Nationalism, Historical Aspects of:
The West
Abstract

The article starts from the premise that nationalism has be to studied in relation to nation: an historical aspect of nationalism is the formation of a modern nation and the creation of nation-states in Europe. The study of the phenomenon, however, is complicated by disparate use of the concept nationalism by various researchers. 'Nationalism' has thus become a hazy and not very suitable tool for analysis, which is also reflected in numerous misunderstandings in evaluations of both the positive and the negative roles of nation and nationalism in history. This article documents that, despite the considerable differences in terminology and evaluation, there are roughly five fundamental causal relations which the various research schools consider crucial for nation—and nationalism—forming: (a) state-political historical foundations; (b) ethnic roots; (c) processes of modernization, including industrialization, institutional education, and social communication; (d) nationally relevant conflicts of interest and unevenness of development; and (e) psychological and emotional manipulation.

The complicated process of the modern nation-forming and the onset of the manifestations of nationalism has been, quite understandably, a subject of scholarly research ever since the nineteenth century. This research has had to struggle with a number of theoretical and semantic problems, and has not achieved consensus over the fundamental issues of terminology. The question of what role was played by 'nationalism' has been answered differently by different authors, primarily depending on how they defined nationalism, nation, nationality, national identity, ethnic group—and relations between these categories. Therefore, it is most important to investigate through what terms the authors analyzed the processes and

how they defined the terms.

1. The Problem of Definition

The fundamental problem of terminology derives from
the fact that it concerns a process resulting in the
formation of new communities, and that these communities
used a term for themselves which had already
originated in the Middle Ages, but was given a
different content in different political and cultural
conditions. On the one hand, 'nation' in English
included all inhabitants living under one government
and ruled by the same laws. The first edition of *Grande
encyclopedie* also defined '*la nation*' in similar terms,
but later the use of a common language was added to
this characterization. On the other hand, 'nation' in
German and also in Polish, Czech etc. was traditionally primarily
associated with language, culture, and also sometimes with a shared
past. That is why anglophone researchers find it hard
to accept speaking about a fully fledged nation in
cases where there is no nation-state (Kemilainen 1964).
It was only during last two decades, when the term "nations without
state" was introduced into the scientific discourse (Guibernau 2007).
Another difficulty comes from the fact that 'nationalism'
entered the academic vocabulary quite late: it
was a neologism originally used in politics and,
therefore, laden with political connotations. Nevertheless,
the term is also derived from 'nation,' which
means that it becomes related to the linguistic connotations
mentioned. It follows that anglophone
literature will associated nationalism, one way or
other, with a state and/or a struggle toward statehood.

1.1 Views on Nation, Nationality, and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century

The study of nation and national consciousness
developed alongside the nation-forming processes at
least form the mid-nineteenth century and was influenced
by the following circumstances: (a) the previous
linguistic tradition; (b) the axiom of "primordiality",
that is by the idea that the nation *an sich* had existed
since the Middle Ages and that people gradually
realized their objective belonging to it; (c) the degree of

nation-forming of a given nation: English and French researchers presumed the existence of a nation as a state-nation, while for German, Italian, and 'East-European' writers a nation was not commonplace and they were still looking for a suitable definition. It is not a coincidence that the largest numbers of the studies of nation can be found in the German-speaking territory. It needs to be added that English and later American authors also looked for a definition of a nonstate community. For the most part, they used the words 'nationality' or 'peoples.'

The large number of studies written up until World War II can be divided into two main streams:

(a) Nation was defined by objective, empirically researchable, characteristics. These usually included, first of all, cultural and linguistic characteristics in combination with various other features—from political ties to territorial, economic, and 'blood' relations. Nevertheless, already at the beginning of the twentieth century some authors concluded that it was impossible to find a universally applicable combination of characteristics, including all entities considered nations at the time. That is why a differentiation between a state and a cultural nation gained support (Meinecke 1907). The criterion was whether the community which called itself a nation was a state or not. Another approach was to define nation as a 'community with a shared past,' which originally applied only to the members of the ruling classes and e_lites, but which integrated the entire population in the course of historical development since the Middle Ages (Bauer 1907).

(b) Nation was defined subjectively—its members were aware of their belonging to the nation and wanted to belong to it. This concept could be expressed in terms of agitation—as a will to form a nation—or existentially, as a sort of a 'plebiscite'—as a decision to belong to an existing national community (Renan 1888). Typically, the subjectivist concept of nation originally appeared in essays rather than in empirically

researched studies.

The dividing line between both concepts is not clear cut. On the one hand, supporters of the objectivist definition realized more and more strongly that a nation could not exist without national consciousness. On the other hand, the subjectivist definition did not preclude a primordialist (or perennialist) concept of a nation. It is symptomatic that national consciousness, 'nationalism,' became a tool of scholarly analysis as late as in the period between the two World Wars. The pioneer of the study of nationalism, Carlton J. Hayes (1926), presumed that it was necessary to define the object of nationalism, and attempted to define both nation and nationality through objective features.

1.2 The Definition of Nation and Nationalism in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century

The sad experience with nationalism during World War II for Europe effected the approaches of historians and social scientists to the study of nation. The political acuteness of this study increased and also with it the political commitment of the authors. Although opinions continued to vary, most researchers agreed on a number of points in setting priorities in research and in discarding insupportable views:

(a) An overwhelming majority of researchers more or less distanced themselves from the view that nation is a timeless category and a blood-related community;

(b) Agreement was also reached concerning the impossibility of defining nation only through cultural and linguistic characteristics;

(c) Nation was usually accepted as a distinct community only if evidence was available that the members of the community (or at least the prevailing majority of them) considered themselves a nation;

(d) Hence the growing emphasis on the study of 'nationalism,' as a subjective manifestation or as a precondition for an objective existence of a nation. Nevertheless, conservative historians perpetuated for a while the traditional idea that a modern nation

was a continuation of a medieval nation. After all, studies of national (or proto-national) identities in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age are fairly common in Europe.

In the conditions of political bias against German nazism and Italian fascism, the atmosphere in Europe was not favorable for applications of the term nationalism as a neutral tool for historical analysis as it was developed by Hayes (1931). On the contrary, the numbers and importance of authors who considered nationalism as a negative extravagance which needed to be overcome increased. According to authors such as Friedrich Hertz , Edward H. Carr and later also Elie Kedourie (1960) nationalism was invented by irresponsible educated individuals, spread by equally irresponsible demagogues and politicians, and should be eradicated as a dangerous legacy of the past.

A polarized and modified variant of this concept as promoted by Hans Kohn in his numerous publications became more influential. In his view, two kinds of nationalism were to be distinguished: 'western,' which was rationalist, constitutional, liberal, democratic, and developed in France and the UK; and 'eastern,' which was irrational, mythical, racist, and reactionary. Although this 'dichotomy' (Snyder 1954) was persuasively criticized many times (Kemilainen 1964, Billig 1997, Schopflin 2000), it had a number of adherents.

Most historians and social scientists sought acceptable ways of defining nation as an objectively existing social group during the postwar decades. The approach that it was possible to develop an authoritative set of 'features' every nation had to have survived only as the official (although not Stalinist) doctrine of Soviet research. On the other hand, a number of authors were trying to find a more free definition by combining several kinds of relations. Among these relations, Boyd Shafer (1955) distinguished 'illusions,' such as economic needs, language, shared history, and objective relations, such as shared

government, shared cultural, and social institutions. The sociologist Pitrim Sorokin (1947) saw nation as a 'multibound group' formed by a set of individuals 'linked by two or more unibound ties.' These could be a territory, a language, a religion, and_or physical conditions. A similar view among sociologists is held by Smith (1991) who characterized nation as a population set sharing the same myths, same historical territory, mass culture, and economy. Another variant of this perspective was a concept of nation as a social group bound by a changing combination of several kinds of historically strengthened, mutually substitutable relations, while civic equality of all members of the group and the consciousness of their shared history were necessary and non-substitutable ties (Hroch 1985).

The problems with finding a common, generally acceptable definition of nation also lead to giving up such a definition and favoring the subjective definition of nation: 'a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation' (Seton-Watson 1977). This change was often associated with the 'discovery' of Renan's concept of nation. The result was an increased frequency of use of the term nationalism. The object of this nationalism was often not defined, or it was characterized as 'super-personal entity' towards which a nationalist individual feels 'unconditional loyalty' (Lemberg 1964). This view gradually radicalized: nationalism began to be considered a given reality, while nation was regarded a construct, a myth, or an invention. The theoretical authority became Benedict Anderson (1983)—through no initiative of his own. He called nations 'imagined communities,' by which he meant that a nation as a group could only exist if its members were able to imagine that they belonged to a community of people, of whom the majority they did not know, and would never know. This view, however, can also be interpreted that nation is just an illusion and an invention, therefore, the 'necessity' of its formation

can be doubted. The constructivist concepts of nation do not solve the problem of definition, they merely move it to another perspective: they also have to explain the term nationalism in its historical context. Equally as in the case of nation, there is not a consensus among researchers on the term nationalism either. Quite the contrary, the terminological confusion is augmented by the haphazard use of the term nationalism by researchers and without attempts at definition.

However, we can also find important exceptions. John Breuilly (1982) defines nationalism as a politics based on the premise that a nation exists, and which identifies itself with this nation. It demands political autonomy for the nation, usually in the form of a state. Gellner's authoritative definition of nationalism as an effort to obtain the attributes of a state for own ethnic entity appears around the same time. Later, Gellner substantially modified his definition: 'Nationalism is a political principle which maintains that similarity of culture is the basic social bond' (Gellner 1997). Recently, some authors propose to understand nationalism as a "discoursive formation" (Calhoun 1997) or "the way of seeing the world" (Delanty 2002). This particular form of discourse does not mean a denial of reality (Ozkirimli, str. 2010). Attention will now be paid to those authors who considered nation as objectively existing, 'essential.' Karl W. Deutsch (1953) made the first significant attempt at a new approach. He defined nation as 'a community of complementary habits of communication.' This communication community then forms a basis for a shared national culture and also nationalism. This approach was later more precisely defined as a group of people capable of better mutual than 'outward' communication and co-operation, and which is politically organized and autonomous. Members of the nation then associate community consciousness with certain values and with culture. Thus a foundation was created for the development of nationalism. Another step in this direction is the definition of

nation as a 'social formation' which is 'integrated through the means and relations of communication, production, organization, and exchange' (James 1996). It needs to be mentioned that the majority of these authors did not know that they were drawing on a concept of Bauer (1907).

The view that nation is primarily defined by statehood is widespread mainly among anglophone authors. J. Breuilly, Stein Rokkan, and Charles Tilly should be mentioned, and also Louis Snyder, and Anthony Giddens, who maintains that a nation only exists 'when a state has a unified administrative reach over the territory over which its sovereignty is claimed' (Giddens 1987). Similarly, Eric Hobsbawm concludes that nation is 'a social entity only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state' (Hobsbawm 1989). In these schools of thought, nationalism was closely connected with the state.

Defining nation by statehood runs against an important empirical fact that communities which have had a long way to go to statehood, and sometimes have not even sought it, call themselves 'nations.' Especially in English there is a problem with finding an adequate term for this case.

From the opposite side, cultural activities and traditions are recently again regarded as a factor of central importance defining the modern nation (Leerssen 2006).

1.3 Debate over the Evaluation of Nationalism

As mentioned in Sect. 1.2, the term nationalism had been a political term until the inter-war period. It was used in both negative and positive senses: referring either to a negative and an anti-social attitude (especially in the political language of the socialist movement), or to a commendable and noble love for one's nation (in the political language of some rightwing movements).

Some authors writing within the Marxist tradition associated nationalism with negative social phenomena. E. Hobsbawm and, less distinctly, B. Anderson are examples of this perspective. It is also true,

however, that this same tradition made the important
attempt to characterize the 'Janus-face' of nationalism:
as a phenomenon which could have a negative
and oppressive impact on the one hand, and a positive
impact as a liberating force in the struggle against
national or colonial oppression on the other (Nairn
1981).
The distinction between the two kinds of nationalism
is typical for a large number of researchers, and it
is foreshadowed by Hans Kohn's West-East dichotomy mentioned
above. The distinction between positive and negative nationalisms
according to the country or the national context was
also used later (Greenfeld, 1992).
Another dichotomy is a distinction between nationalisms
according to time periods. In 1956, the influential
German historian Theodor Schieder (1991)
evaluated nineteenth-century nationalism as a progressive
and creative factor, while he criticized the
manifestations of the destructive side of nationalism,
especially in the first half of the twentieth century. This
distinction was later repeated by other authors. Ironically,
the official Soviet scholarship also recognized
two similar phases, although it did not explicitly use
the term nationalism.
A majority of contemporary authors recognize the
double-face of nationalism in history, nevertheless, without giving
geo-political meaning. For example,
Louis Snyder (1976) considered nationalism as moral,
as well as immoral, human as well as inhuman. According
to these criteria, it could be evaluated as
positive in some cases and as negative in others. He
saw the main danger of nationalism in its association
with collectivism against individualism. The French
philosopher Etienne Balibar (1991) sees the 'good' side
of nationalism in that it contributes to the development
of state and a community of citizens in general,
it derives from the love of people, and it is tolerant. In
contrast, the 'bad' side of nationalism is in its
expansiveness, hatred, and intolerance. It is
symptomatic that the positive potential of nationalism

is mostly appreciated by non-Anglo-American authors:
apart from the French mentioned, also the
Catalunian historian Josep Llobera (1994) and the
Israeli historian Hedva Ben-Israel can be mentioned among many
other authors. ==Liah Greenfeld (2006) means that nationalism became==
==an important driving force of modernization .==
Another group of authors considers the broad
meaning of the term nationalism to be a source of
imprecisions and misunderstandings, and recommends
the use of the term only to refer to national
egoism, preference of own nation over others, and
placing one's own national interest over the interests
of an individual (P. Sugar, L. Doob, O.
Dann, ==W. Norman==). Some recommended the use of other terms,
such as patriotism (Doob 1964, Samuel 1989, ==A. Vincent, 2002==), love
for one's country, national consciousness, and national feelings
for the positive manifestations of national identity.
Another variant is the recommendation to preserve
nationalism as the neutral term and find other terms,
such as ethnocentrism L. Le Vine, D. Cambell,
ethnonationalism, xenophobia or
chauvinism, for the negative manifestations.
Areal terminological potential can come from those
researchers who take the historical, that is developmental,
perspective. They follow from the fact that
attitudes called nationalism developed from certain
previous, developmentally 'lower' attitudes, perceptions,
and relations, which are sometimes called
identities, at other times loyalty, or primordial sentiments.
The term loyalty is rarely used in historic
research, but it belongs to the terminology of cultural
anthropology. It is characterized as 'a relation of an
individual towards pre-existing given groups, phenomena
values—in the social reality in which the
individual lives' (Geertz 1973).
The term ==national== identity now belongs to the common
terminology of a number of historical analyses. It is
used most consistently by Anthony Smith, who maintains
that nationalism needs to be studied as a certain
consequence, or as another phase in the development

of national identity. At the same time the consciousness
of each individual is determined by multiple
identities, which are more or less interrelated. Unlike
the term nationalism, the term national identity is not
laden or obscured with superficial journalism in the
vocabulary of historic analysis. A number of contemporary
scholars and projects promote using both terms in different meanings
(Guibernau).
The Swedish historian Sven Tagil (1984)
suggests a distinction between 'identity,' referring to
the simple consciousness of belonging to a group, and
'identification,' referring to the active and committed
participation in the work for the nation.
The debate over definitions and evaluation should
not be seen as mere academic disputes or noncommittal
intellectual exercises. The debate is not selfserving,
it is a discussion over whether and how, a
particular term or concept is suitable for explaining
the fact that after 200 years of dramatic and controversial
development in Europe, in most cases, the
nation-forming process almost everywhere resulted in mono-ethnic
nation-states. Nevertheless, neither national identity, nor nationalism
disappeared.

2. Why Nation and Nationalism? Attempts at a
Historical Explanation
Every survey of views on the genesis of nations and
nationalism is confronted with the contradiction
between those who consider nation an invention or a
construct—and therefore the product of nationalism—
and those who see nation as a result of
objective nation-forming processes. Judging from the
verbal expressions, the conflict is irreconcilable. However,
is that really so, or is the conflict not so
fundamental—as Paul James (1996) argues?
The work of Ernest Gellner illustrates the productivity
of the approach which tries to see reality
behind words and aphoristic statements. His apodictic
statement about nationalism creating nations is often
cited and made absolute by 'modernists.' Few of them
realized that Gellner's definition only moved the causal

explanation to a different level: the point was to
explain why nationalism had gained such a response.
At this level, Gellner works mostly with objective
social and cultural factors. Similarly, it clearly follows
from the statements of Benedict Anderson that nations
as 'imagined communities' could only be formed
thanks to particular objective social preconditions.
Therefore, a causal interpretation, does not necessarily
have to dramatically contrast the nation-forming
process with nationalism.
Trying to find an easier orientation, Anthony Smith (1997)
distinguished several categories of historical explanations of
nationalism. Perennialist and primordialist approaches explain the
nation building in terms of "longue durée" and of primordial ties and
attitudes (Bergh, Geerts, Fishman, Connor, Hastings). The broad
diapason of modernist authors explained nationalism in the context
of all kinds of modernization processes, in some cases wit stronger
emphasis on constructivism, sometimes with elements of
perennialism (Anderson, Hobsbawm, Breuilly, Tilly, Nairn, Gellner,
Hroch). Between these two main streams positioned Smith his own
theory and gave her the name of ethnosymbolism (Armstrong,
Hutchinson). Ethnic identity were reinterpreted and used as symbols
mobilizing national feelings. As more marginal regards Smith the
"postmodernists", who try to find fully new dimensions, partially based
on modernist paragidmata, partially deconstructing them (Brubaker,
Chaterjee, Billig, Ozkirimli).
The flood of 'theories of nationalism' seems quite justly confusing
at first sight, but a closer examination will reveal that
most accounts attempting historical explanations of
nationalism repeat the same basic relations and
factors, although using different vocabulary and concepts.
The differences between the authors are then
mostly in the emphasis on a particular kind of relation. This is not the
case of those, who belong to the post-modernist stream, and who
resigned to generalizing explanations of nationalism.
This article will therefore not deal with singular authors but
rather it will characterize their evaluation of the
relevance of the particular relations and contexts: (a)
historical background; (b) ethnic and cultural 'roots'
and, within these, also denominational relations; (c)

the process of modernization, that is, particularly
industrialization—and the ensuing changes of social
structure, social communication, and the unevenness
of the modernization process; (d) conflicts of interests;
and (e) psychological relations. Only a marginal group of authors
consciously resigned to generalizing explanation of "nationalism".

*2.1 Historical Preconditions or the Legacy of the
Past*

The view that nation-forming was an inevitable result
of the historical conditions of the past centuries is now
considered a traditionalist residue. Despite that, historians
as well as social scientists, Anthony Smith the most important among
them, still consider the past
to be an important component of the causal interpretation
of the nation-forming process and nationalism.
They differ in the strength of the influence they
ascribe to history and, particularly, in the analytical
perspective. To put it simply, the importance of history
is seen from two perspectives: from the perspective
of institutions or other objectively operating results
of the past development, and from the perspective of
'collective memory' or the construct of national
history.
In the former the issue is how institutions, relations,
and stereotypes surviving from the past influenced
nation-forming: it refers to the state, legislation, and
also estates, judiciary, borders, internal administration,
the extent of centralism and others. The notion
that the 'right' to the recognition of national existence
is conditioned by the existence of a 'national' state
from the Middle Ages gave rise to the nineteenthcentury
distinction between 'historical' and 'nonhistorical'
nations, that is, nations with or without
their own (political) history. Although this distinction
is no longer considered relevant, a number of authors
still work implicitly with the idea that some nations
(such as the French, the Dutch, and the Portuguese)
are a given, 'natural,' and organic part of the state
system, while others formed somewhat by 'accident'
(the Estonians, the Slovenes, the Bulgarians, and

many others). Authors (for example, Shafer, Breuilly, Hobsbawm, Rokkan, Llobera, Tilly, and Barth) who define nation by statehood or understand nationalism as a struggle for statehood, usually assign an important role to political or state history.

A particular problem in analyzing the role of history is that people expressed views and stereotypes which many researchers would today call 'nationalist'—that is, manifestations of national consciousness—already in the Middle Ages and especially in the Early Modern Period—a long time before the modern nation-forming processes. Modern historians agree that the pre-Modern manifestations of national consciousness did not include the entire community but only the privileged classes—the nobility and also sometimes the higher burgher categories (Hagen Schulze, Norbert Elias, and others). Bauer was already aware of this in his periodization of national development.

'Collective memory' is the other perspective on the effects of the past on nation-forming. Authors working within discourse analysis particularly emphasize that the strength of past statehood is not important, but the way the past was understood, interpreted, and worked with—and therefore also manipulated in the national interest. Hobsbawm's phrase 'invented tradition' is usually quoted in this context, and it usually refers to skepticism toward any real historical continuity. At the same time, it is unthinkable to invent the past without any real evidence. On the other hand, recent research confirmed, how important it is to study the creating of the image, the construct of 'national history' under the conditions of nation-forming (Stephan Berger, Chris Lorenz 2008).

2.2 Ethnic Roots of Nationalism

It is understandable that most authors who associate nation and nationalism with state do not ascribe much importance to the ethnic and cultural component of the nation-forming process. Some even consider ethnic consciousness neutral, and not automatically a source of nationalism.

On the other hand, a number of authors consider

ethnic identities and cultural particulars an important, if not a key precondition of a development toward a modern nation. Anthony Smith (1991, 1986) paid the greatest attention to this relation. He differentiated between the degrees of ethnic identity and considered that an 'ethnie' could also develop its collective memory. Ethnic groups could also enter into conflictual relations, which in many aspects forestalled national conflicts (Horowitz 1985). A number of other authors considered ethnic roots of national existence important, despite their differences in terminology: sometimes they spoke of ethnonationalism, sometimes of nationality, and at other times of primordiality or primordial ethnicity.

Unlike the general role of ethnicity, religion is only mentioned in concrete cases (the Balkans, Ireland), and it is not listed among the necessary preconditions of the nation-forming processes. Nevertheless, several authors acknowledge the indirect role of religion as a modernizing factor in education and communication, particularly as an agent of reformation and counterreformation (Anderson (1983), Armstrong (1982) and others). The significance of overcoming religiosity with the rise of secularism is also acknowledged. At the same time, some authors see nationalism as a 'national,' secularized religion.

2.3 Nation and Nationalism as Manifestations or Consequences of Modernization

The modern nation-forming doubtlessly occurred during the period of civil revolutions, industrializations, and the beginnings of the free market. That is, during the period called modernization by some, overcoming of traditional society by others, and the transition from feudal to capitalist society by other authors. Most authors (unlike, for example, Kohn) consider this simultaneous occurrence more than a coincidence, but they construct the causal relations in different contexts. Already in 1953, Deutsch saw the industrial revolution and the onset of the free market as crucial for the spread of nationalism. Later, he

considered nationalism a response of people, on the one hand, to the possibilities of improving their status thanks to social mobility, and on the other hand, to the loss of ties to the traditional lordships and settlements. Gellner's thesis (1983) about industrialization as the fundamental impulse for the birth of nationalism cannot therefore be seen as original. Gellner, however, does not conceive of industrialization in the literal sense referred to by historians, that is, as the introduction of the industrial mode of production. Rather, he means market economy and social mobility in general as factors opening the way for the principles of equality of citizens and their new role in the transformation of culture. Michael Mann (1988) and other authors, such as Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (1991) work with a similar, although more differentiated, thesis. Carolyne M. Vogler (1985) also shares this perspective when she maintains that the 'disjunction between economics and politics' occurred, and that significantly contributed to the dissolution of multinational states and the creation of nation-states. In contrast to the thesis of the role of industralization, other authors emphasize general modernization changes ensuing from the progressing liberation of the market and people (Hroch (1985), Llobera (1994)). The emergence of the new forms of enterprise (that is, capitalist enterprise) and the related social mobility are specifically reflected in increasing social communication, that is, a system of an increasing amount of information being exchanged among an increasing number of people. As mentioned, Karl W. Deutsch ascribed the key importance to this circumstance on the formation of nation and nationalism, but his onesided emphasis on communication was not generally accepted. His views were, nevertheless, confirmed within another terminological framework: the thesis about the crucial role of education in the people's ability to accept the notion of a nation as an abstract community became the central argument of Anderson. It was already advocated earlier by Gale Stokes (1974)

who proposed that the acceptance of such a notion depended not only on elementary literacy, but also on schooling until the age when a child developed the ability of abstract thinking. The German sociologist Berndt Giesen (1991) connected both of these perspectives: in the conditions of the new type of communication between addressees who did not know each other, a new style of communication and new coding was necessary. The idea of nation became such a code for encoding the new living conditions of modern society.

Numerous researchers argue that the spread of nationalism was boosted by the deepening of the unevenness of development—another consequence of modernization and 'industrialization.' A specific form of unevenness was a 'cultural division of labor between the core and the periphery,' which resulted in the inferior social role of the periphery. This led to the 'internal colonialism' as a breeding ground of national and regional movements opposing the 'center' (Hechter 1975). Mann (1988) and Nairn (1981) also considered uneven development and the associated sentiments of oppression, important factors of nationforming processes. The view of the nation-mobilizing role of unevenness ('backwardness') has been criticized frequently and its general validity has been rejected.

2.4 Nationally Relevant Conflicts of Interests

This brings the discussion to the factor which—again veiled by the various terms—plays an important role for perhaps still the majority of approaches seeking the explanation of nation-forming and also of the spread of nationalism in objective social changes. The thesis of internal colonialism alone suggested that the conflict between the falling-behind periphery and the center could be expressed in the categories of national interest. In other words, uneven development could be counted among nationally relevant conflicts. Some authors accentuated the role of international conflicts and above all of wars as decisive basis of nationalism and national mobilization (Langewiesche,Laitin). There is no doubt that in some

parts of Europe –above all in South-East – wars accompanied all cases of nation formation. On the other side, wars used to be rather a consequence and accelerator of militant nationalism, instead of being its origin (Hogan 2009).

All this range of conflicts from wars to socially and status-motivated tensions can be seen as conflicts of interest. This fact makes any generalization difficult, but it also allows for different interpretations. The most frequently listed conflict in the explanations of nationalism is the conflict ensuing from uneven development. A social conflict between groups or classes which, at the same time, belonged to different ethnicities is theorized relatively seldom in contemporary research (Miroslav Hroch, Paul James, Tom Nairn, Eric Hobsbawm), as is the idea of the struggle against an old society in the national interest (Boyd Shafer).

2.5 Nationalism as a Result of Psychological, Cultural, and Emotional Manipulation

Most researchers working on the explanations of nationalism also look for its sources in the realm of psychology and emotions. The individual models, however, differ significantly according to which aspect of human psyche they consider important. Insecurity of a human individual, the need to belong to a group and to identify with it, are some of the most frequently quoted aspects. The insecurity is then seen as being caused by perceived (or real) endangerment, while the source of endangerment can be either external danger or internal insecurity resulting from the perception of uprootedness, dissolution of old securities, old faith, etc. (Miroslav Hroch, Gale Stokes, Anthony Smith, Bernd Giesen, Ernest Gellner). Nationalism is sometimes considered a sick, pathological reaction to such perceived endangerment (Committee on International Relations 1987), and at other times a response to the inferiority complex (Lemberg 1964). Anderson speaks of the need to overcome the fear of an individual death by identifying with an immortal nation.

Following partially from Geertz's primordial ties, some researchers tried to apply biological research on

animal behavior to nationalism, and explain nationalist
attitudes as the 'territorial imperative' (Snyder
1975). Nevertheless, this approach has remained marginal
in the overall context.
'All the stronger' has recently become the effort to
explain nationalism as a cultural construct deriving
from the activities aiming at the emotional mobilization
of human psyche. Thus national rituals are
becoming a subject of intense research (George Mosse,
1973), as well as symbols, celebrations in the name of
nation (E.Francois , G.Elgenius 2011), and pilgrimages to places
commemorating the
national past (Nora 1986)—in short, activities deliberately
aimed at the emotional element of the human
psyche. It includes also manipulations through state institutions,
media, movies – factors which are regarded as decisive of nationalist
mobilization in the eyes of constructivists and post-modernists.
Overall, differences in the explanations of nation formation
are not as fundamental as it may appear on
the surface from the different terminology and the
verbal radicalism of some authors. The understandable
efforts for originality and impressive contribution
are often a facade of new expressions repeating older
conclusions and findings.
Most of the studies on the historical origins of
nationalism are flawed in that they ignore the fact that
the process of nation-forming was present in two basic
types in Europe: the first started with state-nations
which had existed since the Middle Ages and began to
transform into modern nations at the end of the
eighteenth century or later. The point of departure of
the second type were non-dominant ethnic groups
which inhabited the territories of large multi-ethnic
empires, did not have ruling elites, had their own
cultural traditions in a codified language, and had
either disrupted or no tradition of statehood. That is
why it is important to distinguish between nationalism
(whether considered as a part of national identity or
merely as its nationally egoistic variant) developed in
the conditions of state-nations and the kind of nationalism

known from national movements. The latter
type again differs depending on whether it developed
under conditions of Phase of national agitation (Phase B) or a mass
national movement (Phase C). In any case, nationalism should
never be viewed as a compact theory or 'ideology'
comparable to liberalism, clericalism, or socialism. It
has always been a mixture of variously structured
stereotypes which, in the environment of forming a
fully fledged nation, had the ability to attach itself to
any political ideology and live with it in a symbiotic or
parasitic relationship.
(Translated by Libora Oates-Indruchova_)
See also: Clan; Cold War, The; Conservatism: Historical
Aspects; Environmental History; Ethnic Groups_
Ethnicity: Historical Aspects; Medicine, History
of; National Socialism and Fascism; Nationalism and
Expressive Forms; Nationalism: Contemporary
Issues; Nationalism: General; Nationalism, Historical
Aspects of: Arab World; Nationalism, Sociology of;
Nations and Nation-states in History; Nation-states,
Nationalism, and Gender; Power in Society; Primary
Elections; Rationality in Society; Religion: Nationalism
and Identity; Revolutions, History of; State
Formation; State, History of; Western European
Studies: Culture; Western European Studies: Gender
and History

Bibliography
Anderson B R 1983 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, London
Armstrong J A 1982 *Nations before Nationalism*. University of Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC
Balibar E, Wallerstein I 1991 *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Verso, London, New York
Bauer O 1907 *Die Nationalitatenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie* [The issue of nationality and social democracy]. Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, Vienna
Berger S, Lorenz Ch 2008 *The Contested Nation. Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories, Macmillan, Palgrave*
Billig M. 1997 *Banal Nationalism, Sage, London*
Breuilly J 1982 *Nationalism and the State*. St. Martin's Press,

New York

Brubaker R 1996 *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, NY

Calhoun C 2007 *Nations Matter:Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream, Rotledge, London, New York*

Connor W1994 *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ

Committee on International Relations, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry 1987 *US and THEM: the Psychology of Ethnonationalism*. Brunner_Mazel, New York

Deutsch K W 1953 *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

Doob L W 1964 *Patriotism and Nationalism: Their Psychological Foundations*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT

Elgenius G 2011 Symbols of nations and nationalism: celebrating nationhood, New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Gellner E 1983 *Nations and Nationalism*. Basil Blackwell, London

Gellner E 1997 *Nationalism*. Weidenfels & Nicolson, London

Geertz C 1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, New York

Giddens A 1987 The nation-states and violence. In: Giddens A *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA

Greenfeld L 1992 *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity, Harvard Univ.Press, Cambridge/Mass*

Greenfeld L 2006 *Modernity and Nationalism, in: Delanty G, Kumar K,The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism, SAGE, London*

Guibernau M 2007, *The Identity of Nations, Polity Press, Cambridge*

Hayes C J H1926 *Essays on Nationalism*. Macmillan, New York

Hayes C J H 1931 *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*. R R Smith, Inc., New York

Hechter M 1975 *Internal Colonialism: the Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536–1966*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London

Hobsbawn E J 1990 *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge University Press,

Cambridge, NY

Hogan P C 2009 *Understanding Nationalism* Columbus, Ohio UP

Horowitz D L 1985 *Ethnic Groups in Conflict.* University of California Press, Los Angeles

Hroch M 1985 *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: a Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, NY

Hroch M 2000 In the National Interest, Prague Charles University

James P 1996 *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community.* Sage, London

Kedourie E 1960 *Nationalism.* Hutchinson, London

KemilainenA1964 Nationalism: problems concerning the word, the concept and classification. *Studia Historica Jyvaskylansia III*, Jyvaskyla, Finland

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

Laitin D D 2007 *Nations, States, and Violence, Oxford University Press*

Langewiesche D 2003 *Der Krieg in den Grundungsmythen europaischer Nationen und der USA /The War in the Foundings-Myths of European nations and USA/, Campus, Frankfurt M.*

Leerssen J 2006 *National Thought in Europe, Amsterdam University Press*

Lemberg E 1964 *Nationalismus I.II.* Rowohlt Reinbeck, Hamburg, Germany

Llobera J R 1994 *The God of Modernity: the Development of Nationalism in Western Europe.* Providence, Oxford

Mann M 1988 *States, War and Capitalism: Studies in Political Sociology.* Blackwell, Oxford, UK

Meinecke F 1907_1911 *Weltburgertum und Nationalstaat* [The Weltburgertum and the Nation-State]. R. Oldenbourg, Munchen_Berlin, Germany

Mosse G L 1973 *The Nationalization of the Masses.* Howard Fertig, New York

Nairn T 1981 *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neonationalism*, 2nd exp. edn. NL Bond_Verso, London

Nora P 1986 *Les Lieux de Me_moire* [*The Locations of Memory*], *II. 1–3 La Nation*,. Gallimard, Paris

Norman W 2006 Negotiating *Nationalism. Nation Building, Federalism and Secession in the Multinational State*, Oxford UP

Ozkirimli U 2010 *Theories of Nationalism. A Critical Introduction,* New York, Palgrave Macmillan

Renan E 1888 (1947) Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? (What is a nation?] In: *Oeuvres completes I.* Calman Levy, Paris

Samuel R (ed.) 1989 *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity.* Routledge, London_New York

Schieder T 1991 *Nationalismus und Nationalstaat: Studien zum nationalen Problem im modernen Europa.* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Gottingen, Germany [Nationalism and nationstate: studies of the national problem in modern Europe]

Schopflin H 2000 *Nations, Identity, Power, Hurst, London*

Schulze H 1996 *Staat und Nation in der europaischen Geschichte* [*State and Nation in European History*]. Verlag C. H. Beck, Munich, Germany

Seton-Watson H 1977 *Nations and States: An Inquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism.* Methuen, London

Shafer B C 1955 *Nationalism: Myth and Reality.* Harcourt, Brace and Comp., New York

Smith A D 1986 *The Ethnic Origins of Nations.* Blackwell, Oxford, UK

Smith A D 1991 *National Identity.* Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, UK

Smith A D 1998 *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism, Routledge, London and New York*

Smith A D 2009 *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism*, Routledge

Snyder L L 1954 *The Meaning of Nationalism.* Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ

Snyder L L 1976 *Varieties of Nationalism: a Comparative Study.* Dryden Press, Hinsdale, IL

Sorokin P 1947 *Society, Culture and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics, A System of General Sociology.* Harper, New York

Stokes G 1974 *Cognition and the function of nationalism. Journal of Interdisciplinary History.* **4**: 525–42

Tagil S (ed.) 1984 *Regions in Upheaval. Lund Studies in International History.* Essette Studium, Solna, Sweden, Vol.

22
Vincent A 2002 *Nationalism and Particularity*, Cambridge UP
Vogler C M1985 *The Nation State: The Neglected Dimension of Class.* Brookfield Gower, Aldershot
M. Hroch, Charles University Prague
Adress:Na hroudě 17
  100 00 Praha 10
hrochmir@seznam.cz