nation state: a sovereign state the members of which are also united by those ties such as language, common descent, etc. which constitute a nation.

J.A.R. Marriott, 1918, European Commonwealth, vol. ii, p. 18:
The ultimate genesis of the world conflict of today is sought ... in ... the existing european politics ... based upon the recognition of the rights of a larger number of Nation-states, entirely independent and maximally co-equal.

Huxley & Harden, We Europeans, vol. vi. p. 187:
The nation-state is a modern and product, the result of certain peculiar and circumstances

J. Shebbeane, an Essay on the Origin, Progress and Establishment of National Society

William Mayfair, An Inquiry into the present causes of the decline and fall of powerful and wealthy nations (London, 1805)

Breuilly on the creation of the nation. It is a product of the streamlining of the political power system of the territorial and monarchical states of Western Europe in the early modern period. ‘As these states extended their authority over their subjects and diminished that of other institutions such as churches, estates and guilds, and as they came into increasing and more intensive conflict with one another, so they took on the character of nation states’. (p. 75) ‘These states did not, however, justify their actions in nationalist terms and were not so judged by their critics That would have implied that the state, in some way or another, was an expression of the society it governed’. (p. 76) In other words this definition suggest that a full nation state is where the power structure is a state structure ultimately answerable or in any case representing the society, the nation.
Furthermore, to Breuilly, the origin of nationalism is in the internal opposition to the monarchy, the representatives of the people or the nation against the monarch. The nation is an expression of an emerging new system of legitimation and governance.

It will be necessary to clarify the meaning of phrase ‘the crisis of the nation state’. From there I go on to examine how ....
Here I shall argue, after that I will consider

‘The basic characteristic of the modern nation and everything connected with it is its modernity’ (Hobsbawm, p. 14)

Hobsbawm, following Ernest Gellner, defines ‘nationalism’ the idea that ‘the political and national unit should be congruent’ (Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, p. 1). Hobsbawm adds: ‘this principle also implies that the political duty ...to the polity which encompasses and represents the ... nation, overrides all other public obligation, and in extreme cases (such as wars) all other obligations of whatever kind’. (p. 9)

purely spatial unscrambling was unrealistic (Hobsbawm, p. 33)!!!
national heterogeneity of nation-states was accepted p. 34


writing in his capacity as an ‘economic nationalist’
'The science of political economy is a political science. It is a servant of politics, not the day-to-day politics of the individuals and classes who happen to be ruling at a particular time, but the lasting power-political interests of the nation. And for us the national state is not, as some people believe, an indeterminate entity raised higher and higher into the clouds in proportion as one clothes its nature in mystical darkness, but the temporal power-organization of the nation, and in this national state the ultimate standard of value for economic policy is 'reason of state'. There is a strange misinterpretation of this view current to the effect that we advocate 'state assistance' instead of 'self-help', state regulation of economic life instead of the free play of economic forces. We do not. Rather we wish under this slogan of 'reason of state' to raise the demand that for questions of German economic policy - including the question whether, and how far, the state should intervene in economic life, and when it should rather untie the economic forces of the nation and tear down the barriers in the way of their free development - the ultimate and decisive voice should be that of the economic and political interests of our nation's power, and the vehicle of that power, the German national state. (pp. 198-99)

state is a spatial concept.
Intro, Pal-Schultze

the sovereignty of the nation-state - perhaps its key resource and its primary characteristic p. 1

There is infinite puzzlement about England, or more properly Britain. The theory clearly states that absolutism is a state-building process. How could Britain build a strong military-fiscal state without being absolutist. Those who misunderstood British history were the victims of that particular conceptual illusion. Since Britain wasn't absolutist, they supposed that it was not, could not, be an aggressive state builder either. In the case of the Whigs, whoever they were, this was not just a mistaken belief, it was a useful foil.

for imperfect correspondence between states and nations:
see also B. Barry

conventional view, according to Greenfield

France:

Brewer, following Mann, following Weber:
States consist of centralized institutions exercising sovereignty - acting as the final source of authority - over territorially demarked areas

the sociological canon.

Most writers on nationalism see the nation as a concept rather than something natural. To the, nations are 'imagined communities'.

Anthony Smith has come to the conclusion, after much study of nationalism, that nations have 'ethnic origins'. This means that we should not believe that nations have been produced only by modern developments, such as capitalism and industrialisation, as Gellner suggests. Nations exit when and where people talk about. What they mean is another matter.

Gellner's definition of nationalism simply implies the desire of some nationally defined group wishing to have a 'nation-state' of their own, just like the 'traditional' national states, th great powers.

The nationalism of the French revolution was a political concept, which sought to put all citizens on an equal footing, instead of excluding most from active membership of the state. The idea of the nation now meant a community based on political equality and democracy, and democratic
nationalism was the most powerful doctrine which spelled out why that was so, and how it was to be achieved.

Change; the idea of the political nation was developed by some people long along ethnic and language lines of demarcation, rather than according to democratic criteria. This changed an inclusive notion to an exclusive one, it excluded from the nation those citizens who were not ethnically or linguistically qualified to be members.

injustice of an alien form of rule
imperial culture
last 300 years of multinationalism
nation-state is the recognition of the nation (as a cultural as well as a political entity)

I may begin by remarking that much German learning and subtlety has been applied to distinguishing the conception of a "Federal State" (Bundes-Staat) from that of a "Confederation of States" (Staatenbund). I think that perhaps undue importance has been attached to the aim of getting a clear and sharp distinction. I do not, at any rate, propose to discuss the various possible lines that may be drawn: or determine exactly when communities forming a union designed to be permanent cease to be individually sovereign - especially as federality in Switzerland has a long career before any sovereignty is claimed. (p.433)

a federal state is only one kind of composite state. As I said in my Elements of Politics, a state including parts that have, from any cause, a high degree of political separateness may be called composite; even if the governments of its parts are controlled regularly by one supreme legislature, so that its constitution remains formally unitary ...

country-state versus city-state
the modern country-state (187)
need of sovereignty, monarchy 191
modern monarchy etc. 194
the unity of the European monarchy against oligarchy and federation of city states (195)

So, monarchical unity to popular unity, which is the nation, via the Hobbesian idea of abstract popular sovereignty!

I have so far treated the 'unity' of a state as depending solely on the fact that its members obey a common government. And I do not think that any other bond is essentially implied in the conception of a state. Still, it should be recognised that a political society, whose members have no consciousness of any ties uniting them independently of their obedience to government can hardly have the cohesive force necessary to resist the disorganising shocks and jars which external wars and internal discontents are likely to cause from time to time. If a political society is to be in a stable and satisfactory condition, its members must have - what members of the state state sometime lack - a consciousness of belonging to one another, of being members of one body, over and above what they derive from the mere fact of being under one government; and it is only when I conceive them as having this consciousness that I regard the state as being also a 'nation'. According to the generally accepted ideal of modern political thought a state ought certainly to be also a nation; still we cannot say that the characteristic of being a nation is commonly implied in the current use of the term 'state' or 'political society'.(26-7)

'We live in a world which is increasingly punctuated by crises which daily affect the welfare and life-chances of countless millions of human beings'. (David Held, 'A Discipline of Politics?' in his Political Theory and the Modern State (Cambridge, 1989), p. 244
To mistake the *civitas* to the *natio* in Roman terms was inexcusable. A *natio* was a group of foreigners coming from the same geographical region, whose status was not being members of the *civitas*. Guido Zernatto, *Nation: The History of the Word*, *Review of Politics* 6 (1944), pp. 351-66.

Sieyès:
ideas which suit ‘les plus petites municipaltés’ are not suitable for the government of 26 million people. ‘France n’est point, ne peut pas être une démocratie; elle ne doit point devenir un état fédéral, composé d’une multitude de republiques, unies par un lien politique quelconque. La France est et doit être un seul tout, soumis dans toutes ses parties à une legislation et à une adminstration communes’ (Dire sur la question du veto royal, p. 237)

Je regarde le PREMIER CITOYEN comme le surveillant naturel, pour la nation, du pouvoir exécutif. J’identifie la roi avec la nation; ensemble, ils font cause commune contre les erreurs et les entreprises du ministère (p. 231)

Dire de l’Abbé Sieyes sur la Question du Veto Royal, & C. A la séance du 7 semptembre 1789

*`moi, a-t-elle dit, qui ne suis qu’un avec la nation.`

laws are also representations of the nation (232)

S. want equal political rights, freed from the politiqual consequences of the distinction of ranks.

La roi, considere comme PREMIER CITOYEN, comme CHEF de la nation, est cense representant de la nation dans toutes assemblees graduellles, jusqu’a l’Assemble nationale. (233)

dechirer la France en une infinite de petites democracies, qui ne s’uniroient ensuite que par les liens d’une confederation generelle, a peu pres comme les 13 ou 14 Etats-Unis d’Amerique se sont confederes en convention generelle. (p. 234)

La France ne doit point être un assemblage de petites nations, qui se gouvernoient sépaérement en democracies; elle n’est point une collection d’Etats; elle est un tout unique, composé de parties int égrantes; ces parties ne doivent point avoir séparément une existence complète, pace qu’elles ne sont point des toutes simplement unis, mais des parties ne formant qu’un seul tout Cette différence est grande; elle nous intéresse essentiellement (p. 234)

Au lieu d’une administration générale, qui, partant d’un centre commun, va frapper uniformément les parties les plus reculées d l’empire … (p. 234)

integrate the innards of the country, which otherwise is just an unordered ‘chaos of customs, regulations, particular prohibitions of each locality’ (235)

S. doesn’t use ‘nations’ to describe the parts, but municipalities and provinces (235), which needs to be united as one community as one single source of legislation.

what unites modern European peoples is the division of labour (p. 236)

against the ‘appeal to the people’, the principle of direct democracy

The National Assembly must be ‘one and indivisible’ (p.242)

Proposition: France not a republic of small states, but a single kingdom, uniform, etc. (p. 244)

It the notion of the state is derived from Hobbes, and the notion of the nation from French revolutionary constitutional thought, than the idea of a ‘nation-state’ is not so much an oxymoron, but a redundant tautology. The nation is not the boundary principle in either of them, for Hobbes it is the extent of the a state’s defensive capability which constitutres the boundary, for Sieyes the capability to
enter into a system of sociability defined by the division of labour. In the proper 'nation-state' nation is the boundary principle, and in order to function as such it has be given a specific embodied meaning in ethnic, linguistic and perhaps racial terms.

Emmerich de Vattel, *Droit des gens* (1758) 'A nation is a political body, or a society of men united together to procure their advantage and security by their common force'

Sieyes: 'The nation exists before anything, it is at the origin of everything. Its will is always legal, it is the law itself' (257) 'If the nation, to become a nation, had been required to await a positive mode of being, it would never have been ... ' (257)

Jean-Joseph Mounier, first constitutional committee, established on 6 July
constitution could be created by the free and formal consent of a nation (258)

cannot be direct democracy of the Champs de Mars, p. 259)

Mounier:
The French are not a new people that has just left the forests to form an association, but a vast society of twenty-four million persons that wishes to tighten the bonds uniting all its parts and to regenerate the realm, a society for whom the principles of true monarchy will always be sacred (215, 260)

difference between Mousnier and Sieyes (263)
Sieyes: not only limiting an existing power, but creating one de novo. (264)
more was needed to establish the fact that 'there is only one power, only one authority' (264)
note in year III, unpublished, quoted by Forsyth

Préliminaire de la constitution. Reconnaissance et exposition raisonnée des droits de l'homme et du citoyen. Lu les 20 et 21 juillet 1789, au comité de constitution, Ecrits politiques, 189-206

Forsyth, 110

that rights were the result of a social contract rather than prior to it - a position that Démeunier, in turn, characterized as 'the system of Hobbes, rejected by the whole of Europe' (454) (268)

Mounier a Monarchien

Rousseauian terms (274) or Hobbesian?

If it was Rousseauian, once representation was added to it, it was by definition Hobbesian!

National assembly:
Mounier against the nation:
if the nation was the basis of deciding on a new constitution de novo, that 'to his mind, this notion was the purest metaphysical nonsense. It required the absurd conception of the nation as existing prior to government, prior to laws, prior to magistrates. For Mounier, this was logical impossibility, since 'a people in a body that recognised no head would be convulsed in the most horrible anarchy'. (276)
i.e. the retroactive building could not be the same as the forward looking state building. Good.

Mounier:
The nation never intended to do injury to the true principles of monarchy; it only wished that limits be determined to prevent its degenerating in future into arbitrary power (587, p. 276)
The debate on the royal veto was a crucial one from the point of view of transforming the monarchy into a 'nation-state'. But the borders of France remained!

The king was the 'principal part of the state' (p. 281)

Mirabeau: 'The nation is the whole, is all .... 'the nation is not a part, but the whole' (609-10, 281)

The constitution and hence the nation was anterior to the monarchy (611, 281) without a veto, Mousnier said 'He would be absolutely only a magistrate following its orders or a mere general of the army; the government would no longer be monarchical but republican (282)

concedes half-way

It is an incontestable truth that the source of sovereignty resides in the nation, that all authority emanates from it, but the nation cannot govern itself' (283)

argument against ancient democracies, dangerous in small states, in a large state was a dangerous chimera.

The nation isn't sovereign, it is the source of sovereignty, it actually then delegates its sovereignty.

Mounier: crazy for the French to seek to retain the direct exercise of sovereignty: 'One must understand this latter term as meaning indefinite and absolute power' ... 'Thus to say that a nation is sovereign is to say that it has all the powers' (566, 283)

The opposition is between the nation being the source of sovereignty, or directly being the sovereign (285)

Mounier and Sieyes' arguments coalesced around the same formulation, although in pursuance of opposite strategies over the royal veto

The Rousseauist conclusion was that the people must exercise sovereignty

Sieyes found the notion of an appeal to the people incoherent (295)

monarch as first citizen

the nation is the constituent power
unity and indivisibility instituted in the creation of the National Assembly on 17 June 1789.

defence of representative government

'France is and must be a single whole, subject in all its parts to common legislation and administration' (594, 298)

society was a large workshop

, the would be citizens were 'work machines', the whole political system was exclusively based on work' (299)

'The expression appeal to the people is therefore as much mistaken as it is impolitic. In a country that is not a democracy - and France cannot be - the people, I repeat, can speak or act only through their representatives'. (300)

Instead of a general administration, originating from a common centre to strike uniformly the most distant parts of the empire; instead of legislation deriving from elements furnished by all the citizens and recomposed in mounting to the National assembly, which is alone charged to interpret the general will - which then falls back with all the weight of an irresistible force on the very wills that had contributed to its formation - we could only have, in the interior of a realm bristling with barriers of all kinds, a chaos of customs, regulations, and prohibitions particular to each locality (593, 300)
Sieyès here defined the nation without reference to the historical traditions of France as a purely theoretical understanding of the people as a multitude united in such as capable of acting as one body (a union, a society, a people, a nation) under the direction of one will, the model for which in Sieyès' case was not at all Rousseau's patriotic general will, but a theory of utilitarian sociability based on the model of the division of labour.

He gave a theoretical history of the stages of political community building, as the rise of the compacted unity of free individuals (76)

The nation forms itself solely under natural law, its is the very basis of constitutions, cannot be constituted by the balance and contracts of parts such as the corporate orders of the mixed constitution. This would suppose that the three parts could contract with each other because they were sort of nations, entities which could enter into positive constitutional action because by previous right.

the nation was first and foremost the active unity of individuals as the providing the constituent power of the body politic, secondly a combination of labour.

'Even if the nation enjoyed regular States-General, this constituted body would be incompetent to decide on a dispute concerning its own constitution.' (p. 131)

Kohn:
Nationalism ... is not older than the second half of the eighteenth century. Its first great manifestation was the French Revolution, which gave the new movement an increased dynamic force'. (3)

'Nationalism is inconceivable without the ideas of popular sovereignty preceding - without a complete revision of the position of ruler and ruled, of classes and castes.' (3)

'The growth of nationalism is the process of integration of the masses of the people into a common political form. Nationalism presupposes the existence, in fact or as an ideal, of a centralized form of government over a large and distinct territory. This form was created by the absolute monarchs, who were the pacemakers of modern nationalism; the French Revolution inherited and continued the centralising tendencies of the kings, but at the same time it filled the central organisation with a new spirit and gave it power of cohesion unknown before. Nationalism is unthinkable before the emergence of the modern state in the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Nationalism accepted this form, but changed it by animating it with a new feeling of life and with a new religious fervor' (4)

'Nationalism is a child of the French Revolution' Gooch
Nationalism is modern, very modern Carlton J.H. Hayes

William Hazlitt:
'Patriotism, in modern times, and in great states, is and must be the creature of reason and reflection, rather than the offspring of physical and local attachment. ....

The first mention in French of nationalism was by the ex-jesuit abbé Barruel in his published in Hamburg in 1798-9. 'Nationalism', he wrote, 'took the place after 1789 of philanthropy. ... It was then permissible to despise foreigners, to deceive them, to be offensive to them. This virtue was called "patriotism"' Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du jacobinisme (5 vols., Hamburg, 1798-9), vol. 3, p. 184, cited by F. Baldensprenger, La révolution française, vol. 11 (Paris, 1892), p. 263

Power, in the modern world, is principally about the control of the state. The central task is to relate nationalism to the objectives of obtaining and using state power. (Breuilly, 1)

The term 'nationalism' is used to refer to political movements seeking or exercising state power and justifying such action with nationalist arguments.
A nationalist argument is a political doctrine built upon three basic assertions:
(a) There exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character
(b) The interests and values of this nation take priority over all other interests and values
(c) The nation must be as independent as possible. This usually requires at least the attainment of political sovereignty

Diderot in the Encyclopédie: 'nation' 'une quantité considérable de peuple qui habite une certaine étendue de pays, renfermée dans de certaines limites, et qui obéit au même gouvernement'

Rousseau Dann and Dinwiddy p. 8

Dann and Dinwiddy
If a nation-state had already been in existence during the period of the ancien régime, the crucial point was the problem of sovereignty. The new nation only had to conquer the existing state. In this situation the national movement was identical with the struggle for democratic reforms and institutions (9)

Furetière, Dictionnaire, 1690: 'Nation signifies a great people inhabiting a single are of territory defined by certain boundaries, or even under a certain dominion'.

Dictionnaire de l’Académie française, 1694, 1740, 1762
A Nation is constituted by all the inhabitants of a single State, of a single country, who live under the same laws and employ the same language'.

everything which was called royal became renamed national Godechot, 15

Léon Duguit, Traité de droit constitutionnel (2 vols., Paris, 1911), I. 607: 'In the French doctrine, as it was expressed in our constitutions of the revolutionary era and of 1848, the nation is the titular source of sovereignty. The nation is a person with all the attributes of personality, conscience and will. The “person” of the nation is ... distinct from the State, and is anterior to it; the state can only exist where there is a nation, and the nation can subsist even when the state no longer exists or does not yet exist'. (15)

Nationalism

Hugh Seton-Watson
'little point in trying to analyse nationalism itself as an ideology'. ‘Its essence is very simple: it is an application to national communities of the Enlightenment doctrine of popular sovereignty. ... The rest of nationalist ideology is rhetoric’ (Nations and States p. 445)

Gellner
‘Their [any nationalist writer] precise doctrines are hardly worth analysing’ p. 124

B. Anderson
contrast between ‘political power’ and ‘their philosophical poverty and even incoherence’ nationalism is not an ideology, but rather something like ‘kinship’ and ‘religion’

Jacobins, Barere thinks the national interest is like a ‘pater familias’ Szporluk, p. 81

Rousseau ‘if not outright nationalist theorists, were major contributors to theories of nationalism’ 82

Rousseau was the first among modern thinkers to argue that a nation exists independently of the state ... 82?

Hobsbawm, 1972 good p. 82
public became redefined as national 85 (not the monarchy was redefined?)

B. Anderson marxist see 86
print as standard print languages

Herder

Nationalism 1938

2 kinds of nationalism
differentiates between that of the 19th and the 20th c.

one: nation is distinct from the state, pride of national culture, aims at cultural homogeneity in the newly created state transformed from dynastic empire. For example Eastern Europe, national emancipation, adapted by Great Britain and France, seemed not 'incompatible with the preservation of world peace or even the attainment of world federation'. (330)

20th nationalism: more aggressive, sees the 'State as a moral absolute, economic nationalism, and territorial expansion at the expense of alien peoples'. 330 'incompatible with the peaceful co-existence of nation-States, since it implies the right of any one nation-State to increase its power and wealth by any methods irrespective of the effect of other States'. (331)

2nd type 'is integrally bound up with the idea of the State; and it is from the ideology of the state rather than from that of the nation,...., that the characteristics which have been recently brought nationalism into disrepute are derived They are typical of recurring phases of State development and State philosophy; ... They are not therefore to be regarded as being in any way of the essence of nationalism, though they no doubt derive an impetus from their association with nationalism in certain states'. 331

or they are two phases of the same idea. Becoming, and then use of the fusion of nation and state. 331

the situation, mainly external, which determines

is there any connection with a particular kind of government?

1 with liberal democracy rights of man etc. bad things are the reaction against liberal nationalism, it is a paradox to attach it to totalitarianism. 334

2 modern totalitarian state 333
liberal nationalism was an oxymoron, had to give way to authoritarianism, from Rousseau through Hegel to Mussolini and Hitler 334
communitarian, nation is the highest value 334

3rd school, nationalism does not belong to either tendency, it can go with both

Asia will go nationalist as industrialisation spreads 335

339
Europe may become a large multinational nation-state, but it will have then to develop as a nation 339, a common loyalty, different in scale, not in kind