### Theories and Practices of Nationalism -Assignment 1

Zubair Abid, 20171076

**Question**: How are nations like communities? Is there is a difference between the communities which are formed by civic and ethnic nationalisms?

(Write an essay (800-1200 words) explaining your answer. Draw on examples of at least two nations and nationalisms other than India.)

### Introduction

Most widely-accepted notions of nations today have a common grounding in considering them to be *communities* of people: from Stalin and Seton-Watson's definitions to Benedict Anderson's. But the manner of these people "coming together", as it were, also differs from one nation to another. The *conception* of a nation as formed by a particular people affects how the final "community" is. We attempt to explore both the community nature of nations, and how said nature changes with the ideological imagination of it.

### How are Nations Like Communities?

### Communities as a horizontal brotherhood

To understand the community aspect, we look at Benedict Anderson's proposed 'working definition' of a nation as an "imagined political community, imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign". Why does he define the nation in terms of community? It is observed in the modern nation that most people with nothing in common with each other - language, ethnicity, political affiliation - who may never even meet, consider themselves to be connected in some way due to sharing a nationality by chance of birth. Despite whatever inequality exists, the nation is still conceived as a horizontal 'brotherhood', a comradeship among equals. People go to war, potentially sacrificing themselves for their 'brothers and sisters' of the community, that they will likely never meet. It has some markings of a community, but it is not the traditional Gemeinschaft <sup>1</sup>.

 $<sup>^1{\</sup>rm Anderson},$  B. R. O. G. (1991). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso. Pages 5-7

### Nation in the framework of Gemeinschaft and Gesselschaft

This begs comparison to the traditional imagining of a community. As discussed in the lecture, the key components of a Gemeinschaft are:

- social order based on personal ties (of 1000 or so at maximum)
- custom and tradition as the moral code
- family (birth) as the guiding force for social status and economic roles
- fulfillment at the cost of individual movement.

None of these apply to any nation of millions that for all intents and purposes seems more aligned with Gesselschaft instead. But on closer examination, this too does not match. There is a distinction between the nation and its call for a sovereign state; social contract and mutual consent is shared among the citizens and the state but not with the 'Nation' itself. So what is this community? Ernest Gellner argues that "it (nationalism) invents nations where they do not exist", taking pains to establish the 'falsity' of this community <sup>2</sup>. Anderson opts to call it an 'imagined' community instead, noting that his peer's statement implies the existence of 'true' communities of the scale to be juxtaposed to nations, and also that all communities larger than primordial villages with face-to-face contact are, in fact, imagined <sup>3</sup>.

### A short correspondence between nationalism and religion

On that note, a good comparison to align the perspective of national community to is the imagined community of religion. The community of strangers of the same religious faith is driven by their common faith, the sacred (and equidistant) language, a common 'fraternity'. It provides an ideological perspective similar to that of nationalism, only the latter is in fact "intellectually poorer". We need only look at Kohn's words in *The Nature of Nationalism* 

 $\dots$  man's loyalty was due to his church or religion; a heretic put himself out of the pale of society in the same way that a "traitor" to his nation does today.  $^4$ 

 $<sup>^2{\</sup>rm Gellner},$  E. (1964). Thought and change P. 169. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. http://archive.org/details/thoughtchange0000gell  $Emphasis\ added$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Anderson, B. R. O. G. (1991). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso. Pages 5-7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Kohn, H. (1939). The Nature of Nationalism. The American Political Science Review, 33(6), 1001–1021. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/1948728 Emphasis added

# Is there a difference between the communities which are formed by civic and ethnic nationalism?

There is a difference. But it isn't black-and-white. Most sovereign nations today <sup>5</sup> appear to have some form of civic basis in their constitutions and laws for naturalized citizenship - mentioning, in some cases, the migrating individual's national status too. Some founded on civic principles have shown ethno-nationalist sentiments of late (eg: USA <sup>6</sup>). But a difference still exists for ethnically-*imagined* nations <sup>7 8</sup>, be it in their incorporation as by constitution (think Israel <sup>9</sup>), or in the popular imagination of the residents (consider India).

A quick demonstration of why popular Indian imagination is ethnic - consider how the population deifies the achievements of non-citizens with any degree of Indian descent as an Indian achievement, despite the individual's own national alignment which may not match this imagination. Or even in the behaviour towards those who don't "look Indian".

### Theoretical differences distinguishing the two

Why should there be a difference?

It's in the imagination of a nation. Hans Kohn talked of "western" (civic) and "eastern" (ethnic) nationalisms <sup>10</sup>, and the motivations for each highlights the difference in the imagination that forms aforementioned imagined communities.

Civic nationalism is based on principles of individual rights. The State precedes the nation - the nation here is no clarion call for sovereignty against an 'other', but rather a *structure that aids the exploration of individual liberty*. Kohn examines this ideation through John Milton in Puritan England:

With him nationalism... was the affirmation of individual freedom from authority, the self-assertion of personality in face of its own

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Based on a brief survey, all states allow some form of naturalization in order to be a citizen of the country, with some of them specifying nationality as well. However, it isn't as "easy" for some if the to-be immigrant has no familial connection to the State. Bhutan requires 30 years of residency with no record of remonstrances against the government, Kuwait requires 20 years along with the requirement of being a Muslim. Israel and China too, although we will be discussing those at length later.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Bonikowski, B., & DiMaggio, P. (2016). Varieties of American Popular Nationalism. American Sociological Review, 81(5), 949–980. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416663683

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Kuwaiti Nationality Law. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2020, from https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/83364/91990/F734821664/KWT83364.pdf

<sup>8</sup>Bhutan Citizenship Act, 1985. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2020, from

https://www.nab.gov.bt/assets/uploads/docs/acts/2014/Bhutan\_Citizen\_Act\_1985Eng.pdf

<sup>9</sup>Safran, W. (2016). Citizenship and Nationality in Democratic Systems: Approaches to
Defining and Acquiring Membership in the Political Community: International Political Sci-

Defining and Acquiring Membership in the Political Community: International Political Science Review. P. 13-15 https://doi.org/10.1177/019251297018003006

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Kohn, H. (1965). Nationalism its Meaning and History. Revised Edition Princton, NJ.

government or church 11

The nation is manifestation of a code, not a people. The community, others with like-minded interests. At least in its conception, there is no ethnic limitation imposed. Anyone with aligned goals can join the nation and further it.

Ethnic nationalism, on the other hand, "emerges as protests against existing social structure". It's a call for sovereignty from an oppressor. The community rallied around the cause of sovereignty can have arbitrary commonality, but necessarily includes a supposed shared history, a 'glorious past' where the community once was and must strive to return to through the efforts of individual members. This community is thus limited.

With the theory behind us, we consider examples of each.

## Imaginations of ethnic nationalism in China, Israel, and more

Israel is the classic example of a nation with Ethnic roots - the UN resolution announcing its creation refers to it as a "Jewish State" <sup>12</sup>. Such is prominently visible in its naturalization laws, where the **Law of Return** allows for citizenship to be conferred solely on Jewish ethnicity on three months of residence, opposed to three years required <sup>13</sup> for regular naturalization.

China is another prominent nation that not only requires a common territorial history, but also ethnic. The Han form a majority in the nation - 91.6% in total <sup>14</sup> - and "Ethnicity and nationality have become almost interchangeable for China's Han" <sup>15</sup>. Naturalisation is already a tough task, as despite laws governing that permanent residents without familial connections can become nationals <sup>16</sup>, there are only 1448 naturalized citizens in the most populated country in the world <sup>17</sup>. Adding to that is the consideration of the Han as ethnically "pure", with minorities like the Uighurs sent to camps for not being

<sup>11</sup> Kohn, H. (1965). Nationalism its Meaning and History P. 16-17. Revised Edition Princton,

 $<sup>^{12}</sup> Safran,$  W. (2016). Citizenship and Nationality in Democratic Systems: Approaches to Defining and Acquiring Membership in the Political Community: International Political Science Review. P. 13-15 https://doi.org/10.1177/019251297018003006

 $<sup>^{13}</sup>$ Apply naturalized you if be are permanent resito dent. (n.d.). GOV.IL. Retrieved September 2, 2020. from  $https://www.gov.il/en/service/request\_for\_citizenship\_of\_a\_person\_who\_holds\_pemanent\_residency$ <sup>14</sup>CIA China Summary. (n.d.). Retrieved September 1, 2020, from

https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/attachments/summaries/CH-summary.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>The upper Han. (n.d.). The Economist. Retrieved September 1, 2020, from https://www.economist.com/briefing/2016/11/19/the-upper-han

this imagination of the nation <sup>18</sup>.

### Imaginations of the "civic" nations

In contrast we consider the United States of America. Arguably among the first nations to be founded on the basis of principles:

What held the new nation together was an idea, the idea of liberty under law as expressed in the Constitution. <sup>19</sup>

The (non White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) view of American nationalism is civic. A citizen is so due to their allegiance to the Constitution, and ethnicity plays no role, leading to the nation's reputation as a "melting pot".

It so happens that this is *not* the only view of American nationalism <sup>20</sup>. Reasonably popular imagination of the nation tends to make ethnic restrictions on membership, and this is not unique to the United States (think India again). Like aforementioned, there's significant mish-mash of the two, and it remains to be seen which branch will prevail at the end of it all.

### **Points**

- How are nations like Communities (Benedict Anderson):
  - Conceived as horizontal
  - Conception of a connect, even if most will never meet
  - Not exactly Gemeinschaft. There's millions, not thousands. There is individual movement, and family does not define social status, economic role, etc. We're still in Society, but we imagine there is a connection between random people we will never meet, cannot possibly ever meet, because we're born within the same arbitrary plot of land. Sometimes not even that.
  - Kohn people consider themselves to be "of" a place, as opposed to "in" a place
- Answer: yes.
- First, what I mean by ethnic and civic. Using the definition of "by the constitution" and "by the ethnic nature", aka a limitation on religion, etc. Why? Because of countries like India, that would fall under "ethnic nationalism" as per Kohn, but is (still) Civic Nationalism in practice.

 $<sup>^{18}\</sup>mathrm{Up}$  to one million detained in China's mass "re-education" drive. (n.d.). Retrieved September 2, 2020, from https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/09/china-up-to-one-million-detained/

 $<sup>^{19}{\</sup>rm Kohn},$  H. (1965). Nationalism its Meaning and History P. 19-20. Revised Edition Princton, NJ.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>Bonikowski, B., & DiMaggio, P. (2016). Varieties of American Popular Nationalism. American Sociological Review, 81(5), 949–980. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416663683

Noting here that most nations seem to have some sort of naturalization process, but that does not always translate, like in China, hence these will be considered Ethnic.

Basically, I'm not considering here the origin, but the current status of it, how it is considered.

- However, I will be using the original definitions by Kohn to motivate why
  civic and ethnic nationalisms are different.
- "Western nationalism" As Kohn calls it arises from the Englishman's need to have liberty. England, the first "new nation", Nationalism from the religious matrix, the self consideration of "new Israel". John Milton:

With him nationalism was not a struggle for collective independence from an "alien yoke"; it was the affirmation of individual freedom from authority, the self-assertion of personality is face of its own government or church, "the deliverance of man from the yoke of slavery and superstition." Liberty to Milton was religious, political, and personal.

It is founded in a common principle of "liberty" and some unexplained belief that the nation is the ultimate source for the protection of these liberties. There is belief in a code here, the nation is a vessel. The belief is in the written law which is to serve a greater good, and not ethnicity. Not from an outward perspective, anyway.

• Ethnic nationalism, on the other hand, is primarily externally motivated - a protest against an existing social structure. It is expanded by propaganda and education (however: France did this too!). And it relies on the image of an "ideal future" based on a non-existent "golden past"

### Random thoughts

- "Western nationalism" As Kohn calls it arises from the Englishman's need to have liberty. England, the first "new nation", Nationalism from the religious matrix, the self consideration of "new Israel". John Milton:
- Ethnic nationalism, on the other hand, is primarily externally motivated a protest against an existing social structure. It is expanded by propaganda and education (however: France did this too!). And it relies on the image of an "ideal future" based on a non-existent "golden past"
- India is a nation due to the political partition by the British?
- Civic nationalism: Follow the Constitution and you're a national
- Ethnic nationalism: Be something
- Israel allows citizenship by return, descent, naturalization, etc. Exclusionary policy, and many have termed it as such, and UN creation marked it as "Jewish State". It also allows for nationals from the lands.

- Also, all Jewish people (as defined) can be Jewish nationals easily.
- Kuwaiti law requires one to be muslim. But there are no other restrictions on ethnicity per se.
- Bhutan has a strict citizenship law, immigration is based on parents/long servitude.
- There is an ethnic bleed into the Civic nationalisms
  - WASPs in America, the idea of immigrants not being American, especially if not white.
  - All nations seem to have a constitution allowing for naturalization
- There is a difference of sorts between communities of civic nationalism and communities of ethnic nationalism. Kinda. Now, most modern states have a constitution, but some are significantly more ethnic than others, while some display characteristics of wanting to be ethnic nationalist but are strictly civic till date
  - But america for example is a split community. Half want ethnic considerations? Does "white" count? It's a request for elimination of other ethnicities from the state. Others abide by the civic model.
- Han Chinese want to be more ethnic? Elimination of non-Han
- China considers all Hans to be chinese.

865 at the start.