

Contents

<i>List of Boxes</i>	vii
<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	ix
1. Introduction	1
Why nationalism?	1
Objectives	5
Structure	6
2. Discourses and Debates on Nationalism	9
Historical overview	9
The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries	10
1918–1945	31
1945–1989	39
From 1989 to the present	46
3. Primordialism	49
What is primordialism?	49
The nationalist thesis	51
Pierre van den Berghe and the sociobiological approach	53
Edward Shils, Clifford Geertz and the culturalist approach	55
Adrian Hastings and perennialism	58
A critique of primordialism	60
Primordialism today	67
4. Modernism	72
What is modernism?	72
Economic transformations	72
Tom Nairn and uneven development	73
Michael Hechter and internal colonialism	77
Political transformations	83
John Breuilly and nationalism as a form of politics	83
Paul R. Brass and instrumentalism	88
Eric J. Hobsbawm and the invention of tradition	94
Social/cultural transformations	97
Ernest Gellner and high cultures	98
Benedict Anderson and imagined communities	105
Miroslav Hroch and the three phases of nationalism	113

A critique of modernism	120
Modernism today	137
5. Ethnosymbolism	143
What is ethnosymbolism?	143
John Armstrong and myth-symbol complexes	144
Anthony D. Smith and the ethnic origins of nations	148
A critique of ethnosymbolism	157
Ethnosymbolism today	165
6. New Approaches to Nationalism	169
Why 'new'?	169
Michael Billig and banal nationalism	170
Nira Yuval-Davis and feminist approaches	175
Partha Chatterjee and post-colonial theory	182
Craig Calhoun and nationalism as discursive formation	187
Rogers Brubaker and ethnicity without groups	190
A critique of new approaches	194
7. Understanding Nationalism	199
A critique of the theoretical debate on nationalism	199
The outline of a theoretical approach to nationalism	205
Nationalism studies today	217
<i>Bibliography</i>	220
<i>Index</i>	240

Chapter 1

Introduction

Why nationalism?

Most recent texts on nationalism start by pointing to the ‘rediscovery’ of nationalism as a subject of academic inquiry with the proliferation of ethnic and nationalist conflicts across much of the world in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war. Delanty and Kumar, for example, remark that ‘nationalism has seemingly returned with renewed vigor in recent decades’, attracting growing attention from scholars from a variety of disciplines (2006a: 1; see also Day and Thompson 2004; Conversi 2002; Leoussi 2001). Spencer and Wollman make the point more personally noting that they began ‘to think seriously about nationalism ... when faced with the catastrophic consequences of what appeared to be a sudden explosion of nationalism in the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s’ (2001: 1), while already a few years earlier Smith was observing that ‘The last ten years have witnessed a phenomenal growth in the practice and study of nationalism’ and that ethnic nationalism ‘has flourished more widely and powerfully than at any period since the Second World War’ (1998a: xi).

Yet this picture of the worldwide proliferation of ethnic and nationalist conflicts needs to be seriously qualified. It has been documented that there has been a sustained decline in the total number of armed self-determination conflicts since the early 1990s, with a countervailing trend towards containment and settlement. As Hewitt *et al.* (2008) report, 26 armed self-determination conflicts were ongoing as of late 2006; 6 conflicts were settled between 2001 and 2006, and another 15 contained (2008: 14). A similar point is made by David D. Laitin, who claims that the world will take on a different colour if we shift our gaze from the catalogue of violent ethnic conflicts to the probability of violence given ethnic difference. After considering available quantitative data on ethnic and communal violence in Africa, for example, Laitin concludes: ‘the percentage of neighboring ethnic groups that experienced violent communal incidents was infinitesimal – on average only 5 in 10,000 had a recorded violent conflict per year’. The same holds for other parts of the world as well; hence ‘the popular belief that nationalism and ethnic differences in and of themselves are dangerous is discredited by quantitative research’ (2007: 10–11, 22).

How can we explain this gap between available data and academic (as well

as popular) perceptions? One reason is ‘selection bias’. According to Laitin, far more attention is given to violent cases than peaceful ones in the literature. This can partly be explained by what Brubaker and Laitin have referred to as the ubiquity of the ethnic frame, which ‘generates a coding bias in the ethnic direction’:

Today, we [actors and analysts alike] are no longer blind to ethnicity, but we may be blinded by it. Our ethnic bias in framing may lead us to overestimate the incidence of ethnic violence by unjustifiably seeing ethnicity at work everywhere and thereby artifactually multiplying instances of ‘ethnic violence’. (1998: 428)

The second reason that creates the gap between data and perception according to Laitin is the tendency to take the accounts of combatants at their face value. The grievances expressed by the combatants may have contributed to violent mobilization, but they are mostly latent, and it is precisely those factors that make these grievances ‘vital and manifest’ that differentiate violent from non-violent cases. ‘*Ex ante* measures of grievance levels are not good predictors of the transformation of latent grievances into manifest ones.’ In any case, it is difficult to know ‘whether, when, where, to what extent and in what manner’ the posited grievances, beliefs and fears are actually held (Laitin 2007: 23–5; Brubaker and Laitin 1998: 443).

These observations suggest that the talk of the rise of nationalism or the proliferation of ethnic conflicts needs to be taken with a pinch of salt. But can we conclude on the basis of this that nationalism does not matter? Certainly not, and even the prevalence of a coding bias in the ethnic direction and the persistent tendency to kick off discussions of nationalism by referring to ethnic and nationalist hotspots in this or that part of the world are testament to this. Nationalism does matter – as the fundamental organizing principle of the interstate order, as the ultimate source of political legitimacy, as a readily available cognitive and discursive frame, as the taken-for-granted context of everyday life. As such, it not only forms the horizon of international and domestic political discourse, and the natural framework for all political interaction, but it also structures our daily lives and the way we perceive and interpret the reality that surrounds us. It impinges on our analytical perspectives; it shapes our academic conventions. This is what some commentators have aptly termed ‘methodological nationalism’, the pervasive tendency to equate the concept of ‘society’ with that of the ‘nation’, to presuppose that the nation is the natural and necessary form of society in modernity (Wimmer 2006 and Wimmer and Schiller 2002; Chernilo 2006 and 2007). This is particularly the case with history as:

the very tools of analysis by which we pretend to practice scientific history were invented and perfected within a wider climate of nationalism and

nationalist preoccupations. Rather than neutral instruments of scholarship, the modern methods of researching and writing history were developed specifically to further nationalist aims. (Geary 2002: 16)

Social scientists and political theorists, too, take the existence of nations for granted, making it a background condition of their analyses and ruminations. This is what leads Canovan to argue that underneath most contemporary political thinking lie ‘assumptions about the existence of bounded, unified political communities that seem suspiciously like nation-states’ (1996: 27). In short, nationalism matters a lot and it seems difficult to disagree with Calhoun who contends in his recent book (snappily entitled *Nations Matter*) that:

Even where we are deeply critical of the nationalism we see, we should recognize the continued importance of national solidarities. Even if we wish for a more cosmopolitan world order, we should be realistic enough not to act on mere wishes. (2007: 1)

Given this, it is striking that nations and nationalism have been a peripheral concern of social and political theory for much of the twentieth century. With the exception of the pioneering works of historians like Carleton Hayes, Hans Kohn, Louis Snyder and E. H. Carr, it is only in the 1960s and 1970s that we find a lively academic debate on nationalism, spurred on by the experience of decolonization and the proliferation of new states in Asia and Africa. Subscribing to some version of the then ascendant ‘nation-building’ model, most of these studies saw nationalism as a concomitant of the modernization processes, an outcome or by-product of the transition from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ society. The debate has been taken to a whole new level in the 1980s with the publication of John Armstrong’s *Nations Before Nationalism* (1982), John Breuilly’s *Nationalism and the State* (1982), Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1983), Ernest Gellner’s *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), Eric J. Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s *The Invention of Tradition* (1983) and Anthony D. Smith’s *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (1986), among others. Nationalism, which had to wait until 1974 to have its first academic journal, finally had a stimulating, even polemical, literature.

It is possible to identify two reasons for the belated development of a fully fledged literature on nationalism. The first was the general indifference of mainstream academic thinking to nationalism as a topic of investigation in its own right. This attitude was partly conditioned by the rigidity and conservatism of established disciplines, which regarded nationalism either as *passé* or as a lesser, marginal preoccupation, as opposed to ‘state’, ‘democracy’, ‘justice’, ‘development’ and the like. Even as late as the 1990s, Yael Tamir recalls how difficult it was to justify her choice of nationalism as a PhD topic in Oxford:

When I embarked on this project, nationalism seemed almost an anachronistic topic. During my years in Oxford, I exhausted a stockpile of phrases in answer to the comment, ‘How interesting!’ (Oxfordese for ‘How weird!’) – usually uttered after I reported I was writing a thesis on nationalism. (1993: ix)

The picture was further complicated by the tendency to take nations and nationalism for granted, a point we have alluded to above. This is the main thrust of Billig’s argument on nationalism and the sociological common sense in his influential *Banal Nationalism* (1995: Chapter 3). Drawing our attention to the curious absence of nationalism in the subject indexes of standard textbooks in sociology, Billig shows how ‘society’ is construed in the image of a ‘nation-state’ by mainstream sociology – an assumption that ‘we’, the readers, are expected to share. If ‘society’, a universal feature of human existence, is treated as a ‘nation-state’, then nationalism ceases to be a problem worth exploring, and becomes a humdrum part of our social life. It only returns as a topic of investigation when an odious form of nationalism threatens the integrity of ‘our’ society. In that case, Billig argues, the textbooks of sociology are likely to add subsections, even whole chapters on nationalism. But even if they do:

nationalism will still be seen as something surplus, even contingent. It will be a special subject. ‘Society’, modelled on the image of ‘our’ nation, will continue to be treated as necessarily universal. In this way, ‘our’ nationalism need not return textually. (1995: 54)

This brings us to the second reason that deferred scholarly intrusions into national phenomena, namely the tendency to reduce nationalism to its extreme manifestations, that is to separatist movements that threaten the stability of existing states, or to aggressive right-wing politics. Such a view locates nationalism on the periphery, treating it as the property of others, not of ‘us’. In the words of Billig, ‘“our” nationalism is not presented as nationalism, which is dangerously irrational, surplus and alien’; through a rhetorical sleight of hand, it is repackaged as ‘patriotism’, which is necessary and beneficial. This enables theorists to ignore their own nationalisms; when nationalism ‘as a condition is projected on to “others”, “ours” is overlooked, forgotten, even theoretically denied’ (ibid.: 5, 17, 55). Yet this commonly accepted view is misleading as it turns a blind eye to the myriad ways in which nationalism is reproduced in established nations, forming a backdrop to public life, embodied in the habits and routines of everyday life.

It would not be wrong to say that the reasons that delayed the development of a vibrant literature on nationalism have gradually disappeared as the twentieth century wore on. Nationalism has proved to be much more than an academic fad, destined to vanish, like the grin of the Cheshire cat, as soon as

another ‘pastime’ is found, and has become one of the most explored topics in social sciences. Today, we find ourselves immersed in a flood of publications on nationalism, including, in addition to case studies and theoretical treatises, introductory texts (Smith 2001a; Spencer and Wollmann 2001; Delanty and O’Mahony 2002; Zimmer 2003; Day and Thompson 2004; Puri 2004; Lawrence 2005; Ichijo and Uzelac 2005; Dieckhoff and Jaffrelot 2005; Grosby 2005a; Hearn 2006), handbooks and readers (Guibernau and Hutchinson 2001; Pecora 2001; Spencer and Wollman 2005; Delanty and Kumar 2006b), monographs or edited collections devoted to a particular theorist/thinker or approach (Conversi 2002; Varouxakis 2002; Culler and Cheah 2003; Barnard 2003; Guibernau and Hutchinson 2004; Malešević and Hugaard 2007; Leoussi and Grosby 2007; Dingley 2008), even encyclopedias (Motyl 2001; Leoussi 2001 – the works cited here are limited to those published after 2000; for earlier examples, see Further Reading at the end of this chapter). Then there are the specialized journals, research centres, internet networks, academic programmes. The upshot of this has been a name – the field is now widely referred to as ‘nationalism studies’ – and an immense, highly diversified, literature. It is now time not only to take stock of the theoretical debate on nationalism, but also to move beyond the classical debate which has become too parochial and sterile over the years, and to set a new research agenda for the future.

Objectives

This book has three main objectives: first, to provide a systematic overview of some of the key theoretical approaches to nationalism and to consider the main criticisms raised against them in a comparative perspective; second, to point to the limitations of the classical debate and to identify the theoretical problems we are still facing; and finally, to propose, in the light of these considerations, an alternative theoretical framework that can be used in the study of nationalism. Before proceeding, however, I would like to say a few more things about what this book ‘is not’.

This book is not an exegesis into historical or philosophical discourses on nationalism. Its focus is on contemporary theoretical debates on nationalism, those that have developed and come of age in the second half of the twentieth century. Needless to say, these debates have not taken place in a vacuum; most of the issues and problems that preoccupy contemporary theorists have already been identified and debated at length by, first, philosophers and historians, then the pioneering figures of social sciences over the past two centuries. Hence the second longest chapter of this book will be devoted to earlier discussions on nationalism in order to situate the contemporary debate in a wider historical context. Yet, given the vast amounts of ink expended to comprehend

nationalism, the treatment of various thinkers and their work will necessarily be sketchy and fragmentary.

This book is not a collection (or ‘collage’) of case studies either. In fact, one of the objectives of the book is to call attention to a problem that bedevils, sometimes even threatens the integrity of, the study of nationalism, namely the casual (one may say cavalier) use of brief historical examples to sustain an argument or to corroborate a particular theoretical perspective – what Breuilly (2005) ingeniously called the ‘scissors-and-paste’ type of argument. Lacking detail and context, this type of argumentation obfuscates analysis, leading us to see nationalism everywhere at work. This does not imply that theoretical discussions should steer clear of historical analyses. On the contrary, theories do not mean much unless tested against actual cases. But the cases should be examined in detail, not just cited for illustrative purposes with reference to a few standard (mostly outdated) texts. This book will not engage with actual cases in detail, mainly for reasons of space (see however Özkırımlı and Sofos 2008, for a detailed examination of the Greek and Turkish cases); it will not, however, fall into the trap of a ‘scissors-and-paste’ approach either, and refer to particular cases only when they are mentioned by the theories under review. It will also stress the value of theoretically informed historical analyses and comparative studies throughout, and in fact suggest this as one way out of the analytical stalemate that characterizes current debates.

Finally, this book does not claim to be exhaustive. Although it now covers more theorists (including non-Western ones) than before, it still omits a lot, notably contributions in languages other than English. There is no meaningful way to justify the choices made here except reiterating a point made earlier, that any such selection is bound to be partial. I do however believe that my selection reflects the main trends in the field and offers a balanced overview of all major contributions to the theoretical debate on nationalism.

Structure

Reflection on nationalism has a long past, and earlier assumptions and convictions continue to cast a shadow on contemporary discussions on nationalism. With this in mind, I will begin my survey by situating current debates historically and theoretically.

The following four chapters will be devoted to the discussion of the main theoretical positions with regard to nationalism. Each chapter will open with an overview of the various versions of the theoretical approach in question. It will then summarize the main criticisms levelled against these approaches, and conclude with a discussion of the contributions of theorists who have attempted a reformulation of this position in recent years.

In accordance with the general tendency in the field, I will start my discussion

with primordialist approaches. Hence Chapter 3 will examine the different versions of primordialism, namely the nationalist, sociobiological, culturalist and perennialist explanations. Chapter 4 will focus on modernism. Taking the differences between the theorists that fall under this category into account, I will divide them into three groups in terms of the key factors they identified in their analyses. Hence, scholars like Tom Nairn and Michael Hechter who stressed the importance of economic factors will be discussed under the heading ‘economic transformations’; scholars like John Breuilly, Paul R. Brass and Eric J. Hobsbawm who emphasized the role of politics and power struggles between contending elites will be considered under the heading ‘political transformations’; finally, scholars like Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and Miroslav Hroch who gave priority to social and cultural factors will be reviewed under the heading ‘social/cultural transformations’. Chapter 5 will explore ethnosymbolism, focusing in particular on the contributions of the two leading figures of this approach, John Armstrong and Anthony D. Smith. Chapter 6 will be devoted to recent approaches to nationalism. In this chapter, I will first try to substantiate the claim that we have entered a new stage in the theoretical debate since the end of the 1980s. I will then discuss the work of Michael Billig, Nira Yuval-Davis, Partha Chatterjee, Craig Calhoun and Rogers Brubaker to illustrate the new generation of research on nationalism.

In Chapter 7, I will first offer a critique of the tripartite classification commonly used in categorizing various theoretical positions. I will then provide a critical assessment of the positions themselves, and propose an alternative framework of analysis that can be used in the study of nationalism. I will conclude by offering some reflections on the current state and the future of nationalism studies.

Further reading

As I have pointed out above, there are now several introductory texts on nationalism. Among these, Smith (1983) [1971] is still the standard work of reference for the theories of the 1950s and 1960s. The fact that Smith is a participant to the contemporary debate is more manifest in his later surveys of the field, namely his *Nationalism and Modernism* (1998a) and *Nationalism* (2001a), which are coloured by a heavy dose of scepticism towards modernism. For more balanced overviews which give due weight to recent approaches, see Day and Thompson (2004) and Puri (2004); for the current state of the play in the classical debate, see Ichijo and Uzelac (2005); and for a historiography of the theoretical debate on nationalism, see Lawrence (2005). Among the various readers and handbooks, Eley and Suny (1996b) and Delanty and Kumar (2006b) stand out, the former for the space it allocates to alternative interpretations, and the latter for its thematic breadth and the quality of the individual contributions. The collections of essays by Periwal (1995) and Balakrishnan (1996) need also to be mentioned in this context. The two-volume *Encyclopedia of Nationalism* (2001) by Motyl, on the

other hand, is an exhaustive resource for anyone interested in nationalism, broadly construed, and not just theories of nationalism. The essays by Laitin, Suny, Walker, Kaiser and W. Smith in the first, thematic, volume of the encyclopedia are to be particularly commended.

Apart from these, the reader should also consult the various specialized journals on nationalism, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Nations and Nationalism*, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, *National Identities*, *Nationalities Papers*, *Ethnicities*, *Ethnopolitics*, among others, and *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, the biennial journal of the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism (ASEN) which includes, in addition to short thematic articles, a list of associations, research centres, journals and bulletins that are devoted to the study of nationalism, and a section on recent publications.

Index

- Acton, Lord, 25–6
Anderson, Benedict, 10, 105–13, 131, 132–3, 134, 183
Anthias, Floya, 176–7, 179, 180
anti-colonial, 39, 73, 112, 120, 155, 183
 see also colonial, colonialism; post-colonial, post-colonialism
anti-imperial(ist), anti-imperialism, 76, 97, 130
 see also imperialism, imperialist, theory of imperialism
antiquity, 30, 65, 68, 144, 149, 156, 160, 204
Armstrong, John A., 144–7, 149, 157–8, 165, 166, 179, 200
ASEN (Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism), 8, 149
 see also SEN (Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism)
assimilation(ist), assimilationism, 19, 79, 90, 92, 104, 127, 129, 150, 153
authenticity, 156, 215
autonomy, 24, 55, 58, 118, 154, 160
 institutional, 82, 122
 see also national-cultural autonomy
- Balibar, Étienne, 63, 170–1, 210–11
banal nationalism, 4, 170, 171–4, 196
Barnard, Frederick M., 14, 47
Barrès, Maurice, 34
Barth, Fredrik, 146, 206
Banton, Michael, 28, 124
Bauer, Otto, 20, 22–4, 178
Billig, Michael, 4, 107, 170–4, 196
boundaries (ethnic, national, group), 61, 62, 82, 90, 138, 146, 173, 176, 179, 181, 182, 187, 188
 boundary mechanisms, 145, 146
Brand, Jack A., 122–3
Brass, Paul R., 61, 62–3, 88–93, 129
Breuilly, John, 6, 32, 41, 45, 64, 65, 83–8, 98, 120–1, 128, 130–1, 134, 135, 136, 159, 160, 161–2, 218
Brubaker, Rogers, 2, 57, 67, 165, 190–4, 195, 196, 197, 208, 210, 218
Calhoun, Craig, 3, 37, 160–1, 174, 187–90, 195, 196, 197–8, 205, 206, 218
capitalism, capitalist, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 72, 75, 76–7, 110, 114, 121, 123, 138, 185, 201
 anti-capitalist, anti-capitalism, 22, 185
Carr, E. H., 31, 37–9
Chatterjee, Partha, 182–7
citizen, citizenship, 12, 14, 16, 34, 86–7, 94, 96, 104, 133, 138, 152, 165, 176, 181, 203
class, 18, 20, 21, 23, 66, 75, 76, 84, 91, 100, 114, 119, 123, 126, 135, 146, 152, 159, 176, 210
colonial, colonialism, 81, 97, 111, 112, 113, 120, 134, 155, 185, 186
 see also anti-colonial, anti-colonialism; post-colonial, post-colonialism
communications theory/approach, 41–2
Connor, Walker, 66, 157, 158–9, 199, 200
conscription, 94, 152
constructivism, social constructionism (social construction), 61, 193, 197–8, 216
contingency, 108, 164, 202, 219
cosmopolitan, cosmopolitanism, 3, 17, 35, 132, 196
Coughlan, Reed M., 55–7, 62, 66
culture (ethnic, national), 13, 22, 28, 32, 40, 49, 52, 56, 57, 63, 67, 68, 69, 73, 79, 81, 82, 88, 89, 96, 100–3, 104–5, 114, 116, 120, 127, 132, 138, 141, 143, 148, 150, 152, 153, 155, 156, 159, 164, 169, 170, 172–3, 176, 180, 184, 185–6, 187, 203, 207, 215
customs, 15, 24, 27, 50, 58, 118, 155, 156, 179, 181, 212

- decolonization, 3, 39, 72
 democracy, 94, 125, 139
 Deutsch, Karl W., 41–2, 78, 91, 114, 119
 diaspora, 155
 discourse, 206–8, 213
 nationalism as (nationalist discourse),
 2, 125, 170, 173, 174, 175, 178,
 183, 185–6, 187–8, 190, 198, 202,
 206–11, 213–16
 discourse analysis, 113, 170
 Durkheim, Emile, 26–8, 98
 education, educational
 institutions/system, 12, 15, 22, 27,
 40, 91, 92, 95, 101–2, 112, 116,
 130, 132, 133, 136, 139, 144, 179,
 212
 see also schooling
 elites, 51–2, 66, 75, 83, 87, 88–93, 94,
 111, 112, 114, 116, 119, 127, 128,
 129, 152, 155, 158–9, 164, 165,
 166, 168, 170, 193, 194, 195, 200,
 201, 204, 205, 209
 Eley, Geoff, 160, 161, 169
 Eller, Jack D., 55–7, 62, 66
 emotions, 55, 57, 66, 69, 124, 174, 201,
 202, 218
 Engels, Friedrich, 17–19
 Enlightenment, 11, 13, 14, 16, 32, 35,
 36, 69, 74, 75, 77, 97, 106, 111,
 183
 Enloe, Cynthia, 175, 176, 180
 essentialism, essentialist, 69, 125
Ethnic and Racial Studies, 8
Ethnicities, 8
 ethnicity, 2, 53–4, 57, 58–9, 62, 65, 66,
 88, 89, 103–4, 115, 125, 127, 139,
 143, 144, 146, 150, 152, 153, 156,
 157, 160, 163, 164, 182, 190–4,
 196, 197, 201
ethnies, 55, 143, 144, 150–3, 155, 156,
 158, 159, 162, 164, 214
 ethnocentrism, 54
Ethnopolitics, 8
 ethnosymbolism, ethnosymbolic
 approach, 124, 126, 127, 128, 132,
 136, 143–4, 148–57, 158, 161–5,
 166–8, 194, 196, 200–1, 202–4,
 214, 215
 Eurocentrism, Eurocentric, 39, 41, 77,
 131, 148, 170
 everyday (life, experiences, practices), 2,
 4, 110, 170, 171, 193–4, 196, 207,
 209, 211, 215, 217
 family, 13, 38, 44, 45, 49, 66, 139, 181,
 188
 fascism, 33, 88, 97
 fatherland, 13, 195
 see also homeland; motherland
 feminism, feminist, 170, 175–6, 182, 195
Feminist Review, 182
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 11, 14–15, 44,
 45
 Foucault, Michel, 206, 207–8, 210, 213,
 218
 French Revolution, 16, 33, 35, 38, 44,
 75, 97
 functionalism, functionalist, 40–2, 132,
 135–6, 145
 Gandhi, Mohandas, 130
 Geary, Patrick J., 3, 64–5, 160
 Geertz, Clifford, 49, 55–8, 67, 200
 Gellner, Ernest, 10, 28, 45, 51, 63–4, 73,
 96, 98–105, 107, 130–1, 132,
 133–4, 135–6, 149, 172, 188
 gender, gendered, 128, 169, 170, 175–6,
 179, 181–2, 190, 210, 211
Gender and History, 182
 general will, 12, 87
 genocide, 92
 globalization, 173
 Gramsci, Antonio, 77, 212–13
 Greenfeld, Liah, 131, 175, 200, 204
 Grosby, Steven, 64, 67–70, 145, 201
 groupism, 190–1, 197
 habitus, 211
 Hall, John A., 99, 135, 136
 Hall, Stuart, 206, 207, 212
 Halliday, Fred, 64
 Hastings, Adrian, 58–60, 64–5, 67, 131,
 200
 Hayes, Carleton, 31, 32–5, 39
 Hechter, Michael, 77–83, 122–3, 124–5
 hegemony, 167, 202, 207, 210, 212–13,
 215

- Herder, Johann Gottfried, 11, 13–14, 32, 47, 167
- historicism, 44, 164
- history (discipline of), 2–3, 33, 64–5, 66, 82, 84, 85, 94, 199
- national (ethnic), 22, 25, 27, 51, 52, 68, 95, 118, 140, 141, 154, 156, 159, 163, 164, 183, 188, 209
- Hobsbawm, Eric J.,
- homeland, 51, 61, 116, 140, 143, 150, 154, 155, 156, 160, 172, 173, 174, 203, 210
- see also* fatherland; motherland
- homogeneous, homogeneity, 18, 30, 61, 65, 79, 100, 103–4, 114, 160, 169, 190, 205, 208, 213
- homogeneous empty time, 109
- Hroch, Miroslav, 113–20, 134–5, 136–7, 200, 204
- Hutchinson, John, 127, 165–8, 182, 201
- ideology (nationalism as), 16, 34, 58, 69, 87, 125, 126, 143, 154, 156, 200
- imagined communities, 106–7, 110, 112, 113, 134, 172, 179, 183, 185, 215
- imperialism, imperialist, theory of imperialism, 22, 76, 113, 120
- see also* anti-imperial
- industrialization, industrialism, industrial, 18, 72, 75, 76, 79–80, 83, 94, 100–3, 122, 123–4, 125, 127, 130, 131, 133–4, 135, 138, 190, 201
- instrumentalism, instrumentalist, 61, 88, 89, 93, 128, 129–30, 150, 201
- integral nationalism, 33, 34, 155
- intellectuals, intelligentsia, 33, 50, 51–2, 73, 76, 91, 108, 111, 112, 117, 118, 130, 133, 137, 149, 152, 153, 155, 156, 161, 170
- internal colonialism, 77–8, 81, 82, 122, 123–4
- internationalism, internationalist, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 34, 38
- invention of tradition, 94–5
- James, Paul, 26, 73, 74, 164
- Jayawardena, Kumari, 176, 182
- Journal of Gender Studies*, 182
- Kant, Immanuel, 11–12, 44, 45
- Kedourie, Elie, 11–12, 43–6, 99, 130, 148, 163, 188
- kin selection, 54–5
- kinship (descent, ancestry), 25, 35, 53–5, 61, 62, 63–4, 66, 67–8, 77, 106, 113, 148, 150, 156, 187, 188, 215
- Kohn, Hans, 15, 31, 35–7, 154
- Laitin, David D., 1, 2, 140–1, 162–3, 192, 215, 218
- language, 13, 14–15, 18, 23, 24, 25, 30, 43, 49, 54, 55, 58, 61, 64, 68, 73, 81, 91, 92, 96, 108, 110–11, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118, 120, 132, 133, 138, 144, 147, 154, 167, 173, 179, 181, 187, 194, 208
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilich, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 78, 122
- Lerner, Daniel, 40–1
- liberalism, liberals, 24, 26, 31, 36, 37, 87
- liberal nationalism, 32, 33–4
- literacy, 42, 91, 96, 101, 102, 111, 114, 119, 138
- literature, 17, 44, 51, 58, 60, 160, 187
- longue durée*, 127, 143, 144, 145, 146, 158, 166, 171, 203,
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 19, 20, 21, 23
- Malešević, Siniša, 161, 164–5, 197
- Mann, Michael, 121, 137–40
- Marx, Karl, 11, 17–19
- Marxism, Marxist(s), 17–19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 31, 72–3, 74, 76–7, 99, 105, 122, 125, 182
- neo-Marxist(s), 46, 72–3
- Maurras, Charles, 34, 155
- McClintock, Anne, 175–6
- McCrone, David, 128, 200–1, 205
- medieval age/period (Middle Ages), ix, 58, 62, 65, 68, 112, 114, 136, 156, 157, 160, 203, 204
- methodological nationalism, 2–3, 170
- Michelet, Jules, 29
- migration, immigration, 103, 143, 177
- militarism, militarist, military, 33, 80, 138, 139, 150, 181
- Mill, John Stuart, 11, 25–6
- Minogue, Kenneth, 40, 130, 132, 135–6, 148

- minority, minorities (ethnic,national), 79, 93, 104, 159
 mobility, 42, 44, 45, 100, 103, 114, 118, 119
 modernism, modernist(s), ix, 28, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 83, 84, 120, 123, 126, 127, 128, 132, 136, 137, 139, 140, 143, 144, 148, 160, 165, 194–5, 200, 201, 203, 204, 214, 215, 216
 modernity, modernization, 2, 3, 39–41, 42, 69, 72, 76, 77, 80, 82, 85, 87, 91, 94, 115, 126, 127, 128, 132, 133, 134, 135, 144, 153, 160, 166, 183, 185, 200, 215, 218, 219
 modernization theories, 39–41, 41–2
 motherland, 195
 see also fatherland; homeland
 Munck, Ronaldo, 17, 18–19
 myth-symbol complexes, 147, 204

 Nairn, Tom, 17, 73–7, 105, 120–1, 123, 125, 164, 201
 narrative, 10, 51, 52, 63, 84, 133, 161, 170, 195, 211, 215–16
 national-cultural autonomy, 20, 22
National Identities, 8
Nationalities Papers, 8
Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 8
Nations and Nationalism, 8, 149
 naturalizing, 174, 207, 210, 211, 212, 215
 Nimni, Ephraim, 18, 19, 47
 Norval, Aletta J., 163–4

 O’Leary, Brendan, 10–11, 40, 124, 129–30, 131, 134, 135, 157
 organic thought, 44, 145, 154
 Orridge, Andrew W., 121, 123

 patriotism, patriotic, patriots, 4, 12–13, 14, 26–7, 87, 116, 137, 173, 173
 peasant(s), peasantry, 19, 23, 68, 77, 86, 104, 119, 159, 184
 perennialism, perennialist(s), 50–1, 58, 64–5, 67, 69, 72, 144, 157–8, 162, 164, 200, 201, 202–4, 215
 plurality, plural, 166, 202, 209, 210
 popular culture, 143, 170
 post-colonial, post-colonialism, 113, 170, 182–7
 see also anti-colonial, anti-colonialism; colonial, colonialism
 post-modern, post-modernism, 113, 166, 170, 195, 196, 216–17
 power, 26, 38, 42, 51, 80, 83, 85–6, 88, 90, 93, 100, 134, 154, 167, 169, 171, 181, 185, 187, 202, 207, 210, 212–13, 218
 primordialism, primordialist(s), 49–51, 55–8, 60–7, 69, 70, 72, 77, 88, 96, 129, 136, 137, 145, 148, 150, 164, 200, 201–2
 print capitalism, 110

 race, 13, 16, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 53, 54, 181, 190, 192, 193, 197
 Ranger, Terence, 94–5
 rational choice theory, 73, 82–3, 124–5, 140–2
 rationalism, rationalist, 16, 36, 164, 183
 regionalism, regional, 23, 68, 79, 122, 123, 138
 reification (reify), 41, 136, 163, 164, 167, 170, 180, 187, 190, 191–2, 206, 211–12
 religion, religious, 25, 27, 30, 44, 45, 49, 59, 60, 61, 65, 68, 81, 95, 106, 108, 110, 113, 118, 127, 131, 138, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 152–3, 156, 157, 160, 177, 179, 181, 185, 203, 206, 209, 212
 Renan, Ernest, 30, 217
 Renner, Karl, 20, 22
 reproduction, 54, 55, 82, 90, 161, 170, 171, 173–4, 176–7, 180, 182, 190, 196, 210, 212
 rituals, 27, 28, 94, 157, 160, 207, 211
 Robinson, Francis, 89, 129
 Romanticism, Romantic(s), 11, 13, 14, 15–16, 44, 164, 167
 Roshwald, Aviel, 68–9, 204
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 11, 12–13, 32, 33, 38, 45, 181

 Schlegel, Friedrich, 15–16, 33
 schooling, 92, 96, 119, 209
 see also education, educational institutions/system
 secession, 24, 39, 93, 123, 155

- Second International, 19–20
self-determination (right to), 1, 11, 12,
20, 21–2, 24, 45, 135
SEN (*Studies in Ethnicity and
Nationalism*), 8
sexuality, 179, 180, 190, 210
Shils, Edward, 49, 50, 55, 57
Sieyès, abbé Emmanuel Joseph, 16
Smith, Anthony D., x, 1, 10, 27, 28, 37,
39, 40–1, 42, 45, 50, 57, 58, 61, 62,
65, 66, 69, 72, 98, 123, 124, 126,
127, 128, 132, 136, 139–40, 143–4,
147, 148–57, 158–60, 162–4, 165,
166, 178, 182, 194–6, 199, 200–1,
202–4, 215, 216
Snyder, Louis, 31
sociobiology, sociobiological approach,
53–5, 62, 63
solidarity, 28, 30, 41, 42, 80–2, 90, 122,
150, 187, 189, 192, 206, 215
 organic and mechanical solidarity, 27
sovereignty, 24, 43, 51, 58, 69, 82–3, 84,
124, 138, 139, 181, 186, 187, 209,
214
Stalin, Joseph, 23–4
state(s), 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28,
32, 33, 35, 38, 58–9, 65, 70, 72, 78,
80, 82, 83, 84–8, 89, 92, 96, 100,
102, 112, 113, 114, 128, 132–3,
134, 135, 138–9, 140, 150, 152,
160, 165, 166, 176, 177, 187, 190,
201, 210, 212, 214
Suny, Ronald G., 160, 161, 202, 207,
212, 218
symbols, symbolism, 28, 42, 70, 88, 90,
91, 95, 129, 143, 144, 145, 146,
147, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 161,
164, 167, 171, 177, 180, 203, 206,
211, 213
Symmons-Symonolewicz, Konstantin,
159, 160
taxation, 152
territory, 24, 58, 63, 65, 68, 82–3, 99,
140, 146, 147, 148, 154, 155, 156,
160, 172, 181, 188, 203, 209
Tilley, Virginia, 58, 67
Tilly, Charles, 191, 215
tipping game/model, 140–1
totemic principle, 27
tradition, traditional, 15, 18, 27, 28, 33,
39–40, 41, 44, 46, 50, 59, 70, 94–5,
124, 127, 133, 135, 143, 152, 153,
157, 161, 165, 167, 179, 180, 181,
190, 204
uneven development, 75–6, 117, 121
urbanization, 42, 72, 201
van den Berghe, Pierre, 53–5, 61–2
von Treitschke, Heinrich, 28–9
Walby, Sylvia, 176
war(s), 33, 34, 68, 83, 128, 138, 150, 180
Weber, Max, 10, 26, 28, 56, 98, 131, 195
woman, women, 159, 170, 175, 176,
177–82, 186–7
Williams, Gwyn A., 212
Williams, Raymond, 213
Wimmer, Andreas, 2, 165, 167, 218
Women's Studies International Forum,
182
Yuval-Davis, Nira, 166, 175–82
Zionism, Zionist, 36, 62, 163, 178
 post-Zionism, 69
Zubaida, Sami, 65, 125, 133, 205