonomy by providing individuals with a sense of belonging and purpose. In Miller's view, individuals are more likely to flourish when they feel connected to a larger community that shares their values and principles. National identity, therefore, can be a source of personal empowerment, allowing individuals to navigate the complexities of modern life with a greater sense of confidence and security. This connection between national identity and individual autonomy is central to Miller's vision of a just and stable society (Miller, 2008). Furthermore, Miller's conception of liberal nationalism is deeply rooted in the principles of justice and equality. He argues that national identity, when constructed within the framework of liberal democratic values, can promote social justice by fostering a sense of mutual responsibility among citizens. This sense of responsibility, in turn, can encourage citizens to support

policies that address social inequalities and promote the common good. By integrating the principles of justice and equality with the realities of national identity, Miller's theory of liberal nationalism offers a powerful argument for the compatibility of nationalism with liberal democratic ideals (Miller, 1995).

Miller's work also addresses the potential for conflict between national identity and global citizenship. While he acknowledges the importance of global cooperation in addressing transnational challenges, such as climate change and human rights, Miller argues that national identity remains a crucial component of individual and collective life. He contends that global citizenship, while important, cannot replace the deep sense of belonging and mutual obligation that national identity provides. For Miller, the challenge is to find a balance between the demands of national identity and the imperatives of global cooperation. Liberal nationalism, he argues, offers a way to navigate this tension by providing a framework for understanding how national identity can coexist with global responsibilities (Miller, 2008: 11). In summary, David Miller's theory of liberal nationalism provides a compelling argument for the importance of national identity in promoting social justice and political stability. He offers a robust defence of the idea that national identity, when constructed inclusively and rooted in liberal democratic values, can foster mutual trust, cooperation, and social solidarity. Miller's perspective highlights the potential of liberal nationalism to address the challenges of cultural diversity and social justice, offering a framework for understanding how national identity can contribute to the common good. His work provides a powerful rebuttal to critics who argue that nationalism is inherently exclusionary or incompatible with liberal democracy, demonstrating that national identity can, in fact, be a force for justice, equality, and social cohesion (Miller, 1995).

2.3. Will Kymlicka's Contribution to Liberal Nationalism

Will Kymlicka's contribution to the discussion of liberal nationalism introduces a significant shift in how multiculturalism and cultural diversity can coexist within a liberal democratic framework. In *Multicultural Citizenship*, Kymlicka extends the traditional notion of liberal nationalism by arguing that it is possible to construct a national identity that not only tolerates but actively

accommodates the cultural differences of minority groups. His work offers a pathway for integrating cultural diversity without sacrificing the values of liberal democracy, which he sees as essential for promoting social integration and cohesion. Kymlicka believes that recognising and respecting cultural diversity can strengthen national unity rather than fragment it, an idea that distinguishes his approach from more traditional views of nationalism (Kymlicka, 1996: 61). One of Kymlicka's core ideas is that national identity can and should be built on principles that recognise cultural pluralism (Konak, 2020: 87). Unlike classical notions of nationalism, which often seek to homogenise society through assimilation, Kymlicka's theory of liberal nationalism is grounded in a pluralistic and tolerant approach. He argues that cultural recognition is crucial for the well-being and dignity of individuals, particularly members of ethnic and national minorities. By ensuring that cultural identities are respected within the broader national framework, individuals can fully participate in national life without abandoning their cultural heritage (Kymlicka, 1996: 83-84). This form of liberal nationalism thus creates a balance between individual rights and collective identities, avoiding the pitfalls of assimilationist policies that often alienate minority groups.

Kymlicka's argument for group-differentiated rights is one of the most innovative aspects of his theory. He proposes that, within a liberal democracy, it is possible to have rights that are specific to ethnic or national minorities without undermining the principles of equality and justice. For Kymlicka, the liberal conception of justice must be broad enough to include special protections for minority cultures, ensuring their survival and flourishing within the national context (Kymlicka, 1996: 26). This is a departure from more statist forms of nationalism, where the nation is often equated with a homogeneous cultural identity. Instead, Kymlicka promotes a vision of nationalism that is inclusive and open to diversity, allowing for the coexistence of multiple cultural communities within a single national framework. In line with this, Kymlicka redefines the concept of the nation itself. Drawing from Max Weber, he views nations as historical communities that have a shared territory, language, and mass culture. However, rather than demanding that these communities conform to a singular cultural

identity, Kymlicka argues that liberal nationalism should respect and accommodate their diversity (Kymlicka & Norman, 2000: 1). His theory sets out several key principles for how liberal nationalism should function: it must show sensitivity to other cultural expressions, promote openness in the articulation of citizenship rights, and avoid threatening minority communities with forced assimilation. By adhering to these principles, Kymlicka envisions a form of civic nationalism that is inclusive and respectful of cultural differences, aligning it with liberal democratic values (Kymlicka, 1996: 39-41).

Kymlicka's pluralistic view of liberal nationalism also addresses the practical challenges posed by multiculturalism. He recognises that tensions can arise between the desire for a unified national identity and the need to respect cultural diversity. However, he believes that these conflicts can be mitigated by constructing a national identity that is inclusive of all cultural groups. This requires promoting a common set of values and principles – such as justice, equality, and respect for human rights – that all citizens can share, regardless of their cultural background (Piper, 2002). By doing so, Kymlicka argues that liberal nationalism can create a sense of unity and belonging without erasing the distinct identities of minority groups. Moreover, Kymlicka emphasises that the integration of minority cultures into the national framework does not mean subordinating them to the majority culture. Instead, he advocates for a model where different cultural groups are seen as equal participants in the national community. This allows for a sense of belonging and inclusion that is not contingent upon cultural conformity. For Kymlicka, this approach to liberal nationalism is the best way to ensure that all citizens, regardless of their cultural background, can feel a genuine sense of attachment to the nation. This is especially important in multicultural societies, where the failure to accommodate diversity can lead to social fragmentation and political instability (Kymlicka, 1996: 212).

Kymlicka's theory also highlights the ethical dimension of cultural recognition. He argues that recognising and accommodating cultural diversity is not merely a practical necessity for social cohesion but a moral imperative. In his view, liberal

democracies have a duty to ensure that all citizens, particularly those from minority groups, have the opportunity to maintain their cultural identities while participating fully in the national community. This emphasis on cultural recognition aligns with Kymlicka's broader commitment to justice and equality, as he believes that cultural diversity should be seen as a valuable resource for society rather than a problem to be solved (Tok, 2003). Through this lens, Kymlicka's liberal nationalism offers a framework for addressing the challenges of multiculturalism while upholding the principles of liberal democracy. He contends that policies designed to recognise and accommodate cultural diversity are essential for fostering a sense of belonging and inclusion among all citizens. In his view, the failure to provide such recognition can lead to alienation and social disintegration, which ultimately weakens the fabric of the national community. Therefore, Kymlicka's liberal nationalism is not only compatible with multiculturalism but is also necessary for its success.

One of the most compelling aspects of Kymlicka's theory is its ability to provide a comprehensive response to the critics of multiculturalism who argue that it undermines national unity. By promoting an inclusive national identity that respects cultural differences, Kymlicka's liberal nationalism addresses these concerns head-on. He argues that, far from eroding national unity, cultural recognition strengthens it by creating a more inclusive and cohesive society. In this way, Kymlicka's theory provides a robust defence of liberal nationalism in the context of multicultural societies, showing that it can be a force for social integration and cohesion rather than division (Kymlicka, 1998: 144). Furthermore, Kymlicka's work provides a clear framework for how national identity can be constructed in a way that is both inclusive and respectful of diversity. He advocates for policies that promote civic integration while allowing minority groups to maintain their cultural distinctiveness. By doing so, Kymlicka believes that liberal nationalism can create a more harmonious society, where all citizens feel valued and included. This vision of a multicultural liberal democracy is one of the key contributions of Kymlicka's theory, and it remains highly relevant in today's increasingly diverse societies (İnaç & Ünal, 2013; Konak, 2020).

In conclusion, Will Kymlicka's contribution to liberal nationalism offers a nuanced and inclusive approach to the challenges of multiculturalism and cultural diversity. By advocating for a form of liberal nationalism that recognises and accommodates cultural differences, Kymlicka provides a framework for constructing a national identity that is both cohesive and pluralistic. His theory highlights the potential of liberal nationalism to foster social integration and cohesion while upholding the principles of justice, equality, and individual rights. Kymlicka's work remains an essential contribution to the ongoing debate about the role of national identity in multicultural societies, offering a vision of liberal nationalism that is both morally compelling and politically feasible.

3. IS LIBERAL NATIONALISM A UTOPIA? THE REALIZABILITY OF LIBERAL NATIONALISM

Whether liberal nationalism is a utopian ideal or a realisable political theory is a subject of ongoing debate among scholars. Proponents of liberal nationalism argue that it offers a practical and balanced approach to national identity and democratic governance, capable of addressing the complexities of modern, multicultural societies. They contend that liberal nationalism can create a cohesive and inclusive national community by integrating the principles of liberal democracy with a sense of national solidarity. Yael Tamir, for instance, emphasises that liberal nationalism can promote both collective and individual well-being by ensuring that national identity is inclusive and respectful of diversity. She argues that a well-constructed national identity can foster social solidarity and trust among citizens, which are essential for the functioning of a liberal democracy. Similarly, David Miller contends that a shared national identity can provide the basis for social justice and political stability, promoting mutual trust and cooperation among citizens. However, critics argue that liberal nationalism may be inherently utopian, given its challenges and contradictions in practice. One of the primary criticisms is its potential for internal contradictions, particularly in balancing national identity demands with the protection of individual rights. Critics argue that the emphasis on national identity may lead to exclusionary practices and discrimination against minority groups, thus undermining the

principles of liberal democracy. Additionally, the focus on national solidarity may conflict with the liberal emphasis on individual autonomy and personal freedoms (Mason, 1999; Scavenius, 2017).

Another challenge is the practical applicability of liberal nationalism in diverse and complex societies. Constructing a unified national identity inclusive and respectful of diversity is difficult, particularly in societies with deep-seated ethnic, cultural, and religious divisions. The tension between national unity and cultural diversity remains a central concern for liberal nationalism, raising questions about its feasibility and sustainability in the real world (Chin, 2021). Furthermore, the historical and contemporary examples of nationalist movements often reveal the difficulties in achieving the ideals of liberal nationalism. In many cases, nationalist movements have resorted to exclusionary practices and policies that undermine the principles of justice and equality. The challenges of integrating cultural diversity and promoting social cohesion within a unified national framework highlight the complexities of realising the ideals of liberal nationalism.

Despite these challenges, proponents of liberal nationalism argue that it remains a valuable theoretical framework for understanding and addressing the complexities of national identity and democratic governance. They contend that the principles of liberal nationalism can provide a guide for constructing a cohesive and inclusive national community, even if the ideal may be difficult to achieve in practice fully. By promoting a balance between individual rights and collective identity, liberal nationalism offers a vision for a harmonious and just society. In conclusion, the debate over the realizability of liberal nationalism highlights the challenges and complexities of integrating national identity with liberal democratic principles. While the ideals of liberal nationalism may be challenging to achieve in practice fully, the framework provides a valuable guide for understanding the interplay between national identity and democratic governance. Further research and analysis are needed to explore the potential of liberal nationalism to address the challenges of cultural diversity and social justice in modern, multicultural societies.

CONCLUSION

In exploring the theories of liberal nationalism put forth by Yael Tamir, David Miller, and Will Kymlicka, this essay has highlighted the significant contributions each thinker has made to reconciling national identity with the core principles of liberal democracy. These scholars offer complementary perspectives, each addressing distinct dimensions of how liberal nationalism can function in diverse, modern societies. However, the divergences in their approaches also provide a nuanced understanding of the complexity of balancing national identity and individual rights within a liberal framework. Yael Tamir's theory emphasizes the moral and psychological importance of national identity for both individuals and society. Tamir asserts that a well-constructed national identity is not in conflict with liberal values but is instead essential for promoting personal autonomy and fostering democratic participation. Her argument hinges on the belief that individuals need to feel connected to a larger national community to live fulfilling lives. In her vision, liberal nationalism is inclusive, fostering social solidarity while respecting diversity. Tamir's work stands out for her insistence that national identity, when constructed inclusively, can play a progressive and unifying role in liberal democracies. David Miller, on the other hand, focuses more on the ethical and political dimensions of national identity, particularly in relation to social justice. Miller views national identity as a foundation for fostering trust and cooperation among citizens, which are essential for the functioning of a liberal democracy. His theory posits that a shared national identity creates the social cohesion necessary for individuals to engage in collective decision-making and support redistributive policies. For Miller, liberal nationalism is essential for promoting social justice and political stability. Unlike Tamir, whose focus is on personal autonomy within a national context, Miller's emphasis is on the role of national identity in ensuring the collective well-being of society. Will Kymlicka, meanwhile, extends the debate by focusing on how liberal nationalism can accommodate cultural diversity within a unified national framework. Kymlicka argues that liberal nationalism must not only tolerate but actively accommodate the

cultural differences of minority groups. His concept of multicultural citizenship provides a framework for integrating cultural diversity without undermining the core principles of liberal democracy. Kymlicka's theory emphasizes the moral imperative of cultural recognition, asserting that individuals can only participate fully in national life if their cultural identities are respected. His approach adds an essential layer to the discussion by addressing the challenges of multiculturalism in liberal democracies, which both Tamir and Miller do not explore as deeply.

Despite their different focal points, these three theorists share a common belief in the importance of national identity for the functioning of liberal democracies. Each sees national identity as a vehicle for promoting social cohesion, democratic engagement, and individual autonomy. However, they differ in how they conceptualize the role of national identity in relation to individual rights. Tamir places a strong emphasis on the psychological and emotional aspects of belonging, while Miller is more concerned with the political and ethical implications of national solidarity. Kymlicka, in contrast, focuses on the structural accommodations necessary for integrating cultural diversity within a national framework. Their theories complement one another in significant ways. Tamir's focus on inclusivity and personal autonomy provides a strong moral foundation for understanding the role of national identity in liberal democracies. Miller's emphasis on social justice and political stability offers a practical framework for how national identity can support the functioning of democratic institutions. Kymlicka's work on multiculturalism fills an important gap by addressing the challenges of accommodating cultural diversity within a national framework. Together, these theories present a holistic view of how liberal nationalism can function as a unifying force in diverse, modern societies.

However, liberal nationalism is not without its critics. One of the primary challenges it faces is the potential for internal contradictions, particularly in balancing the demands of national identity with the protection of individual rights. Critics argue that an emphasis on national identity can lead to exclusionary practices, undermining the very liberal values that theorists like Tamir, Miller, and Kymlicka seek to protect. For instance, while Tamir's vision of

liberal nationalism is inclusive, there is always a risk that the emphasis on a collective identity could marginalize those who do not conform to the dominant national narrative. Similarly, while Miller's emphasis on social justice is compelling, his focus on national solidarity may sometimes conflict with the liberal commitment to individual autonomy.

Another challenge is the practical difficulty of constructing a cohesive national identity in multicultural societies. Kymlicka's work addresses this issue by advocating for a pluralistic approach to national identity, but the tension between national unity and cultural diversity remains a central concern for liberal nationalism. The challenge lies in creating a national identity that is inclusive and respectful of diversity while also fostering a sense of belonging and mutual trust. This is particularly difficult in societies with deep-seated ethnic, cultural, and religious divisions, where the boundaries of national identity are often contested. Despite these challenges, the issue of liberal nationalism is likely to become even more important for nation-states in the coming decades. As globalization and migration continue to reshape the demographic makeup of many countries, the question of how to integrate diverse populations within a cohesive national framework will become increasingly urgent. Liberal nationalism offers a promising solution to this challenge, providing a framework for balancing the demands of national identity with the need to protect individual rights and accommodate cultural diversity.

In the future, liberal nationalism could serve as a guiding principle for nation-states seeking to navigate the complexities of global interconnectedness while maintaining social cohesion. The theories of Tamir, Miller, and Kymlicka provide valuable insights into how this might be achieved. Tamir's emphasis on the emotional and psychological importance of national identity, Miller's focus on the political and ethical dimensions of social justice, and Kymlicka's advocacy for multicultural citizenship all offer important contributions to the ongoing debate about the role of national identity in liberal democracies. In conclusion, the theories of liberal nationalism developed by Yael Tamir, David Miller, and Will Kymlicka offer a rich and nuanced understanding of how national identity can coexist with liberal democratic values. Their work

provides a compelling argument for the importance of national identity in promoting social cohesion, democratic engagement, and individual autonomy. While liberal nationalism faces significant challenges, particularly in balancing national identity with individual rights and accommodating cultural diversity, it remains a valuable theoretical framework for addressing the complexities of modern, multicultural societies. As nation-states continue to grapple with these challenges, the insights provided by Tamir, Miller, and Kymlicka will become increasingly relevant, offering a vision for a harmonious and inclusive society that respects both collective identity and individual rights.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections On the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Atasoy, F. (2020). *Milliyetçilik Tartışmaları: Sosyolojik Temellendirme Örnekleri*. Ankara: Net Kitaplık Yayıncılık.
- Berezin, M. (2022). "Identity, narratives, and nationalism". In A. Sajo, R. Uitz, & S. Holmes (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of illiberalism* (pp. 237-249). New York: Routledge.
- Chin, C. (2021). "Multiculturalism and nationalism: Models of belonging to diverse political community". *Nations and Nationalism*. 27(1): 112-129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12657>.
- Couture, J., Nielsen, K., & Seymour, M. (1996). "Afterword: Liberal nationalism both cosmopolitan and rooted". *Canadian Journal of Philosophy Supplementary*. 22: 579-662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1997.10716828>.
- Çiçek, A., & Taylan, Ö. (2023). "Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi ve Dicle Üniversitesi öğrencilerinde milliyetçilik algısı üzerine bir saha araştırması". *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 32: 418-448.
- Gat, A. (2012). *Nations: The long history and deep roots of political ethnicity and nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gellner, E. (2008). *Nations and nationalism*. İthaca: Cornell University Press.
- Grader, S. L. (1985). "John Stuart Mill's theory of nationality: A liberal dilemma in the field of international relations". *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 14(2): 207-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298850140020801>.
- Hall, J. A. (1998). *The state of the nation: Ernest Gellner and the theory of nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hechter, M. (2024). *Milliyetçiliği Dizginlemek* (A. Yanık, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2021). *On nationalism*. Paris: Hachette UK.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1992). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A. D. (Eds.). (1994). *Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- İnaç, H., & Ünal, F. (2013). "The construction of national identity in modern times: Theoretical perspective". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 3(11): 223-232.
- Kaufmann, E. (2000). Liberal ethnicity: Beyond liberal nationalism and minority rights. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 23(6): 1086-1119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014198700750018423>.
- Kedourie, E. (1993). *Nationalism* (4th ed.). Hampshire: Blackwell.
- Kirloskar-Steinbach, M. (2001). "Liberal nationalism: A critique". *Trames*. 5(55): 107-119. <https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2001.2.01>.
- Kitromilides, P. M. (2005). "Elie Kedourie's contribution to the study of nationalism". *Middle Eastern Studies*. 41(5): 661-663. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200500233166>.
- Kohn, H. (1944). *The idea of nationalism: A study in its origins and background*. New York: Macmillan.
- Konak, İ. (2020). *Liberal ve Komüniteryan Çokkültürlülük*. Ankara: Nobel Bilimsel Eserler.
- Köktürk, M. (2016). *Millet ve milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.

- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights* (Reprint ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Finding our way: Rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (2000). "Citizenship in culturally diverse societies: Issues, contexts, concepts". *Citizenship in diverse societies*. 1: 1-43.
- Lind, M. (1994). "In defense of liberal nationalism". *Foreign Affairs*. 73(3): 87-99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20046660>.
- Lorberbaum, M. (1994). "Review of Liberal nationalism". *Mind*. 103(410): 236-239.
- Mason, A. (1999). "Political community, liberal-nationalism, and the ethics of assimilation". *Ethics*. 109(2): 261-286. <https://doi.org/10.1086/233896>.
- Miller, D. (1995). *On nationality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, D. (2008). "Nationalism". In J. S. Dryzek, B. Honig, & A. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political theory* (pp. 546-562). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxford/hb/9780199548439.003.0029>.
- Miller, M. L. (2010). "From liberal nationalism to cosmopolitan patriotism: Simon Deutsch and 1848ers in exile". *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'Histoire*. 17(3): 379-393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2010.481931>
- Moore, M. (1999). "Beyond the cultural argument for liberal nationalism". *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*. 2(3): 26-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698239908403282>.
- Moore, M. (2001). "Normative justifications for liberal nationalism: Justice, democracy and national identity". *Nations and Nationalism*. 7(1): 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00001>.
- Özkirimli, U. (2017). *Theories of nationalism: A critical introduction* (3rd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Perry, T. (2014). *Autonomy, culture and nationality: The failure of liberal nationalism*. In *APSA 2014 annual meeting paper*.
- Piper, L. (2002). "Do I need ethnic culture to be free? A critique of Will Kymlicka's liberal nationalism". *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 21(3): 180-189. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajpem.v21i3.31344>.
- Renan, E. (2018). *What is a nation? and other political writings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Scavenius, T. (2017). "The Indeterminacy Failures of Moral Cosmopolitanism and Liberal Nationalism". *Journal of Global Ethics*. 13(2): 206-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2017.1364659>.
- Smart, P. (1992). "Mill and nationalism: National character, social progress and the spirit of achievement". *History of European Ideas*. 15(4): 527-534. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-6599\(92\)90058-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-6599(92)90058-K).
- Smith, A. D. (2013). *Nations and nationalism in a global era*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Smith, A. D. (2009). *Ethno-symbolism and nationalism: A cultural approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Spencer, V. A. (2014). "Rethinking cultural and political nationalism". *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. 2(4): 666-673. <http://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2014.970561>.
- Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal nationalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tamir, Y. (2019). "Not so civic: Is there a difference between ethnic and civic nationalism?". *Annual Review of Political Science*. 22(1): 419-434. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-022018-024059>.
- Tamir, Y., & Rodrik, D. (2019). *Why nationalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tok, N. (2003). *Kültür, kimlik ve siyaset: kültüre ilişkin meseleler için kimlik temelli bir yaklaşım*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

- Tok, N. (2013). "Liberal milliyetçilik". In A. Öztürk (Ed.), *Res Publica* (pp. 266-285). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Tomasi, J. (1995). "Kymlicka, liberalism, and respect for cultural minorities". *Ethics*. 105(3): 580-603. <https://doi.org/10.1086/293728>.
- Uzun, T. (2020). *Türk Milliyetçiliği ve MHP*. Ankara: Orion Yayınları.

ETİK: Bu makale, yazarın başvuru aşamasındaki beyanına göre; araştırma ve yayın etiğine uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

ETHIC: This article has been prepared in accordance with research and publication ethics, according to the author's statement at the application stage.

ÇIKAR ÇATIŞMASI VE FİNANSAL KATKI BEYANI: Yazarın başvuru aşamasındaki beyanına göre; çalışmanın tarafsızlığı ile ilgili bilinmesi gereken bir mali katkı veya diğer çıkar çatışma ihtimali (potansiyeli) ve ilişki alanı yoktur.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION DECLARATION: According to the author's statement at the application stage; There is no financial contribution or other conflict of interest possibility (potential) and relationship area that should be known about the objectivity of the study.



Bu eser Creative Commons Atf-GayriTicari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License.