

"Babeş-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca  
College of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences  
Field of study: Political Science  
Doctoral School de Political Science and Communication

# **THEORIES OF NATIONALISM AND MODELS OF MANAGING THE MULTICULTURAL DIFFERENCES**

---

DOCTORAL THESIS

## **SUMMARY**

Ph. D. coordinator:  
Prof. habil. Vasile Boari, Ph. D.

Ph. D.-student:  
Horia-Alin Lupu

Cluj-Napoca  
2021

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	6
<b>CHAPTER I. ETHNOCULTURALE COMMUNITIES AND MINORITIES – BASIC CONCEPTS. NAȚIONALISM – TYPOLOGIES, MODELS AND THEORIES.</b>	23
I.1. Terminological introduction	23
I. 2. Types of ethno-cultural communities. Introductory presentation	24
I. 3. Patterns of mobilization/ethnic conflict and theories on nationalism. Short review	27
I. 4. Nationalism and models of state building. Introductory presentation	28
I. 5. Classifications of nationalism and types of nationalism	30
Figure 1 (Bieber 2020, 15)	32
<b>CHAPTER II. MICRO- AND MEDIO-SOCIETAL LEVEL. IDENTITY AND ETHNO-CULTURAL AFFILIATION</b>	36
II. 1. Identity –perspectives and definitions:	37
II. 2. Identitary strategies, identitary finalities and social determinism	40
Figure 2	43
II. 3. Identitary strategies and minorities	46
II. 4. Areas of action and concrete ways to respond to ethno-cultural minorities	50
II. 5. Ethno-cultural communities and the otherness. Social representation and imagology	54
<b>CHAPTER III. MACRO-SOCIETAL APPROACH. INTERETHNIC CONFLICTS –METHODS OF RESOLVING CONFLICTS</b>	56
III. 1. A classic taxonomy of methods of approaching solving interethnic conflicts (McGarry și O’Leary, 1993)	56
III. 2. The critique of theory/political philosophy. A taxonomy of methods of resolving ethnic conflicts adjusted from a democratic values perspective (Kymlika și Norman, 2000)	75
<b>CHAPTER IV. NATIONALISM – EXPLANATIONS AND DEFINITIONS. THEORIES AND THEORETICIANS OF NATIONALISM</b>	79
IV. 1. Nationalism. Explanations and definitions. Concept history.	79
IV. 2. Theories and theoreticians of nationalism	89
IV. 2. 1. Introductive considerations	89
IV. 2. 2. Classic modernism – the main current of nationalism theories	91
IV. 2. 3. Primordialism and perenialism – main alternatives to classical modernism?	149
IV. 2. 4. Constructivism	181
IV. 3. Ethnicity and nation beyond modernism	196
IV. 3. 1. Fragmentation and hybrid identities	198
IV. 3. 2 Social gender and nation	200

IV. 3. 3 The relationship between liberalism and civic as well as ethnic nationalism	204
IV. 3. 4. Nationalism as a set of irrational beliefs	208
IV. 3. 5. Nationalism and globalization	211
IV. 3. 6. Beyond modernism?	219
<b>V. STATE, SOCIETY AND NAȚIUNE. NORMATIVE AND PRAGMATIC SOLUTIONS TO MANAGE MULTICULTURAL DIVERSITY</b>	<b>221</b>
V. 1. Ethnic, civic, multicultural nationalism and their critique	221
V. 1. 1. Myths and types of nationalism	222
Figure 3. National identity - three paradigms (Brown 2000, 5)	223
V. 1. 2. Nation as a promotor of development and social justice approach	224
V. 1. 3. Are there two types of nationalism (good – civic, and bad – ethno-cultural)? Civic and cultural nationalism differences reviewed	232
V. 1. 4. Controversial meanings of civic, ethno-cultural and multi-cultural nationalism. A critique of multiculturalism	248
V. 1. 5. How can the state answer to nationalist disputes? Corporate and pluralist approaches on multicultural nationalism	257
V. 2. A distinct version of nationalism – liberal nationalism	272
V. 3. Recognition, identity and multiculturalism. Charles Taylor’s contribution	277
V. 4. Multicultural citizenship and multicultural liberalism. Will Kimlicka’s central intellectual figure	283
V. 4. 1. Overall view on W. Kymlicka’s (and associated) contributions to shape the model of multiculturalism and related ideas	283
V. 4. 3. Multiculturalism – challenges and concrete solutions	310
V. 4. 4. Some mentions on the state of multiculturalism in Central and Eastern Europe	387
V. 4. 5. Challenges of multiculturalism from the point of view of supporters and their critics	390
V. 5. Methods of managing differences at the level of ethno-cultural-diverse societies	413
V. 5. 1. Normative and practical options on managing ethno-cultural diversity –a typology	415
<b>VI. CRITICISM OF THE THEORY ON THE NATION AND NATIONALISM. CRITICISM OF MULTICULTURALISM AS A SOLUTION TO LIBERAL NORMATIVE PHILOSOPHY REGARDING THE RIGHTS OF ETHNO-CULTURAL COMMUNITIES</b>	<b>480</b>
VI. 1 Searching for a definition. The difficulty of elaborating a universally-acceptable definition of the nation	481
VI. 3. Criticism of theories on nation and nationalism. Two mutually exclusive but non- exhaustive/incomplete paradigms, and a attempt at synthesis with limited success	511
VI. 4. Solutions and recommendations on the theoretical deficit of studies on nationalism and the nation	532

VI. 5. Additional knowledge gains of a quasi-exhaustive theoretical approach	536
VI. 6. The critique of multiculturalism	542
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	543
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY:</b>	592
<b>ANNEX 1</b>	624
<b>ANNEX 2</b>	632

## **EXTENDED SUMMARY**

This Ph. D. thesis has its own intellectual story. The result of which made the form, not the approach or the methodology used, to be a rather unconventional one. The writing process of this thesis was one of reading, documentation, criticism and, last but not least, one of learning.

My initial plan with regards to the thesis was a simple one, as was the research topic. I intended to start with the theories on nationalism and use as a methodological benchmark the type of content analysis brought about by David Robertson in 1976<sup>1</sup>, to analyse the positioning on the left-right ideological axis using the electoral programmes of political parties (model which subsequently inspired multiple comparative research on party programmes through the development of the “Manifesto Research Group” but not only – some research extending to the ideological evaluation of public policies and including names such as Ian Budge, Michael Laver, Hans-Dieter Klingemann) – Ian Budge 2006, 425-426.

My objective was to create axes/continuums to measure nationalism using these theoretical and methodological bases, depending on the identified relevant dimensions, having a large applicability. More specifically, a *measuring instrument* with general validity, built on theoretical grounds, having as an objective the inventory/identification of relevant types of nationalism and measuring their intensity.

Being that the methodology was clear and applied by me in previous research endeavours, and that my previous contacts with the study of nationalism focused on relatively clearly delineated subjects/themes, the logical documenting process directed me to look for a definition as well as a complete and exhaustive theory, from an explanatory point of view, of nationalism, nation and possibly of the specific differences of the latter (nationality, ethnicity). After covering dozens of authors (starting with the classics which I have already read, like Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, Rogers Burbaker or – partially – Will Kymlicka and others) and

thousands of pages, I came to the conclusion - I believe entirely justifiable - that such a definition and theory does not exist.

To explain what *I found* in the field, I would have to jump over the descriptive-analytical content as well as over the critical one and anticipate the conclusions of this paper in the following paragraphs. The following summarised argumentation will explain, I believe, the decision – which under some angle could be perceived as a necessity – to modify my initial plans with regards to the research theme, design and research methods.

The identified definitions, beyond the major differences between them, are stipulative, sometimes willingly incomplete, circumscribed to the theoretical approach they are part of, relatively easy to invalidate through logic or contradicted by easy-to-find concrete examples. Practically, they do not correspond to the requirements of a definitional process, even in the field of social sciences, of circumscribing as exactly as possible the defined concept, delineating it from a logical point of view with regards to the proximal typology and the specific difference, and “cropping” it as clearly as possible from the surrounding environment. They give us at best a relative picture of what nationalism, nation, nationality and ethnicity mean, according to the current status of the theory and current research. To back up my claims I will cite two known names in the field: Tom Nairn<sup>2</sup>, who states that nationalism is the more ideal and subjective out of the ideological phenomena, and Charles Tilly<sup>3</sup> according to whom “nation” is “one of the most unclear and controversial terms in the political dictionary”.

A similar situation can be found in the field of theory with regards to nationalism. The scientific study of nationalism, excluding the names I mentioned as precursors, debuted timidly in the 1950's and 1960's, with one name, Karl Deutsch, being invoked as an early exponent (although his pursuits in the field were rather marginal). There is a lack of a dominant paradigm (from an explanatory capacity point of view), and the theoretical field is divided into three rival and *apparently* mutually exclusive theories: *modernism/instrumentalism* – mentioned in this paper mostly as “classic modernism”, a term coined by Anthony D. Smith (1998), *primordialism/perennialism* and *constructivism*. In fact, the summed up common characteristics of each of these theories (*the dogma*, according to some papers that could be considered classics or exponents to these theories) are rarely respected by the authors subordinated to the respective orientation.

Moreover, the explanations proposed by each paradigm are obviously incomplete – this being the primary critique brought to the followers of *modernism*, probably the most numerous in the field, and which the followers of *primordialism/perennialism* such as Daniel Bell (1975) or Walker Connor (1994) tend to accept it themselves. Constructivism, the last theory to develop chronologically, represents according to my conclusions (reasoned in the criticism part of the nationalism theories) an implicit recognition of the failure of the other two paradigms to offer complete and complex explanations, and a compromise between them (in the sense of a midpoint

between two contrary trends) whose logical coherence has proven to be quasi-impossible to achieve, and not a *synthesis* in the Hegelian sense of the term.

As such, I believe we should be careful in even calling this approach a theory/paradigm.

To demonstrate that my radical critique is not singular I can call up on the opinions of Rogers Brubaker (2010), who, although he recognises the early merits of constructivism in boosting knowledge, states that its “intellectual blade” has eroded and that the trend has become clichéd, bland and routine, not more than a simple intellectual fashion or, as the author puts it, is has regressed to the level of common sense and ended up expressing “constructivist platitudes” (Brubaker 2010, Preface XXV, 7-9).

Of course, nothing would have stopped me in a practical sense to choose a definition and a theory less blatantly *contradicted* by reality, in which case the consonant examples would overcome the dissonant ones (“Swans tend to be white”, as Karl Popper claims) and, obviously keeping into account that we are evaluating in an area of probabilistic disciplines, I would have developed a methodologically-correct research instrument which I would then have applied to the realities of various nationalisms with the purpose of measuring them. The only question which has, after the long period of literature review (and, I must admit, without any connotation other than the forming of some intellectual habits after almost 18 years of teaching, systematic reading and research in the field of theory and political science), managed to interpose almost obsessively against the idea of this process was *what exactly* would that instrument measure? What would have been, beyond the correct form and the diligent crossing of all the official milestones one has to achieve for a doctorate thesis, the real *epistemological* statute of such an endeavour? From this point of view, my paper is probably not similar (and I believe it cannot and should not be similar) to those written by doctoral students freshly out of their masters studies. This is not a comparison but merely a weighting.

As such, finding the shortcomings and difficulties of the state of theoretical knowledge in the field mentioned above as anticipated conclusions, I was redirected to a new objective in the research process: that of *critically approaching the theories on nationalism*, including the definition part, and of *formulation of solutions at the theoretical level*, to the extent that the available knowledge resources and my own intellectual ones can make this endeavour possible.

This is where the paper takes its extensive nature from, because a critical analysis of definitions (and trying to formulate new ones) cannot be done without presenting a considerable number of them (or of explanations having definitional value, this thesis comprising between 50 and 60 such wordings), and a critical analysis of the state of the field of study from a theoretical point of view could not be undertaken without a thorough and relatively complete review (with its inherent gaps and imperfections) of the three major paradigms and its representative authors (chapter IV of the paper).

I started the thesis with a short chapter, following a terminological-conceptual introduction for those less familiarised with the study of nationalism (but tuned in the fields of social science and political theory), mentioning the main concepts, theories, typologies and taxonomies in the field, some with an indicative role. All these are shortly defined and most of them are used, conceptually elaborated, analysed in-depth and illustrated later in the thesis (chapter I).

I also considered that one must not neglect the primary pursuits that mark the study field of nationalism, at 1) micro- and mid-social level and 2) at macro-social level. This resulted in the presentation (including the critical feedback) of the studies related to *identity/identity strategies* (chapter II), a new and relatively productive orientation of the national affiliation theme (nation/nationality as a type of identity) as well as the one pertaining to *ethnic conflicts and ways to resolve them* (chapter III), the approaches starting from this type of realities giving birth to some of the most known papers in the field, such as John McGarry and Brendan O’Leary volume (1993) or the ample tome of Donald Horowitz (1985). Given the concrete nature of these two types of pursuits and their mostly inductive character, I considered that they should precede the presentation and critical analysis of nationalism theories.

Given the fact that some of the most recent theoretical pursuits of nationalism, with an *assumed normative* character, are those related to multiculturalism, I considered that these deserve a section/chapter in this paper (chapter V). Firstly because a critical analysis of the nation-related theories cannot omit exactly the ones that explicitly propose a method of organising/managing the national and ethnical realities, and secondly because of the accentuated multicultural reality of a large part of the world today. Even if including this chapter complicates the shape of the paper, I believe that it brings added value to its content. The chapter presents the contributions of multicultural authors (the intellectual figure of Will Kimlicka<sup>4</sup> distinguishing among them), the criticism they faced, their answer to those critics, and a presentation and analysis of the concrete problems/challenges that could be generated by multicultural policies in the current context. In closing I present a typology inspired by Chandran Kukathas (2006) and extended and developed substantially by the author of these lines<sup>5</sup>, which comprises the current ways of managing multicultural diversity, as an alternative to the non-conflict ethno-cultural pluralism proposed by McGarry și O’Leary (1993).

The last chapter (VI, in conjunction with Annex 2) is intended for the thesis itself: the critical analysis of definitions regarding nation, nationalism and ethnicity and the proposal of some original definitions for nation<sup>6</sup>, nationalism, nationality and ethnicity, as well as the critical analysis (advantages and disadvantages) of each of them. Introducing this new definition, justifying the characterisation of nationalism made by Rogers Brubaker (1996) or Anthony D. Smith (1998) with regards to its protean character, allows for the distinction of new forms of nation that have appeared and are already manifesting themselves officially, such as the “delocalised/de-territorialised nations” (the case of Hungary or Croatia) and the “non-independent/non-sovereign official nation” (the more recent case of Quebec province, starting

with May 2021)<sup>7</sup>. Also, the extensive critique of the main theories of nationalism and the relatively non-spectacular but – I believe – useful solutions the author of this paper envisages and proposes for overcoming the impasse of this area of knowledge, both from the point of view of the theory as well as the vision for research (using as a model Rogers Burbakers (1996, 2010) approaches about research in the field). The end of the chapter includes a personal evaluation and critique to multiculturalism.

The paper ends with a conclusion section which reveals on one side my own contributions structured in the form of additions and nuances to the level of theoretical and empirical knowledge in the field, and on the other side it informs on important questions that have not yet been addressed, they were not answered and on which the knowledge undertaking of nationalism, nations and ethnicity must still focus on. Also presented are the minuses, limits and non-achievements of the paper.

Following this relatively synthetic presentation which allowed for the elucidation of the motivation behind the development of this paper in the form it was written and following an introduction to (familiarisation with) its content, I will exhibit a more detailed guide to the paper, using as landmarks the chapters and their *subdivisions/parts*, in order, so that it constitutes a relatively complete summary and a comprehensible reading guide. I will present the approaches, concepts, relevant authors and ideas as well as their place in the paper and the contributions brought to each chapter and subchapter. The inherent, somewhat dry character of this presentation will be – hopefully – compensated by the reading of the whole thesis.

**Chapter I** starts with a terminological introduction in which the term ethnic minority is differentiated by the one of statistical or sociological minority. As an equivalent to it the phrase ethno-cultural community is introduced, which will be used the most throughout this paper, and synonym terms are presented. It also explains other similar but distinct terms to the ethno-cultural community, such as the “lifestyle enclave” (Kymlicka 1995a, 19) or the ethnic subculture (Fellerer, Pyrah, Turda 2020, Foreword; 3-6). Moreover, an indicative, heuristic definition of nation is presented, saying that a nation is “that (ethno)cultural community which reached or tends to reach the stage of forming modern states”.

*Subchapter I.2* presents types of electoral communities, according to Ted Robert Gurr (1995), Will Kymlicka (1995a, 1995b) and Dorel Abraham, Ilie Bădescu & Septimiu Chelcea (1995), *Subchapter I.3* introduces the readers to the area of patterns/models of ethnic mobilisation and summarises the main theories on nation and nationalism according to Donald Horowitz (1985) and Ted Robert Gurr (1995), *subchapter I. 4* offers some examples of relations between types of nationalism and the models of state building, according to Juan José Linz and Alfred Stepan<sup>8</sup> (in Salat 2001) and Herbert Kitschelt (1992), and subchapter I.5 presents synthetically a relatively wide pallet of types of nationalism, according to authors such as Jack Snyder (2000), Florian Bieber (2020), David Brown (2000) and others.



The purpose of this chapter is to create a terminological/conceptual and typological map, relatively extensive with regard to the included elements and at the same time brief with regards to circumscribing them, the terms, classifications and relational models in the study of ethnicity, nations and nationalism – terms, concepts and typologies which will be found, in most part, at a more in-depth and extensive level of the analysis later in this paper.

**Chapter II** approaches the ethno-cultural communities at the micro- and mid-levels of society and includes a perspective which has proven to be very productive in time in the analysis of ethnicity, nationalism and nations – the one of identity. In the subchapters, the historical analysis is corroborated on one hand with the psychological, sociological and socio-psychological analysis, and on the other hand with the theoretical/political philosophy analysis. At a relatively schematic level, substantially developed in the present form, this chapter was included in the bachelor thesis of the author in 1996<sup>9</sup>. Subchapters II.1, II.2 and II.4 present the course and particularities of the aggregation of identity within the social sciences, at psychology level, social psychology level and, in the end, from a dynamic perspective – the one presented by the *indentitary strategies* according to Camilleri, Kastersztein et al. (1990).

These are circumscribed in consequence to the existence of a *set of identities* whose components could be held by individuals and groups in a successive or even simultaneous manner, and which could be materialised or mobilised depending on the context and the historical, economic, social and cultural factors Camilleri, Kastersztein et al. (1990, 18), different types of dynamic strategies as well as identity strategies peculiar to the ethno-cultural communities.

*Subchapter II.3* is dedicated especially to a historical-philosophical analysis (more specifically a history of ideas) undertaken by Charele Taylor (1994), which associated identity with the need of recognition and modernity, and explains how pre-modern/pre-Enlightenment identity, ascriptive and hierarchical, was transformed through the ideas developed by Rousseau into one of equal dignity, expression of the authentic self, but also, according to Herder, rooted and expressed culturally. Taylor specifies that beside these characteristics, it is also manifested through “dialogue”, by communicating and interacting with others (Taylor 1994, 32-33).

*Subchapter II.5* presents briefly a series of ideas and concepts on the image of the other (social representation, concept introduced by Serge Moscovici<sup>10</sup>, and imagology), relevant in the interactions between groups and in our case between ethno-cultural communities, including in the context of identification/identity and recognition. The cited authors are Denise Jodelet (1990) and Abraham, Badescu și Chelcea (1995). Beyond the importance of the identity perspective, this chapter is also relevant because of the need for analysing ethnicity and nationalism from both the ground-up as well as from up-down, idea expressed by authors such as Eric J.

Hobsbawn (1993, 78-79, 126-130) and by one of the most innovative researchers in the field, Rogers Brubaker (2010).

**Chapter III** continues the idea expressed above but changes the analysis perspective and concentrates on the macro-social one. Furthermore, one of the contexts that generated perhaps the most studies and research themes on ethnicity and nationalism – interethnic conflicts – is analysed here. Like the previous chapter, this was included as well – in a less developed and updated manner – in my bachelor thesis (1996)<sup>11</sup>. In the first subchapter the approach focuses more on conflict theory, while in the second on the field of political theory.

*Subchapter III.1* incorporates a classic perspective, more specifically the one of classification and explanation of the existing ways of in which these conflicts can be solved according to the taxonomy of John McGarry and Brendan O’Leary. The authors dedicated a volume edited by them in 1993 to put together, present (chapter I) and illustrate in detail (in the other chapters) the above-mentioned taxonomy. The authors, who operate the theoretical distinction between typology and taxonomy, present two sets of ways to manage conflicts starting from a typological distinction: eliminating the differences versus managing them. The strategies pertaining to *eliminating the differences* include a) genocide b) involuntary resettlement c) division or secession (auto-determination) and d) integration/assimilation. The ones related to *managing the differences* refer to a) hegemonic control b) arbitration (the intervention of a third party), c) cantonization/federalization and d) consociationism (Mc.Garry, O’Leary 1993, 4). The criteria advanced by the authors to evaluate these strategies are related to the morality of the method, its effectiveness and the existence of positive estimates regarding the long-term viability.

In *subchapter III.2*, Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (2000) analyse and revise the taxonomy of McGarry and O’Leary from the perspective of compatibility of methods/strategies with the basic criteria of democracy and human rights. I will not reproduce here separately the revised taxonomy; I will only state that the authors eliminate arbitration on the grounds that it is not a strategy in itself, but only a means of reaching a way or the other to resolve a conflict. I will only point out that, from the author’s perspective, the methods which we can consider morally legitimate, aimed at *eliminating differences*, only a) division/secession (although the authors state that empirical reality has shown that, in its application, ethnic conflicts are often passed on to successor states, and partly b) assimilation (as long as it’s desired by the community concerned). Regarding the management of differences, the revised model presents more favourable perspectives from the point of view of legitimacy, including a) territorial autonomy (cantonization and/or federalization), b) non-territorial autonomy ( consociationalism or division of power) and c) multicultural integration ( the latter being introduced by the authors instead of arbitration), all considered compatible with fundamental human rights, democracy and minority rights (Kymlicka și Norman 2000, 12, 15).

**Chapter IV** is the second in length but probably one of the most important in the paper. In order to make the radical critique possible (however, I consider, argued and justified) of *Chapter VI*, it was indispensable to include in this chapter an extensive presentation of the definitions of nation, ethnicity and nationalism, in the first part, and theories of nationalism and nation in the other subchapters, finally presenting, analytically and critically, the challenges facing nationalism today. The approach is one of the history of ideas (in the first part), and of political science, political and sociological theory in the rest of the chapter.

Subchapter IV.1 presents the evolution of conceptions of nation and nationalism and the evolution of their definitions, including those divergent / dissonant with current ones, such as that of foreign students at the University of Paris (Elie Kedourie 1993, 5-6). Names related to the evolution of ideas are presented, such as Machiavelli, encyclopaedists Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond D'Alembert, Jean-Jaques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottfried von Herder and Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, John Stuart Mill and Giuseppe Mazzini, Woodrow Wilson, their ideas often being presented through the lens of modern authors on the field of nationalism, such as David Miller, Charles Taylor, Eric J. Hobsbawm, Elie Kedourie. Historical milestones are highlighted such as the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, Romanticism and the emergence of both German and Italian nationalism and their role as models, as well as key developments such as the implementation of the "Wilsonian Points" after World War I and UN establishment in 1945 with its Charter which stipulates the right of peoples to self-determination. It also mentions the authoritarian-totalitarian turn taken by nationalism, as a trend of ideas and practical orientation, after the beginning of the twentieth century (Miller 2006, 534-535), this fact discrediting it for a good period of time and to a significant extent both in philosophical and academic field as well as in the eyes of the public opinion.

*Subchapter V.2* presents in detail the main theories related to the theme of nationalism and the ideas of a large part of relevant thinkers in the field, with the inherent limits regarding the capacity to comprehend any such approach. In the short *section V.2.1.*, the forerunners of the scientific study of the nationalist phenomenon are presented, such as Ernest Gellner, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber or Hans Kohn. In the rest of the subchapter, the main three theories / paradigms of nationalism are displayed and analyzed.

A separate clarification is required towards the way in which I documented and elaborated this *subchapter IV.2*. It is largely based on the structure of Anthony D. Smith's book *Nationalism and Modernism* (1998), one of the few works (and in my opinion the most relevant) that focuses on the presentation and critique of nationalism theories. However, from A. D. Smith's paper only the *pattern / model of analysis* was taken, and it was improved by adding personal ideas and those of authors with contemporary publications or succeeding that of Smith (David Brown, David Miller, Sergiu Mişcoiu, Ted Robert Gurr, Allison Dundes Renteln, Dodeye Uduak Williams, Florian Bieber, Will Kymlicka, Liviu Neagoe, Allison Dundes Renteln). From the point of view of the content of the work, all the authors included in Smith's analysis whose writings were accessible to me were read in original, from precursors to main authors within

each paradigm (Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, Elie Kedourie, Rogers Brubaker, Eric Hobsbawm, Charles Tilly, Donald Horowitz, Walker Connors, Daniel Bell), adding into the presentation and analysis contributions of authors who fell into one or the other currents but published their work after 1998 (Thomas Kamusella, Marius Turda, Will Kymlicka).

Going back to the presentation of Chapter IV, *Section IV.2.2* presents definitions of modernism (classical) - as alternative titles, instrumentalism and partial situationism - as a phenomenon characteristic of modernity and triggered by concrete and intentional historical, economic, social and political developments, being favorable to a certain group / elite (nationalists). Also, the characteristics of the theory are opposed to the approach of ethnicity that Rogers Brubaker calls *substantialist* (1996, 15), which considers national realities as data, objective, palpable, found in the perceptions of nationalists and in historical works of popularization. Classical modernism (I mainly used this term in the thesis) began as a theoretical orientation in the years 1950-1960 (one of the first names mentioned being that of Karl Deutsch), reached its maximum development around the 1980s, aggregated autonomously the field of study of nationalism and made to predominate, within it, theoretical approaches and methods from within the social sciences.

Next, the subchapter presents the main versions of modernist theory:

- Industrialization and modernism, which emphasize the role of capitalism, the industrial economy, the unified market, and the education system in creating a national community (Ernest Gellner, 1983)

- Capitalism, Marxist and post-Marxist perspectives that perceive nationalism as a false consciousness or depending on the utility instrumentally brought to their purposes. As an author who took inspiration from Marxist ideas, Tom Nairn<sup>12</sup> (Smith 1998, 49-55) speaks of a nationalism of the underdeveloped peripheries, the same model of unequal development and the theory of dependence being also used by Miroslav Hroch<sup>13</sup> and Michael Hechter<sup>14</sup> (Smith 1998, 56-58).

- The role of the state, administration, institutions, army (military control over the territory) in the creation of the nation (according to Anthony Giddens<sup>15</sup>), its takeover of the functions of structures and intermediate associations scattered in the modernization process and the nationalism evaluated as a political ideology (Jean Breuilly<sup>16</sup>) or the role of revolutions in the development of nations (Charles Tilly, 2004).

- We find a special perspective in the work of Rogers Brubaker, who rejects the use of the term nation in research, considering it only a practical category and not for analysis, *assumed / presumed* only by the nationalist discourse, not a real, tangible entity (Brubaker 1996, 3, 10). He proposes as substitutes the terms "nationhood" and "nationness" (nationality, ethnicity). Interethnic relations and nationalism are, in his view, characterized by a "triadic model" nation state (nationalizer) - national minority - mother country.

- Thomas Kamusella (2020) perceives nationalism in an integralist, extreme version of modernism, in which manipulative elites subordinate disciplines such as ethnology, ethnography and linguistics and control the educational system to impose a national reality.

-Political Messianic nationalism, by Elie Kedourie (1993), who considers nationalism to be equivalent to, and manifests itself as a militant religion / faith.

- Invented traditions, to replace extinct traditions, or taking over, processing and replacing historical existential landmarks (Eric J Hobsbawm); or the creation and existence of imagined communities, named as such because they go beyond the realm of direct interactions, both used as bases for nationalism.

*Subchapter IV.3* is dedicated to primordialism and perenialism; if the former refers to the essential (basic, fundamental) and organic character of ethno-cultural characteristics, the latter takes into account the age of these characteristics and their durability. The theory, in its two variants, appears as an alternative to modernism. With regards to approach and method, if in the initial phase history, geography and ethnology / ethnography are used, we later move (also) to the disciplines and methods of social sciences (socio-biologists, psychology, sociology, social psychology). The merit of the approach is that it displays the explanatory limitations of modernism, without managing to take its place.

*Primordialism* has multiple variations:

- The organic one is named after the organic nationalism of Hans Kohn<sup>17</sup> (according to Smith 1998, 146-147), which predates the development of the modernist current.

- Biological primordialism, which has Pierre van der Berghe<sup>18</sup> as its exponent (Smith 1998, 148-150), argues that ethnicity is based on living together and endogamous marriages, the result of a natural instinct, which only then gives rise to a cultural form or linguistic aspects of the community.

- In the context of cultural primordialism, Eduard Shils<sup>19</sup> (who states that public and civil relations within the modern state have as a core the primordial family, religious, and ethnic ties) - Smith 1998, 151 - Clifford Geertz<sup>20</sup> and Steven Grosby<sup>21</sup> (Smith 1998, 152, 156-157 ) emphasize the primacy of the cultural elements specific to a community, these being, according to the latter, filtered by individuals through *cognitions* that give them measure and importance; Daniel Bell (1975), another important exponent of cultural primordialism, states that ethnic affiliation developed at the expense of the classical one and that the nationalist trend was one that used politics and culture for common ends, providing aristocrats and masses with bridges for connection and communication and a sense of common affiliation.

*Perenialism* manifests itself in several forms:

- Perennialism of ethnic continuity (Joshua Fishman<sup>22</sup>)- in Smith 1998, 59-61 - refers to the ancestral and immemorial character of ethnicities, but they are seen as historical and social constructs, and not as organic data; one possible accusation would be that this current does not distinguish between ethnic groups and nations.

- Ethnic perennialism as opposed to modern nations, with Walker Connor (1994) and Donald Horowitz (1995) as exponents, refers to the possible (but not necessary) continuity between an ethnicity with ancient roots and relevance today; it makes a nation, according to Connor (1994, 202) "the largest type of family."

- The perennialism of the historians includes authors such as Samuel George Frederick Brandon<sup>23</sup>, John Armstrong<sup>24</sup>, Steven Grosby<sup>25</sup>, Liah Greenfeld<sup>26</sup>, John Gillingham<sup>27</sup> or Adrian Hastings<sup>28</sup> (in Smith, 1998, 167-168, 170-172); their claims refer to more concrete aspects than other types of perennialism (and relatively convincingly argued), invoking the existence of proto or quasi-national structures in countries such as Israel or Egypt (since antiquity), Armenia, Georgia, eleventh century Saxon England or the Anglo-Norse of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, or sixteenth-century France, which had many features in common with modern national statehood, including in terms of (up to a point) self-awareness<sup>29</sup>; the relations of these proto / quasi-nations with modern nations can be one of continuity or recurrence.

*Section V.2.4* presents the latest major theory on nationalism, constructivism, considered to be a synthesis between the first two. Has Anthony D. Smith (1998), Ted Robert Gurr (1995), David Brown (2000), Sergiu Mişcoiu (2006) as supporters and exponents, as well as Hugh Seton-Watson<sup>30</sup>, Susan Reynolds<sup>31</sup> (Smith 1998, 174-177). The current tries to generate a point of intersection between the continuity or recurrence of an ethno-cultural tradition and the creation of the nation in the modernity period, without succeeding in circumscribing it.

- An exponent of cultural nationalism John Hutchinson<sup>32</sup> emphasizes the role of the nation's cultural nationalism, which he sees as a recurring, traditional manifestation that generates organic solidarity among its members. Politically, it aims to create "a state representative of the community so that it can participate as an equal in the development of rational and cosmopolitan civilization" - a desideratum belonging to modernity (Smith 1998, 177-180).

- The complex myth-symbol apparatus is conceptually developed by John Armstrong<sup>33</sup>, inspired by the model (*histoire de la*) *longue durée*, and thus trying to base a model of historical continuity over long periods, from pre-national eras. Symbols are built through opposition and interaction with others, providing landmarks for communication not only within society but between generations. They are based on and are justified by myths, the gearing of several myths building moments and elements of identification and continuity. The way in which these myths come to be aggregated is not very clear, although an aggregation engine was represented by

religion, nor the way in which the boundaries between groups get to be drawn (Smith 1998, 181-183, 185-187).

- Ethno-symbolism, the variant of constructivism proposed by Anthony D. Smith takes some of John Armstrong's ideas and tries to substantiate a "dual legitimacy" of nations, claimed from ethnic heritage / continuity, on the one hand, and from the establishment of political systems on the other hand, starting with the XVII-XVIII centuries. Although Smith introduces two models into the process of nation-formation, i.e. the civic and the ethnic nationalism, the questions on which constructivism does not conclude remain unanswered here as well.

Rogers Brubaker is one of the most virulent critics of constructivism, who considers that orientation, which has become dominant in his opinion, has become routine, has lost its intellectual edge and has regressed to the level of common knowledge and platitudes (Brubaker 2010, preface XXV , 7-9).

*Subchapter IV.3* includes the challenges that nationalism faces in the contemporary, postmodern period. It begins by quoting the text of a lecture by the well-known historian William H. McNeil, who states that nationalism corresponds to a well-defined period in Western history that is coming to an end (Smith 1998, 200-201). The approaches and critiques in this end of the chapter are multidisciplinary, even composite, and I will list them briefly below:

*IV.3.1.* The fragmentation of the great national narratives and the development of hybrid identities, in the context of globalization, migration, marginalization of some categories.

*IV.3.2.* Social gender and nation. The issue of the disparity between the contribution of women to the development of nationalism and nations, or their symbolic representation as mothers / breeders of the nation, and the concrete position they have in national societies. Another challenge may be generated by the oppressive traditions towards women in certain ethno-cultural communities.

*IV.3.3.* The relationship between liberalism and civic nationalism, respectively ethnic nationalism, a section that debates the artificial separation between civic and ethnic nationalism and the conflict, refuted by a considerable number of arguments and contexts, between liberalism and nationalism. The main author who contributes to this fragment, David Miller (2006, 535-3537) unlike the multicultural authors analyzed in the next chapter, refers to majority nationalism.

*IV.3.4.* Nationalism as a set of irrational beliefs. This simplifying view is debated by D. Miller (2006) and it is analyzed in what context the warnings included in it should be taken into account.

*IV.3.5.* Analyzes the complex impact of globalization on nationalism, the relationship between the two concepts and realities in the context of developments such as the technological

revolution in TI / IT, international migration and the development of supranational regional organizations such as the EU, and the existence of setbacks in the latter.

The chapter ends with a series of conclusions regarding these sets of challenges to the phenomenon of nationalism.

**Chapter V** (the most ample of this paper) focuses on the vision of managing the multicultural diversity of this paper. It includes a part of analysis in the area of social sciences / political science, which focuses on the types of nationalism in relation to the organization of the state and the relationship between civic and ethnic nationalism (*subchapter V.1*, David Brown 2000), a part of analytical political philosophy that investigates the relationship between liberalism and nationalism (*subchapter V.2*, Yael Tamir 1993), a part of normative political theory that addresses the issue of multiculturalism from the perspective of identity and recognition (*subchapter V.3*, Charles Taylor 1994). The rest of the chapter, ie most of the pages, are dedicated to the model of liberal multiculturalism, elaborated and developed by Will Kymlicka and his collaborators in a series of works (Kymlicka 1995a; 1995b; 2001; 2007; Kymlicka and Norman 2000). These include also discursive content and an extensive series of typologies together with public policy recommendations, plus a series of concrete problematic aspects related to the issue of multiculturalism that I tried to subject to both the test of logical coherence and that of reality (Critiques of different authors on multiculturalism and Will Kymlicka's answers to them are presented towards the end). The chapter ends with a typology of multicultural diversity management improved and developed by the author of these lines.

*Subchapter V.1* David Brown (2000) analyzes civic and ethnic nationalism and reaches the conclusion that on the one hand that there can be no radical difference between them, both invoking elements of rational interest and emotional / affective attachment, or appeal to the notion of duty (“biological family”, in the case of ethnic nationalism, and “matrimonial family” in the case of the civic one, according to Maurizio Viroli Viroli<sup>34</sup> in Brown 2000, 35). In reality, states have tried to achieve a combination of these, after the first decades of the twentieth century, when the state goes beyond its Hobbesian phase and becomes a promoter of development, social equity and a provider of services. In exchange for this "offer", minority ethno-cultural communities were required to integrate in the form of assimilation (at least in part) into the majority culture. This model came to be questioned when the welfare state crisis of the 1970s started. This meant a resurgence of ethno-nationalist issues and a (re) mobilization of marginalized ethnic minority elites. This again put civic nationalism in a contradictory / conflicting position with the ethnic one, but also with the reappeared multicultural nationalism<sup>35</sup> (2000, 35-49).

In *Section V.1.3* Brown seeks to dismantle the distinction between a “good” civic nationalism (contractual, voluntarist, rational, forward-looking) and a “bad” civic nationalism (traditionalist, organicist, affect-based / resentful, past-oriented) which is based on the distinction introduced by Hans Kohn<sup>36</sup>, distinctions as a result of which ethnic nationalism would always



take an illiberal / authoritarian form. Brown manages to dismantle with arguments and examples the elements on which this distinction is based (and its conclusions), concluding that ethnic nationalism tends to become authoritarian only if it is expressed by marginalized and resentful elites (Brown 2000, 50-69).

*Section V.1.4* presents the criticisms of multicultural nationalism aggregated by D. Brown, who, in his view, 1) does not address the issue of identity at the level of individual choice, raises issues at the level of 2) group rights (from the perspective of individual group relations and the distribution of power within them) and that of 3) the distribution of resources, and 4) unsatisfactorily resolves the relations between the majority and minorities (Brown 2000, 129-132).

*Section V.1.5* introduces us into the analysis of the types of multiculturalism, which according to the author are the *corporatist* (inspired as a name by authoritarian corporatism, conceptually developed by economist Mihail Manoilescu and others) over-regulated by the state, rigid and very expensive, and the *pluralist* (inspired by Michael Walzer<sup>37</sup>, flexible, active especially in the area of civil society and open to negotiation - Brown, 135-151 (for details see pages 263-277 of the paper).

*Subchapters V.2 and V.3*, although different in approach (both in the area of political theory / philosophy) introduce and develop two distinct conceptual and factual realities in the area of nationalism:

- Yael Tamir (1993) speaks of liberal nationalism, perfectly compatible with the defense and promotion of individual rights and freedoms. For these, the ethno-cultural context (with emphasis on the role of culture) represents the context in which individuals evolve and the object of their value and emotional attachments.

- Charles Taylor (1994), through a creative foray into the history of political ideas, emphasizes the evolution of identity as individual dignity and cultural affiliation, emphasizes the detrimental effects on individuals of non-recognition / disrespect and raises (before Will Kymlicka) the problem of the lack of ethnic neutrality of the state, suggesting that it needs some remedies.

*Subchapter V.4* presents Will Kimlika's extensive and relevant contribution to multiculturalism and its evolution over time. I will present it here very briefly, the central element of the problem being that, from the point of view of liberal citizenship, *the lack of ethnic neutrality of the state* (expressed in official language, flag, insignia, national holidays, celebrated traditions) *must be compensated* at the level of members of minority ethnocultural communities, and they, being able to only exercise those particularities of their identity together, need an extension of this compensation in the form of their recognition (language, religion, culture, traditions) *in the public space*.

Kymlika refers to three main types of ethno-cultural communities (beyond much broader and more nuanced typologies), national minorities (linked to a certain territory and at least partially equivalent, according to the author, to nations), indigenous peoples (similar in many respects to the former, but influenced in their evolution and characteristics by a different context and history) and ethnic minorities (especially immigrants).

Here is one of the models of measures / "good practices" (developed by Will Kymlika together with Keith Banting and proposed by Kymlika in his 2007 volume, 66-74), which the author considers for each of these categories:

*- National/sub-state minorities:*

- 1) territorial autonomy of federal or quasi-federal type
- 2) Official status of minority languages, either at regional or national level
- 3) granting guarantees of representation in the central government or in the constitutional courts
- 4) Public funding of studies at university / school level and mass-media in minority languages
- 5) Constitutional or parliamentary recognition of "multinationalism"
- 6) granting international legal personality at various levels to minorities (eg the right of minority regions to be represented in international bodies, to sign treaties, to have their own representative sports teams, etc.)

*- Indigenous peoples:*

- 1) recognition of rights / titles of possession to their own land
- 2) recognition of self-government rights
- 3) observance of historical treaties signed by states with them / signing of new treaties
- 4) recognition of cultural rights (related to language or occupations such as hunting / fishing)
- 5) recognition of customary laws
- 6) granting guarantees regarding their recognition / consultation within the central government
- 7) giving constitutional or legislative status of the distinct status of indigenous peoples
- 8) support for / ratification of international instruments on indigenous rights
- 9) positive discrimination for members of indigenous communities

*- Ethnic minorities/immigrant groups:*

- 1) constitutional, legislative or parliamentary status of multiculturalism, at central and / or regional or municipal level
- 2) the adoption of multiculturalism in the school curriculum

- 3) the inclusion of tasks of representation / awareness of ethnic diversity among the tasks of the public media and as a condition for licensing private media institutions
- 4) granting exceptions to dress codes, mandatory Sunday rest laws (either by legislation or by legal decisions)
- 5) legal acceptance of dual citizenship
- 6) funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities
- 7) financing bilingual education or mother tongue learning
- 8) positive discrimination for disadvantaged groups of immigrants
- [9] (proposed by some authors, but perceived as problematic by Banting and Kymlicka) acceptance of a large number of immigrants as permanent residents and future citizens]

*Section V.4.3* analyzes in detail a set of public policies proposed by multiculturalism that are perceived as potentially problematic. Beyond the critical presentation made to the authors' text, I try to go beyond it by analyzing it not only from a logical / conceptual point of view, but also by comparing their models / visions with the realities they refer to and with their evolution. This section deals with a) federalism and the rights of national minorities, b) the application of minority rights in the case of indigenous peoples, c) language rights and their limits, d) the religious rights of minorities - in the education system, in family law and related to gender equality, e) multiculturalism, integration and Black population.

*Section V.4.5* Critically presents the main objections, at a theoretical or practical level, in principle or in reality, to multiculturalism (in addition to the approach already presented in this regard by David Brown), which I will return to in the last chapter of the paper.

*Subchapter V.5*, in *section V.5.1* presents a typology - using as a model a typological presentation of Chandran Kukathas (2006, 581-595), completed with elements taken from David Brown (2000, 135-151 ) and Abraham, Bădescu and Chelcea - extended, developed and extensively exemplified by me (from 6 categories to 8, and from 14 pages to 61-62), regarding the existing ways of managing multicultural diversity. Its eight elements are:

- The solution of differentiated rights - liberal multiculturalism
- The solution of cosmopolitanism
- The option of corporate multiculturalism
- The option of pluralist multiculturalism - difference and tolerance
- Tolerance / Radical tolerance
- Deliberative democracy in multicultural societies
- Extended communities and extended concrete rights, in the absence of symbolic recognition

- The international dimension of minority rights

**Chapter VI** is entirely dedicated to a radical critique (and I consider abundantly and logically argued) of the state and economy of knowledge in the field of nationalism, more precisely of the definitions and explanatory theories about nation and nationalism. In conjunction with Annex 2 (which includes 50 definitions), it highlights, I think, as clearly as possible that:

1) There is no universally-valid, lexicographical definition (corresponding to the logical and scientific requirements existing in the case of a definition) of the nation (but neither of related concepts such as nationalism, nationality, ethnicity).

2) None of the three main theories in the field is exhaustive / dominant from an explanatory point of view, in order to be considered the *theory of nationalism*.

To remedy this deficit at the level of theoretical knowledge, I have taken the following steps:

- I developed and proposed a series of definitions and presented their advantages and disadvantages, also initiating the testing and falsifiability process related to them. These are the following:

1) A nation is an ethno-cultural or trans-sectional identity community based on the experiences of a common past, developing a lasting and special relationship with the territory of residence, with its own developed institutions, which has reached or rightfully aspires to statehood, or union with / joining to an already existing state.

2) A *nationality* can be: a) a nation without its own state; b) an ethno-cultural identity community developing a lasting and special relationship with the territory of residence, with its own developed institutions, living outside the mother country, (partially synonymous with the diaspora); c) the specific aspect related to belonging to an ethno-cultural community identity with its own developed institutions that characterize the citizens of a state. The meaning of a) and b) are, at least in part, synonymous with the phrase national minority.

3) *Ethnicity* (synonymous with ethnic minority) is an ethno-cultural, unitary or fragmented identity community, developing a lasting and special relationship with the territory in which it was established through recent migration, with a less conscious sense of belonging and / or with less developed community institutions.

4) *Nationalism* is a current of thought (and sometimes a mode of action) that characterizes the members of a community or part of them, including ideas, values, beliefs and often related practices related to their origin, identity and functioning of the members of that community and manifests itself at the level of self and hetero-definition. It has a role claimed

from traditions, and instrumental and identitary functions for the members of the group in question, distinguishing them and differentiating them from members of other communities and often making a connection between the past, present and future of the community.

5) *Ethno-cultural community*: a group characterized by common features, which can be objective (hetero-defining): physical (race, ethnicity, origin or territory) and socio-cultural (language, religion, culture) or perceived / manifested by its members (self-defining): representation of common history or founding myths, mobilization of members, and the perception of being different from others.

- I formulated a series of proposals and suggestions related to theoretical and research approaches in the absence of a dominant paradigm in the field.

- I have highlighted some secondary conclusions of various kinds resulting from the extensive literature review process, concerning:

- the relative relevance / indicative character of the distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism and the relevance of that between liberal and illiberal nationalism

- the need to reintegrate research on nationalism into the body of the social sciences, through a more interdisciplinary approach

- the promising prospects for the application of identity approaches in the study of nationalism

The paper concludes with the (relatively summarized) section of conclusions and two annexes. The first presents a synopsis of the terminology, concepts and typologies regarding ethno-cultural communities, nationalism and multiculturalism and how they evolved across the thesis, and the second presents 50 of the definitions (explanations with definition valence) presented in the paper (used in conjunction with the theory critique in Chapter VI).

I hope that this summary, in some places detailed and in others willingly elliptical, will succeed in fulfilling its purpose and direct the curiosity of the reader to read the thesis, if one still reads works of 600 pages, whatever they may contain, in A.D. 2021. Or, at least, parts of it.

## ENDNOTES:

---

<sup>1</sup> Robertson, David. 1976. *A theory of Party Competition*. London and New-York: Wiley. Robertson proposes a solution to the debate, previously initiated, on important issues on the political agenda and on parties that are positional (allow the positioning for or against them, and could be represented on a left-right axis) and those that have a meaning /valence itself and no rational political actor (in the sense of the theories of rational choice) would place / manifest against them ("valence issues") - such as fighting corruption or maintaining peace. According to Robertson, all issues on the political agenda have a meaning in themselves / are "valence issues", and no political party would position itself for or against them (depending on the concrete issue). Thus, no party will say it wants to raise taxes. Therefore, the issue will be accentuated (repeatedly) by the parties seeking to reduce them (those on the right), and those who plan to increase them (those on the left) will mention it little or not at all, insisting instead on the relevance of social protection (as a result of tax increases).

Placing on an axis / a continuum (or more, but this is not the place to go into details) left-right could be done, simplifying, by 1) identifying the specific positions of the left and right (derived from the values promoted by the corresponding ideologies ) and 2) counting their appearance in party documents (programs, electoral manifests, speeches, etc.). According to Ian Budge 2006, 424-426).

<sup>2</sup> Nairn, Tom. 1977. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. London: New Left Books, 97-98 (in Smith 1998, 49)

<sup>3</sup> Tilly, Charles (ed.). 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 6 (in Smith 1998, 76)

<sup>4</sup> In Kymlicka's volumes 1995a, 1995b, 2001, 2007, Kymlicka and Norman (eds.) 2000

<sup>5</sup> Including and combining ideas taken from Dorel Abraham, Ilie Bădescu and Septimiu Chelcea (1995), as well as from David Brown (2000).

<sup>6</sup> Thus, the nation is defined by me as "an ethno-cultural or trans-sectional identity community based on the experiences of a common past, developing a lasting and special relationship with the territory of residence, with its own developed institutions, which has reached or aspires to statehood , or in union with / joining an existing state".

<sup>7</sup> Please see the following pages from the paper: 344-349

<sup>8</sup> Linz, Juan José; Stepan, Alfred. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. Southern Europe, East Africa and Post-Communist Europe*, Baltimore-London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, conform lui Zellner, Wolfgang. 1999. *On the Effectiveness of the OSCE Minority Regime. Comparative Case Studies on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the High Commissioner on National Minorities of the OSCE*. Hamburg: Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik

<sup>9</sup> The chapter represents the revised and substantially added version of the one introduced in the diploma paper Conflict Configurations in Interethnic Relations - Theories and Models, coordinators Vasile S. Dâncu and Istvan Horvath, held at the Faculty of Political Science in July 1996 (scored with the highest grade).

<sup>10</sup> Moscovici, Serge, 1961 (new edition, revised, 1976): *La psychanalyse, son image, son public*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, chapter 1, according to Neculau, Adrian. 1992. „Reprezentările sociale – A New Career”, *Analele științifice ale Universității „Al. I. Cuza”*, Iași, 1992, taken by Abraham, Bădescu, Chelcea 1995, 287-288

<sup>11</sup> The chapter represents the revised and substantially added version of the one introduced in the diploma paper Conflict Configurations in Interethnic Relations - Theories and Models, coordinators Vasile S. Dâncu and Istvan Horvath, held at the Faculty of Political Science in July 1996 (scored with the highest grade).

<sup>12</sup> Nairn, Tom. 1977. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. London: New Left Books., according to Smith 1998

<sup>13</sup> Hroch, Miroslav. 1985. *Social preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

<sup>14</sup> Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

<sup>15</sup> Giddens, Anthony. 1985. *The Nation-State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press, according to Smith, 1998

<sup>16</sup> Breuilly, John. 1993 [1982] *Nationalism and the State*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Manchester: Manchester University Press, according to Smith 1998

<sup>17</sup> Kohn, Hans. [1944] 1967a [1944] *The idea of Nationalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, New-York: Collier-Macmillan; Kohn, Hans. 1967b *Prelude to Nation-States: The French and German Experience, 1789-1815*, New York: Van Nostrand

- 
- <sup>18</sup> van der Berghe, Pierre 1978. "Race and ethnicity: a sociobiological perspective", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1, 4, 401-411; van der Berghe, Pierre. 1979. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*, New York: Elsevier; van der Berghe, Pierre. 1995. "Does race matters", *Nations and Nationalism I*, 3, 357-368
- <sup>19</sup> Shils, Eduard. 1957. "Primordial, personal and sacred civil ties", *British Journal of Sociology*, 7, 13-45
- <sup>20</sup> Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, London: Fontana
- <sup>21</sup> Grosby, Steven. 1994. "The verdict of history: the inexpugnable tie of priordiality – a reply to Eller and Coughlan", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 17, 1, 164-171
- <sup>22</sup> Fishman, Joshua. 1972. *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays*, Rowley MA: Newbury House; Fishman, Joshua. 1980. "Social theory and ethnography: neglected perspectives on language and ethnicity in Eastern Europe", in Sugar, Peter (ed.) *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe*, Santa Barbara CA: ABC-CLIO, 69-99
- <sup>23</sup> Brandon, Samuel George Frederick. 1967. *Jesus and the Zealots*, Manchester: Manchester University Press
- <sup>24</sup> Armstrong, John. 1982. *Nations before Nationalism*, Chapel Hill NC: University of North Carolina Press; Armstrong, John. 1992. "The autonomy of ethnic identity: historic cleavages and nationality relations in the USSR", in Motyl, Alexander (ed.) *Thinking Theoretically about Soviet Nationalities*, New York: Columbia University Press, 23-44
- <sup>25</sup> Grosby, Steven. "Religion and nationality in antiquity", *European Journal of Sociology*, XXXII, 229-265
- <sup>26</sup> Grenfeld, Liah. 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press
- <sup>27</sup> Gillingham, John. 1992. "The beginnings of English imperialism", *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 5, 392-409
- <sup>28</sup> Hastings, Adrian. 1997. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- <sup>29</sup> An interesting example, but by Florian Bieber (2020, 33-34), who quotes Nicholas Tackett (2017. *The Origins of the Chinese Nation: Song China and the Forging of an East Asian World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) is the Song Dynasty China (960-1279)
- <sup>30</sup> Seton-Watson, Hugh. 1977. *Nations and States*, London: Methuen
- <sup>31</sup> Reynolds, Susan. 1983. "Medieval *origines gentium* and the community of the realm", *History*, 68, 375-390
- <sup>32</sup> Hutchinson, John. 1987. *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State*, London, Allen & Unwin, 12-17; Hutchinson, John. 1994. *Modern Nationalism*. London: Fontana, chapter 3
- <sup>33</sup> Armstrong, John. 1982. *Nations before Nationalism*, Chapter Hill NC: University of North Carolina Press, 4, 7-9, chapter 2
- <sup>34</sup> Viroli, Maurizio. 1995. *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 118
- <sup>35</sup> It should be noted that David Brown (2000) is one of the few authors who does not view multiculturalism as something different and separate from the mainstream of nationalism, a form distinct from its main body, as other authors do, including those who are critical of him. He sees it as a natural evolution in the body of nationalist currents, with advantages and disadvantages. Another interesting thing to note is that, although Brown's criticisms of multiculturalism in the form presented by Kymlicka are quite original and, most of all, extensive, and the latter responds extensively after 2000 to many of the criticisms addressed to his work, he never refers, anywhere, ever (as far as I know) to those brought by David Brown. His name is not mentioned.
- <sup>36</sup> Kohn, Hans. 1944. *The Idea of Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan; Kohn, Hans. 1962. *The Age of Nationalism*. New York: Harper & Row
- <sup>37</sup> Walzer, Michael. 1995. "Pluralism: A Political Perspective", in Kymlicka, Will (ed.) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press