

Nationalism, Ethnicity, Citizenship

Nationalism, Ethnicity, Citizenship:
Multidisciplinary Perspectives

Edited by

Martyn Barrett, Chris Flood and John Eade

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Nationalism, Ethnicity, Citizenship:
Multidisciplinary Perspectives,
Edited by Martyn Barrett, Chris Flood and John Eade

This book first published 2011

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2011 by Martyn Barrett, Chris Flood and John Eade and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-2841-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-2841-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| List of Contributors | vii |
| Preface | ix |
| Martyn Barrett, Chris Flood and John Eade | |
| Chapter One | 1 |
| Nationalism, Ethnicity, Citizenship: Multidisciplinary Perspectives – An Introduction | |
| Martyn Barrett, Chris Flood and John Eade | |
| Chapter Two | 13 |
| Is Nationalism an Anachronism? Notes on the Mutations of National Idealism in a Global Age | |
| Ulf Hedetoft | |
| Chapter Three | 35 |
| Nationalism, Belonging, Globalization and the ‘Ethics of Care’ | |
| Nira Yuval-Davis | |
| Chapter Four | 49 |
| Representing the Nation and the Muslim Other: Television News Coverage in Three Countries | |
| Chris Flood, Stephen Hutchings, Galina Miazhevich and Henri Nickels | |
| Chapter Five | 77 |
| Citizenship, Ethnicity and Mainstream Society: The European Welfare States Navigating between Exclusion and Inclusion | |
| Hans van Amersfoort | |
| Chapter Six | 101 |
| Rebranding Britain? Ideological Dilemmas in Political Appeals to “British Multiculturalism” | |
| Susan Condor | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter Seven..... | 135 |
| What does it Take to be a Political Actor in a Multicultural Society? | |
| Nicholas P. Emler | |
| Chapter Eight..... | 163 |
| Intercultural Citizenship – An Education Perspective | |
| Michael Byram | |
| Chapter Nine..... | 181 |
| Integrationist to Citizenship Education Policy within England: | |
| A Forward Movement or a Backward Step? | |
| Richard Race | |
| Index of Names..... | 195 |
| Subject Index | 201 |

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Martyn Barrett, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH, UK.

Michael Byram, School of Education, Durham University, Leazes Road, Durham DH1 1TA, UK.

Susan Condor, Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, Fylde College, Lancaster LA1 4YF, UK.

John Eade, Department of Social Sciences, Roehampton University, Roehampton Lane, London SW15 5PU, UK.

Nicholas P. Emler, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH, UK.

Chris Flood, Department of Politics, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH, UK.

Ulf Hedetoft, The Saxo Institute, University of Copenhagen, Njalsgade 80, DK-2300 Copenhagen, Denmark.

Stephen Hutchings, School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK.

Galina Miazhevich, Christ Church, University of Oxford, St. Aldates, Oxford OX1 1DP, UK.

Henri Nickels, Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism, Rue Royale 138, 1000 Brussels, Belgium.

Richard Race, School of Education, Roehampton University, Roehampton Lane, London SW15 5PU, UK.

Hans van Amersfoort, Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam, Het Binnengasthuis, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237, 1012 DL Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Nira Yuval-Davis, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of East London, Docklands Campus, 4-6 University Way, London E16 2RD, UK.

PREFACE

This book is the second edited volume to be based on a selection of the keynote addresses presented at the annual conferences of the Centre for Research on Nationalism, Ethnicity and Multiculturalism (CRONEM), University of Surrey, UK (the first volume being that by Eade, Barrett, Flood & Race, 2008). For the present volume, we decided to commission chapters from a range of different disciplines which focused on issues concerning the nature of, and the interconnections between, nationalism, ethnicity and citizenship.

CRONEM was established as a multidisciplinary research centre in 2004 by the University of Surrey working in collaboration with Roehampton University, with John Eade acting as the Executive Director and Martyn Barrett and Chris Flood acting as the two Academic Directors of the Centre. CRONEM held its first annual conference in 2005. Since that year, the CRONEM conferences have become a regular fixture for many academics, researchers, policymakers and practitioners eager to learn about the latest developments in the study of nationalism, ethnicity, citizenship, multiculturalism and migration across a range of different disciplines.

The conference is typically attended by anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, geographers, economists and educationists, as well as by experts in migration studies, European studies and policy studies. It is therefore a genuinely multidisciplinary event, with papers from all of these disciplines being presented alongside each other in order to enable different understandings to be considered in relationship to each other so that both overlapping and contrasting understandings of phenomena can be identified and discussed. The conference has increasingly become an international event, with participants now coming from 25-30 different countries each year.

In the current book, each chapter consists of a written paper which its author produced subsequent to making their original conference presentation. Due to the change in medium, these written chapters are far more substantial pieces than the original conference papers from which they have stemmed. As a result, each author is able to present a much more detailed and considered account of the issues which they are considering and analysing.

Taken together, these papers, drawn as they are from so many different disciplinary perspectives, provide a unique and fascinating picture of our current understanding of nationalism, ethnicity and citizenship.

Professor Martyn Barrett

Professor Chris Flood

Professor John Eade

Reference

Eade, J., Barrett, M., Flood, C. & Race, R. (Eds.) (2008). *Advancing Multiculturalism, Post 7/7*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

CHAPTER ONE

NATIONALISM, ETHNICITY, CITIZENSHIP: MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES – AN INTRODUCTION

MARTYN BARRETT,
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY, UK

CHRIS FLOOD,
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY, UK

JOHN EADE,
ROEHAMPTON UNIVERSITY, UK

This book provides a detailed examination, from a variety of different disciplinary perspectives, of issues concerning nationalism, ethnicity and citizenship. The overall aim of the book is to take stock of our current understandings in this area, and to establish whether there are any connections between the understandings which are being articulated within different social science disciplines. For this reason, the contributors have been deliberately drawn from a range of academic disciplines including Politics (Hedetoft), Sociology (Yuval-Davis), Communication/Media (Flood et al.), Geography (van Amersfoort), Psychology (Condor and Emler) and Education (Byram and Race). Interestingly, despite this diversity of disciplinary perspectives, a remarkably consistent picture emerges by the end of the book.

Nationalism, ethnicity and multiculturalism lie at the heart of many of the societal changes which are currently transforming countries across the world. In the last 20 years, migration has altered the world in such a way that many of the old certainties which were provided by the established framework of nation-states have been undermined. The movements of peoples across the globe are being driven by many different factors, including warfare, persecution, environmental catastrophe, famine, poverty,

international trade and business, domestic labour market needs and employment opportunities, the emergence of global communication and transportation networks and, last but certainly not least, the search for a better life (GCIM, 2005). Although there have been slight drops in levels of migration to some countries since 2008 as a result of the recent economic downturn, the scale of migration which has occurred over the past 20 years has meant that virtually all countries have become increasingly ethnically diverse during this period (OECD, 2010). In short, cultural diversity and multicultural societies have become an established fact of life in many countries across the world.

Migrants make substantial contributions to the countries within which they live, not only through their labour but also through the taxes they pay, through their participation in local communities, and through their cultural activities (see, for example, Alexander & Knowles, 2005; Back, 1996; Burrell, 2009; Eade, 1997; Eade & Valkanova, 2009; Gilroy, 1987, 1993). However, many migrants and minorities, especially those of the first generation, retain a significant involvement and interest in their country of origin, with transnational loyalties and attachments sometimes being stronger than their attachment to their country of work and residence (Garapich, 2008; Ryan & Webster, 2008; Vertovec, 2009; Werbner, 2002).

It has also been argued that multicultural societies and transnational communities undermine traditional conceptions of citizenship which treat citizenship as the legal status linking an individual to a state, thereby granting to that individual a range of political, civil and social rights and responsibilities (Marshall, 1950; Faulks, 2000). Clearly, patterns of transnational affiliation, not to mention the rise of cosmopolitanism in which individuals identify as global rather than national citizens (Held, 2003; Brock & Brighouse, 2005; Beck, 2006; Beck & Edgar, 2007; Steger 2008), challenge traditional notions of citizenship which are instead grounded in loyalty and affiliation to a particular nation-state. The emergence of ethnically diverse societies and transnational communities not only poses challenges to the practical functioning of nation-states but in the long term may also undermine nationalism as the ideological foundation underpinning the international, state-centric system. However, in the period since the end of the Cold War, nationalism has undergone a striking revival, giving renewed vigour to existing secessionist movements and encouraging the emergence of new ones, sometimes combining with jihadist Islamism in parts of Asia, the Middle East and North Africa. Inter-ethnic conflicts – from Northern Ireland to former Yugoslavia, to Chechnya, to Sri Lanka, to Indonesia – have been regulated by varying mixtures of military force, partition, expulsion, mediation and political

settlement (Gammer, 2010; Guelke, 2010; Harff & Gurr, 2003; Horowitz, 2001; Wolff, 2007).

At the same time defensive forms of xenophobic nationalism have been manifested in many states with high levels of immigration from abroad, as in the US and Western Europe, or even with influxes arising from domestic migration, as in the case of Russia. The rise of populist radical right-wing parties in a number of European countries (Hainsworth, 2008; Mudde, 2007; Norris, 2005; Rydgren, 2004) has fed on, and into, this current of anxiety and resentment among sections of native populations who perceive their societies as being threatened by swamping, competition in the labour market, pressure on public services and cultural adulteration. In less aggressive reaction, the climate of national retrenchment has encouraged resistance to European Union integration by substantial sections of the national publics of several Member States since the mid-1990s (Fligstein, 2009; Fuchs, Magni-Berton & Roger, 2008; Leconte, 2010): hostility to the inclusion of Turkey in a future enlargement of the EU also owes much to the potential for large-scale intra-European immigration from that country.

Hence, there are numerous important questions linked to the phenomenon of modern migration and to the rise of multicultural societies and transnational communities which are currently being examined within different disciplines. Questions which relate particularly to the present book include:

- To what extent do multiculturalism and transnationalism undermine nationalism or, on the contrary, provoke its reassertion? Is nationalism now out of date as an ideological foundation for modern states or is it evolving as societies change?
- How do the multiple identities and multiple levels of belonging (e.g., ethnic, religious, national, transnational) experienced today interact with traditional nationalist ideology?
- Within multicultural societies, how far do representations of 'cultural others' still play a role in nationalist constructions of 'the nation'?
- How successfully have the welfare systems of nation-states responded to the influx of migrants without appearing to divert resources from the indigenous populations? Why are extreme right-wing parties gaining increased levels of support, and what are the dilemmas which need to be addressed by national governments in response to these phenomena?

- How do national politicians regard the multicultural nature of their countries, and have they moved beyond the traditional logic of nationalism within their own thinking?
- What social and psychological resources do citizens require in order to function effectively at the political level within multicultural democratic societies?
- How can the educational systems of states, which have traditionally been used for nationalist purposes, be harnessed to enhance the competences needed by their citizens for successful living in a multicultural world?
- What changes need to be made to educational policies in order to ensure the effective integration of minority citizens?

These questions, which all revolve around issues linked to nationalism, ethnicity and citizenship in the contemporary world, are addressed in detail in the subsequent chapters of the book.

The chapters in this book

In his chapter, Ulf Hedetoft begins the debate by raising the question of whether nationalism is a historical anachronism, a residue of the past which is no longer relevant in the globalised world of today. He explores several specific hypotheses which have been advanced in the literature to justify this claim, and he finds that all are questionable, with neither multiculturalism nor transnationalism standing in opposition to nationalism but instead representing contemporary reformulations of national identity politics which are in fact helping to keep nationalism alive. Furthermore, while trickle-down effects from elite cosmopolitanism to national populations may convey the general impression that nationalist thinking is anachronistic, Hedetoft argues that banal everyday nationalistic practices are still pervasive and hold considerable power in the lives of many people across the globe. However, significant transformations are currently taking place as a consequence of globalisation and migration, and these transformations are requiring nationalism to adapt to these new circumstances.

Nira Yuval-Davis adopts a different lens through which to examine nationalism. She explores how contemporary constructions of nationalism relate to a feminist 'ethics of care'. Noting that citizenship today entails multiple levels of belonging (e.g., local, regional, national, ethnic, religious, etc.), she argues that the emotions of attachment, loyalty and solidarity at these multiple levels often clash with traditional nationalist

ideology and the rigid all-or-none boundary which it constructs around the status of formal citizenship. Analysing the role within contemporary societies of women in general and of care workers in particular, she explores not only the tension which exists between neo-liberal ethics and the ethics of care, but also the intriguing parallel which exists between, on the one hand, caring for the nation, and on the other hand, caring within the labour market and the domestic sphere. She argues that, despite the fact that nationalism is often considered to be a masculinist enterprise, it paradoxically also depends upon a particular kind of ethics of care.

Nationalism also forms the main focus of the chapter by Chris Flood, Stephen Hutchings, Galina Miazhevich and Henri Nickels. They explore the way in which nationalism utilises images of cultural others in order to construct representations of the nation. Analysing how British, French and Russian television news broadcasts represent Islam and Muslims within their coverage, they conclude that these representations reflect the ideological biases of banal nationalism in all three countries. Their analysis reveals how representations of Islam within these broadcasts are very heavily dominated by stories concerning terrorism, war, violence, extremism, misgovernment and deprivation, with comparatively little attention being given to positive stories concerning successful integration and peaceful dialogue. The result is that Islam is predominantly associated with negative connotations. The distinctively different emphases which are deployed by the broadcasters within each of the three countries are interpretable in terms of each nation's particular history and specific orientation towards multiculturalism and its own approach towards its internal Muslim minority populations. However, despite these differences in emphasis, within all three nations, the selection of topics and the mode of coverage serve to implicitly reinforce the idea that Muslim attitudes, values and practices stand in fundamental contrast with those of the home nation.

The fourth chapter, by Hans van Amersfoort, examines the dilemmas which are currently faced by nation-states in relationship to migration, ethnic diversity and citizenship. In an attempt to understand the rise of extreme right-wing politics in Western European states, he identifies a tension between the nature of these welfare states, which are committed to the provision of services and the safeguarding of political, civil and social rights for their citizens, and processes of globalisation which are driven by the needs of both the domestic and the international labour markets. The dynamics of these labour markets, coupled to the increasing flows of people claiming either refugee or asylum status, means that the governments of these welfare states have lost a great deal of their control over inward

migration. However, these states are also signatories to refugee and human rights conventions, which means that, once immigrants and refugees are living within their borders, it is incumbent upon them to extend services such as housing, health care and education to these individuals. While Western European states have been attempting to impose much more stringent border controls as well as internal controls in order to exclude immigrants from their welfare systems, the new forms of cultural differentiation which have now emerged within European societies as a consequence of large-scale migration have led extreme right-wing parties to espouse far more radical courses of action, proposals which have been gathering increasing levels of support within many countries. The real dilemma confronting the welfare states, according to van Amersfoort, is how to maintain the human rights of immigrants and refugees, and the economic activity which is required for the welfare state to function, without entering into an open-ended obligation to support any and all migrants who might wish to enter these countries.

While van Amersfoort spreads his attention across the Western European welfare states in general, the following chapter, by Susan Condor, is more specific in its focus: she examines the arguments which have been articulated in speeches by British politicians about ethnic diversity and multiculturalism within Britain. The two main speeches which she focuses on are attempts to present British multiculturalism as a progressive, tolerant and socially inclusive approach to cultural diversity. However, in examining the contents of these speeches, Condor discovers internal contradictions and tensions. While these speeches present a view of multicultural Britain which is in sharp contrast to the outdated view that Britain is an ethnically homogeneous nation, the speeches nevertheless present an image of Britain as being founded on core British liberal values which differ from those of other nations. In doing so, these speeches share a similar rhetoric to that which is used by the far-right British National Party. As Condor reveals, the contents of these speeches are based on an assumption that nations are racially and culturally homogeneous, presenting British multiculturalism as a form of British cultural uniqueness and as a particular form of brand distinctiveness which provides a route through which the country can pursue its own national interests in the international arena. Hence, in these speeches, British multiculturalism in fact echoes the discourses of ethnic nationalism and British imperialism. This conclusion accords with that of Hedetoft, that banal nationalism is still pervasive despite the rhetoric about cultural diversity, with multiculturalism itself being a new reformulation of national identity politics.

Given the reality that most societies today are ethnically diverse, the following chapter, by Nicholas Emler, examines the psychological requirements which are needed by individuals to function effectively as active citizens within multicultural democratic societies. He suggests that there are three main aspects to political participation in such societies: holding opinions, agreeing to procedural norms for negotiating differences in opinion, and having the resources and skills to participate in political processes. Emler argues that the essential psychological components for meeting these three requirements are: having an interest in politics; having a sense of civic duty; paying attention to political matters; having political knowledge; holding opinions; and having an ideological identity. He notes that there is substantial empirical evidence that education is a major influence on levels of participation, and this influence is likely to be mediated through all of these various psychological components. By contrast, lack of opportunity and lack of material resources may have considerable (negative) impacts on levels of participation. The implications here are that members of disadvantaged minority groups are likely to be hampered in their participation through their restricted educational and social opportunities and through their limited material resources, and possibly also in some cases by an incompatibility between their cultural values and the principles of political tolerance and democratic participation which are required for the negotiation of differences in political opinion.

Emler draws attention to the central role of education in enhancing active citizenship, and the significance of education is a theme which is pursued further by Michael Byram in his chapter. He notes that national education systems are used extensively for a number of political and economic purposes, including creating and consolidating national identity, creating human capital for the economy, promoting social equity, and promoting participation in democratic processes. These goals, which all emphasise the national dimension, are commonly pursued in school subjects such as history, geography, national language and literature and citizenship/civic education. Byram argues that, by contrast, foreign language education is uniquely positioned within the school curriculum to extend the horizons of learners beyond the borders of the nation-state, by enabling them to engage with people of other countries and cultures and to cast a critical eye over their own nation and culture. Hence, foreign language education is an ideal vehicle for developing learners' intercultural competences and understanding, and for facilitating the development of the intercultural attitudes, knowledge, skills and action propensities which are needed for engaging with people from other cultures. Byram uses the term "intercultural citizenship" to refer to this cluster of capacities, a form

of citizenship which is vital for effective interaction, dialogue and active participation in multicultural societies.

The final chapter, by Race, also examines the role of the state educational system. He provides a detailed case study of how citizenship education policy within England, particularly in relationship to the education of immigrants and ethnic minority children, has developed over the past 50 years. Initially, in the 1960s and 1970s, when minority children were failing within the system, English education policy identified the problem as being located in immigrant parents and their cultural heritage rather than in the educational system which was failing to cope with cultural diversity. Throughout this period, efforts were made to involve parents to a greater extent in the education of their children. In recent years, a shift has taken place, with government policy instead emphasizing that there is a range of factors, both familial and institutional, that are linked to poor school performance and placing a greater emphasis on citizenship education. However, Race argues that the new citizenship curriculum lacks any real focus on issues of cultural diversity and instead stresses concepts such as responsibility and duty (which are implicitly skewed towards national rather than multicultural concerns).

Conclusion

Taken together, and despite the fact that they have been written from a wide range of different disciplinary perspectives, the various chapters in this book paint a remarkably consistent picture. They offer a view of a world in which nationalism is still very much a dominant ideology. Despite the unprecedented trends in migration which have taken place in recent years, banal nationalistic practices are still pervasive and hold considerable power in people's lives, with negative representations of cultural others still being used to construct representations of the nation. And while globalisation and migration may have required nationalism to transform and adapt, particularly to the multicultural constitution of contemporary societies and to the fact of people's transnational allegiances, nationalism is no less powerful a force today, permeating the discourse of even well-intentioned politicians who believe that they are fully embracing the new multicultural reality.

That said, both nationalism and citizenship today have become far more complex than in the past. Nowadays, individuals commonly experience multiple levels of belonging (local, regional, national, transnational, ethnic, religious, etc.), and for some people there may be incompatibilities between their different identifications. Additional

dilemmas and conflicts exist at the macro political level, with migration and ethnic diversity posing such severe challenges for the welfare systems of many nation-states that they are struggling to cope with the dilemmas they face. And located at the very centre of these various forces, many members of ethnic minority groups routinely experience a level of disadvantage which is so severe that they fail to accumulate the psychological resources which are needed to engage with political systems and processes, and are unable to participate effectively in the life of the societies in which they reside.

Education may provide the key to unlocking at least some of these problems. Several of the contributors to this book draw attention to the potential of education to enhance citizens' lives. School systems are uniquely positioned to extend people's horizons beyond their own nation-state, to enhance their intercultural competences and understanding, and to equip them with the psychological resources which are needed to participate effectively in the public sphere. However, the full potential of education in this regard has yet to be properly harnessed by national governments, with educational policies all too often still being focused primarily or exclusively on national needs. The hope must be that the educational policies of the future will be driven far less by nationalist ideologies and much more by the everyday needs of the individuals who are now residing within our ethnically diverse societies.

References

- Alexander, C. & Knowles, C. (2005). *Making Race Matter: Space and Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Back, L. (1996). *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture: Racisms and Multiculture in Young Lives*. London: UCL Press.
- Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. & Edgar, G. (2007). *Cosmopolitan Europe*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brock, G. & Brighouse, H. (Eds.) (2005). *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burrell, K. (Ed.) (2009). *After 2004: Polish migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Eade, J. (Ed.) (1997). *Living the Global City: Globalization as Local Process*. London: Routledge.
- Eade, J. & Valkanova, Y. (2009). *Accession and Migration: Changing Policy, Society, and Culture in an Enlarged Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Faulks, K. (2000). *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- Fligstein, N. (2009). *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity and the Future of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuchs, D., Magni-Berton, R. & Roger, A. (2008). *Euroscepticism: Images of Europe among Mass Publics and Political Elites*. Leverkusen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Gammer, M. (2010). *Ethno-nationalism, Islam and the State in the Caucasus: Post-Soviet Disorder*. London: Routledge.
- Garapich, M. (2008). The migration industry and civil society: Polish immigrants in the United Kingdom before and after EU enlargement. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34, 735-52.
- GCIM (Global Commission on International Migration) (2005). *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action*. Report of the Global Commission on International Migration. Accessed 19th June 2010 at <http://www.gcim.org/en/finalreport.html>.
- Gilroy, P. (1987). *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson.
- . (1993) *Small Acts: Thoughts on the Politics of Black Cultures*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Guelke, A. (Ed.) (2010). *The Challenges of Ethno-Nationalism: Case Studies in Identity Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hainsworth, P. (2008). *The Extreme Right in Western Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Harff, B. & Gurr, T. (2003). *Ethnic Conflict in World Politics*, 2nd edition. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Held, D. (2003). *Cosmopolitanism: A Defence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Horowitz, D. (2001). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Leconte, C. (2010). *Understanding Euroscepticism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P. (2005). *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OECD (2010). *International Migration Outlook: SOPEMI 2010*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ryan, L. & Webster, W. (2008). *Gendering Migration: Masculinity, Femininity and Ethnicity in Post-War Britain*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Rydgren, J. (2004). *Movements of Exclusion: Radical Right-Wing Populism in the Western World*. Hauppauge NY: Nova.
- Steger, M. (2008). *The Rise of the Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the Global War on Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Werbner, P. (2002). *Imagined Diasporas among Manchester Muslims: The Public Performance of Pakistani Transnational Identity Politics*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Wolff, S. (2007). *Ethnic Conflict: A Global Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER TWO

IS NATIONALISM AN ANACHRONISM? NOTES ON THE MUTATIONS OF NATIONAL IDEALISM IN A GLOBAL AGE

ULF HEDETOFT,
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

Introductory

This chapter will analyse the merits of the widely held assumption that nationalism is properly a thing of the past, an anachronism, since it is out of sync with the functional requirements, institutional contexts and cultural opportunities of a global age characterised by diversity, trans-national attachments and cosmopolitan networks. Following a discussion of the meaning and uses of the concept of anachronism, it will be argued that the answer to the problem must depend to a significant extent on the mutability of national forms of identification and the extent to which nationalism is tied to very specific properties of 'state'. Different hypotheses will be surveyed, and it will be concluded that rather than testifying to an incompatibility of global processes and national forms of identification, the notion of anachronism primarily reflects a growing divide between normative and analytical positions.

Framing the issue

Back in 1882, when nationalism as a modern sentiment of mass identification was still under construction, French historian and scholar of religion and nationalism Joseph Ernest Renan had the courage to predict that '[t]he nations are not something eternal. They had their beginnings and they will end. A European confederation will very probably replace them' (Renan, 1882/1990). Along the same modernist lines, though about

a hundred years later, Miroslav Hroch and many other sociological and political analysts theorised that the history of nations and nationalism can be broken down into ‘phases’, even if different scholars suggest different names, typologies, continuities, interrelations, and branching points for them (Gellner, 1983; Hroch, 1985; Schieder, 1992; de Wever, 2004). The common denominator is the perceived existence, metaphorically speaking, of a *dawn*, a *high noon*, and a *dusk* of nations and nationalism (Hedetoft, 2006). A pertinent question to ask is whether we have reached Renan’s ‘end point’: are we living through the dusk of nationalism – is it, in one or more senses (see below) an anachronism, as is frequently argued and even more frequently implied, especially by theorists of postmodernism and globalisation?

In a similar vein, Eric Hobsbawm once referred to the Hegelian aphorism that the owl of Minerva flies out at dusk – when phenomena to be explained are past their peak – to suggest a generic explanation of why the *scholarship* on nation states and nationalism has experienced a boost since 1970 (Hobsbawm, 1990, p. 192; see also Smith, 2001, p. 21). On that kind of analysis, what might seem to confirm the relevance and adequacy of nationalism is a sign of its gradual disappearance.

Put in different terms: in phases of social transformation, new and deeper insights tend to surface, because transformations, shocks or revolutions challenge existing assumptions and paradigms (Kuhn, 1962). Both ways of conceiving the problem theorise a particular pattern of interaction between social reality and epistemological progress. The notion of nationalism as a modern anachronism in a global age, which is relatively pervasive these days (albeit currently subject to certain doubts due to the global economic crisis), may do so in a different way, while possibly somehow confirming a number of modernist theories about the phase-specific features of nationalism and globalist conceptualisations of its outdated character.

Conversely, it may be argued that Hobsbawm is only right if the period after 1970 can in fact be categorised as the ‘dusk’ of nationalism and the advent of a new era in which nationalism either does not function properly any more or has been robbed of its proper environment. On both counts, the outcome is less than clear. While it is true that the period after 1970 ushers in some serious challengers to national communities and national identification, national identity and the nation-state are very much with us and still play important roles – though these roles may have shifted somewhat and may relate differently to the international order than in earlier phases. Without any doubt they survive as forms of regressive, sentimental nationalism, in right-wing and anti-immigrant politics, and in

many other forms as well – which on the other hand, to some, is evidence precisely of the anachronism of nationalism... Janus now only looks one way: backwards!

Before proceeding further along this path, it is necessary to take a closer look at the focal and contested notion of anachronism itself.

The meanings of anachronism

The most general definition of anachronism is that it refers to a phenomenon situated incorrectly out of its proper time frame. The most common use of the concept of anachronism in historical research has to do with ‘the impropriety of depicting past phenomena in terms of values, assumptions, or interpretative categories of today’ (Verbeeck, 2006, p. 181; see also Ritter, 1998) – i.e. as a kind of scholarly imposition of the present on the past, an application found in commonsense parlance as well. Much historicist debate has hinged on the problem of whether or not historical research can avoid a certain measure of anachronism in this sense, the assumption being that all historians are necessarily products of their own time and that objective scholarship, where full empathy with and understanding of past eras on their own terms is achieved, is impossible: the past, so the argument goes, must be recognised as a ‘foreign country’, the alter ego and precondition of ‘today’ at one and the same time. The cruder understanding of anachronism within this ambit deals with more obvious errors of timing, chronology, or geographical placing due to contemporary dislocations of memory or perception.

This is an important discussion, but not really central to the most widespread use of anachronism when it is associated with a critique of nationalism as a phenomenon out of its proper time context.¹ Here the meaning is rather the opposite, and the ‘impropriety’ one in which present-day facts and processes are depicted in terms of the (national) values, assumptions, and interpretive categories of yesterday. The past is allegedly imposed on the present as a tempting frame of understanding, a normative ideal and nostalgic myth, and (in practical everyday terms) a frame of reference of politics and action. This is basically the accusation levelled by (post)modernist and globalist thinkers: citizens in all walks of life across the globe have become so used to nationalism and its home-grown framework, the sovereign nation-state, that nationalism has survived as an illusory frame of action, perception and identification, although ‘reality’

¹ The more traditional definition of anachronism can also, however, be found in literature on nationalism, see e.g. Goodblatt (2006).

has proceeded to a new ‘post-national’ stage. Here are a few random illustrations of this frame of mind, picked from various sources, and probably recognisable to everybody:

- ‘The ideals of nationalism today represent at best an amusing anachronism, and at worst a considerable and possibly dangerous obstacle to the individual’s pursuit of affluence’ (Fredrick Sheppard, ‘Nationalism’, unpublished prize-winning English essay, UBC, 2001/02)
- ‘There was another broadside across the bows of the SNP in the *Daily Telegraph* this week. Andrew O’Hagen, a Scot, wrote a wonderful piece in which he damned the “mad anachronism” of Scottish Nationalism’ (Rod Liddle, ‘Scottish Nationalism is Compelling’, *The Spectator*, 2 May, 2007)
- ‘The notion of a homogeneous, independent state in either social, economic or political terms is already anachronistic (...) most of humanity would be better off proceeding directly to greater integration rather than clinging desperately to an outmoded form of organisation’ (Barry Shenker, ‘Zionism and Socialism’, The Hagshama Department, 2007, accessed 13 February 2009 at <http://www.wzo.org.il/en/resources/view.asp?id=1350>)
- ‘The very idea of a “Jewish State” is an anachronism’ (Jerry Z. Muller, ‘Us and Them. The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism’, *Foreign Affairs*, March/April, 2008)
- ‘Nationalism in Europe (...) is quite an anachronism specially [sic] when we are trying to build up a European Union. If really we are living in a global world I think this ideology must die, like many others before it’ (Monica Ferrer, customer review of *The Red Menace*, Amazon.com, 29 January 2004, accessed 14 February 2009)
- ‘Nationalism is a symptom of the past that no longer affects the bodies of truly global citizens, and the fact that nationalism can no longer be sustained in the hands of the world’s political elite makes the death of nationalism a fait accompli [sic]’ (Earl Blaney, ‘Anachronistic Nationalism’, *Korean Times*, 11 May, 2008)

At a more scholarly level of reflection, the allegedly anachronistic nature of nationalism and the nation state is by now most often referred to as ‘methodological nationalism’. Andreas Wimmer, Ulrich Beck and others have developed this concept to critique the phenomenon that sets in when scientific analysis is pre-framed and its results predetermined by the straitjacket of national and state-oriented values, norms and loyalties

(Chernilo, 2006; Wimmer & Glick-Schiller, 2002): the nation has become internalised to such an extent that its life, institutions and guiding principles assume the character of scholarly *doxa* and make many academics blind to facts and assumptions running counter to or transgressing an international order and subjective affiliations rooted in national states.

A similar critique can be found in C. Lorenz' distinction between different forms of anachronism (Lorenz, 1998). Lorenz differentiates between anachronism of facts, language and perspective, the last of the three alluding, in Lorenz' view, to a situation where historians impose their worldview and values on the past. However, as already indicated, the form of distortion that may be at large in the case of nationalism's anachronism, and which is captured by the notion of methodological nationalism, is really the opposite: we may be disposed towards analytically and methodologically imposing the national world of the past on what is seen as a post-national world of the present – the two being discontinuous with one another, i.e. standing in a relationship of mutual exclusion.

Thus, 'methodological nationalism' is Lorenz's critique of historicism in reverse, the scholarly reflection of the anachronism of nationalism, and the confirmation that Hobsbawm may have been right. It constitutes a serious charge against the validity of much humanistic and social-science scholarship, and posits that nationalism, as ideology and rigid thinking, is as much the tacit agenda of scholars as it is the identity basis of everyday citizens.

Now, without questioning that 'methodological nationalism' makes an important point and identifies a real problem correctly, the aim of this chapter in that regard focuses not on specific examples of theoretical blindness to nation-transgressing facts and processes, but on the more fundamental question of the compatibility or incompatibility of 'nation' and 'globality'. In other words: should examples of shifts of perspective, factual distortion, or blindness to new developments be seen as reflections of the erosion or non-existence of the nation state and its nationalism – as instances, that is, of anachronistic scholarship, where the implicit frame of reference is no longer extant – or more benignly as examples of adherence to a still-factual social structure, which is in transformation or being supplemented by international and global 'layers'? In other words, it addresses the gravity and extent of the possible dislocation of 'mental frame' and 'real developments' – both in the minds of citizens with loyalties informed by the idealism of statehood, and of scholars methodologically

hampered by the traditions of thought within which they have been raised and educated.

In order to dig a bit deeper, let me briefly take a look at what I choose to call the theorem of *evolutionary functionalism*, which is at the root of modernist views of nationalism and its current postulated anachronism, and without an understanding of which we cannot determine if the critique hits home or misses the point.

Evolutionary functionalism

Evolutionary functionalism captures all modernist conceptions of nationalism, be it the theories of Gellner, Hegel, Hobsbawm, Hroch, Nairn, Renan, Weber, or others. This structure of thought is based on the combination of three factors:

1. The notion of endogenously interrelated historical phases, obeying a particular evolutionary teleology of history, a determinist historical logic, according to which later phases represent a higher stage of development than earlier ones, but previous phases are the necessary prerequisites for later ones.

2. The idea of the inherent and inevitably functional character of nationalism – nationalism as the dependent variable of modernism. Nationalism – as ideology, organization and identity (in that order) – comes into being as a necessary *function* of economy and society (and, implicitly, dies when they are transformed). In more Marxist variants of this approach, the superstructure of national thinking is determined by the economic base, at least in the last resort. Death need not be instantaneous, however, hence the assumption of:

3. the existence of a time lag between objective developments and subjective consciousness. Nationalism, once in existence, is granted a certain autonomy, and can live on (anachronistically, in the terms of this chapter) for some time, but will eventually petrify and vanish, as the contrast between new societal needs and the need for a more suitable form of consciousness becomes more evident. In this phase, protagonists of the old ideology will wage a determined battle, and scholars will thematise it more intensively, adding to the impression that nationalism is still very much alive and kicking: the owl of Minerva will fly out at dusk.

A number of poignant arguments can undoubtedly be levelled against this way of conceiving the problem. However, let us for a moment accept this rather rigid and schematic way of conceiving relations between nationalism as consciousness and contemporary social structures. Then the question becomes: does such a phase-based, deterministic and functional

set of assumptions as regards nationalism's anachronism really have a rational basis in contemporary economic structures, in a new configuration of the international order, or in radically new global, trans-national relations between people, elites and state?

It is clearly impossible within the limits of one chapter to pursue all the intriguing sub-questions, hypotheses and theoretical problems to which this question can give rise, but I shall try to identify some core factors, suggest a way to handle them, and finally present my own tentative conclusions to the key question of whether nationalism should in fact be regarded as an anachronism, or at least to what extent this might be a plausible thesis. As the argument progresses, positions that are more sceptical towards the assumptions of evolutionary functionalism will be included and addressed.

Four hypotheses

The most fundamental question has to do with the interrelationship between nationalism and globalisation: is it antagonistic or complementary? 'Anachronism or not' depends on how we address this question. It can be done by initially investigating three different hypotheses. After these three, a fourth – qualitatively different – hypothesis will be introduced and discussed.

Hypothesis no 1. ***The functionalist argument:*** *If state and nation belong together, and the state is declining or moribund because of 'globalisation', then nation and nationalism might conceivably be heading out of the back door and be appropriately designated as anachronisms, although this fact might be disguised by the political and cultural attention still given to nationalism and the tendency of the current crisis to reinforce it by means of protectionist measures.*

This is the modernist thesis of progressive, interdependent, historically logical phases objectively replacing each other, in some versions coupled with the notion of a subjective time lag, which keeps the conscious realisation of anachronism at bay. It is intimately based on the assumption of a *necessary and functional* linkage between state and nation(alism): modern states produce nationalism, and when states wither away or are replaced by another system of political organisation, nationalism too will wither away, because the sap from which it lives is no longer there.

This hypothesis, then, needs to be able to argue that global or regional processes impact on the national state so deeply that they jeopardise its survival. Further, it needs to produce evidence of the *necessary* functional

interdependence of state and nation(alism) – an organic marriage of the two.

As a minimal control process, we need to consider arguments produced in at least three different research fields and related schools of thought:

- Arguments pertaining to qualitative changes of sovereignty and the rise of neo-empires (Hardt & Negri, 2000; Hedetoft, 2008; Held et al, 1999; Keohane, 1994; Streeter, Weaver and Coleman, 2009)
- Literature on the destiny of states in the European Union (Hoffman, 1995; Kaiser, Leucht & Rasmussen, 2009; Milward, 1992; Rumford, 2007; Weiler, 1999)
- Theories of globalisation and what they say about state/global interactions in historical perspective (Bauman, 1998; Beck, 2000; Hedetoft, 2003; Hirst & Thompson, 1996; Østerud, 1999; Pauly & Coleman, 2008)

All three fields have produced extremely complex and challenging arguments concerning the erosion of Westphalian political and legal sovereignty, border-transgressing economic and technological processes, the uneven global distribution of power resources and the rise of global and regional hegemonies, and the process whereby European states progressively become more and more dependent on decisions taken in the European Union. There can be little doubt that regional integration, economic shifts of economic, political and military clout, and interdependencies at a serious global level matter more and more. They present states with radically new challenges and are transforming the look, texture and institutional rationale of the international scene. In other words, they are leaving an indelible imprint on the political organisation of the state system and its cultural underpinnings.

On the other hand, even the most radical and well-argued theories fail to show convincingly that these developments are tantamount to an erosion of the state as such – as opposed to a series of functional shifts between units and systems. Sovereignty may now be a different animal from what it used to be, less uniformly invested in national states; but are states with less, or different forms of sovereignty, no longer states? Is neo-imperialism and its more or less subtle mechanisms of subordination and control dependent or independent of states? Are protectionist reactions to the current crisis evidence of political anachronism, or proof that the autonomous (if not sovereign) state still exists? Even the most ardent globalist would probably admit that the jury is still out on such crucial