

08 - NATIONS AND NATIONALISM IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERNIZATION IN 19TH CENTURY

Is the integration of modern nations in 19th century a precondition or the result of modernization? “Europe of nations” as it emerged from processes of modernization is fundamentally different than “Europe of states”, even before the breakup of multinational empires in 1918. National integration can be explained as a “national revival” - addition of new content to proto-national societies or as a formation of new, functional societies that are more or less based on “objective” foundations. In either case, national integration, emergence of nation as primary factor in political discourse and new, national legitimation of states is a *historical turning point* in the domain of both personal identification and politics.

Participants are encouraged to submit their own topics. Suggestions below are intended just as a starting point or source of ideas to perspective participants. Seminars about specific nations or regions are preferred, so that we could study the topics starting from specific examples and move toward general in the course of discussion.

SUGGESTED TOPICS:

1.) Modern nation – concept, substance, integration

a) Concept of nation

New substance of an old term *natio*, change in the meaning of terminology as a symptom of new social context. Spread of national discourse from “elite” to “common” culture in the process of national integration. Did the social and political elites shape the common understanding of nation, or did they create their national discourse according to the existing common beliefs?

b) Between subjective and objective

Is nation a real of imaginary community? Processes of national integration can lead to conclusions about nation as “constructed” society. But examples of unsuccessful national integrations show the importance of strong proto-national foundations.

c) Criteria of national affiliation

Nations are determined by their criteria of affiliation (e.g. language, territory, common history, culture, religion). Those criteria are not constant or universal, different nations are defined through different criteria. Relative importance of certain criteria primarily depends on specific context, mainly the differentiation from “Other”.

d) Civic and ethnic nationalism

Civic nationalism is generally associated with states that were modernized and territorially defined before the completion of national integration. In contrast, ethnic nationalism stems from the process of national integration without territorially and politically defined independent state. Can it be claimed that in the first case state shapes the process of national integration and in the second, development of nation leads to the

formation of nation-state? Also, does the need to define national territory in second case results in exclusive character of ethnic nationalism?

e) National history – interaction of national integration and nationalistic historiography

Century of nations is also a century of historiography. Historiography collects, codifies and even creates essential national tropes and myths. With the proliferation of literacy and education, historiography became one of the sources of common view on the past. What are the social roles of historiography in 19th century and in the processes of national integration?

2.) Economic, social and political function of nation

a) Nations and modernization

In most cases “western” and “eastern” forms of nations correlate with civic and ethnic nationalism. In the processes of modernization periphery is distinguished from center by a delay in industrialization and formation of modern centralized and bureaucratic state. Is the difference between civic and ethnic nationalism a consequence of such delay? How do economic, social and political functions of nations affect multinational states such as Hapsburg Monarchy or Ottoman Empire?

b) Functional nationalism

Military mobilization of revolutionary France, economic integration of industrial England and political mobilization of nations in multinational states are different forms of national mobilization. Modern state needs standardized culture, especially language. Industrial societies need geographically and occupationally mobile workforce. Modern armies need a common command language. Is national integration, primarily as it emerges from common language and education, a byproduct of modernization or does modernization depends modern nations?

c) National integration as a modernization process

National integration and modernization both represent responses to the new needs of modern states in 19th century. Relation between those processes is different in modernization centers and periphery, and between nations that are modernized in the context of territorially defined modern states and those modernized in multinational states. How do the processes of national integration and modernization correspond in those different circumstances?

d) From “Europe of states” to the “Europe of nations”

Europe, as it emerged from 19th century with formation of modern nations, was fundamentally different than pre-modern Europe. The bases of most modern nation-states were shaped in 19th century. However, after unification of Germany and Italy there were no major territorial changes in Europe until the breakup of multinational states in 1918. How can the new shape of post-Versailles Europe be presented in continuity or discontinuity in relation to 19th century Europe?