Nation Formation and National Identity

MONTSERRAT GUIBERNAU
_____ Doctor, Reader in Politics – The Open University

1. INTRODUCTION

In a globalized world in which national and ethnic diversity have become more visible than ever before, how is national identity constructed? What are the connections between national identity and citizenship? Since its establishment, the nation-state has enjoyed access to substantial power and resources which often have been employed to generate a single national identity among its citizens. The intensification of globalization processes has prompted the transformation of the classical nation-state by breaking its monopoly over the economy, defence, the media and culture, among many other aspects and functions. Rising global interdependence and the emergence of transnational political and economic forces are shifting the locus of real decision-making elsewhere. At the same time, small political and economic units have become functional in a globalized world, and this in part accounts for the unexpected salience which nations without states are currently acquiring.

In this paper, I argue that the nation-state has been fundamentally transformed by the impact of globalization, however, such transformations instead of signaling the nation state's irrevocably demise have prompted the nation-state to recast its classical nature. Further to this, in my view, there is some kind of inherent contradiction concerning the effects of globalization upon the state's ability to generate a single national identity among its citizens. Yet while globalization has provided the nation-state with the most potent means to achieve the cultural homogenization of its population, it has also rendered possible the emergence of cultural flows which break national borders and threaten the state's monopoly upon culture and the media.

In the first part of this paper, I examine how some of the main features of the classical nation-state are being altered under the influence of globalization processes. Here I introduce the concept of the post-traditional nation-state to

refer to a new type of state which has emerged as a result of substantial modifications being made to traditional conceptions of state sovereignty, territoriality and legitimacy over the absolute control of the means of violence. The second part focuses upon the study of national identity. It considers to what extent the main strategies traditionally employed by the nation-state to generate a single national identity among its citizens have been transformed under the impact of globalization.

2. DEFINITIONS

Previous to any discussion about these issues we need to establish a clear-cut distinction between four main concepts: state, nation, nation-state and national identity. By 'state', taking Weber's definition, I refer to 'a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory' (Weber, 1991, 78), although not all states have successfully accomplished this, and some of them have not even aspired to accomplish it. By 'nation', I refer to a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself (Guibernau, 1996, 47). The nation-state is a modern political institution, characterized by the formation of a kind of state which has the monopoly of what it claims to be the legitimate use of force within a demarcated territory and seeks to unite the people subjected to its rule by means of cultural and linguistic homogenization. National identity is based upon the sentiment of belonging to a specific nation, endowed with its own symbols, traditions, sacred places, ceremonies, heroes, history, culture and territory.

But there is yet another term that needs to be defined: globalization. So far, no singular account of globalization has acquired the status of orthodoxy and for this reason the following section offers a brief outline of some definitions while assessing competing approaches to the subject.

Throughout this paper I understand globalization to refer to the intensification of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life. Globalization is characterized by instantaneous communication and much greater human interdependence than ever before made possible by the technological revolution which has been taking place in the last twenty years or so. One of globalization's most significant consequences is the redefinition of space and time. This involves changes in the perceptions of the physical

limits of space, and a dramatic reduction in the time required producing and processing information.

Intrinsic to globalization is the dialectic of the local and the global, a process by which local events are transformed and shaped under the influence of the extension of social connections stretching across time and space. At the same time, local happenings achieve a completely new significance when they are removed from the perceived time and space where they take place. The local and the global intertwine forming a web in which both elements are transformed as a result of their own interconnections. Globalization expresses itself through the tension between the forces of the global community and those of cultural particularity, ethnic and cultural fragmentation, and homogenization.

3. GLOBALIZATION AND THE NATION-STATE

Does globalization signal the end of the nation-state's era? or on the contrary, is globalization prompting the emergence of a new type of nation-state? To what extent is the traditional concept of state sovereignty being altered? This section examines changes concerning the nation-state system, the nation-state's capacity to exert administrative control, its power to claim the legitimate monopoly of the means of violence within a given territory, and its territoriality. From now on, I operate with what could be described as an over-simple dichotomy between the 'classical' nation-state and the 'post-traditional' (post-classical) nation-state. I am justified, I believe, in using this dichotomy because these two terms exemplify two contrasting ideal types of how the nation-state could be defined both before and after globalization. The main emphasis of the section is upon providing an account of the key changes affecting the nation-state in its original, *i.e.* 'Western' habitat. Thus, whenever I speak of 'the nation-state', the reader should understand 'Western nation-state' and, most often, 'European nation-state', unless otherwise specified.

3.1. The nation-state system

It is not until the nineteenth century that we find a Europe divided into clearly defined nation-states – even as late as 1871 in the case of Italy and Germany. It is precisely from this period onwards that the nation-state became recognized as the unit of political power *par excellence*. It was also around that

time when emigrant populations from Europe, set up 'colonized nation-states' in distant areas of the world, for example the Latin American states, the USA, Canada and Australia. Most of these states were created after wiping out indigenous groups or reducing them to a tiny fraction of the overall population. These new states generally achieved independence after fighting wars of national liberation against the metropolitan powers.

Further to this, the overseas empires build by some European states were progressively dismantled after World War II and resulted in a considerable number of new independent states being created in Asia and Africa. Many of these post-colonial states turned into 'state-nations', a term that refers to a situation in which a state is arbitrarily designed ignoring the cultural and linguistic identities of the groups falling within its boundaries and aspires to become a nation. The notion 'state without a nation' perfectly applies to Third World countries where in most cases there is no sense in which a nation precedes the emergence of the state.

It could be argued that 'states without a nation' also exist in Europe and elsewhere, since most nation-states contain more than one nation or parts of nations within their territory. Furthermore, some nation-states find it hard to establish a shared core of cultural, historical and linguistic elements among their citizens. But to apply the term 'state-nation' to a Western European country would not be accurate, since, in this case, the problem is not the lack of a nation to legitimize the state but the existence of more than one nation living within the state's boundaries. This might also be true of a few African and Asian cases for example Nigeria and Burma. Most Western nation-states are based upon one of its nations becoming dominant and subduing the other nations or parts of nations included within their territories. Often, many of these other nations have memories of a time when they had enjoyed their own independent political institutions. For instance, in Spain, Castilian culture and language have dominated the state since the eighteenth century and have attempted the assimilation of Catalans, Basques and Galicians. The English language and culture have prevailed within Britain and as a result of this, Scots, Welsh and Cornish have been anglicized despite the current re-emergence of nationalism in these areas.

At the dawn of the twenty-first century, the nation-state remains the primary actor in international relations; being a sovereign nation-state seems to be the chief international status symbol as well as to confer entrance to world society. The nation-state is defined as existing within a system of nation-states which has traditionally been based upon the mutual recognition of sovereignty which simultaneously provides an ordering principle for what is 'internal' to states and what is 'external' to them. In this context, the relation

between sovereignty and the principle of equality of states becomes very close, since

> "a state cannot become sovereign except within a system of other sovereign states, its sovereignty being acknowledged by them; in this there is a strong pressure towards mutual recognition as equals, whatever the factual situation in respect of differential power" (Giddens, 1985, 282).

The nation-state system is now confronted with an unprecedented rise in the number of intergovernmental organisations, international and supranational agencies and institutions ranging from the United Nations (UN) to the European Union (EU), including also non-state actors and transnational bodies which include multinational corporations, pressure groups and non-governmental organisations such as Greenpeace or Amnesty International, among many others.

The proliferation of new political actors in the global arena challenges the traditional model of individual sovereign states entitled to autonomous and independent action. To a certain extent, it also expands its scope beyond traditional geopolitical concerns to involve a wide range of financial, security, ecological and social issues. In this light, the growing number of transnational and international agencies and organizations reflects and simultaneously contributes to the strengthening of a sense of greater interdependence between diverse peoples, places and governments which come to the fore due to the intensification of globalization processes.

Nevertheless, the nation-state system is still a highly operative body. At present, nation-states are the only officially visible bodies in institutions such as the UN, NATO, ASEAN and other international organisations. Even more crucially, nation-states are the main architects of these institutions and decide on their functioning, conditions for entry and structure and, in most cases, they also financially sustain them.

Further to this, nation-states are the subjects and creators of a global network which, for the most part, disregards national and ethnic minorities as political actors. Nation-states often ignore the demands for self-determination of national minorities living within their territories and, in so doing, they tend to undermine democratic arguments grounded on the principle of popular sovereignty and the right of peoples to self-determination as well as to ignore the force of the emotional bonds which lie at the heart of sub-state forms of nationalism. Yet, it is my contention that the rising number of democratic nationalist movements in what I have referred to elsewhere as "nations without states" (Guibernau, 1999), where there is a cultural community but no independent political institution fully represents it, has the potential to further

erode the present configuration of the nation-state system by questioning the legitimacy and the democratic credentials of some nation-states hostile or reluctant to recognize internal national diversity within their territories.

In spite of the challenges from below and from above that we have just analysed, the nation-state remains the main actor in the international political arena. It is undeniable, however, that new political actors, raging from supra-national and international institutions and organizations to nations without states seeking self-determination and ethnic groups demanding recognition, are day by day acquiring greater significance and forcing the nation-state to recast its traditional nature.

3.2. Administrative control

A key feature of the classical nation-state is its capacity to exert administrative control within a limited territory. This involves the power to legislate and sanction those who trespass the law. Currently, nation-states are faced with an ongoing process involving the increasing intrusion of external bodies in their legislative as well as their judicial functions.

The traditional concept of state sovereignty, which originally emerged in sixteenth century Europe to explain and legitimize the Absolutist State, came to involve the state's control of the economy, culture, social order and communication within a bounded territory which became the legal framework of the state. After the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648,

> "The mutual recognition by states of each other's sovereignty in the most important contemporary matter, religious belief, meant that states were willing to forge certain political objectives in return for internal control and stability. By exploiting the autonomy from external interference sanctioned by this mutual and international agreement, states were able to impose 'sovereignty' on their societies" (Hirst & Thompson, 1999, 257).

It was at that point that the modern state emerged as a territorially specific and politically dominant power dependent in part on international agreements. This traditional concept of a theoretically absolute national sovereignty has been considerably limited and qualified by the growth of international law and organization.

It can be argued that the sovereignty of states is being undermined and that the scope of state authority has narrowed as a consequence of globalization. This is not to imply, however, that states remain static and have turned into redundant political agents. The state's transformative capacity should not be

underestimated. One may argue that the state, as both agent and product of a dynamic and still unfolding historical process, is closely connected institutionally and ideologically with the larger project of modernity and capitalist expansion. Put differently, the state should be considered as an evolving phenomenon embedded in particular space and time rather than as a static geopolitical entity (Camilleri & Falk, 1992, 241).

In the foreseeable future, sovereignty will be much less the defining characteristic of the state's structure or mode of action. As Camilleri and Falk argue,

> "The contemporary world is one where community, autonomy and the division between *internal* and *external* have become sharply contested categories, where the institutional foundations of sovereignty are themselves under challenge. It may well be that the principle of sovereignty was an important, perhaps indispensable, instrument in the development of national capitalism, but that with the emergence of fully-fledged global capitalism we have entered a new historical phase which is beginning to give birth to new forms of political theory and practice" (*Ibid.*, 246).

Right now what becomes unpalatable to some European nation-states is the realization that the changes prompted by further EU political integration are giving way to a completely different political scenario in which their traditional power and status are being challenged in a radical way. There is no route back to the old days when some nation-states could dream of closing their borders and living in isolation. Political, economic and social interdependence is becoming more acute than ever before. This is illustrated by the rise in new forms of 'political regionalism' which involve the proliferation of

> "geographical clusters of contiguous nation-states which share a number of common attributes, have significant levels of interaction, and which enjoy institutionalized cooperation through a formal multilateral structure" (Held et al., 1999, 74).

There are examples of political regionalism emerging in different parts of the world. In Europe, the European Union designates an economic and political community of states, and in South Asia, the South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) defines the boundaries of an emerging political complex. This 'new regionalism' is also emerging in Latin America, especially with the creation of MERCOSUR (Southern Cone Common Market) and in North America with the development of NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement).

The post-traditional nation-state is a political institution able to work in partnership with other states within the framework of larger institutions of which it is so far, the main player and engineer, but progressively, these

institutions are opening up some space for new political actors to emerge and be represented within them.

3.3. Territoriality

Max Weber's definition of the state includes territoriality as one of its main defining features. He refers to it as the space within which the state's regularized administrative staff is able to sustain the claim to the legitimate monopoly of the means of violence (Weber, 1991, 78).

From the late eighteenth century onwards, a process was initiated by means of which the chronically disputed and loosely managed frontiers characteristic of feudalism turned into clearly delimited borders demarcating the territory within which the nation-state could claim its sovereignty. Borders became carefully monitored, and they had to be agreed between different nation-states. In some cases, borders became contested, as when more than one state put forward separate claims upon a single territory. War and diplomacy have been consistently employed to solve this type of dispute.

State borders have traditionally been regarded as an expression of state power, and strong states have sought to expand their territory by conquest, annexation, or other diplomatic means. Indeed, the map of Europe has been redrawn numerous times after intra-state conflicts and external confrontation with other states. During the twentieth century, the two World Wars, the independence achieved by some former Soviet Republics after 1989, the unification of Germany, the break-up of Yugoslavia and the separation of Czechoslovakia illustrate the tendency to almost constant redrawing of borders among states. The legitimacy of such territorial alterations, however, has to be sanctioned by the international community which since 1945 is represented by the United Nations. This is a feature which highlights a key issue in international politics; the constitution of a new sovereign state is not a purely internal affair, rather it requires the approval of the reflexively monitored state system. For instance, the occupation of North Cyprus by Turkey in 1974 resulted in the creation of a 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus' recognized only by Turkey, and condemned by the UN Security Council. The independence of the Baltic Republics, or the new states emerging from the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, or the peaceful separation of Czechoslovakia required and obtained the sanctioning of the international community which responded with different speeds in each particular case. Concepts of sovereignty and popular representation and historic culture were at the heart

of the arguments invoked by those who sought to create independent states when applying for international recognition.

At present, the territoriality of the nation-state is being challenged to a limited extent at two different levels. First, by the 'new regionalism' which tends to generate supra-state organizations cutting across state boundaries, as with the case of the EU after it took the decision to allow the free circulation of goods and peoples within its territory.[1] Second, by the political decentralization of the state and the devolution of power to selected national minorities which are granted the right to re-establish or create their own autonomous political institutions.[2] The nation-state is under pressure from above and from below to redefine its classical concept of territoriality and adjust to a new political scenario within which supranational organizations and sub-state political communities are gaining salience.

3.4. Violence

The state's exclusive control over the means of internal and external violence is being challenged by the advent of nuclear weapons and the intensification of military globalization, a concept which refers exclusively to

> "the process (and patterns) of military connectedness that transcend the world's major regions as reflected in the spatio-temporal and organizational features of military relations, networks and interactions" (Held et al., 1999, 88).

From the sixteenth century to the present, states have been defined by their power to make war and to draw on the lives and property of their citizens in order to do so. During the Cold War period, the constant tension between the capitalist and the communist blocs reinforced the need for permanent mobilization against an ever-present threat of war. The development of nuclear weapons has radically transformed the meaning of war as Clausewitz (See Aron, 1976) conceived it. Traditional war sought to attain some objectives, it was a means to solve some inter-state disputes once diplomacy had failed. In contrast, nuclear war has a sole objective, this is the total destruction of the

---

[1.] The Schengen Agreement (1985 and 1990, implemented in March 1995) signed by Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain – Britain, Ireland and Denmark remained outside – resulted in the abolition of frontiers between the signing parties.
[2.] A recent example corresponds to the British Labour government's programme of constitutional reform which has involved, among other things, the creation of a Scottish Parliament, a Welsh Assembly and also a devolved parliament in Northern Ireland (1999).

combatants and it is in this sense that the development of nuclear weapons has made war impossible between nuclear powers, assuming that their leaders are ready to avoid complete devastation.

Nuclear weapons have resulted in the elimination of conventional war between nuclear states, except for by proxy wars, and, with very few exceptions, have displaced non-nuclear conflicts to peripheral regions, here the defeat of one side would not lead to nuclear confrontation.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction poses a potential threat to all states. Nuclear weapons have acted as a deterrent force, since the leaders of all countries understand that their use could trigger the world's total destruction. In conditions of globalization, the possession of a powerful military arsenal by some individual states is not necessarily a symptom of their enduring sovereignty. Rather it points to their integration into (or emergence as part of) a transnational military system whose construction and operation are increasingly at odds with the theory of sovereignty. Furthermore, nuclear weapons and other new technologies of war demand global deployment and this requires many states to house within their territorial boundaries weapons over which, although they insist on having control, they often have little or none at all.

A separate counter-argument which reflects the tension between the enduring power of the nation state and the challenges posed by globalization refers to the higher status and prestige enjoyed by those nation-states possessing nuclear weapons.

As for the internal control of violence, in theory, states are subject to human rights regulations monitored by NGOs such as Amnesty international, or international organisations sanctioned by the nation-state system such as the UN. According to Dandeker, in the near future

> "the most likely focus of collective violence will be regional conflicts among developing countries or subnational conflicts within one or more of these societies" (Dandeker, 1998, 39).

In his view, armed collective violence will be extruded from the core countries to focus on the interface between core and periphery. In this context, core countries are expected to take upon themselves – willingly or unwillingly – the task of a peacekeeping-type role in regional security operations legitimated through the UN.

The post-traditional nation-state is not to be conceived as an autonomous political actor, free to pursue any external policy in an anarchical society of states. Instead of that, this type of state has greatly increased the number of ways in which it is bound together with other states. Globalization has added

complexity to the international alliance systems and international security structures. The consequence of this is not an increasing irrelevance of the nation-state as a political institution, rather it points to the need to reconsider the centrality of the nation-state's monopoly of violence within a given territory as its major defining feature.

3.5. Summary

1. State sovereignty has been considerably limited and qualified by the intensification of globalization processes which have resulted in the rise of supranational institutions and organizations, and the strengthening of nationalist movements in nations without states.

   Most nation-states are not constituted by a single nation which is coextensive with the state; internal diversity is the rule. The nation-state has traditionally based its legitimacy upon the idea that it represents the nation, in spite of the fact that, often, the state once created had to engage in nation-building processes aiming at the forced homogenization of its citizens. It now becomes apparent that, in many cases, these processes have largely failed; the re-emergence of nationalist movements defending the right to self-determination of the national minorities they claim to represent illustrates this. Nationalist movements emerging in Catalonia, Scotland, Quebec, Kurdistan, Palestine, Corsica, and Tibet are cases in point.

2. Globalization has transformed the classical nation-state's control over the national economy, culture and information in two major ways. On the one hand, it has constrained the power of the nation-state by dramatically increasing the porousness of its borders. At present, there are competing transnational organizations and media actors which are able to cut across national boundaries and penetrate culturally into different societies; they range from international news agencies to multinational advertising companies and powerful television and radio stations. On the other hand, globalization has provided the nation-state with extraordinary resources which, in many respects, strengthen the state's capacity to create and disseminate a homogeneous culture, and select and control the information available to its citizens. Never before had the nation-state such a wide range of potent technology at its disposal. In addition to greater state control over culture and information, these new technologies have dramatically transformed the state's

capacity to control its citizens by means of sophisticated surveillance mechanisms.

3. The threat of nuclear war and the total destruction associated with it has put an end to European wars and to wars between nuclear powers which now tend to fight wars by proxy in peripheral areas of the planet. In recent years we have witnessed a substantial evolution of the international alliance systems and international security structures together with the institutionalization of global regimes with jurisdiction over the military and security affairs.

Globalization by strengthening some of the nation-state's classical functions and limiting and radically transforming others has prompted the emergence of the post-traditional nation-state defined by a type of sovereignty which manifests itself in its power to:

a) Decide upon the creation, functioning and financing of supranational political institutions;

b) Devolve power and provide legitimacy to regional institutions created within its territory;

c) Act as constitutional arbitrator and regulator of law and order within society;

d) Govern public life and the relationships between plural groups co-existing within its territorial boundaries.

Let me now consider how we might best understand national identity in the global age by completing the preceding discussion with an analysis of how the strategies employed by the classical nation-state to generate an homogeneous national identity among its citizens are being transformed under the impact of globalization.

4. GLOBALIZATION AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

At present, national identity is one of the most powerful forms of collective identity. National identity is based upon the sentiment of belonging to a specific nation, endowed with its own symbols, traditions, sacred places, ceremonies, heroes, history, culture and territory. Two major implications derive from this. First, a common national identity favours the creation of solidarity bonds among the members of a given community and allows them to imagine the community they belong to as separate and distinct from others. Second, individuals who enter a culture emotionally charge certain symbols, values,

beliefs and customs by internalizing them and conceiving them as part of themselves. The emotional charge that individuals invest in their land, language, symbols and beliefs while building up their identity, facilitates the spread of nationalism. There is a political dimension to national identity. It refers to the wish of those sharing a common national identity to have the right and the power to decide upon the political destiny of the nation they belong to.

The defining criteria of identity are: continuity over time, and differentiation from others, both fundamental elements of national identity. Continuity springs from the conception of the nation as a historically rooted entity that projects into the future. Differentiation stems from the consciousness of forming a community with a distinctive shared culture attached to a concrete territory, both elements leading to the distinction between members and 'strangers', 'the rest', 'the outsiders'.

Classical nation-states have invariably sought to homogenize their populations and instill in them a sense of common national identity. Wherever the nation-state encountered resistance to its objective, it did not hesitate to apply tough measures ranging from forced assimilation to repression, discrimination, or even mass deportations of people and genocide. Its objective was the annihilation of internal cultural difference. Throughout time, varying degrees of state power, access to resources and commitment to different political ideologies have determined the success and methods employed by different states in their quest for cultural homogenization. Among the main strategies generally employed by the state in its pursuit of a single national identity capable of uniting its citizens are:

1) The construction and dissemination of a certain *image* of the 'nation', often based upon the dominant nation or ethnic group living within the state's boundaries and comprising a common history, a shared culture and a demarcated territory.

2) The creation and spread of a set of symbols and rituals charged with the mission of reinforcing a sense of community among citizens.

3) The advancement of citizenship involving a well-defined set of civil and legal rights, political rights and duties, and socio-economic rights. The state by conferring rights upon its members favours the rise of sentiments of loyalty towards itself. It also establishes a crucial distinction between those *included* and those *excluded* from the community of citizens, this is, between those entitled to certain rights and those deprived from them within the boundaries of the state.

4) The creation of common enemies. The prosecution of war has proven crucial to the emergence and consolidation of a sense of community among

citizens united against an external threat, be it imminent, potential or invented.

5) The progressive consolidation of national education and media systems as key instruments in the dissemination of a particular 'image of the nation' with its symbols and rituals, values, principles, traditions and ways of life, its common enemies, and, even more crucially, a clear cut definition of how a 'good citizen' should be defined.

Significant changes in the context within which these strategies are carried out have been registered in the last twenty years or so. Most of these changes are closely connected to the intensification of globalization processes and the emergence of the post-traditional nation-state. But what are these changes? How can we best understand them? What new challenges do they pose to traditional conceptions of national identity? This is an ambitious task which can not be fully accomplished within the limited scope of this paper. For this reason, in what follows I am only able to sketch some of the major transformations affecting the way in which national identity is already being constructed by the post-traditional nation-state.

4.1. Challenges to an homogeneous national identity

At present, demands for political autonomy or independence are often grounded on the principles of popular sovereignty and democracy. Such claims hold the potential to seriously subvert the idea of a homogeneous national identity which generally ignores intra-state diversity. By advancing their own distinctive identities, national minorities and ethnic groups challenge the state-created myth of a culturally homogeneous people living within its territory. A myth adopted and sought after with varying degrees of intensity and success by different nation-states. It could be argued, however, that social movements pressing for the rights of ethnic groups and national minorities have existed well before the era of globalization. Nevertheless, globalization has added very distinctive features to these movements by providing, to those who can afford it, potent means to promote their own languages and cultures, denounce unfair situations, create virtual resistance networks and organize political action where co-presence is not a necessary condition. Globalization has radically transformed the ways in which information and culture can be created and disseminated.

In addition, globalization has added visibility to the ways in which nation-states conduct politics and deal with their national and ethnic minorities.

Visibility contributes to the denunciation of unjust situations but, so far, it has not proved very efficient in halting repression and changing them. The visibility associated with globalization has placed greater pressure upon nation-states to present themselves as democratic by either genuinely democratizing their functioning and structure or by skillfully seeking to hide their non-democratic practices, something which is becoming increasingly difficult. Greater visibility of national and ethnic minorities has revealed that, in spite of continuous attempts to homogenize their populations, most nation-states remain multinational and multiethnic. This fact, so long hidden and/or neglected, reveals the urgent need for European states to find alternative strategies for the construction of national identity on a more integrative basis. Failure in this respect inevitably threatens social cohesion and fuels further claims for devolution and secession which, in many parts of the world, are already leading to the state's break-up.

The Spanish transition to democracy illustrates how increasing visibility of the democratic claims for recognition put forward by Catalans and Basques, together with the desire to be accepted by Western supranational institutions such as the EU and NATO, prompted a fundamental redefinition of Spain. Such redefinition entitled changes in the Spanish state structure and, to some extent, Spanish national identity. During the Francoist regime (1939-1975) the state imposed an image of Spain defined by centralism, Conservatism, Catholicism and the pre-eminence of Castilian culture. The 1978 Constitution transformed the nature of Spain. Democracy forced the Spanish State to recognize the differences that existed within it and to confer the status of autonomous community upon Catalonia and the Basque Country in the first instance, thus proceeding to a radical modification of the Spanish model of the state. In the new democratic Spain, the creative role the state plays in relation to nationalism in the interconnection between Catalonia and Spain applies reflexively. The definition of Spain has to be examined and reformed in the light of incoming information about Spain itself; this concerns the nations or, in the terms of the 1978 Constitution, the 'nationalities and regions' forming Spain.

The power structure through which the Francoist state was able to impose its own constructed Spanish national identity, persuading social actors – when necessary by force – to adjust at least their public life to it, has now been eroded. Spanish national identity has to be defined in relation to its constituent nations, while these nations are at the same struggling to recuperate and develop the key elements of their specific national identities suppressed under Franco. The very definition of Spain is at stake here: by defining itself as a nation, Catalonia challenges the model of an homogeneous Spanish

national identity defended not only by Francoism but also by some Conservative sectors currently complaining about the substantial autonomy acquired by Catalonia and the Basque Country.

4.2. Cultural confrontation, competition and dialogue

Although nation-states are still capable of generating and disseminating common symbols and reproducing rituals destined to enhance a sense of community among their citizens, they can no longer count on their exclusive capacity to exert cultural control over their territories. The new technologies associated with globalization have loosened the state's ability to impose a single culture upon its population and rendered cultural homogenization difficult. Yet, this assertion has to be qualified because, as we have already mentioned, never before had the nation-state such potent technology at its disposal to generate and disseminate a particular culture and control its population. The post-traditional nation-state seeks to present its national symbols and rituals in isolation from those belonging to other cultures and peoples. But, instead of cultural isolation, we are witnessing increasing interdependence which manifests itself through cultural confrontation, competition and dialogue. Of course, this is not an even phenomenon which affects all nations equally, but it stands as a constantly expanding feature in the age of globalization.

Two specific examples which illustrate this are the Canadian government's campaign to promote, redefine and strengthen Canadian national identity initiated by Primer Minister Pierre Trudeau (1982) in the light of growing support for nationalist parties in Quebec, and the redefinition of Spanish national identity initiated by the Socialist government (1980-1996) and continued by the Conservative Popular Party government (1996-2004). In both cases, greater resources in the hands of the nation-state's governments have resulted in numerous campaigns emphasizing those elements which make up Canadian national identity in one case, and the new post-Francoist Spanish national identity in the other. These campaigns have been confronted by moves to promote and encourage the French language and Quebec culture in Quebec, and the Catalan language and culture in Catalonia. On top of this, Quebecers and Catalans are being influenced by a wide range of information and cultural models which in Quebec arrive primarily through the USA media, and in Catalonia through the Americanized European media. The strength of these different cultural flows is uneven, and deserves careful

examination. For our purposes here it is sufficient to emphasize the complexity of the new cultural context brought about by globalization and how this challenges, in a radical manner, traditional patterns employed by the nation-state in the construction of national identity.

4.3. National identity and citizenship

The whole process of translating the ideas of popular sovereignty into universal adult suffrage required a long and hard struggle during which the Enlightenment ideas began a slow but compelling process, and permeated in varying degrees first the educated classes and then the masses in the various European countries. The achievement of citizenship rights was by no means a process which could be taken for granted, since we can find a contrast between its defence among certain intellectual circles and the strong resistance to it on the part of the more privileged sectors of society.[3]

Citizenship established a clear-cut distinction between those entitled to direct engagement in governance processes and those excluded from them. In the West, the concession of further rights to citizens grew quickly after the Second World War and the establishment of diverse welfare-state models in various countries. Since then, and due to the impact of globalization upon the proliferation of international and supranational institutions, the nation-state's traditional role as a rights-giver *par excellence* has been challenged by institutions such as the United Nations and the European Union. For this reason, some scholars argue that a 'post-national' type of citizenship alongside the existing 'national model' may be emerging in Europe (Soysal, 1994). At this stage, it is not clear how potent and widespread this new model will become.

In the last fifty years, greater emphasis has been placed on Human Rights as defined, and to a certain degree, guaranteed by the United Nations. The

---

[3.] In most European countries, enfranchisement was limited to male citizens owning a certain amount of property – France in 1830 had a population of some 30 million while boasting an electorate of a mere 90,000. But wealth, although it was the main restriction on the franchise, was by no means the only one. Religion too could disenfranchise a man, particularly if he were a Catholic in a Protestant state, or a Jew. In Britain Catholics had to wait until 1829 and Jews until 1858 for the right to vote. The universal franchise for men was mostly obtained by the early years of the present century, while women had to wait longer. In the United States, female suffrage on a par with men was conceded in 1920. In Britain, the campaign for parliamentary suffrage yielded a bitter struggle that only achieved successful results after the First World War when women were conceded voting rights because of the crucial role they had played in the war. Women in Belgium, France, Italy and Japan had to wait for the Second World War to have the same effect in their countries.

definition of specific rights to be conferred upon EU citizens is much more recent. It represents a major step in so far as it breaks the nation-state's unique status as rights-grantor and opens up the possibility for EU citizens, dissatisfied with some aspects of their countries' legislation, to appeal to EU institutions whenever the right in question has already been granted by the EU to its citizens. This specific situation reflects an anomaly based upon the lack of total harmonization between EU laws and regulations and those of its member states, and explains why, in some cases, some countries' rulings have been overridden by the EU Court of Justice.

For instance, it could be argued that EU citizenship, once fully defined, could make redundant a great deal of the EU member states' legislation. In this new political scenario, as some Scottish or Catalan nationalists hold, it would make sense for Scotland or Catalonia to seek independence within the EU, while lessening their ties with Britain and Spain.

So far, the nation-state's status as guarantor of its citizens' rights has contributed to strengthening its ability to instill a sense of common national identity. However, the progressive supersession of the state's traditional role and its replacement by supranational institutions holds the potential to weaken the citizens' loyalty to the state. Consciousness of forming a group with a shared history, culture and territory plays a fundamental part in the construction of national identity and it is unlikely that such a potent emotional attachment could be easily replaced by membership of larger political institutions such as the EU. But this argument should not underestimate the fact that not all citizens feel with the same intensity the emotional bond which connects them to their nation-states. In this respect, the intensity of the emotional attachment of Scots, Welsh, Irish (in Northern Ireland), Catalans, Basques, Flemish, Quebecers, Corsicans and Bretons to their respective nation-states would require careful attention. For instance, it might be worth considering whether greater devolution to nations without states such as Catalonia combined with the consolidation of European citizenship could eventually contribute to weakening the nation-state's capacity to infuse a homogeneous national identity among its citizens. Further to this, one could question to what extent the strengthening of the EU could affect the relationship between different levels of identity.

M. GUIBERNAU

4.4. Finding new common enemies

An essential strategy in the generation of national identity consist of uniting people against a common enemy. Since their foundational period, nation-states have been engaged almost continually in the fighting of war. Territorial, religious, ethnic, political and economic arguments have been employed to justify fighting against a wide range of external enemies.

Wars have contributed to the dissemination of the idea of the nation as a community of fate. Besides, they have generated sentiments of solidarity towards fellow citizens and loyalty to the nation-state. Yet, while in some parts of the world conventional war continues to operate as a practical tool in dealing with enemies and contributing to the generation of a strong sense of national identity, in the West the absence of war poses some questions about how national identity can be constructed in peacetime. A possible response to this question points to the emergence of new kinds of external and internal enemies. The former include more abstract enemies such as the threat of international terrorism, Islamic fundamentalism, organized crime or ecological disasters. The latter may include some national and ethnic minorities, migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers as groups which, for various reasons, represent the 'alien', the 'different' and generally prompt the reinforcement of the state's national identity. Quite often, immigration ends up strengthening the nation-state. In selected cases, some of these 'alien' groups are portrayed as holding a potential threat to the stability, order, prosperity and/or well being of the nation-state. Some political parties and associations employ these type of arguments to justify their stand against migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers, while at the same time displaying a negative attitude towards devolution. Arguments for exclusion grounded on ethnic and national differences can lead to vehement hostility whenever racist and xenophobic ideas are added to them.

In 2000, the entry into Austria's coalition government of Jörg Haider's Freedom party alarmed governments in the rest of Europe. Mr Haider's party is the most successful, yet among the most extreme, representative of a comparatively new breed of far right European parties which play by the rules of democracy and seem to share a deep antipathy to Europe's growing ethnic diversity. These parties share a stance against immigration and have obtained considerable support in various EU countries, the Freedom party in Austria, the Vlaams Blok in Belgium, the National Alliance in Italy, the People's party in Denmark, and the National Republican Movement and the Front National in France. They all portray immigrants as a common enemy against which

nationals should unite and, so far, they have managed to obtain a significant response from the electorate by developing a strategy based upon drawing boundaries between those who 'belong' and those who, in their view, should remain outside.

4.5. Media and education

As we have already mentioned, the post-traditional nation-state actively seeks to retain control of the national media and finds its backing crucial in moulding public opinion. The role of the media, in general and other type of elections, has proven decisive in determining the fate of contending political parties and providing legitimacy to state actions and policies.

Even more important, national education continues to play a fundamental part in defining the national community and supplying a sense of continuity and purpose to the very existence of the nation-state. National education as Gellner (1983) demonstrated, equips individuals with the language and culture which will allow them to live and work within a given society. The importance of controlling the national curricula becomes apparent when the nation-state decides on such vital issues as:
- the content of national history;
- whether to include the languages and cultures of minority nations and ethnic groups as forming a part of the national culture;
- what religions, if any, should be taught to students, and;
- how other countries, peoples and cultures are to be presented.

As a consequence of globalization, the state is gaining greater control over the education system and fighting to increase its control over some of the media. Simultaneously, however, globalization has made possible the creation of continuous flows of information which cut across state boundaries. There is some kind of inherent contradiction concerning the effects of globalization upon the state's capacity to impose an homogeneous image of the nation. At a time when the state has the most potent means to successfully accomplish the cultural homogenization of its citizens, the proliferation of global flows of information hampers the state's objective and breaks its monopoly upon culture and the media. There is great tension between these two consequences resulting from globalization. Matters are further complicated by acknowledging that not all nation-states possess the same power and resources to become global players, and that not all external information and cultural flows have the same ability to reach ordinary citizens in different

parts of the world. Furthermore, the status and social class of citizens determines the variety and quality of the information they have access to; a very substantial number of citizens still remain deeply influenced by the national education and media system.

A crucial question when dealing with the impact of globalization upon culture is whether we are moving towards a unitary global culture or, on the contrary, whether globalization will strengthen the power and favour the blossoming of particular cultures. Globalization when applied to culture is an enabling as well as a constraining phenomenon. By enabling, I mean the unprecedented possibilities for expansion and reproduction of particular cultures that the development of new technologies has favoured. The constraining aspect refers to the undeniable difference in access to resources between different cultures.

Here I have only been able to sketch some of the major transformations brought about by globalization that need to be considered in any attempt to analyze the main strategies employed by the post-traditional nation-state in the construction of national identity. They concern the ways in which the 'image' of the nation is constructed, changes involving the re-definition of citizenship rights and duties, the construction of new 'common enemies', and the break-up of the state's monopoly over the national education and media systems.

5. CONCLUSION

Globalization is dramatically transforming the context within which political action takes place and forces the nation-state to fundamentally recast its nature in order to react to unprecedented challenges concerning state power and world politics. The nation-state is no longer the unique centre of governance and authority, rather its territory is steadily losing its relevance as a frame for political, economic, social and cultural life.

In recent years, globalization has contributed to the transformation of the conditions upon which the traditional building blocks of national identity were based. At present, one of the nation-state's greatest challenges concerns the urgency to redefine national identity. In my view, if they are to meet these challenges, European states need to construct what could be referred to as a more 'pluralist' national identity by which I mean a type of identity grounded upon a re-newed concept of the state as a democratic institution, efficient in

solving its citizens' daily troubles, capable of opening new spaces for dialogue, and ready to accommodate national and ethnic diversity within its boundaries.

The failure to do so will inexorably lead to a radicalization of state nationalism as a backlash against mounting pressure to tolerate and recognize national and ethnic diversity. Although some states may feel tempted to follow this path, it is likely to be a shortsighted strategy embedded in some kind of obstinate resistance to the recognition of the fact that there is no room for the 'classical nation-state' in the global age. Even more crucially, there is no longer any place for the attempt to enforce a single national identity upon the state's citizens if democratic principles including that of consent are to prevail.

The post-traditional nation-state is faced with the need to accept the consolidation, and where they did not previously exist, the emergence of multiple identities expressing regional as well as supranational allegiances which are closely connected with the rise of multilayered forms of governance at a local, regional, national and supranational level.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
EU	European Union
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
UN	United Nations

REFERENCES

ALBROW (M.), *The Global Age*, Cambridge, 1996.
ARON (R.), *Penser la guerre – Clausewitz*, Paris, 1976.
BOYER (R.) & DRACHE (D.) (eds.), *States against Markets*, London, 1996.
CAMMILLERI (J.A.) & FALK (J.), *The End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmented World*, Aldershot, 1992.
CASTELLS (M.), *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford, 1996.

DANDEKER (C.) (ed.) 1998 *Nationalism and Violence*, New Brunswick and London: Transaction.

GELLNER (E.), *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford, 1983.

GIDDENS (A.), *The Nation-State and Violence*, Cambridge, 1985.

GIDDENS (A.), *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, 1990.

GUÉHENNO (J.M.), *The End of the Nation-State*, Minneapolis, 1995.

GUIBERNAU (M.), *Nationalisms: the nation-state and nationalism in the twentieth century*, Cambridge, 1996.

GUIBERNAU (M.), *Nations without States*, Cambridge, 1999.

GUIBERNAU (M.), *Catalan Nationalism*, London, 2004.

GUIBERNAU (M.), & HUTCHINSON (J.), *History and National Destiny*, Oxford, 2004.

HELD (D.), "Democracy, the nation-state, and the global system" in: D. HELD (ed.), *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge, 1991, pp. 89-112.

HELD (D.) & McGREW (A.), GOLDBLATT (D.) & PERRATON (J.), *Global Transformations*, Cambridge, 1999.

HELD (D.) & McGREW (A.), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge, 2000.

HIRST (P.) & THOMPSON (G.), *Globalization in Question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance*, Cambridge, 1996.

HIRST (P.) & THOMPSON (G.), *Globalization in Question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance*, Cambridge, 1999 [1996] 2nd edition.

HOOGVELT (A.), *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The New Political Economy of Development*, London, 1997.

HUNTINGTON (S.P.), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, 1996.

KEOHANE (R.O.), "'Hobbes' dilemma and institutional change in world politics: sovereignty in international society" in: H.H. HOLM & G. SORENSSEN (eds.), *Whose World Order?*, Boulder, 1995, pp. 231-245.

OHMAE (K.), *The End of the Nation State*, New York, 1996 (1995).

ROSENAU (J.), *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*, Cambridge, 1997.

RUGGIE (J.G.), "Territoriality and beyond", *International Organization*, XLI, 1993, pp. 39-52.

RUIGROK (W.) & VAN TULDER (R.), *The Logic of International Restructuring*, London, 1995.

SCHOLTE (J.A.), *International Relations of Social Change*, Buckingham, 1993.

SMITH (A.D.), *Nationalism and Modernism*, London, 1998.

SOYSAL (Y.), *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Post-national Membership in Europe*, Chicago IL, 1994.

STRANGE (S.), *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*, Cambridge, 1996.

WEBER (M.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, H. GERTH & J. WRIGHT MILLS (eds.), London, 1991 [1948].

WRISTON (W.), *The Twilight of Sovereignty*, New York, 1992.

Natievorming en nationale identiteit

MONTSERRAT GUIBERNAU

_____ SAMENVATTING _____

De soevereiniteit van de staat wordt aanzienlijk beperkt en in banen geleid door het mondialiseringsproces, dat zorgde voor de opkomst van supranationale instellingen en organisaties en het versterken van nationalistische gevoelens in staatsloze naties.

De meeste natiestaten bestaan niet uit één natie die parallel loopt met de staat; interne diversiteit is de regel. Het wordt nu stilaan duidelijk dat staatsgeleide natievormingsprocessen vaak faalden; de wederopkomst van nationalistische bewegingen die het zelfbeschikkingsrecht van nationale minderheden vragen, illustreert dit.

De globalisering heeft de klassieke controle van de natiestaat over de nationale economie, cultuur en informatie in twee opzichten veranderd. Enerzijds heeft dit proces de macht van de natiestaat beperkt door zijn grenzen meer en meer open te stellen. Anderzijds heeft de globalisering de natiestaat van buitengewone hulpmiddelen voorzien, die de capaciteit van de staat om een homogene cultuur te creëren en om de informatie die voor de burgers beschikbaar is te selecteren en te controleren. Nooit eerder had de natiestaat zulk een groot technologisch potentieel. Daarenboven zorgen deze nieuwe technologieën ervoor dat de staat zijn burgers kan controleren door middel van gesofisticeerde systemen.

Klassieke natiestaten hebben steeds getracht de bevolking te homogeniseren door hen een gemeenschappelijke nationale identiteit op te dringen. Doorheen de tijd hebben de verschillende niveaus van staatsmacht, toegang tot rijkdom en toewijding tot politieke ideologieën het succes en de methodes voor culturele homogenisering bepaald. Bij de belangrijkste gebruikte strategieën hiervoor behoren:

1. Het opbouwen en propageren van een zeker _beeld_ van de 'natie'.
2. Het creëren en verspreiden van een aantal symbolen en rituelen die het gemeenschapsgevoel bij de burgers zouden kunnen versterken.

M. GUIBERNAU

3. Het toekennen van het burgerschap.
4. Het creëren van gemeenschappelijke vijanden.
5. Het consolideren van nationale educatie en mediasystemen.

De laatste twintig jaar traden significante veranderingen op in de context waarin deze strategieën werden uitgevoerd. De meeste van deze veranderingen zijn gerelateerd aan het intensifiërende mondialiseringsproces en de opkomst van de posttraditionele natiestaat. Dit artikel heeft getracht deze veranderingen te onderzoeken en de belangrijkste hedendaagse strategieën van de staat in het opbouwen van een nationale identiteit te belichten.

Formation de la Nation et identité nationale

MONTSERRAT GUIBERNAU

—————————————— RÉSUMÉ——————————————

Le processus de la mondialisation limite fortement le pouvoir souverain et son bon fonctionnement. Il induit, en effet, le développement d'institutions et d'organisations supranationales et renforce les sentiments nationalistes dans les Nations privées d'État.

Les États-Nations se fondent rarement sur une Nation unique évoluant en parallèle avec l'État. Dans ce domaine, la diversité interne est la règle. Il s'avère de plus en plus que le processus de formation d'une Nation, conditionné par l'État, est voué à l'échec. La montée des mouvements nationalistes, qui demandent le droit à disposer d'eux-mêmes pour les minorités nationales, en est l'illustration.

La globalisation modifie de deux manières le contrôle classique qu'exerce l'État-Nation sur son économie, sa culture et sur l'information nationale. D'une part, ce processus réduit la puissance de l'État-Nation, contrainte d'ouvrir davantage ses frontières. D'autre part, la globalisation pourvoit l'État-Nation de moyens extraordinaires augmentant sa capacité à créer une culture

homogène, à sélectionner et à vérifier l'information mise à la disposition du citoyen. L'État-Nation n'a jamais eu l'usage d'un tel potentiel technologique, qui lui permet, en outre, de contrôler les citoyens à l'aide de systèmes sophistiqués.

Les États-Nations classiques ont toujours tenté de rendre la population homogène en lui imposant une identité nationale commune. De tout temps, les différents niveaux du pouvoir étatique ont déterminé l'accès à la richesse, la consécration d'idéologies politiques, le succès et les méthodes d'une uniformisation culturelle. Les stratégies les plus importantes visant ces objectifs sont les suivantes:

1. Conception et diffusion d'une certaine *image* de la 'nation'.
2. Création et propagation de symboles et de rituels aptes à renforcer le sentiment d'appartenance du citoyen.
3. Octroi de la citoyenneté.
4. Consolidation nationale de l'éducation et des médias.

Au cours des vingt dernières années, le contexte dans lequel ces stratégies sont mises en œuvre a changé de manière significative. La plupart des modifications sont liées au processus croissant de la mondialisation et à l'apparition de l'État-Nation post-traditionnel. Le présent article analyse ces changements et tente de mettre en lumière les stratégies contemporaines, opérées par l'État, visant à construire une identité nationale.

M. GUIBERNAU