



## IMAGINING GEOGRAPHY: NATION AND NATIONALISM

Bilal GORENTAS\*

### Abstract

Nation and nationalism have always been controversial concepts for researchers. This paper aims to provide some valuable insights into this controversial research domain, in order to create a clearer perspective to understand and study nations and nationalisms. This paper scrutinises a wide range of literature in the nationalism studies. It has identified three main questions in nationalism studies and reviewed the answers to these questions so as to draw a conceptual framework that can be used as an analytical tool to approach and examine nations and nationalisms. The paper begins with exploring the meanings of the terms 'nation' and 'nationalism' in the literature. It, then, seeks the origins of nations and nationalism. Finally, it identifies some existing typologies of nationalism in the literature.

**Keywords:** Nation, Nationalism, Geography, Imagined Communities.

### Introduction: Nation and Nationalism

The importance of nations and nationalisms in today's world has been a contentious topic. There have been many debates about whether nations and nationalism have been losing, or already lost, its significance. It can be accepted that the formations and functions of nations and nationalisms have been in a constant state of flux. Yet, it is also clear that today's political map remains to be defined by nations and national borders. Hence, there is a continual need to examine these constantly evolving concepts and the ways in which geographies and communities are 'imagined' (Anderson, 1991; Said, 1979).

This paper has reviewed the continually expanding literature in the nation and nationalism studies. Three key themes have been observed in this controversial topic. These three themes have been shaped by three questions:

1. What is nation and nationalism?
2. What is the origin of nation and nationalism?
3. Are there different types of nationalism?

The paper will firstly attempt to define and explain the terms, followed by the investigation of the origin of nation and nationalism. Finally, It will focus on the different typologies of nationalism in the literature.

#### 1. Defining the Terms

Defining the concept of the 'nation' is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and contentious parts of the literature. As Tilly and Ardant said the term was 'one of the most puzzling and tendentious items in the political lexicon' (Tilly & Ardant, 1975, p. 6). Hence, there have been many different explanations of the term. After discussing two 'provisional definitions' of the term, Ernest Gellner suggests that 'it is probably best to approach this problem by using this term without attempting too much in the way of formal definition' (Gellner, 2006, p. 7). Yet, many scholars have attempted to define this phenomenon from different perspectives. All these attempts can be analysed in three main categories. The first category includes those who define the term by 'objective' factors such as gene, language, history and territory. The second one consists of those whose definitions also include some 'subjective' factors such as perception, attitudes and sentiments, in addition to 'objective' ones. Finally, the last category is composed of those who attempt to define the term by 'subjective' factors and approach the term as a completely modern construction. This categorisation is, by no means, exhaustive. However, it helps to investigate the literature from a clearer perspective.

The first group is 'primordialism'. Primordial definitions are usually based on some 'unquestioned truths'. The first thing that they use to define the term is 'gene'. The term 'nation' is usually defined as a community of people of the same descent. The truth here is that biologically there is no pure race. As Bauer

---

\* Dr., Kilis 7 Aralık University, Geography Department, bilal.gorentas@kilis.edu.tr

reminds us 'the Italians are descended from Etruscans, Romans, Celts, Teutons, Greeks and Saracens; French of today are from Gauls, Romans, Britons and Teutons; Germans are from Teutons, Celts and Slavs' (Bauer, 1996, p. 39). Therefore, as Renan (1995, p. 148) states, the ethnic considerations have nothing to do with the formation of the modern nations.

If the gene cannot be the centre of the definition, then the second 'objective' factor would be 'language'. Is it the language that combines people into nation? Snyder says that 'people who speak the same language are irresistibly drawn together' (quoted in Billig, 1995; 1976, p. 21). It should be accepted that if one analyses the modern nation formations, the language would be one of the most important factors to distinguish the nations from each other. Hence, social scientists often assume that language is the central pillar of the nation (Edwards, 1991, p. 269). This is somehow more understandable as it is comparatively a more visible 'objective' marker. Yet, there is no such a unique language. There are language families, which are subdivided, intertwined and overlapping. Therefore, what was said about 'gene' applies also to language. Here, Renan (1995, p. 150) also reminds us that although the USA and England speak the same language, they are not on that account a single nation. Switzerland, on the contrary, has no common language yet is a nation. Hence, language is an important 'objective' element in the definitions of the modern nations; it may invite union, however, it does not necessarily compel them (Renan, 1995, p. 150). Again, if it is the language that combines people into a nation, then if the borders separate the members of such groups, these borders are arbitrary, unnatural and unjust.

The final 'objective' factor to discuss is history. All nations have their own history, this is understandably and undoubtedly one of the most important elements of a nation. As Hobsbawm states 'nations without a past are contradictions in term, what makes nation is the past; what justifies one nation against others is the past' (1992a, p. 3). Each nation has its own common history, which is unique and antique and it is mostly full of victories and heroes. Hence, history has a crucial importance in any explanations of any nation. Yet, the history here is basically the self-interpretation of nations themselves. When Renan talks about the significance of history on nations, he states that 'to forget and to get one's history wrong are essential factors in the making of a nation' (Renan, 1995, p. 145). Hence, the history that nationalists want here is not the one that any professional academic historian should provide (Hobsbawm, 1992b). The national histories that have been written by nationalists, therefore, are nothing more than a common myth (Gellner, 2006, p. 47). All these attempts to create a history basically aim to create a common sense, in which the nation is a group of people who are naturally drawn together by the same 'gene', 'language' and 'history' in the same territory with a 'long-delayed political destiny' (Gellner, 2006, p. 47). That is why Anderson (1991, p. 5) identified one of the paradoxes of the literature as 'the objective modernity of nations to the historian's eye vs. their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists.

Those 'primordialist' definitions of a nation that include 'gene', 'language' and 'history' are based on the perceptions that nations are given, unchangeable basic human categories. Stalin's definition of nation can be an example of these kinds of definitions who stress 'objective' factors. According to Joseph Stalin: 'a nation is an historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture' (1913, *Marxism and the National Question*). Although such 'naturalising' discourse can be overpowering, particularly in the essentialist forms of nationalism, it is now clear that these so-called 'objective' factors are not enough to explain what a nation is and how the national borders are drawn. Therefore, if these so-called 'objective' elements cannot explain the phenomenon, there should be some 'subjective' factors.

The second group's definitions are those that combine these 'objective' factors with some 'subjective' ones. This approach has mainly been propounded by Anthony A. D. Smith (1986). Smith accepts that the 'objective' definitions have always excluded some widely accepted cases of nations; thus, they fail to include some nations (A. D. Smith, 2001, p. 11). He also finds pure 'subjective' definitions too large to explain a single nation form and to distinguish nations from other kinds of communities such as tribes, city-states and empires (A. D. Smith, 2001). As a solution he combines these 'objective' factors with 'subjective' ones and calls this approach 'ethnosymbolism'.

This approach provides more acceptable explanations. In his definition, Smith firstly attempts to differentiate 'ethnie' and 'nation'. He defines nation as 'a named human community occupying a homeland and having common myths and shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common

rights and duties for all members' (A. D. Smith, 1991, p. 43), 'ethnie' is in turn defined as 'a named human community connected to a homeland, possessing common myths of ancestry, shared memories, one or two more elements of shared culture, and a measure of solidarity, at least among the elites'. Smith accepts that there is no direct link between these 'ethnies' and modern nations. Smith recognises that many 'ethnies' have not transformed into modern nations. However, he argues that the modern nations are originated from pre-existing ethnies (A. D. Smith, 2001). Here, he attempts to explain how these 'ethnies' are required to turn into nations by many transformations of modernity. Therefore, he gives special attention to 'myths and symbols' in order to explain how these 'ethnies' become nations (A. D. Smith, 1986, p. 15-16).

All Smith's attempts might be seen as a sensible middle way between the primordial views and the modernist approaches as he attempts to explain nations with a combination of ancient 'ethnies' and modern 'myths and symbols'. However, Breuilly (1996, p. 150) argues, searching the origins of modern nations into past 'ethnies' is not very helpful to any understanding of nationalism. To become a nation an 'ethnie' must undergo many changes which transform its structure and mentality and throughout this process it absorbs many alien elements and a never-ending flux of influences from other cultures (Özkirimli, 2003). A. D. Smith (2001) argues that three fundamental elements of modern nations are absent in pre-modern 'ethnies': legal; political and economic identity. However, as Breuilly (1996) states, these are the principal institutions in which national identity can achieve form.

Therefore, it should be accepted that nationalism, both as an ideology and movement, is a completely modern phenomenon. It can be accepted that nationalists use the myths and symbols of the past to build a national identity yet it is very difficult to evaluate their impact on nation building since in many cases nationalists invent these myths. Smith also dismisses those nations who do not have any ethnic formations, like the USA. Therefore, digging into the past to find the antique sources of the modern nations does not facilitate to explain them. These attempts might even cause the resuscitation of nationalism (Özkirimli, 2003). Hence, if any of these so-called 'objective' criteria in the definition of a nation cause failure, then, the 'subjective' ones should be the decisive ones.

The final group consists of those whose definitions are based on the 'subjective' factors, such as perceptions and attitudes, and approach to the term 'nation' as a modern construct. Until now, this paper has argued all these definitions include any of these so-called objective factors, which refer to naturally or materially given bonds, such as gene, language and history, have failed to explain the phenomenon by some means or other. Therefore, the terms can best be explained by 'subjective' factors, by which are referred to socially and discursively constructed bonds. The first thing that should be accepted is that 'nations' have exclusively emerged in a particular, and historically recent, period (Hobsbawm, 1992b, p. 9). This means that nations have a historically recent beginning. In this sense, if they are not a natural and primordial phenomenon, then they should have been created or, in Anderson's term, 'imagined' (1991). Hence, nations should have been engendered by nationalism, not the other way around (Gellner, 2006, p. 54). As an example of 'subjective' definition, Anderson (1991, p. 6) defines the term as 'an imagined political community- and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign'.

These 'subjective' definitions do not mean that there was no race or language or any culture. There were definitely many pre-existing cultures and languages. However, they were 'often subtly grouped, shading into each other, overlapping, intertwined; there exist, usually but not always, political units of all shapes and sizes' (Gellner, 2006, p. 47). What nationalism does is to use these pre-existing cultures and to transform them radically into nations. Histories are created, common languages are constructed, traditions are invented and racial purities are restored. In most cases, there is a dominant culture and all other sub-cultures and languages are assimilated and dissolved into this dominant culture. In some cases, there is not even a single 'ethnie' to make a link to any pre-existing culture; or in some cases, there is a 'poly-ethnic nation' that comprises separate 'ethnies' that have somehow come together. A nation can be built by redefining 'an existing ethnic group as the nation into which everybody should fuse' [by 'incorporation'] or creating 'a new national category through the amalgamation of a variety of ethnic groups [by 'amalgamation']' (Wimmer, 2013, p. 50). It is in this regard that Bauer (1996, p. 43) defines nation as a 'community of destiny'. Therefore, the pattern of these 'imagined communities' cannot be explained only by difference of languages or distinct 'ethnies' and cultures. Nations, however, can be explained by the way

they have been imagined (Anderson, 1991). Hence, if they are not natural and God-given ways of classifying people, then the important question that rises here is that why, how and when nations have emerged.

## **2. The Origin of Nations and Nationalism**

There have been many different theories of the origin of nation and nationalism in the literature and all these differences mostly depend on the ways they define and approach the terms. All these theories can also be analysed into the same three categories created in the previous section. These are the primordial approach; the ethno-symbolist approach; and the modernist approach. In this section particular attention will be given to the last approach as the terms are accepted to be historically very modern.

The first approach to the emergence of nationalism is the 'primordial' approach. The basic idea here is that nations have existed for a long time, even from the beginning of humankind. Here, nations are accepted to be God-given 'natural' communities and one can easily trace back their history throughout centuries. The problem with this approach is simply the lack of evidence (Breuilly, 1996, p. 149). It seems that it is not possible to find any nation formations or nationalist movements in pre-modern societies. Even Smith, as an ethno-symbolist, sought some pre-modern civilisations, like ancient Egypt, Greeks and Jews, and argued that they were far from being nations in the contemporary sense of the word (Özirimli, 2003, p. 81). It is a historical fact that many of the empires and states had diverse populations. Hence, it can be argued that ethnicity was not as important as today. When Zubaida criticises the primordial approach, he states that 'the state and military apparatus of the Ottoman Empire was by no means exclusively Turkish -it included various Caucasian ethnicities, Albanians, Kurds and Turkish-speaking populations were not favoured over the others' (Zubaida, 1978, p. 54). The primordial approach is not even a nationalist theory; it is more a view that is mostly held by nationalists themselves. Some scholars even suggest that the sociological usage of the primordial approach should be abandoned because of its passivity and anti-intellectualism (Eller & Coughlan, 1993, p. 200). However, as Tilley argues, this approach enables us to explore how these meanings are produced and reproduced, and why 'such knowledge systems suggest themselves as 'givens', prior to individual thought and action' (Tilley, 1997, p. 503). In this sense, it seems not quite reasonable to follow Eller and Coughlan's suggestion. Yet, it should be accepted that nationalism, both as politics and ideology, is very modern.

A more acceptable version of this is the 'ethno-symbolist' approach. This approach suggests that nations are not pure modern phenomena and thus, modernism tells only half of the story of nationalism. The other half, which refers to the pre-1789s, was omitted (Armstrong, 1982; Hastings, 1997; A. D. Smith, 2001). They argue that the existence of nation and nationalism go even before the sixteenth century (A. D. Smith, 2001, p. 97). In this view, the origin of the nations should be sought in earlier ethnic communities. Smith (1986) seeks the origin of nations by tracing their genealogy into pre-ethnic foundations. He argues that nations were formed on the basis of ethnic cores. However, it does not explain the nations who formed without immediate ethnic antecedents. Therefore, he attempts to explain them by the idea of an 'ethnic model'. Smith states the first nations were powerful and culturally influential and they provided a model for subsequent cases of nation-formations (Özirimli, 2003, p. 177). Smith argues this model was 'sociologically fertile' (1991, p. 40). Yet, this does not explain why nation and nationalism emerged. The first important criticism of the ethno-symbolist approach might be their tendency to discuss 'nations' before 'nationalism'. As Breuilly argued, it is the nationalism that shaped and re-shaped nations, not the other way around. Another important point is that 'nationalism is not simply a claim of ethnic similarity but a claim that certain similarities should count as the definition of political community' (Calhoun, 1993, p. 229). For this reason, nationalism needs rigid boundaries in a way pre-modern ethnicity does not (Calhoun, 1993, p. 229). Nationalism requires a distinctive form of group identity, which is difficult to find in pre-modern civilisations. Therefore, it is not reasonable to claim that there were nations and nationalism in the pre-modern era. Searching the origin of nations and nationalism in pre-ethnic foundations would not explain how some 'ethnies' transformed into nations and some did not. Therefore, it seems more beneficial to investigate the origin of nation and nationalism within the modernist approach.

According to the modernist approach the birth of nationalism goes back to the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century (Anderson, 1991; Hobsbawm, 1992b). Up until those times, the world political systems were defined by dynastic and religious terms. The root of nationalism, therefore, lies in these realms. Hence, it seems beneficial to start the investigation of the origin of nations

from this point. Yet, it does not mean that nationalism somehow superseded religion or that the erosion of religious certainties produced nations, neither does it mean that the death of dynasties caused the birth of nations. However, what caused the erosion of religious certainties and destroyed the dynasties might have also triggered the birth of nationalism.

The emergence of nationalism is one of the major puzzles of modern history (Billig, 1995). There is different approaches to explain how nationalism emerged and spread all over the world. Yet, there is a historical fact that the rise of nationalism and nation-states coincided with the emergence of capitalism. A question arises as to whether this was accidental or not. In order to answer this question, it is beneficial to briefly investigate the rise of the capitalist economic systems and its social, spatial and political effects.

First of all, it should be accepted that the capitalist economic systems first emerged in Europe, just like the first nation states. In pre-capitalist times, modes of production in Europe were characterised by a kind of unity of economic and political power (E.M. Wood, 2002). There was a fragmented state power, which created a distinctive kind of political, judicial, and/or military power, the power of feudal lordship. The transformation in the modes of production towards capitalism compelled these feudal ruling classes to consolidate their fragmented political power and 'parcellised' sovereignty to more centralised monarchies (E. M. Wood, 1999). The socio-political effects of this transformation have been widely analysed by especially Marxist scholars (see; Harvey, 2006; Hobsbawm, 1992b; Jessop, 1990; N. Smith, 2010; E.M. Wood, 2002).

Capitalism can, initially, be seen and defined as 'an economic system in which goods and services are produced for sale in order to make profit in a large number of separate firms using privately owned capital goods and wage-labour' (Jessop, 2003, p. 12). Capitalism creates a society where the only way to survive is by making a profit. In this economic system, competition between separate enterprises rules the system. Survival requires accumulation of larger and larger quantities of capital. Yet, as Jessop (1990) and other scholars (Harvey, 2006; N. Smith, 2010; E.M. Wood, 2002) agree, this new system required more than just economic institutions for this accumulation process.

According to Jessop (1990) most of these 'extra-economic' needs (referred to as political, judicial and/or military institutions) for capitalism have been provided by a new type of state system, the capitalist type of state. This new type of states has had some important functions for the capitalist mode of production, re-production and capital accumulation. First of all, they secured the general external conditions for capital accumulation, such as legal order and protection of property rights. Secondly, the fictitious commodification of land, money, labour-power, and knowledge has also been possible with this new form of states. They also secured the rights and capacities of capital.

Another function of these states for capitalism is to define the boundaries between the economic and extra-economic and to modify the economic and extra-economic preconditions for capital accumulations (Jessop, 2003, p. 45). The most important part of these discussions, for the purpose of this research, is that nationalism and the nation-states firstly emerged along with these new type of states (Stokes, 1986; E. M. Wood, 1999). When E. M. Wood (1999, p. 3) analyses the development of the English nation-state, he states that '*the social transformations that brought about capitalism were the same ones that brought the nation-state to maturity*'. An important question arises here: How and why did these new states need nationalism?

One of the toughest theoretical issues of nationalism is its relationship to capitalism (the world economic system, industrialisation, modernisation) (Stokes, 1986). One reason for that would be the general character of modern capitalism that tends to go beyond national borders, whereas nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the national unit should be independent within a defined territory. This feature of capitalism might understandably be seen as a contradiction for this relationship.

Gellner (2006) states that nationalism was the only possible outcome of the socio-political transformations brought about by industrialisation. In his book, *Nations and Nationalism*, Gellner deeply analyses the agrarian societies and their transformation towards industrial societies. For him, this transformation is crucial for understanding of nationalism (Gellner, 2006, p. 17). In agrarian societies, there is a small ruling class that horizontally differentiated at the top and there is a huge class of agricultural producers living in vertically insulated communities at the bottom. In the industrial societies, however, the social and cultural differences between rulers and ruled are not clear. According to Gellner, high culture has become a dominated culture; 'the clerisy' is universalised and became co-extensive with the entire society

(Gellner, 2006, p. 34). He suggests that all these transformations happened due to the needs of industrialism for a mobile literate work force.

According to Robinson (2010) there were no public systems of education before the 19<sup>th</sup> century, they all came into being to meet the needs of industrialism. The state's duty was to ensure that citizens are available for the economic tasks industrialism requires. In practice, this means educating the citizenry to a certain cultural standard (Stokes, 1986). This creates cultural homogeneity, which is an essential element demanded by nationalism. However, according to Gellner 'It is not the case, as Kedourie (1993) claims, that nationalism imposes homogeneity; it is rather that a homogeneity imposed by objective, inescapable imperatives eventually appears on the surface in the form of nationalism' (Gellner, 2006, p. 38). With the educational system, 'high culture' becomes universal, not particular; it is transmitted through schools not through folks. Gellner calls it 'the age of universal high culture' which was irresistible and bound also to be 'an age of nationalism' (Gellner, 2006, p. 39). He claims 'if an industrial economy established in a culturally heterogeneous society (or if it even casts its advance shadow on it), then tensions result which will engender nationalism' (Gellner, 2006, p. 104).

All his efforts were to show that nationalism is a result of industrialism's need for literate and mobile labour. Anderson (1991), on the other hand, attempted to link the rise of nationalism with 'print-capitalism'. According to Anderson (1991, p. 34), 'the first modern-style mass-produced industrial commodity was the book'. He argues that the relationship between capitalism and the print technology created possibilities for this new form of 'imagined community' that set the stage for the modern nations. According to Anderson, this worked in three ways. Firstly, as print languages created unified fields of exchange and communication, they gave a new fixity to language and finally they created languages-of-power. Hroch (1985) claims this sort of central direction for education and commercial policy was a need for the capitalist economies and could best be dealt with the modern version of the nation-states.

How can the relationship between nationalism and capitalism be formulated? What was argued so far is that the mode of production has shifted towards capitalist type of production. This shift triggered big social and political transformations in societies that required a new type of state system. This new state system was an essential for capitalist production, re-production and capital accumulation, and needed some strong ties to combine people into a defined territory. They needed homogeneity to function effectively and this is provided by a discourse produced by these new states, mostly through the public education system and by creating a common language, history and culture, which also involved assimilating other cultures. Hence, nationalism is the result of these socio-political transformations that begun with the development of capitalism in Europe. Yet, it does not mean that capitalism creates nationalism and neither does it mean that nationalism is created from nothing but as a result of some socio-political transformations that commenced with the rise of capitalist systems. As also mentioned in the previous section, it is not to deny existing cultures or ethnies. Yet, it is argued that there are even many more cultures and ethnies than so-called 'nations'. It is discussed that many cultures are dissolved and integrated into a dominant culture in order to provide the homogeneity required by nation states. That is all triggered and precipitated by the socio-political transformations that begun with the rise of capitalism.

Yet, there are points that need to be clarified in this argument. First of all, this approach does not aim to explain the emergence of nationalism as a phenomenon that appeared all over the world. Hence, it cannot explain the different nationalist movements since it does not claim that nationalism has emerged in the same way in every corner of the world. Rather, this argument just aims to explain the birth of a particular nationalism and the nation states emerged in Europe, which were believed to be the first ones. Nationalism has undoubtedly appeared under different social and political environments in different parts of the world. The next section will attempt to analyse these differences.

### **3. Types of Nationalism**

The origin of nationalism has mostly been analysed from European perspective especially by those who accept it as a modern phenomenon. This might seem a weak point in this approach because the transformations to nation-state systems occurred differently as a result of different social, political and economic circumstances in different geographies. Thus, there is not just a single way to explain the emergence of nationalism that can be applied to all cases. The previous section can be seen limited as it predominantly focuses on the emergence of nationalism from a European perspective. Yet, it still does not

mean that focusing on European nationalism was less necessary either, since nationalism was born and grown in Europe and spread from there. Therefore, it is important to understand the emergence of nationalism in Europe first.

The following important questions need to be asked:

- How and why nationalism has spread all over the world?
- How it can be classified?

These two questions constitute another important aspect of the nationalism studies. Therefore, this section will attempt to investigate the emergence of nationalism on a global scale. This section will then attempt to classify nationalism.

In the previous section, it was argued that capitalism had a major importance on the social and political transformations through which nationalist movements developed. One can understandably argue that there were no similar capitalist developments in the rest of the world, but these transformations have still emerged. One way to investigate these transformations that occurred in different corners of the world is to analyse the production of space under capitalism. One of the general characters of capitalism is to engender spatial unevenness (N. Smith, 2010). Neil Smith argues this 'spatial unevenness', or 'uneven development', is an inevitable result of the capitalist mode of production and is unique to capitalism (1982, p. 142). It does not mean that pre-capitalist developments were even, however the reasons for the unevenness of pre-capitalist developments are quite different (N. Smith, 2010, p. 98). 'Uneven development' under capitalism is more systematically and completely an integral part of that mode of production.

According to N. Smith (2010), there are two contradictory tendencies inherent in the structure of capitalism: the equalisation of conditions and level of development, and their differentiations. Capitalism, in the first place, produced a geography that is differentiated according to natural features. This natural based differentiation was an initial fundamental feature of the uneven development that occurred in earlier societies. This was based on the availability of natural materials; for example, textiles where sheep could graze, iron and steel where coal and iron ore were available (N. Smith, 1982). This sort of explanation is a traditional geographical approach. This nature-based pattern may explain the initial development of certain places; however, it would fail to explain subsequent developments. The advanced development of capitalism has brought a new and extended dimension to this geographical differentiation.

The capitalist developments shifted the logic behind geographical location from such natural considerations. The reasons behind the relationship between capitalist development and nature were first to overcome the difficulties of distance and second was the necessity of being close to raw materials (N. Smith, 2010, p. 104). However, the developments in transportation removed these natural obstacles. Thus, 'the geographical differentiations have been driven forward by a quintessentially social dynamic emanating from the structure of capitalism' (1982, p. 144). This differentiation proceeds according to 'the social logic' inherent in the process of capital accumulation and this social dynamic involves 'the progressive division of labour at various scales, the centralisation of capital, the evolution of spatial differentiated pattern of wage rates, the development of a ground rent that is markedly uneven over space and so forth' (N. Smith, 1982).

All these processes and relationships are the central determinants of uneven development that contribute to the tendency towards geographical differentiation under capitalism. The second tendency is the process of equalisation that stems from the basic necessity for economic expansion in capitalist society. As argued in the previous section, capitalism requires expansion of capital, which requires an increase in labour, locating and exploiting increased quantities of raw materials and more developed means of transportation that provide cheaper and faster access to raw materials and market. In this system, pre-capitalist societies are suppressed into the service of capital and subjugated through the world market to the rule of wage labour relation (N. Smith, 2010). These differentiation and equalisation processes work in three different scales: urban; national; and global.

Smith states that '*with the transformation of the earth into a universal means of production; no corner immune from the search for the raw materials; every inch of the surface as well as the sea, the air and the geological substratum is reduced in the eyes of capital to a real or potential means of production with a price tag*' (1982, p. 143). This is what lies behind the tendency toward equalisation. Capitalism tends to overcome all the spatial barriers to expansion; this is the process which Marx famously stated 'annihilation of space with time'. Along with these two contradictory tendencies, uneven developments occur not just at regional and urban

scales but also at the international scale (Duncan & Goodwin, 1988). According to Smith, with the advanced capitalist development, the entire globe is partitioned into legally distinct parcels, divided by great fences, real or imaginary (2010, p. 85). Today's world is divided into nation-states and this is, for Smith, a necessity for capitalism.

It was argued that the geography produced under capitalism is unequal at all scales, regionally and internationally. This inequality resulted in two geographically distinct interest groups who either benefit or suffer from such uneven development. This may lead different nationalist movements at national and global scales. At the global scale there were the developed countries that had already built their capitalist systems and possessed the means of production; on the other side, there were the colonised countries that had been exploited by the first group. This situation created a resistance in the colonised countries to the colonial dominations and this resistance formed its own nationalism. The nationalist movements that appeared in Africa, South America and Asia after decolonisation could be interpreted within this resistance. In addition to this wave of nationalism, another big wave of nationalist movements appeared in the post-socialist world after the fall of communism in 1989. At the national scale, the group who suffer from such unevenness might also be nationalised and demand independence from an existing nation-state. This situation would be more likely in the ethnically diverse nation-states, like Spain, the UK, Turkey and Iraq.

Uneven development that occurred under the capitalist mode of production might help to understand the spread of nationalism and give some ideas about the different types of nationalist movements. However, the emergence of nationalism is much more complicated. Nationalism appeared as a consequence of different socio-political transformations in different parts of the world, at different times. These differences also caused different forms of nationalism in different societies. In order to understand why nationalism takes different forms, it is beneficial to investigate the typology of nationalism in the literature.

There are many different classifications of nationalism in the literature. Wirth (1936) argues that nationalism should be studied on the particularistic knowledge of specific cases, rather than lumping together all instances of nationalism. He stresses the importance of historical variations of nationalism and suggests four types of nationalism: hegemony nationalism; particularistic nationalism; marginal nationalism; and the nationalism of minorities. By hegemony nationalism, he refers to the national unifications movements, which he observed in Italy and Germany. Particularistic nationalism, on the other hand, was based upon the secessionist demand of national autonomy. Wirth cites Ireland as a good example for this. Marginal nationalism, as another type of nationalism, was used to refer to the nationalistic movement characteristic of border territories and populations such as Italian-Austrian and Swiss frontiers. Finally, minority nationalism was referred to the nationalist movements of the existing racial, ethnic, cultural, or merely political minorities in existing states (Wirth, 1936).

Snyder (1976), on the other hand, defines four different categories for nationalism: civic nationalism; ethnic nationalism; revolutionary nationalism; and counter-revolutionary nationalism. Civic nationalism is being used to refer to the nationalist movements that emphasise the loyalty to a set of political ideas and institutions. Snyder argues ethnic nationalism emphasises a common culture, language and religion. Revolutionary nationalism focuses on the defence of a political revolution that brings power. Finally counter-revolutionary nationalism emphasises resistance to internal factions that seek to undermine the nation's traditional institutions.

Michael Hechter creates another useful typology. His typology of nationalism is based on his approach that nationalism is 'collective action designed to render the boundaries of the nation congruent with those of its governance unit' (Hechter, 2000, p. 15). Hechter defines four types of nationalism out of this definition: state-building nationalism; peripheral nationalism; irredentist nationalism; and unification nationalism. State-building nationalism is 'the nationalism that is embodied in the attempt to assimilate or incorporate culturally distinctive territories in a given state' (Hechter, 2000, p. 15). Peripheral nationalism 'occurs when a culturally distinctive territory resists incorporation into an expanding state, or attempts to secede and set up its own government (as in Quebec, Scotland and Catalonia)' (Hechter, 2000, p. 16). Irredentist 'nationalism occurs with the attempt to extend the existing boundaries of a state by incorporating territories of an adjacent state occupied principally by co-nationals (as in the case of the Sudeten Germans)' (Hechter, 2000, p. 17). Finally unification nationalism 'involves the merger of a politically divided but



culturally homogeneous territory into one state, as famously occurred in nineteenth-century Germany and Italy' (Hechter, 2000, p. 17). Although Hechter does not claim that his typology is exhaustive, this typology seems to explain especially normative differences between the types of nationalism.

### Conclusion

This paper has formulated a theoretical framework that can function as an analytical tool to understand and study nation and nationalism. There is a wide range of understandings of these controversial terms in the literature. This paper has attempted to analyse this large number of the literature on nation and nationalism. In order to deal with enormous discussions around the terms, three key themes have been created. In the first part, the different definitions of the terms have been analysed. The three main approaches have been identified: the primordial, the ethno-symbolist and the modernist. It has been argued that the terms nation and nationalism are historically modern phenomena. It has been suggested that any explanation that does not have any modernist approach at its core will fail to understand the key features of nationalism. In this paper, a nation is understood as a historically modern human community who share some perceptions of sameness and/or similar political interests and feelings of belonging to each other and a territory. Hence, it suggested that nations should be understood as historically modern constructs.

Secondly, the paper has attempted to investigate the origin of nations and nationalism. Following the first section, three distinctive approaches to the emergence of nationalism have been observed. In this section, the main emphasis was on the modernist approach. The origin of nationalism has been analysed through the social and political transformations that were triggered and precipitated by capitalism. Particular attention was given on the connections between nationalism and capitalism. It underlined the relationships between the socio-political transformations that were brought about by capitalism and the emergence of nationalism. Therefore, it can suggested that the transformations in the formations and functions of nations and nationalism will be better understood and studied in relation to the developments in the capitalist system.

The third section has focused on the spread of nationalism all over the world. The emergence of nationalism in the rest of the world has been analysed. The main attention has been given to the connections between capitalist development and nationalism. The existing classifications of nationalisms in the literature have been reviewed in order to provide some valuable insights into the differences in nationalisms that emerged all over the world. The paper has also evaluated the arguments on the contradictions between the global nature of capitalism and nationalism; and the discussions on the future of nationalism. Although the development of capitalism has weakened the importance of the nation-states in a globalized world, nationalism and the nation-states seem to continue to exist, as today's political world is still being defined by 'nations'

This paper has scrutinised a wide range of literature in the nationalism studies. It has identified three main questions in nationalism studies and reviewed the answers to these questions so as to draw a conceptual framework that can be used as an analytical tool to approach and examine nations and nationalisms. The paper explored the meanings of the terms 'nation' and 'nationalism' in the literature. It, then, sought the origins of nations and nationalism. Finally, it identified some existing typologies of nationalism in the literature.

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. R. O. G. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.
- Armstrong, J. A. (1982). *Nations before nationalism*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Bauer, O. (1996). The Nation. In G. Balakrishnan (Ed.), *Mapping The Nation* (pp. 39-77). London: Verso.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. Sage.
- Breuilly, J. (1996). Approaches to nationalism. In G. Balakrishnan (Ed.), *Mapping The Nation*, (pp. 146-174). London: Verso.
- Calhoun, C. (1993). Nationalism and ethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 211-239.
- Duncan, S., & Goodwin, M. (1988). *The Local State and Uneven Development: Behind the Local Government Crisis*: Polity Press.
- Edwards, J. (1991). Gaelic in Nova Scotia. In C. H. Williams (Ed.), *Linguistic Minorities, Society, and Territory*, (pp. 269-297): Multilingual Matters.
- Eller, J. D., & Coughlan, R. M. (1993). The poverty of primordialism: the demystification of ethnic attachments. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(2), 183-202.
- Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations And Nationalism*., Blackwell.
- Harvey, D. (2006). *The limits to capital*, Verso.
- Hastings, A. (1997). *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism*, Cambridge University Press.

- Hechter, M. (2000). *Containing nationalism*: OUP Oxford.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992a). Ethnicity and nationalism in Europe today. *Anthropology today*, 8(1), 3-8.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992b). *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*,: Cambridge University Press.
- Hroch, M. (1985). *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups Among the Smaller European Nations*, Cambridge University Press.
- Jessop, B. (1990). *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place*, Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jessop, B. (2003). *The Future of the Capitalist State*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Kedourie, E. (1993). *Nationalism*: Blackwell.
- Özkirimli, U. (2003). The nation as an artichoke? A critique of ethnosymbolist interpretations of nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 9(3), 339-355. doi:10.1111/1469-8219.00100
- Renan, E. (1995). What is a Nation. In O. Dahbour & M. Ishay (Eds.), *The Nationalism Reader*. (pp. 143-155). New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Robinson, S. K. (2010). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. Capstone.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Smith, A. D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Blackwell.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. University of Nevada Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Polity Press.
- Smith, N. (1982). GENTRIFICATION AND UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT. *Economic Geography*, 58(2), 139-155. doi:10.2307/143793
- Smith, N. (2010). *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Verso.
- Snyder, L. L. (1976). *Varieties of nationalism: a comparative study*. Dryden Press.
- Stokes, G. (1986). How is Nationalism Related to Capitalism? A Review Article. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 28(3), 591-598. doi:10.2307/178866
- Tilley, V. (1997). The terms of the debate: untangling language about ethnicity and ethnic movements. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 20(3), 497-522.
- Tilly, C., & Ardant, G. (1975). *The Formation of national States in Western Europe*. Princeton University Press.
- Wimmer, A. (2013). *Ethnic boundary making: Institutions, power, networks*. Oxford University Press.
- Wirth, L. (1936). Types of Nationalism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 41(6), 723-737.
- Wood, E. M. (1999). Unhappy families: Global capitalism in a world of nation-states. *Monthly Review-an Independent Socialist Magazine*, 51(3), 1-12.
- Wood, E. M. (2002). *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View*. Verso.
- Zubaida, S. (1978). Theories of Nationalism. In G. Littlejohn (Ed.), *Power and the State*. Taylor & Francis.