NATIONALISM

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

NATIONALISM

1. Introduction: presenting Nationalism

Cariad at ein Gwlad is the title we use for the text by Richard Price – *A Discourse on the Love of our Country* – which sparked the pamphleting war during the years following the French Revolution in 1789. The essay became familiar as a result of the radical, liberal arguments expressed in it and the fact that they prompted Edmund Burke to respond with his famous text, *Reflections on the Revolution in France.* However, Price's main purpose was to discuss nationalism, and in particular those principles which should be the basis of the modern nation. In that respect the text is a worthy reflection of the age – a period now known as one which was not only vitally important from the point of view of the development of liberalism, conservatism and socialism, but also from the point of view of the idea of the nation itself.

Indeed, it is possible to interpret the discussion between Price and Burke, and the quite different ideas expressed by them, as an example of the argument about the **roots of nations and nationali**sm. While Burke represented the more historic point of view, which considers the nation as an organic entity which has evolved over time, Price's ideas are an expression of the modernist interpretation, which establishes a firm connection between the nation and the establishments of state. In the argument between Price a Burke there is also a suggestion of the **different forms of nationalism** which would later develop during the 19th century, particularly **Liberal Nationalism** – which reflects a number of the points of views expressed by Price concerning the need for patriotism in order to promote values such as freedom, virtue and citizenship – and **Conservative Nationalism** – such as **tradition, duty and authority**. In due course alternative nationalistic forms would also develop – **Expansionist Nationalism and Anti-colonial Nationalism** –leading to linking nationalism with discussions about the virtues of empire and colonisation. The one offered a basis for justifying the expansionist campaigns of empire forces, while the other was related to the arguments of those who fought back.

Despite the variety of nationalistic points of view which have developed since the days of the French Revolution, it is possible to recognise some k**ey** elements

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

which characterise nationalism of all kinds. Among them is the emphasis on principles such as **national sovereignty** and **self-determination.** Another element which deserves the attention of nationalists is the need to support the nation's traditional **culture.** However, there is disagreement in some circles over the extent to which cultural characteristics should be emphasised when defining the nation. This leads to a consideration of the popular division between **civic nationalism** and **ethno-cultural nationalism** – based on the (problematic) assertion that it is possible to differentiate between different kinds of nationalism based on the emphasis placed on civic factors (such as citizenship) or ethnic factors (such as race and culture).

When Price discussed his vision for the nation at the end of the 18th century, he did so in the context of Great Britain, and the development of that particular nation. At the time there was no organised nationalistic Welsh movement. However, **nationalism** has been a prominent feature in Welsh **politics** over the centuries, be that from the point of view of the British influence on Wales, or as a result of attempts to gain expression to or recognition of Welshness. Turning then to the world-wide level, it can be claimed that nationalism is an integral part of international politics in action today. This stems from the fact that the nation-state continues to be seen as the basic unit for arranging the political geography of the world, and for structuring the connection between different peoples. However, there are important voices who question whether the nation *should* continue to be such a prominent consideration in future.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

2. The Roots of Nationalism

The discussion about the roots of nationalism is one which has caused fierce debate among a number of historians, political scientists and sociologists. The vast majority of scholars agree that it was at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century that terms such as 'nation' and 'nationalism' and related terms such as 'national self determination' and 'national identity' began to be used regularly in political contexts. However, there is considerable disagreement to what degree the feelings and ideas which came to be represented by these terms should also be treated as things which belong only to the modern era. Scholars have not been able to agree whether nationalism should be treated as a recent phenomenon or rather as something which goes back to the distant past.

To begin, those who support the *primordial* interpretation have insisted that nationalism should be treated like an ancient phenomenon which belongs to the pre-modern era. In the opinion of those who have identified with this point of view, nations are natural and organic units which reflect an instinctive tendency among human beings to arrange themselves into groups, in order to nurture a sense of belonging, identity and certainty. It is argued that nationalism is an unavoidable result of this tendency, and as a result that it can be traced back to the customs of some of the earliest groups and tribes. In addition, it is alleged that it is a phenomenon which will continue for as long as human beings survive. A figure who is linked to the primordial interpretation of nationalism is the German thinker from the 18th century, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). However, it is not only a point of view from the past – fairly similar points of view were also expressed in more modern work by psychologists.

A quite different interpretation of the roots of nationalism is expressed by those who profess the *modernist* radical point of view. As the name suggests, the essence of this point of view is the belief that nationalism is a fairly recent phenomenon – something which came into prominence as part of the huge changes experienced across Europe from the 16th century onwards as history stepped from the Middle Ages into the Modern Age. This was the process

characterised by a series of far-reaching changes. Without doubt, the two most prominent were the development of a social and economic order based on the sovereign state. In the opinion of those who follow the modernist point of view, nationalism is a phenomenon which developed in the shadow of these social, economic and political processes. It is argued that only as a result of the new circumstances of the modern age has nationalism come into existence. Previously the circumstances of life would have made the expansion of such ideas impossible.

One of the foremost exponents of the modernist point of view was the philosopher and anthropologist Ernest Gellner (1925-1995). In his famous book *Nations and Nationalism* (1983) Geller argues that nationalism as a result of the circumstances of modern society means that encouraging a high level of linguistic and cultural adherence was vital. In pre-industrial societies, linguistic or cultural differences did not create a problem. The horizons of the vast majority of people were very local, and the connection between individuals from different social levels was limited. As a result, it did not matter if the linguistic or cultural customs of different classes within society were different. However, in the modern industrial period individuals have come to live far more changeable lives generally to be far more mobile. People no longer spent their lives in isolated communities, and being upwardly mobile became more and more possible. The only way to be able to move people around – and through – society in such a way is by creating a common cultural medium which enables everyone to get on well together. According to Gellner this linguistic and cultural glue was spread across society by means of a common education system, and this provided the basis for developing a sense of nationalism in various parts of Europe during the 18th and 19th century.

Another exponent of the modernist point of view was the Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm (1913-2012). However, the emphasis in Hobsbawm's arguments is slightly different from those of Gellner. Rather than concentrate on general social and economic changes, Hobsbawm insists that attention should be given to the political actions of some specific groups. In Hobsbawm's opinion, it is nonsense to

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

talk of national adherence stretching back to the distant past. Rather, the nation and the feelings of national adherence are things that were deliberately created during the early 19th century. The *bourgeoisie* were a mainly responsible for leading this process, according to Hobsbawm. As a dedicated Marxist, he argued that this group of people had set about 'devising tradition' from the 1830s onwards – for example, national flags, national anthems and national holidays – which would be a basis for the idea of a nation. Hobsbawm argued that this was done in order to develop a sense of nationhood, and thereby encourage the working class to believe that they shared a common interest with those who governed society. As a result, the revolutionary potential of the proletariat was restricted by a 'fake consciousness', while the power and status of the bourgeoisie were maintained.

While the primordial and modernist points of view represent the two extreme ends of the discussion about the roots of nationalism, there is a third point of view which stands somewhere in the middle. This point of view is attributed mainly to the work of the historian Anthony D. Smith (1939-2016) and his *ethno-symbolic* arguments. In the opinion of Smith, the argument of modernists such as a Gellner or Hobsbawm tend to over-simplify matters and ignore the element of continuity between modern nations and pre-modern ethnic communities – continuity, for instance, of traditions, histories, language and literature. At the same time, while Smith emphasises this element of continuity, he also argues that we should not discount the important changes which lead to turning pre-modern ethnic adherence into nationalism as it is recognised by today. All in all, therefore, Smith's point of view insists that modern nationalism should not be presented as a phenomenon arising from nowhere, but rather as something which builds upon the raw material stemming from previous historic times.

To conclude, we see in this section that the discussion about the roots of nationalism has given risen to different points of view among historians, political scientists and sociologists. The basis of this disagreement over these points of view is to what degree should nationalism be treated as a modern phenomenon

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

belonging mainly to the past two hundred years, or rather as something organic and ancient stretching back to the distant past.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

3. Forms of Nationalism

Nationalism is an ideology which encompasses a very wide range of streams. Indeed, at times it appears it would be more appropriate to talk of different nationalisms rather than treat nationalism as one coordinated tradition. To some extent such an argument could be put forward in almost every political ideology. However, there is something quite unique about the extent and variety of the political points of view which have been associated with nationalism over the years. Indeed, at different times nationalism has encompassed innovative and reactionary ideas, and democratic and authoritarian, liberal and repressive, left wing and right wing ideas. This lack of consistency stems in part from the fact that nationalism has developed in different places under very different historic and cultural conditions. However, it also reflects the fact that nationalism is an ideology which, over the years, has been combined with a series of other important ideologies – especially liberalism, conservatism and socialism – and has absorbed some of their key concepts and values. This has given rise to a series of quite different nationalistic traditions.

3.2 Liberal Nationalism

A tradition which combines nationalistic ideas being combined with liberal ones developed during the years following the French Revolution in 1789. Indeed, during the 19th century a very close relationship was seen to develop between these two traditions across different parts of Europe. The series of revolutions seen across the Continent in 1848 was characterised by arguments which combined the call for national self-government and the call for more constitutional and accountable systems of government. The arguments of the nationalist movement in Italy, and in particular those of one of its leaders, Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), were an obvious example of this tendency. Similar principles were held also by Simon Bolivar (1783-1830), and by the leaders of the independence movement in South America which had the aim of bringing to an end the imperialist rule of Spain over the lives of the people of that continent. In addition, the influence of liberal nationalism is seen in the famous 'Fourteen Points' drawn up by the American president Woodrow Wilson (1856-1924) as the basis for the Treaty of Versailles – the peace agreement drawn up at the end of

the First World War and which led to substantial political and territorial reorganisation of parts of central and eastern Europe.

Two important aspects can be mentioned which tend to characterise the ideas of liberal nationalists – the one being a nationalistic aspect and the other a liberal aspect:

- **National self-determination:** In the first place, the nationalistic aspect is highlighted by the fact that liberal nationalists believe the world is divided into a series of different nations, each with its unique identity. In addition, it is assumed that each of these nations is equal in status and represents an appropriate unit for organising a political society. As a result, the aim of traditional liberal nationalism has been to try to create conditions where every nation has **self-determination** – that is, the political independence to form its own future on its own conditions. It used to be presumed that this was equal to possessing the right to establish an independent sovereign state. However, recently many liberal nationalists have argued that it is also possible to have self-determination by means of federal or co-federal arrangements where the nation favours far-reaching home rule, but as part of a larger state.

- **Sovereignty of the people:** Secondly, the nationalistic emphasis on the status of national units is combined with the liberal emphasis on the consent or sovereignty of the people – that is, the belief that political power and authority should arise from the bottom, from among the ordinary people. In this case, of course, the relevant 'people' are members of the nation, and it is their consent which is needed when creating a political community and organising a system of government. This means, therefore, that liberal nationalists are not only concerned where exactly the boundaries of a specific political community would lie, but also what kind of political system would be created within those boundaries.

This emphasis on national self-determination, along with the need for more

accountable government arrangements, explains why liberal nationalism gained so much during the 19th century. This was a time when different nationalist groups called for freedom from the grip of the old European empires, for example, the Austrian Empire. But at the same time, since these empires were dictatorial, the campaigning also included a call for more accountable forms of government.

Despite the popularity of liberal nationalism over the years, critics have drawn attention to a range of possible weaknesses. To begin with, some have accused liberal nationalists of being naive. On the other hand, they are very keen to emphasise the beneficial and innovative aspects of nationalism and have presented them as a reasonable, tolerant and enfranchised force, but on the other hand it is suggested that they are guilty of ignoring the way nationalism has also acted as a destructive force over the years. Secondly, and possibly more seriously, it has been said that the belief of liberal nationalists that all nations should be treated equally with an equal right to national self-determination is a totally unpractical point of view. The truth is that nations are uniform units which contain only one ethnic or cultural group. Very often these nations will encompass various different groups all with different ideas of how their political future should be organised. As a result, the critics of liberal nationalism have argued that its principles cannot offer a reliable guide for dealing with a world which is full of ethno-national differences and tensions.

Despite such criticisms, the interest in liberal nationalism has not waned. To the contrary, during the past twenty years there has been a new wave of academics who have set about discussing the nature of the relationship between nationalist principles and liberal ones. As part of this movement, liberal academics such as Yael Tamir, David Miller and Will Kymlicka have argued that having a kind of national consciousness is vital to allow liberal-democratic societies to be able to work effectively. In addition, it was argued that having a general sense national identity is a means of ensuring that society possesses the kind of unity and trust which is essential in order to support healthy democratic establishments and a generous welfare state.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

3.3 Conservative Nationalism

While nationalism and liberalism developed a close relationship in the early 19th century, conservatives in that period tended to consider nationalism as a dangerous force with the potential to undermine social organisation and stability. However, later in the century conservatives were seen to develop a more favourable attitude towards nationalism, and as a result of that a kind of conservative nationalism developed.

One factor which caused conservative nationalists of the time, e.g. Benjamin Disraeli in Britain, to give more attention to nationalist ideas was the belief that emphasising the existence of a national bond could contribute to uniting members of the nation. It was assumed that such ideas could be used to promote the efforts of conservatives to support social stability and protect traditional establishments. As a result, one of the most noticeable aspects of the conservative form of nationalism has been the emphasis on securing the unity and stability of the nation. There was an attempt to do this by promoting feelings of national duty and of national pride, with the intention of nurturing a sense of belonging and loyalty extending across different social classes. Indeed, based on their ability to urge members of the working class to feel part of the modern capitalist society, many conservatives in the 19th century came to interpret nationalist ideas as useful resources which could be harnessed in order to undermine the appeal of socialism, and in particular its more revolutionary Marxist stream.

Similar tactics were also acknowledged by more contemporary conservatives. For example, there was an obvious nationalistic slant in the politics of Charles De Gaulle, the conservative president of France between 1959 and 1969. De Gaulle placed much emphasis on themes such as national duty and national pride as part of his attempt to rebuild the French state and society following the destruction of the Second World War and the decline of its empire. To a large extent the political agenda of Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom between 1979 and 1990, can be interpreted as one which also had a strong nationalist tendency. Whether in defending her stringent policies on public spending, her

attempt to undermine the trades unions, or her belief in a strong defence policy, Thatcher constantly emphasised the idea of national duty. She argued in favour also of the need to raise the national esteem of the United Kingdom following the demise of its international status during the 1960 and the 1970s.

Another important element which characterises conservative nationalism is the emphasis placed on tradition and history. To some extent the acknowledgement of the history of a nation is an element which characterises almost all kinds of nationalism. However, this is a theme which is very prominent in the arguments of conservative nationalists. This is a form of nationalism which is very keen to look back and elevate some (presumed) golden age from the past. This is obvious from the emphasis placed by conservative nationalists on things such as military successes from the past and the way they tend to be interpreted as absolutely crucial events in the development of the nation. It is seen also in the way an exalted symbolic status is attributed to some traditional establishments, particularly royal families.

Considering the emphasis conservative nationalists tend to attach to national organisation, unity and stability, it is not surprising that this form of nationalism has tended to be expressed in a particularly explicit way at times when it is feared that the nation and its identity are under threat. For example, as part of their attempt to oppose the process of European integration, many right wing politicians from the Continent were seen to argue that the development of 'supernational' systems of government endangered the sovereignty of the nations and also undermined all kinds of traditional national establishments. Of course, this was seen most clearly in Britain among the Conservative Party and UKIP. However, it was a feature of the arguments of other conservative politicians also, for example, the National Front in France or Lega parties in Italy. The way the conservatives have expressed their doubts about international immigration has also been based on nationalist themes. Speaking generally, these arguments insist that too many cultural and religious differences are likely to undermine the feeling of general identity which binds society together and, as a result, this is likely to lead to conflict and instability.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

Considering the arguments above, it is not surprising that conservative nationalism has attracted considerable criticism. Possibly the main criticism of these is that which insists that conservative nationalism is a reactionary tradition by nature which gives rise to prejudiced and intolerant feelings. By placing so much emphasis on national unity, and as a result on the importance of traditional institutions and specific cultural practices, there is a danger that those who profess this point of view insist on interpreting the nation too narrowly and place too much emphasis on the difference between members of the nation and other people. Indeed, in its most extreme form this kind of nationalism can turn into racism or intolerant xenophobia. And yet, it is worth stating that all forms of nationalism – whether conservative, socialist or liberal in nature – are bound to include an element of differentiation and of trying to establish boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. The truth is that defining any identity requires this. In order to know who or what we are, we must know who or what we are not. As the Welsh philosopher J.R. Jones argued: 'we cannot know about belonging without feeling what it is not to belong.'

3.4 Expansionist Nationalism

There is a third form of nationalism which possesses an aggressive, belligerent and expansionist character. This is nationalism which is totally opposed to the more liberal form with its emphasis on equality and self-determination. Indeed, at times there has been a tendency for this more aggressive and expansionist form of nationalism to be very close to Fascist ideas.

It was probably in the final decades of the 19th century – from the 1870s onwards – that this form of nationalism came to the fore, and in the context of the second great wave of colonising by European states. This is the period when the imperial colonies of the time – France, Germany and the United Kingdom – were competing for a hold over parts of the African continent. Of course, a desire to gain economic advantage was one important factor which contributed to driving these efforts. However, a desire to elevate the international status and esteem of the nation was also a prominent consideration, and to a much larger degree than during the earlier periods of colonialisation. Indeed, between 1870 and 1914

possessing an extensive empire came to be treated as an important sign of a nation's prosperity, and as a result the colonising campaigns of the time attracted much public support. There is a tendency also to interpret the period which led to the World Wars as times when aggressive and expansionist nationalism was spreading. The First World War began in 1914 – partly as a result of the tensions which arose from the extended arms war between Germany and the United Kingdom – and despite the destruction and killing which happened in due course, the news was welcomed keenly in many capitals across Europe, since it was assumed that the fighting would be an opportunity to emphasise military might and esteem. Then in the case of the Second World War (1939-1945) the conflict arose to a large extent from the tensions caused by expansionist campaigns by fascist systems in Germany and Italy and Japan during the 1930s – campaigns which had a strong nationalist feel. More recently still we saw the destructive influence of expansionist nationalism at work as part of the bloody fighting which stemmed from splitting the state of Yugoslavia during the 1990s, and especially as part of the campaign by figures such as Slobadan Milošević to create one 'Great Serbia'.

One of the foremost characteristics of the expansionist form of nationalism is a strong chauvinistic attitude. Different from liberal nationalists, this rejects the assertion that all nations are equal, and as a result that they have an equal right to national self-determination. Rather, it is claimed that some nations possess characteristics or virtues that place them above others. Chauvinism of this kind was one obvious element in the ideas of the French nationalist Charles Maurras (1868-1952), who was leader of the right wing movement Action Françoise. Maurras described France as 'an incomparable marvel'. Chauvinism was also a prominent characteristic of the nationalism which formed the basis of colonising campaigns by European countries during the final decades of the 19th century. These campaigns were driven partly by a sure belief in the cultural superiority of Europe. It was assumed that the 'white' peoples of Europe were far ahead, in education and morals, of the 'black', 'brown' and 'yellow' peoples who lived across Africa and Asia. As a result, colonies were introduced as a moral attempt to

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

spread the 'European civilisation' to the 'less sophisticated' and 'less developed' peoples who lived in other parts of the world.

3.5 Anti-colonial Nationality

The experience of living under colonial rule encouraged a sense of nationhood, along with a desire for national freedom, among some of the peoples of Africa and Asia. As a result of this an alternative form of anticolonial nationality developed during the second half of the 20th century.

The process of undoing colonialisation which developed during decades following the Second World War led to a change in the political geography of the world. The old European empires came to an end as the social, economic and political cost of the two world wars meant that states such as France and the United Kingdom no longer had the will or the resources to keep hold of their vast overseas territories. In some cases this happened in a fairy peaceful fashion, for instance, in India in 1947, Tunisia in 1956, and Malaysia and Ghana in 1957. But in many other cases it was only following a long period of armed revolt did the colonial relationships come to an end. For example, that was the case in Algeria (1954-62), Vietnam (1946-54) and Kenya (1952-59). However, what is significant in this context is the fact that the leaders of the anticolonial movements which arose across Africa and Asia during the 1950s and 1960s expressed their arguments in favour of breaking free of their western masters in nationalistic terms.

Originally these arguments followed a similar path to that of some liberal nationalists in the 19th century, such as Mazzini, emphasising the need for systems of government which recognised the equal right of every nation to self-determination. However, the circumstances faced by these new nationalist movements were quite different from those faced by nationalists across Europe a century earlier. To the anticolonial nationalists, there was a very close connection between their call for political independence and an awareness of the lack of social and economic development which stemmed for years of oppression under the European states. A result the nationalism of the anticolonial movement was to combine a focus on the political and constitutional dimension, stressing social and economic inequality. Considering this, it is not surprising that the anti-colonial

form of nationalism had come to develop a close connection with socialist ideas. Indeed, by the 1960s and 1970s a wide range of anti-colonial movements had combined their arguments in favour of national self-government with elements of the revolutionary socialism professed by Marx and Lenin. One factor which contributed to this development was the presumption that Marxism offered a detailed analysis of the inequality and exploitation which were part of the colonialist experience. In addition, Lenin had argued that colonialisation should be interpreted as an extension of the class exploitation which happens invariably under capitalism – something which stems from the need of the large capitalist countries to find labour and raw resources in order to maintain their economic growth.

It is worth stating that it is only in the context of twentieth century anti-colonialisation campaigns has there been an attempt to express nationalistic arguments in a way which closely touches upon ideas which are socialist in nature. Possibly as a result of the influence of the anti-colonialising movements discussed above, a left wing form of nationalism was expressed by many of the sub-state nationalistic movements seen to gain momentum across parts of Western Europe and North America from the 1960s. The nationalist movement in Wales was one example of this tendency, and many influential voices in the ranks of Plaid Cymru and Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Welsh Language Society) argued that an agenda should be adopted which argued for self-determination, and the importance of the Welsh language in socialist terms which emphasised the influence of economic factors. Similar tendencies were also seen in relation to nationalistic movements in countries such as the Basque country and Quebec. However, we should avoid coming to the conclusion that all nationalist movements in contemporary sub-states tend to the left, because there are many examples of those who have taken a more right wing path.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

4. The key elements of Nationalism

As seen in the previous section, nationalism is an ideology which has encompassed a wide and diverse range of political viewpoints. Moreover, these are viewpoints which have overlapped nearly each of the other main ideological traditions, including liberalism, conservatism, socialism and fascism. Even so, despite this breadth, some key aspects remain which can be seen to be fundamental to all forms of nationalistic politics. We discuss the most important of these elements below.

4.1 The nation

The fundamental principle to all forms of nationalism is the idea of the nation as the core political unit. Even so, it has proved extremely difficult to explain exactly what is meant by a nation and what are its key aspects, and this had led to some uncertainty. At its most general level, a nation can be defined as an entity which bring together a group of people who share a common language, culture, religion, traditions and history and who also, usually, share a common territory. However, we can't fully rely on *objective* elements similar to the above when defining a nation. Linguistic, cultural, religious or ethnic diversity of some form is a feature of almost all nations. Switzerland is an obvious example of this; there is a strong sense of nationhood there, but at the same time, there exists three linguistic communities (French, German and Italian). Furthermore, there are many examples of different nations who share a common language or religion. For example, there are numerous nations who have English, French or German as common national languages. This means that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to try to compile a final and definitive list of objective criteria to be used in order to establish where and when a nation exists.

Consequently, any attempt to define a nation must consider a combination of objective features, such as a common language, culture or traditions, with the *subjective* feelings of the nation's members. Ultimately, as argued by the French philosopher and historian, Ernest Renan (1823-1892), what defines a nation (and distinguishes it from other social groups) is the fact that a specific concentration of people wish to identify themselves as a nation and commit to collaborating in order to ensure that others provide formal recognition of that. Usually, this call for recognition places emphasis on the aspirations of the members to gain recognition as a unique political community, and as a result, to attain a level of political autonomy. This autonomy can be secured by establishing an independent state, or through a more limited federate or confederate arrangement.

The fact that nations can be identified on the basis of a combination of objective and subjective factors has led some scholars to analyse the way in which different national movements have chosen to define their particular nation, along with the conditions which have to be met in order to claim membership of the nation. This has led to the division between ethnic nationalism (or ethno-cultural) and civic nationalism which has

claimed a central place in the academic literature on nationalism. These categories are discussed in more detail in Section 5 ‘Nationalism and the civic-ethnic divide’.

4.2 National adherence

Another common trend among nationalists of all types is the belief that the world is divided into a series of different nations, each one possessing its own unique character and identity. Furthermore, nationalists tend to view the adherence which people have towards their nation as one which has extreme significance, and which stands above their adherence to any other collective entity. Whereas other types of adherence, such as class, sex, religion or language, has been significant in some places at certain times, it is claimed that the adherence towards our nation has deeper roots. This adherence has survived over time and is found in all parts of the world.

4.3 National sovereignty and self determination

An important step in the development of nationalism as a political ideology occurred when the idea of a national community merged with the idea of the people’s sovereignty. It is claimed that this occurred during the French Revolution and took inspiration from the writings of the philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78). In his work, Rousseau did not refer directly to the concept of nation, nor to nationalism; however, it’s assumed that his emphasis on the principle of sovereignty offered the basis to an important ideological development with regard to nationalism. Rousseau argued that sovereignty (that is, the ultimate political power) should not lie in the hands of an all-powerful king, which was usual across extensive parts of Europe at the time, but rather in the hands of community of people united by a common culture. The process of governing should then be based on the common will of this community, which Rousseau referred to as ‘the general will’. During the French Resolution, these arguments gained traction with the revolutionaries claiming that the people of France were all ‘citizens’ who possessed basic rights, rather than ‘subjects’, and that consequently, sovereignty should lie in their hands, the members of the nation. As a result, the French Revolution gave rise to the idea that rational governing arrangements should try to ensure that people organised as a nation should be able to govern themselves.

As a result of the above developments, it became increasingly common to treat nations as the appropriate units for organizing political communities. This led to the principle that all nations should have the right to self-determination. Generally speaking, this right was interpreted as one which should enable the nation to organize itself as one meaningful community, and following that, to possess the political independence to form its own future on its own terms. Until fairly recently, it was generally assumed that self-determination was, in the view of all almost all nationalists, synonymous with the right to establish an independent sovereign state. However, it has recently been argued that

many nationalists choose to interpret the principle in a more multifaceted way. This is evident in the work of the political scientist, Michael Keating, on the nature of the constitutional demands put forward by nationalistic movements active across many of Europe's subnational nations. Despite their emphasis on self-determination with the right to form their own future, Keating shows that many of these movements don't aspire to establish independent and sovereign states in the traditional sense. He argues that their objectives are more open-ended, and that they are understand that political and economic arrangements now encompass a range of different layers – local, national and international. Even in the case of nationalistic movements such as the one in Scotland, which has obviously placed a great deal of emphasis on the idea of independence over the past few years, it is evident that many of the independence models put forward included maintaining some important constitutional (the Crown) and economic (the pound) ties with the remainder of the United Kingdom. Similarly, many of the proposals for independence for Quebec espoused by the Parti Québécois since the late 1970s (including during two referenda in 1980 and 1995), have recommended arrangements for sharing sovereignty with the remainder of Canada.

4.5 Culture

A great deal of the discussion surrounding nationalism has focused on the kinds of political or constitutional demands connected to the ideology – and specifically the call for national self-determination – but it must be remembered that the cultural dimension has also been central to the agenda put forward by many national movements. As a result, many nationalists weren't solely concerned with gaining the kind of governmental and civic establishments which would enable the nation to be treated as a political community in its own right. They were also concerned with activity which would promote and strengthen the nation's traditional culture (or, as in the case of several minority nations, reviving and re-establishing their culture). This cultural activity has often focused on promoting the national language, for example, through efforts to promote its use as the community's main medium, or efforts to expand its corpus (for example, by coining and standardizing terms) to ensure that the medium can be easily used to discuss modern developments.

During the second half of the twentieth century, it became fashionable among scholars studying nationalism to argue that cultural activity of this kind was favoured by some specific types of nationalists, who espoused ethno-cultural nationalism whilst other nationalists, who espoused civic nationalism were more likely to focus on political aims which involved building establishments which would form the basis of a new embryonic state. This was seen, for example, in the tendency to label Welsh nationalism as being cultural and ethnic in nature due to the emphasis placed on supporting the Welsh language, whilst Scottish nationalism has been consistently labelled as being political or civic in nature, due to the emphasis places on supporting important establishments such

as Scotland's legal system and its independent education system. However, as shown in the next section, there is a danger in over-emphasising such distinctions, as they can over-simplify the issue. Nationalism in action is almost always a complex combination of cultural, political, ethnic and civic elements.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

5. Nationalism and the civic-ethnic divide

The distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism was introduced by Hans Kohn (1891-1971) in order to analyse and describe different types of nationalism. Despite being fairly recent categories, they are based on perspectives which have a long history extending back to the eighteenth century. Furthermore, despite being categories introduced for analytical purposes, they also have a strong normative element – in the sense that Kohn tends to associate the civic with that which is 'good' and the ethnic with that which is 'bad'. He suggested that civic nationalism is based on open, more liberal and tolerant aspects, whilst ethnic nationalism is more closed, narrow and intolerant.

The crux of the distinction lies in the nation's origins, and specifically that which denotes membership of the national community and brings people together, providing the foundation for their collective identity. Civic nationalism is mainly associated with the Breton philosopher, Ernest Renan (1823-1892). Renan acknowledged that a range of elements contributed towards creating an awareness of nationhood, but he asserted that the most significant ultimately is the longing among group members to think of themselves as a nation – that is, their willingness to will the notion of nationhood. However, despite the significance of Renen in relation to civic nationalism, it's possible to step back even further to the ideas of the Welsh philosopher Richard Price (1723-1791), and his prominent discussion of the nature of patriotism in 1789, shortly before the French Revolution. In his view, neither land nor place of birth is important in defining nationhood, but rather the community of people who choose to live together, and specifically, the government, law and constitution which form the framework for living in that community. It is these civic institutions which bind and sustain us a nation, not our territory or identity.

This civic tradition is very different to ethnic nationalism, which is associated with the belief that a person's identity forms the basis for belonging to a particular nation. Furthermore, there is a tendency to assume that ethnic nationalism treats these elements as ones which are wholly indispensable in order to ensure the survival of the nation and the unity of its members. By today however, there is a tendency to assume that factors such as race or pedigree are the ones which ethnic nationalists would choose to emphasise in denoting membership of the nation. However, this tradition is associated with the ideas of the eighteenth-century German philosopher, Joseph Herder (1744-1803); he also emphasised cultural aspects, such as folklore, traditions and arts, but mostly language, and the unique viewpoint of the world which it represents, and which forms the premise for the nation.

The civic and ethnic categories have developed to be very popular among scholars who have studied nationalism. However, there is a danger of placing too much emphasis on this division as nationalists often espouse arguments which possess a complex

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

combination of civic and ethnic aspects. It's possible to look at some of these tensions by considering the arguments of the English philosopher, John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). Mill is recognised as an advocate for the civic form of nationalism, due to his emphasis on the need to respect the choice of a group of people to form a nation, and also his emphasis on the nation's political history (that is, an awareness of the development of its governing establishments). At the same time, Mill argued that creating the conditions to allow the nation's political establishments to work effectively meant ensuring that all the members shared common cultural traits, and in particular that they shared a common language. Indeed, Mill provides a well-known quotation in which he warns the Welsh that it would be wise of them to sacrifice aspects of their cultural identity in order to facilitate the process of becoming full member of the British 'nation':

'Nobody can suppose that it is not more beneficial for a Breton or a Basque of French Navarre ... to be a member of the French nationality... than *to sulk on his own rocks, the half-savage relic of past times* ...The same remark applies to the Welshman or the Scottish highlander as members of the British nation' (J. S. Mill, *Considerations on Representative* Government, 1861).

It is therefore evident that the arguments of so-called 'civic nationalists' such as Mill cannot always be fully differentiated from the more ethnic viewpoints which emphasise the need for individuals to possess specific cultural features before they can become full members of the nation. Indeed, this is not an exception. Recent research has highlighted that fact that there has been a consistent tendency among many of the West's big nation-states – for example France, Britain and the United States of America, namely the arch examples of civic nations according to Kohn – to espouse interpretations of national identity which emphasise ethnic elements. This is mainly seen in relation to these countries' immigrations policies, in which being able to speak a particular language (French or English) is a precondition for gaining citizenship. As a result, there is no denying that the division between civic and ethnic nationalism is worthy of analysis, but care should be taken not to overly rely on these categories. In truth, rarely do examples of nationalism fall neatly into one category or the other. More often than not, nationalism is a complex combination of both elements.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

6. Nationalism in the politics of Wales

6.1 Owain Glyndŵr

It's possible to initiate a discussion about the influence of nationalistic ideas on Welsh politics by looking back at the time of Owain Glyndŵr. Glyndŵr's rebellion began in 1400 and reached its climax in 1405, before the tide turned away from him. From a nationalistic viewpoint, one of significant features of his campaign is the way in which extensive use was made of mythology and history, and in particular the emphasis on Glyndŵr's lineage and his connections with the House of Aberffraw. Furthermore, Glyndŵr's great emphasis on the need to create inherently Welsh establishments, such as a parliament, universities and an ecclesiastical system, echoed important nationalistic themes. More generally, in view of his campaign, it can be argued that the experience of fighting the Normans and the Saxons had prompted the Welsh people to develop a sense of national identify at an early stage – much earlier than the case with several other peoples across Europe. For example, a cohesive sense of English identity wasn't evident until the beginning of the fifteenth century. To a great extent, the nationalism seen during this period was a fairly primitive form, in which national identify was mainly based on factors such as language, history and mythology. However, the memory of native Welsh laws – the laws of Hywel Dda from the tenth century – was also part of the legacy which Owain Glyndŵr was eager to harness in recruiting support for his rebellion.

The failure of Glyndŵr's rebellion further constricted Wales and meant that the idea of national autonomy wouldn't emerge in a meaningful way for some centuries. Many Welshmen decided instead to try to influence the new English state which was emerging, and also support the efforts to safeguard the Welsh language and Welsh culture. Some feel that these efforts were boosted when Henry Tudor (Henry VII), who was of Welsh descent, became king in 1485, in part because of the support given by the Welsh to his campaign to win the throne. Later, his notorious son Henry VIII passed the Acts of Union in 1536 and 1542 which formalized the counties of Wales as part of the English state. During the reign of his daughter, Elizabeth I, several Welshmen were prominent in shaping that state; for example, John Dee who coined the term 'The British Empire'.

6.2 Michael D Jones and nineteenth century nationalism

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Scotland and Ireland had also been incorporated and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was created. During this century, the state tightened its grip on people's lives – mainly due to the upheaval and protest which arose from the Industrial Revolution – and there was a concerted effort to create and expand a sense of British identify. As a result, the Welsh language

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

and culture of Wales came under increasing pressure; the populace of Wales faced extremely difficult living conditions and the English Church became the target of fierce opposition throughout a nation which had turned towards the nonconformist denominations.

It is therefore unsurprising that a figure such as Michael D, Jones (1822-1898) – according to some, the father of modern Welsh nationalism – came to the fore. Today, he is mainly known as the leader of the campaign to establish a Welsh Settlement in Patagonia in Argentina, but his nationalistic viewpoints went far deeper than that. He argued that English majority culture, through civic establishments such as the law and government, but also through the economy, was undermining the prospects of Wales and the Welsh language. According to Jones, who was an Independent minister, the language was a key element in Welsh national identity but also fundamental to the country's faith – he believed that losing the language would undermine the native Welsh culture, but that it would also lead to a loss of religion among the Welsh. For these reasons, he argued that it was essential to withstand the English state and if that wasn't possible, then there should be a concerted effort to establish a new Welsh order in another part of the world in which the Welsh language could be established as the only official administrative language.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, several other important figures followed Michael D. Jones – including Emrys ap Iwan – and by 1886, Cymru Fydd was formed. This movement led a campaign in favour of Welsh self-government and was supported by prominent Welsh Liberals such as J.E. Lloyd, O.M. Edwards, T.E. Ellis and Lloyd George. This movement had limited success and was wound up by the end of the century, mainly due to disagreement between members in south and north Wales. However, the idea of self-government continued to be discussed at the beginning of the twentieth century, for example, as part of the campaign by E.T John, a Welsh Member of Parliament, or in the efforts of socialists such as T.E. Niclas and David Thomas to form a Welsh Labour Party which supported self-government. However, it's important to emphasise that full independence was never the aim of various campaigns in favour of self-government towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century but rather ensuring a measure of self-government for Wales as a 'dominion' within the international structure of the British Empire.

6.3 Saunders Lewis and the development of Plaid Cymru

Following the First World War, the nationalistic movement in Wales changed direction as figures such as Saunders Lewis (1893-1985) argued for complete independence and stated that there was a demand for a Welsh nationalistic party to achieve that. Plaid Genedlaethol Cymru (the National Party of Wales' original name) was formed in Pwllheli

in 1925 and Saunders Lewis served as its president until 1939. He is known as a brilliant scholar and writer, but his political leadership was less popular. He espoused a very conservative form of nationalism. He placed great emphasis in history and expressed grave doubts about the merits of the modern industrial age – to such an extent that he argued that Plaid Cymru should promote an economic policy which supported the de-industrialization of the South Wales valleys. He also converted to Catholicism in 1932, a decision which proved very controversial in a country of nonconformist chapel goers. Through all of this, the one fundamental and consistent element in his vision was the need to revive the Welsh language and the aim of creating a monolingual Welsh-speaking nation.

The differences between Saunders Lewis and his successor, Gwynfor Evans (1912-2005) are often highlighted. Whereas one was a Catholic, conservative and willing to espouse militaristic viewpoints, the other was nonconformist, a social liberal and also a keen pacifist. Indeed, Gwynfor's firm pacifism was one of the key factors in ensuring that Welsh nationalism, in its collective form, diverged from the Irish form of nationalism. Despite these differences, both men were also similar in many ways. For example, both agreed that history played a significant role in the nationalistic struggle and also that defending the Welsh language was essential in creating a separate Welsh identify. Furthermore, both maintained that Welsh nationalism should be interpreted as a profound political ideology – one that offered an alternative choice to market capitalism on one hand and socialism on the other.

Another important figure worthy of consideration in discussing the ideological development of the nationalist movement in Wales in the twentieth century is J.R. Jones (1911-1970). Jones did not ever have a formal political role as party leader –he was an academic who became Professor of Philosophy at the University of Swansea. During the 1960s, he published several notable essays which gave philosophical expression to some of the core elements of Welsh nationalism. Like Saunders Lewis and Gwynfor Evans, J.R.Jones believed that the Welsh language was integral to the continuation of the idea of a Welsh nation. He argued that it was possible to define the essence of the idea of a nation by referring to three key elements, namely territory, language and state, along with the ties between them. He also introduced the concept of 'cydymdreiddiad' ('interpenetration') between language and territory, a historical process which allows a nation's national language to evolve in harmony with its territory, thereby forming the spirit of the people (i.e. members of the nation). However, in the absence of a state, Jones argued that is wouldn't be possible to ensure the survival of the language nor the people's unique spirit. In his view, Wales' problem was that the Welsh people lived within a state which had no ties to their territory or their spirit; he argued that the United Kingdom was to all purposes a state which had historic ties to England's territory and language, and therefore that state was concerned with assimilating the Welsh, rather

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

than safeguarding their traditions. Without independence and indigenous state establishments, the language and spirit of Wales would slowly fade, and ultimately, with the language extinct, there would be no Welsh people remaining.

6.4 The Age of Devolution

No discussion of nationalism in context of Wales is complete without acknowledging the conflict with British nationalism. When opposing Welsh nationalism, members of the big parties – the Conservatives and Labour Party – would invariably espouse a form of British nationalism. This wouldn't necessarily involve questioning the existence of a Welsh identity, but would emphasise the political nature of Britishness, whilst allowing Welshness to exist as solely a cultural attachment. Even so, the situation became more complex during devolution and the establishment of the National Assembly at the end of the 1990s. There was now pressure on the 'British' parties to adopt a more Welsh outlook in order to respond to the electoral challenges and the policy challenges which arose from the new political context. This was very evident in the case of the Labour Party between 1999 and 2003. Following Plaid Cymru's unexpected success in the first Assembly elections in 1999, the Labour Party endeavoured to adopt a more Welsh image in Wales – a process partly inspired by its leader in Wales at the time, Rhodri Morgan. The Welsh Conservatives and Liberal Democrats also took similar action. It's therefore possible to argue that almost all of the main parties represented in the Assembly (with the exception of UKIP) have adopted some form of Welsh nationalism, in the sense that they are committed to upholding a Welsh governing system. Of course, this doesn't mean that all parties are likely to support steps which would move Wales further along the constitutional path towards independence. However, there is now consensus in terms of the need to treat Welsh politics within a specific Welsh framework.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

7. Nationalism and global politics

Nationalistic tendencies are central to global political systems. This is evident in the fact that we now have an international system based on interaction between a series of sovereign *nation*-states. Of course, the expansion of this system of nation-states to all four corners of the world is a fairly recent development. Whilst the early roots of the process extend back to the Middle Ages, it must be remembered that the notion of a nation-state remained foreign in several parts of the world, until as recent as the first decades of the twenty first century. However, it can be argued fairly confidently that this is now the normal political form across the world.

7.1 Behaviour of nation states

The development of the international system of sovereign *nation*-states is a clear indication of the way in which nationalistic ideas have shaped our modern world. However, scholars who study international politics offer different interpretations of the way in which these national units interact, and specifically how willing they are to collaborate and share resources.

On one hand, those who espouse the Realist perspective on international politics claim that nation-states are essentially introverted units, who will always place self-interest above any other considerations. From this viewpoint, any collaboration between different states is only possible if the respective partners believe that they are benefitting from the process in any meaningful way. These arguments derive from the Realists' core belief that the international system is unstable in nature and that it therefore promotes competition between states, motivating them to place national security and self-interest above all else.

Other scholars have challenged the traditional Realist perspective, arguing that nation-states can behave in an ethical way which also acknowledges the needs of other states. The claim that nation-states do more than consider the safety and interests of their citizens as they play on the international stage. Indeed, this perspective assumes that emphasis on national interests can be balanced with cosmopolitan considerations which acknowledge that the nation-state is a member of a wider international community. Similarly, this is a viewpoint that acknowledges that a person's attachment to his/her fellow countrymen/countrywomen is important, but that he/she also has a significant duty to other individuals throughout the world.

The viewpoints above can lead to different ideas regarding the extent to which nation-states should be able to operate free from the interference of others within the international system. To the Realist, states should abstain from interfering in other states' internal issues, as long as there is no threat to their own self-interest. However, those who hold more collaborative viewpoints maintain that a state will sacrifice its right to external sovereignty if it tramples on the fundamental rights of its citizens. Similarly,

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government

under such circumstances, there is a duty on other states to act in order to improve the behaviour of the offending state.

7.2 Rejection of Nationalism

There is a range of important conceptual traditions which, in different ways, have questioned some of the fundamental principles of nationalism and challenged the assumption that nation-states are the appropriate units for organizing the international community.

To begin with, anarchists have challenged the supremacy of the nation-state based on the belief that they are too big as units and that they over-centralize power which creates corrupt politicians. They tend to favour federal political systems which allow power to thrive at a very local level and there is balance of power between different units. These traditions are often linked to the ideas put forward by figures such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Mikhail Bakunin.

Marxists' suspicion of the modern nation-state derives from their belief that it is the product of a capitalist system, and that therefore it is a political form which will always defend the interests of capitalists at the expense of the working class. As a result, the need to dismantle the state is a consistent theme in Marxists' work as is the need to establish an international sense of unity among the working class which will rise above nationalistic differences. This vision was of course undermined to a great extent by the Communist regimes which were established during the twentieth century. In reality, these were totalitarian systems in which the power of the state increased rather than disappeared. Even so, it can be argued that the communist countries, under the leadership of the Soviet Union, promoted far-reaching collaboration across borders.

One other important tradition which has challenged the idea that nation-states should play a central role in the international system is Cosmopolitanism. This tradition originally emerged from the ideas of thinkers such as Immanuel Kant and Richard Price, who both argued in favour of the need to move beyond the idea of sovereign nation-states towards a global federal system. During the twentieth century, thinkers such as Charles Beitz developed cosmopolitan arguments based on principles such as liberty, equality and individual rights, in order to challenge the idea of a world divided into a series of sovereign nation-states. Beitz encourages us to view justice as a truly international consideration, rather than something which is discussed and practiced within individual nation-states. Furthermore, he argues in favour of far-reaching policies which would lead to the redistribution of resources and wealth across state boundaries. These arguments don't specifically call for abolishing the nation-state, but they are certainly ones which are eager to see its power limited significantly, so that global considerations such as environmental wellbeing and worldwide poverty can receive far more attention.

atebol
Ariennir yn Rhannol gan Lywodraeth Cymru
Part Funded by Welsh Government