

consciousness among these populations – until the era of nationalism succeeded in uniting the community on a new, political basis. Similarly, though world religions like Buddhism and Christianity may be adapted to pre-existing ethnic communities that they in turn reinforce, as in Sri Lanka and Burma, they may, equally, help to erode ethnic differences, as happened to several barbarian peoples when they converted to Christianity and merged with neighbouring peoples, as was the case with Angles, Saxons and Jutes in England.¹¹

In the next chapter I shall explore the particular features of ethnic identity that mark it off from other, including religious, identities. For the moment the similarities between religious and ethnic identity need to be stressed. Both stem from similar cultural criteria of classification. They frequently overlap and reinforce one another. And singly or together, they can mobilize and sustain strong communities.

THE ELEMENTS OF 'NATIONAL' IDENTITY

One kind of collective identity, so important and widespread today, is barely mentioned in Sophocles' Theban plays. Though they sometimes hinge on conflict between cities, they never raise the question of 'national' identity. Oedipus' identities are multiple, but being 'foreign' (i.e. non-Greek) is never one of them. Collective conflicts are, at most, wars between Greek city-states and their rulers. Did this not, in fact, mirror the state of ancient Greece in the fifth century BC?

It was Friedrich Meinecke who in 1908 distinguished the *Kulturnation*, the largely passive cultural community, from the *Staatsnation*, the active, self-determining political nation. We may dissent from his use of these terms, indeed from the terms themselves; but the distinction itself is valid and relevant. Politically, there was no 'nation' in ancient Greece, only a collection of city-states, each jealous of its sovereignty. Culturally, however, there existed an ancient Greek community, Hellas, that could be invoked, for example by Pericles, in the political realm – usually for Athenian purposes. In other words we can speak of a Greek cultural and ethnic community but not of an ancient Greek 'nation'.¹²

This suggests that, whatever else it may be, what we mean by 'national' identity involves some sense of political community, however tenuous. A political community in turn implies at least some common institutions and a single code of rights and duties for all the members of the community. It also suggests a definite social space, a fairly well demarcated and bounded territory, with which the members identify and to which they feel they belong. This was very much what the *philosophes* had in mind when they defined a nation as a community of people obeying the same laws and institutions within a given territory.¹³

This is, of course, a peculiarly Western conception of the nation. But then the Western experience has exerted a powerful, indeed the leading, influence on our conception of the unit we call the 'nation'. A new kind of policy – the rational state – and a new kind of community – the territorial nation – first emerged in the West, in close conjunction with each other. They left their imprint on subsequent non-Western conceptions, even when the latter diverged from their norms.

It is worth spelling out this Western or 'civic' model of the nation in more detail. It is, in the first place, a predominantly spatial or territorial conception. According to this view, nations must possess compact, well-defined territories. People and territory must, as it were, belong to each other, in the way that the early Dutch, for example, saw themselves as formed by the high seas and as forging (literally) the earth they possessed and made their own. But the earth in question cannot be just anywhere; it is not any stretch of land. It is, and must be, the 'historic' land, the 'homeland', the 'cradle' of our people, even where, as with the Turks, it is not the land of ultimate origin. A 'historic land' is one where terrain and people have exerted mutual, and beneficial, influence over several generations. The homeland becomes a repository of historic memories and associations, the place where 'our' sages, saints and heroes lived, worked, prayed and fought. All this makes the homeland unique. Its rivers, coasts, lakes, mountains and cities become 'sacred' – places of veneration and exaltation whose inner meanings can be fathomed only by the initiated, that is, the self-aware members of the nation. The land's resources also become exclusive to the people; they are not for 'alien' use and exploitation. The

national territory must become self-sufficient. Autarchy is as much a defence of sacred homelands as of economic interests.¹⁴

A second element is the idea of a *patria*, a community of laws and institutions with a single political will. This entails at least some common regulating institutions that will give expression to common political sentiments and purposes. Sometimes, indeed, the *patria* is expressed through highly centralized and unitary institutions and laws, as in post-Revolutionary France, though even there the various regions retained their local identities into the early twentieth century. At the other extreme we find unions of separate colonies, provinces and city-states, whose federal institutions and laws are designed as much to protect local or provincial liberties as to express a common will and common political sentiments. Both the United States of America and the United Provinces of the Netherlands offer well-documented cases of such national unions. In many ways the primary purpose of the Union of Utrecht in 1579 and of the Netherlands' States General was to protect the ancient liberties and privileges of the constituent provinces, which had been so rudely assailed by Habsburg policies of centralization under Charles V and Philip II. Nevertheless, the ferocity and duration of the war against Spain soon bred a sense of common purpose and identity (quite apart from Calvinist influence) that expressed a growing Dutch national political community, albeit incomplete.¹⁵

Concurrent with the growth of a sense of legal and political community we may trace a sense of legal equality among the members of that community. Its full expression is the various kinds of 'citizenship' that sociologists have enumerated, including civil and legal rights, political rights and duties, and socio-economic rights. Here it is legal and political rights that the Western conception considers integral to its model of a nation. That implies a minimum of reciprocal rights and obligations among members and the correlative exclusion of outsiders from those rights and duties. It also implies a common code of laws over and above local laws, together with agencies for their enforcement, courts of final appeal and the like. As important is the acceptance that, in principle, all members of the nation are legally equal and that the rich and powerful are bound by the laws of the *patria*.

Finally, the legal equality of members of a political community

in its demarcated homeland was felt to presuppose a measure of common values and traditions among the population, or at any rate its 'core' community. In other words, nations must have a measure of common culture and a civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas, that bind the population together in their homeland. The task of ensuring a common public, mass culture has been handed over to the agencies of popular socialization, notably the public system of education and the mass media. In the Western model of national identity nations were seen as culture communities, whose members were united, if not made homogeneous, by common historical memories, myths, symbols and traditions. Even where new, immigrant communities equipped with their own historic cultures have been admitted by the state, it has taken several generations before their descendants have been admitted (in so far as they have been) into the circle of the 'nation' and its historic culture through the national agencies of mass socialization.¹⁶

Historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology; these are the components of the standard, Western model of the nation. Given the influence of the West in the modern world, they have remained vital elements, albeit in somewhat altered form, in most non-Western conceptions of national identity. At the same time a rather different model of the nation sprang up outside the West, notably in Eastern Europe and Asia. Historically, it challenged the dominance of the Western model and added significant new elements, more attuned to the very different circumstances and trajectories of non-Western communities.

We can term this non-Western model an 'ethnic' conception of the nation. Its distinguishing feature is its emphasis on a community of birth and native culture. Whereas the Western concept laid down that an individual had to belong to some nation but could choose to which he or she belonged, the non-Western or ethnic concept allowed no such latitude. Whether you stayed in your community or emigrated to another, you remained ineluctably, organically, a member of the community of your birth and were for ever stamped by it. A nation, in other words, was first and foremost a community of common descent.

This ethnic model also has a number of facets. First, obviously, is the stress on descent – or rather, presumed descent – rather than territory. The nation is seen as a fictive 'super-family'; and it boasts pedigrees and genealogies to back up its claims, often tracked down by native intellectuals, particularly in East European and Middle Eastern countries. The point here is that, in this conception, the nation can trace its roots to an imputed common ancestry and that therefore its members are brothers and sisters, or at least cousins, differentiated by family ties from outsiders.

This emphasis on presumed family ties helps to explain the strong popular or demotic element in the ethnic conception of the nation. Of course, the 'people' figure in the Western model too. But there they are seen as a political community subject to common laws and institutions. In the ethnic model the people, even where they are not actually mobilized for political action, nevertheless provide the object of nationalist aspirations and the final rhetorical court of appeal. Leaders can justify their actions and unite disparate classes and groups only through an appeal to the 'will of the people', and this makes the ethnic concept more obviously 'inter-class' and 'populist' in tone, even when the intelligentsia has little intention of summoning the masses into the political arena. Popular mobilization therefore plays an important moral and rhetorical, if not an actual, role in the ethnic conception.¹⁷

Similarly, the place of law in the Western civic model is taken by vernacular culture, usually languages and customs in the ethnic model. That is why lexicographers, philologists and folklorists have played a central role in the early nationalisms of Eastern Europe and Asia. Their linguistic and ethnographic research into the past and present culture of the 'folk' provided the materials for a blueprint of the 'nation-to-be', even where specific linguistic revivals failed. By creating a widespread awareness of the myths, history and linguistic traditions of the community, they succeeded in substantiating and crystallizing the idea of an ethnic nation in the minds of most members, even when, as in Ireland and Norway, the ancient languages declined.¹⁸

Genealogy and presumed descent ties, popular mobilization, vernacular languages, customs and traditions: these are the elements of an alternative, ethnic conception of the nation, one that mirrored

the very different route of 'nation-formation' travelled by many communities in Eastern Europe and Asia and one that constituted a dynamic political challenge. It is, as we shall see, a challenge that is repeated to this day in many parts of the world, and it reflects the profound dualism at the heart of every nationalism. In fact every nationalism contains civic and ethnic elements in varying degrees and different forms. Sometimes civic and territorial elements predominate; at other times it is the ethnic and vernacular components that are emphasized. Under the Jacobins, for example, French nationalism was essentially civic and territorial; it preached the unity of the republican *patrie* and the fraternity of its citizens in a political-legal community. At the same time a linguistic nationalism emerged, reflecting pride in the purity and civilizing mission of a hegemonic French culture preached by Barère and the Abbé Grégoire. In the early nineteenth century French cultural nationalism began to reflect more ethnic conceptions of the nation, whether Frankish or Gallic; later these became validating charters for radically different ideals of France. The clerical-monarchist Right was particularly wedded to genealogical and vernacular conceptions of an 'organic' nation, which it opposed to the republican territorial and civic model, notably during the Dreyfus Affair.¹⁹

Nevertheless, even during the most severe conflicts mirroring opposed models of the nation certain fundamental assumptions tied the warring parties together through a common nationalist discourse. In the French example just cited both republicans and monarchists accepted the idea of France's 'natural' and historic territory (including Alsace). Similarly, there was no real dispute about the need to inculcate national ideals and history through a mass, public education system, only about some of its content (notably the Catholic dimension). Devotion to the French language was also universal. Similarly, nobody questioned the individuality of France and the French as such; differences arose only over the historical content of that uniqueness and hence the lessons to be drawn from that experience.

This suggests that behind the rival models of the nation stand certain common beliefs about what constitutes a nation as opposed to any other kind of collective, cultural identity. They include the idea that nations are territorially bounded units of population and

that they must have their own homelands; that their members share a common mass culture and common historical myths and memories; that members have reciprocal legal rights and duties under a common legal system; and that nations possess a common division of labour and system of production with mobility across the territory for members. These are assumptions, and demands, common to all nationalists and widely accepted even by their critics, who may then go on to deplore the ensuing global divisions and conflicts created by the existence of such nations.

The existence of these common assumptions allows us to list the fundamental features of national identity as follows:

1. an historic territory, or homeland
2. common myths and historical memories
3. a common, mass public culture
4. common legal rights and duties for all members
5. a common economy with territorial mobility for members.

A nation can therefore be defined as 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*.²⁰

Such a provisional working definition reveals the complex and abstract nature of national identity. The nation, in fact, draws on elements of other kinds of collective identity, which accounts not only for the way in which national identity can be combined with these other types of identity – class, religious or ethnic – but also for the chameleon-like permutations of nationalism, the ideology, with other ideologies like liberalism, fascism and communism. A national identity is fundamentally multi-dimensional; it can never be reduced to a single element, even by particular factions of nationalists, nor can it be easily or swiftly induced in a population by artificial means.

Such a definition of national identity also sets it clearly apart from any conception of the state. The latter refers exclusively to public institutions, differentiated from, and autonomous of, other social institutions and exercising a monopoly of coercion and extrajurisdiction within a given territory. The nation, on the other hand, signifies a cultural and political bond, uniting in a single political community

all who share an historic culture and homeland. This is not to deny some overlap between the two concepts, given their common reference to an historic territory and (in democratic states) their appeal to the sovereignty of the people. But, while modern states must legitimate themselves in national and popular terms as the states of particular nations, their content and focus are quite different.²¹

This lack of congruence between the state and the nation is exemplified in the many 'plural' states today. Indeed, Walker Connor's estimate in the early 1970s showed that only about 10 per cent of states could claim to be true 'nation-states', in the sense that the state's boundaries coincide with the nation's and that the total population of the state share a single ethnic culture. While most states aspire to become nation-states in this sense, they tend to limit their claims to legitimacy to an aspiration for political unity and popular sovereignty that, even in old-established Western states, risks being challenged by ethnic communities within their borders. These cases, and there are many of them, illustrate the profound gulf between the concepts of the state and the nation, a gulf that the historical material to be discussed shortly underlines.²²

SOME FUNCTIONS AND PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

Let me recapitulate. National identity and the nation are complex constructs composed of a number of interrelated components – ethnic, cultural, territorial, economic and legal-political. They signify bonds of solidarity among members of communities united by shared memories, myths and traditions that may or may not find expression in states of their own but are entirely different from the purely legal and bureaucratic ties of the state. Conceptually, the nation has come to blend two sets of dimensions, the one civic and territorial, the other ethnic and genealogical, in varying proportions in particular cases. It is this very multidimensionality that has made national identity such a flexible and persistent force in modern life and politics, and allowed it to combine effectively with other powerful ideologies and movements, without losing its character.

We can illustrate this multifaceted power of national identity by looking at some of the functions it fulfils for groups and individuals.

In line with the dimensions listed above, we can conveniently divide these functions into 'external' and 'internal' objective consequences.

The external functions are territorial, economic and political. Nations, first, define a definite social space within which members must live and work, and demarcate an historic territory that locates a community in time and space. They also provide individuals with 'sacred centres', objects of spiritual and historical pilgrimage, that reveal the uniqueness of their nation's 'moral geography'.

Economically, nations underwrite the quest for control over territorial resources, including manpower. They also elaborate a single division of labour, and encourage mobility of goods and labour, as well as the allocation of resources between members within the homeland. By defining the membership, the boundaries and the resources, national identity provides the rationale for ideals of national autarchy.²³

Politically, too, national identity underpins the state and its organs, or their pre-political equivalents in nations that lack their own states. The selection of political personnel, the regulation of political conduct and the election of governments are grounded in criteria of national interest, which is presumed to reflect the national will and national identity of the inclusive population.

But perhaps the most salient political function of national identity is its legitimization of common legal rights and duties of legal institutions, which define the peculiar values and character of the nation and reflect the age-old customs and mores of the people. The appeal to national identity has become the main legitimization for social order and solidarity today.

National identities also fulfil more intimate, internal functions for individuals in communities. The most obvious is the socialization of the members as 'nationals' and 'citizens'. Today this is achieved through compulsory, standardized, public mass education systems, through which state authorities hope to inculcate national devotion and a distinctive, homogeneous culture, an activity that most regimes pursue with considerable energy under the influence of nationalist ideals of cultural authenticity and unity.²⁴

The nation is also called upon to provide a social bond between individuals and classes by providing repertoires of shared values, symbols and traditions. By the use of symbols — flags, coinage,

anthems, uniforms, monuments and ceremonies — members are reminded of their common heritage and cultural kinship and feel strengthened and exalted by their sense of common identity and belonging. The nation becomes a 'faith-achievement' group, able to surmount obstacles and hardships.²⁵

Finally, a sense of national identity provides a powerful means of defining and locating individual selves in the world, through the prism of the collective personality and its distinctive culture. It is through a shared, unique culture that we are enabled to know 'who we are' in the contemporary world. By rediscovering that culture we 'rediscover' ourselves, the 'authentic self', or so it has appeared to many divided and disoriented individuals who have had to contend with the vast changes and uncertainties of the modern world.

This process of self-definition and location is in many ways the key to national identity, but it is also the element that has attracted most doubt and scepticism. Given the wide range of human attitudes and perceptions, it is hardly surprising if nationalists, their critics and the rest of us have been unable to agree on the criteria for national self-definition and location. The quest for the national self and the individual's relationship to it remains the most baffling element in the nationalist project.

These doubts are both philosophical and political. Because of the many kinds of national self that present themselves in practice (a natural result of the multifaceted nature of the nation), nationalist doctrine has been attacked as logically contradictory or incoherent. The indeterminacy of national criteria and their vague, shifting, often arbitrary character in the writings of nationalists have undermined the ideology's credibility, even where respect has been accorded to individual nationalist propositions such as the idea of cultural diversity. At best the idea of the nation has appeared sketchy and elusive, at worst absurd and contradictory.²⁶

Intellectual scepticism is paralleled by moral condemnation. In the name of 'national identity' people have allegedly been willing to surrender their own liberties and curtail those of others. They have been prepared to trample on the civil and religious rights of ethnic, racial and religious minorities whom the nation could not absorb. International, or more accurately inter-state, relations have similarly suffered. The ideal of the nation, transplanted across the globe from

its Western heartlands, has brought with it confusion, instability, strife and terror, particularly in areas of mixed ethnic and religious character. Nationalism, the doctrine that makes the nation the object of every political endeavour and national identity the measure of every human value, has since the French Revolution challenged the whole idea of a single humanity, of a world community and its moral unity. Instead nationalism offers a narrow, conflict-laden legitimation for political community, which inevitably pits cultures-communities against each other and, given the sheer number and variety of cultural differences, can only drag humanity into a political Charybdis.²⁷

This is a familiar indictment, and its scope and intensity proclaim the emotional and political power of the ideal that it so utterly condemns. But an ideal and an identity that can fulfil so many functions, collective and individual, are bound to have the most varied social and political consequences, given the variety of circumstances in which nationalists must operate. We could, equally, catalogue the benign effects of nationalism: its defence of minority cultures; its rescue of 'lost' histories and literatures; its inspiration for cultural renaissances; its resolution of 'identity crisis'; its legitimization of community and social solidarity; its inspiration to resist tyranny; its ideal of popular sovereignty and collective mobilization; even the motivation of self-sustaining economic growth. Each of these effects could, with as much plausibility, be attributed to nationalist ideologies as the baneful consequences listed by critics. No more striking, or revealing, testimony could be offered to the ambiguous power of national identity and nationalism or to their profound relevance, for good or ill, to most people in most areas of the world today.

Why this should be so, and what the deeper roots of the power exerted today by national identities are, we must now explore.

CHAPTER 2

The Ethnic Basis of National Identity

The origins of what we have termed national identity are as complex as its nature. I am not saying simply that the origins of each nation are in many ways unique and that there is great variation in the starting-points, trajectories, rates and timings of modern nations. The very question 'what are the origins of nations?' needs to be broken down into several further questions, such as: who is the nation? Why and how is the nation? When and where is the nation?

In fact we can conveniently use these questions to seek a general explanation of the origins and development of modern nations in three parts.

1. *Who* is the nation? What are the ethnic bases and models of modern nations? Why did these particular nations emerge?
2. *Why* and *how* does the nation emerge? That is, what are the general causes and mechanisms that set in motion the processes of nation-formation from varying ethnic ties and memories?
3. *When* and *where* did the nation arise? What were the specific ideas, groups and locations that predisposed the formation of individual nations at particular times and places?

Through answers to these questions, albeit of a general and necessarily incomplete nature, we may hope to shed some light on the vexed problem of national origins and development.

ETHNIC AND ETHNO-GENESIS

If myths like that of Oedipus can be seen as widely believed tales told in dramatic form, referring to past events but serving present purposes and/or future goals, then the nation stands at the centre of one of the most popular and ubiquitous myths of modern times: that of nationalism. Central to this myth is the idea that nations exist from time immemorial, and that nationalists must reawaken

applies with far greater force to nationalist rites and ceremonies, for nationalism dispenses with any mediating referent, be it totem or deity; its deity is the nation itself. The emotions it unleashes are those of the community directed to itself, self-consciously extolling itself. The virtues it celebrates are exclusively and solely those of the 'national self', and the crimes it condemns are those that threaten to disrupt that self. By means of the ceremonies, customs and symbols every member of a community participates in the life, emotions and virtues of that community and, through them, re-dedicates himself to its destiny. By articulating and making tangible the ideology of nationalism and the concepts of the nation ceremonial and symbolism help to assure the continuity of an abstract community of history and destiny.¹⁸

What are the underlying sentiments and aspirations that nationalist ideology and nationalist language and symbols evoke? They relate to three main referents: territory, history and community. In the last chapter we saw how, particularly in demotic *ethnies* engaged in 'vernacular mobilization', intelligentsias sought to construct cognitive maps of a world of nations and to inculcate expressive moralities for collective emulation. To these ends they employed two main strategies: the use of landscape or poetic spaces and the use of history or golden ages. In fact, these strategies were rooted in popular attitudes to space and time and to popular attachments to home and fathers. It was these ancient beliefs and commitments to ancestral homelands and to the generations of one's forefathers that nationalists made use of in elaborating the new ideology, language and symbolism of a complex abstraction, national identity. The new concept of the nation was made to serve as a time-space framework to order chaos and render the universe meaningful by harnessing pre-modern mass aspirations and sentiments for local and familial attachments; herein lay a vital part of the wide appeal of an otherwise abstruse ideology and language.¹⁹

But perhaps the most fundamental sentiments evoked by nationalism were, paradoxically, those of family – paradoxically because real families can constitute an obstacle to the ideal of a homogeneous nation wherever nationalism embraces the ideal in that extreme form. That too was part of David's message in the *Oath of the Horatii*, mentioned earlier; the women on the right of the picture

grieve for the loss of their loved ones and the imminent destruction of their family ties. At the same time the metaphor of family is indispensable to nationalism. The nation is depicted as one great family, the members as brothers and sisters of the motherland or fatherland, speaking their mother tongue. In this way the family of the nation overrides and replaces the individual's family but evokes similarly strong loyalties and vivid attachments. Even where local allegiances are tolerated and real families given their due the language and symbolism of the nation asserts its priority and, through the state and citizenship, exerts its legal and bureaucratic pressures on the family, using similar kinship metaphors to justify itself.²⁰

TYPES OF NATIONALISM

So far I have considered nationalism as an undifferentiated whole in terms of its ideology and core doctrine, its language and symbolism and its sentiments and aspirations. When we move on to consider nationalist *movements*, however, we come up against clear differences in their goals, differences that reach back into the underlying conceptual divergence between the civic-territorial model and the ethnic-genealogical model of the nation, described in chapter 1.

This difference is so profound, and the kinds of nationalism to which these alternative models give rise are so varied, that some have despaired of finding any unitary concept of nationalism. Chameleon-like, nationalism takes its colour from its context. Capable of endless manipulation, this eminently malleable nexus of beliefs, sentiments and symbols can be understood only in each specific instance; nationalism-in-general is merely a lazy historian's escape from the arduous task of explaining the influence of this or that particular nationalist idea, argument or sentiment in its highly specific context. Though few would perhaps go as far as this claim implies, several historians would agree with the basic 'contextualist' argument and regard the differences between specific nationalisms as in many ways more important than any surface similarities.²¹

There are several difficulties with this argument. Nobody would deny the importance of social and cultural context in the rise, formulation and course of a particular instance of nationalism. But to describe it as an instance of nationalism presupposes some idea of

a general family to which such instances belong or which they exemplify, albeit mixed with other elements. It is difficult to avoid recourse to a general concept of the nation and nationalism – even when we agree on the importance and uniqueness of each instance, a claim that nationalists, ironically, would gladly support.

Second, to deny the legitimacy of a concept of nationalism-in-general would prevent us from posing general sociological questions about the modernity of nations and the ubiquity of nationalism's appeal today and from making historical comparisons between different nationalist ideologies, symbols and movements. In fact, the same historians who insist on the specific context of each case of nationalism pose such general questions and make these historical comparisons; and this surely is desirable if we are to gain some understanding of so elusive and complex a phenomenon as nationalism.

Third, the 'contextualist' argument bypasses a fundamental task of the study of complex phenomena like nationalism: the provision of typologies of nationalist ideologies and/or movements. Such typologies recognize the importance of broadly differing contexts without sacrificing the possibility of more general comparisons. Arguing that nationalism exhibits a diversity within unity, they go on to pinpoint the main kinds of ideology and movement in terms of historical period, geographical area, level of economic development, philosophical assumptions, class context, cultural milieu or political aspirations. This is the strategy that I propose to follow here.

This is not the place to consider the various typologies that scholars have proposed. I shall mention one or two, and state briefly my own typology as a prelude to an analysis of the cultural matrix and impact of nationalism in Europe. Other typologies are enumerated in other earlier works.²¹

Undoubtedly, the most influential typology is that of Hans Kohn. He distinguished a 'Western', rational and associational version of nationalism from an 'Eastern', organic and mystical version. In Britain, France and America, he argued, a rational concept of the nation emerged, one that viewed it as an association of human beings living in a common territory under the same government and laws. This ideology was largely a product of the middle classes,

who came to power in these states at the end of the eighteenth century. In contrast, Eastern Europe (east of the Rhine) had not developed a significant middle class. Instead a few intellectuals led the resistance to Napoleon and the ensuing nationalisms. Because they were numerically insignificant and excluded from power their versions of nationalism were inevitably shrill and authoritarian. For the same reason they saw the nation as a seamless, organic unity with a mystical 'soul' and 'mission' that only the vernacular intellectuals could fathom. Hence their often leading role in nationalist movements in Central and Eastern Europe as well as in Asia.²²

This typology can be criticized on a number of grounds. Its geopolitical dimension overlooks the influence of both kinds of ideological nationalism in different European communities – the organic version in Ireland and later nineteenth-century France, the rational ideal in some versions of Czech, Hungarian and Zionist nationalism as well as in early West African nationalisms.²⁴

It is also not clear that Western nationalisms are the product of the bourgeoisie. As we have seen, they owe much to earlier monarchical and aristocratic culture and activities. Similarly, the commitment of the bourgeoisie to rational versions of nationalism is a dubious assumption: witness the often mystical pan-German sentiments of the German industrial bourgeoisie or the support for an organic and 'primitivist' Russian nationalism by wealthy Russian merchants at the end of the nineteenth century.²⁵

There is also the distinction drawn by Plamenatz between the culturally far more developed Italian and German nationalisms and the relatively underdeveloped Balkan and Eastern European nationalisms, with their lack of cultural and educational resources, which hampered their chances and produced weaker, but shriller, movements.²⁶

Despite these criticisms, Kohn's philosophical distinction between a more rational and a more organic version of nationalist ideology remains valid and useful. It is implicit in the distinction drawn in chapter 1 between 'Western' civic-territorial and 'Eastern' ethnic-geographical models of the nation. Here too we have to treat geopolitical labels cautiously. Both models can be found in the 'East', in the 'West', in Asia, Africa and in Latin America, as well as within many nationalist movements.

Nevertheless, the conceptual distinction has important consequences. Civic and territorial models of the nation tend to produce certain kinds of nationalist movement: 'anti-colonial' movements before independence have been attained and 'integration' movements after independence. Ethnic and genealogical models of the nation, on the other hand, tend to give rise to secessionist or diaspora movements before independence and irredentist or 'pan' movements thereafter. This overlooks a number of sub-varieties, as well as mixed cases; but it captures, I think the basic logic of many nationalisms.

On this basis we can construct a provisional typology of nationalisms around the distinction between ethnic and territorial nationalism, taking into account the overall situation in which particular communities and movements find themselves both before and after independence. These situations, together with the basic orientation, largely determine the political goals of each nationalism. Thus we find the following:

1. Territorial nationalisms

- (a) *Pre-independence* movements whose concept of the nation is mainly civic and territorial will seek first to eject foreign rulers and substitute a new state-nation for the old colonial territory; these are *anti-colonial* nationalisms.
- (b) *Post-independence* movements whose concept of the nation remains basically civic and territorial will seek to bring together and integrate into a new political community often disparate ethnic populations and to create a new 'territorial nation' out of the old colonial state; these are *integration* nationalisms.

2. Ethnic nationalisms

- (a) *Pre-independence* movements whose concept of the nation is basically ethnic and genealogical will seek to secede from a larger political unit (or secede and gather together in a designated ethnic homeland) and set up a new political 'ethno-nation' in its place; these are *secession* and *diaspora* nationalisms.
- (b) *Post-independence* movements whose concept of the nation is basically ethnic and genealogical will seek to expand by including ethnic 'kinsmen' outside the present boundaries

of the 'ethno-nation' and the lands they inhabit or by forming a much larger 'ethno-national' state through the union of culturally and ethnically similar ethno-national states; these are *irredentist* and '*pan*' nationalisms.²⁷

This does not pretend to be an exhaustive typology. It omits several well-known kinds of nationalism, notably protectionist economic and 'integral' fascist nationalisms and racial nationalisms. But it can be argued that the latter constitute sub-varieties of post-independence integration or irredentist nationalisms, with which they are, in fact, historically associated, as in the case of Maurras' 'integral' nationalism in the period of French irredentist nationalism over Alsace-Lorraine, or Latin American protectionism at a time of populist integration nationalisms in Argentina, Brazil and Chile.²⁸

Such a basic typology helps us to compare nationalisms within each category, and to place nationalisms in broad comparable contexts, while allowing the possibility of more general explanations. This is not to gainsay the unique features of particular instances of nationalism. On the contrary: the very fact that it has proved necessary to sketch a 'core doctrine' and the basic concepts and symbols of nationalism suggests the importance of those other features of a particular nationalism that are unique to each case. These specific doctrines and concepts (a better term than 'secondary' or 'additional') play a vital role in each instance and not just a supporting role. For it is the *specific* doctrines and ideas that provide the symbolism and ceremonial that arouse the deepest popular emotions and aspirations – notably when they are interwoven with much older symbols and ceremonies. The idea of Poland as the 'suffering Christ', a messianic figure of redemption that pervades the poetry of Poland's great poet, Mickiewicz, is allied to the redemptive power of the Madonna of Jasna Gora, still the object of a mass cult of devotion. The ethno-religious Catholic image of suffering and redemption is central to an understanding of the ideology, language and symbolism of Polish nationalism.²⁹ Similarly, the invocation of Hindu heroes and deities, like Shivaji and the goddess Kali, by Tilak and his followers, though remote from the secular ideology of nationalism-in-general, played a vital role in creating a Hindu Indian nationalism that singled out the unique, the

incommensurable, elements of a genuinely Indian nation. For without such bonds of differentiation there can be no nation.³⁰

The importance of specific doctrines and symbols of nationalism points towards the deeper meaning of nationalism – the ideology, the language, the consciousness. In a world of nations each nation is unique, each is 'chosen'. Nationalism is the secular, modern equivalent of the pre-modern, sacred myth of ethnic election. A doctrine of polycentric uniqueness, it preaches the universality of 'irreplaceable culture values'. Where once each ethnic community was a world unto itself, the centre of the universe, the light amid darkness, now the heritage and culture values from the storehouse of that same community, selected, reinterpreted and reconstituted, form one unique, incommensurable national identity among many other, equally unique, cultural identities. This means that every culture, even the least developed and elaborated, possesses some 'value' that is irreplaceable and may contribute to the total fund of human cultural values. Nationalism, as an ideology and symbolism, legitimates every cultural configuration, summoning intellectuals everywhere to transform 'low' into 'high' cultures, oral into written, literary traditions, in order to preserve for posterity its fund of irreplaceable culture values. Chosen peoples were formerly selected by their deities; today they are chosen by an ideology and a symbolism that elevate the unique and the individual and transform them into a global reality. In former days peoples were chosen for their alleged virtues; today they are called to be nations because of their cultural heritages.

THE CULTURAL MATRIX OF NATIONALISM

A world of cultural diversity, of many 'chosen cultures', is also a world of ethnic historicism. At first sight such a world appears remote from the world of territorial absolutism that saw the birth of nationalist ideologies, symbolism and movements. Nevertheless, it was in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Western Europe that nationalist ideals, motifs and symbols first appeared. For, while sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Europe witnessed powerful movements of messianic religious nationalism – notably in Holland and England but also in Bohemia and Poland – the con-

cepts, ideals, symbols and myths of the nation as an ultimate end in itself had to wait till later and the 'core doctrine' and ideological movements later still.³¹

We are, of course, tracing complex processes that are never easy to periodize, let alone date. 'There is no fixed stage, let alone moment, when one can definitely point to the emergence of true nationalism. When historians debate whether nationalism emerged during the early Partitions of Poland (Lord Acton), during the American Revolution (Benedict Anderson), the English Revolution (Hans Kohn) or even Fichte's 1807 *Addresses to the German Nation* (Kedourie), this tells us a good deal about their different definitions of nationalism but not so much about its emergence. More important, it omits the much longer period of the gestation of nationalism as language-and-symbolism, and as consciousness-and-aspiration. Since it is extremely difficult to gauge consciousness and sentiment, except indirectly, I shall concentrate on the rise of nationalist concepts, language, myths and symbols, even though our sources are located exclusively among the small European educated classes of the eighteenth century.³²

Already in the seventeenth century we find a growing interest in the idea of 'national character' and 'national genius'. We met the latter in Lord Shaftesbury's high opinion of British attainments, to which we may add Jonathan Richardson's comparison of the English with the ancient Greeks and Romans, in which he claimed: 'There is a haughty Courage, an Elevation of Thought, a Greatness of Taste, a Love of Liberty, a Simplicity and Honesty among us, which we inherit from our Ancestors, and which belongs to us as Englishmen; and 'tis in These this Resemblance consists.'³³ Similar sentiments can be found in early eighteenth-century France. Father Daniel linked France's greatness to its monarchy, declaring that 'antiquity itself would find much to admire in the endless productions of the several arts, the thousand marvels that France has produced in our time'; while Henri-François Daguesseau's oration to the Paris Parlement of 1715 praised the 'love of *patrie*' in which 'the citizens find a *patrie* and the *patrie* its citizens'.³⁴

By the middle of the eighteenth century the concept of 'national character' was widely accepted. La Font de Saint-Yenne, an influential art critic, looked back with pride to the *Grand Siècle* of Louis