Chapter 1 : State, Nation and Ethnicity in Contemporary South Asia - Ishtiaq Ahmed - Google Books

Most modern societies are socially, culturally, sexually, religiously, and ethnically heterogeneous; all authors agreed that states should resist the temptation to claim cultural ownership of the political community and instead should strike a balance between unity and diversity.

The term racism is a noun describing the state of being racist, i. The origin of the root word "race" is not clear. Linguists generally agree that it came to the English language from Middle French , but there is no such agreement on how it came into Latin-based languages, generally. By the end of World War II , racism had acquired the same supremacist connotations formerly associated with racialism: The term "race hatred" had also been used by sociologist Frederick Hertz in the late s. As its history indicates, the popular use of the word racism is relatively recent. The word came into widespread usage in the Western world in the s, when it was used to describe the social and political ideology of Nazism , which saw "race" as a naturally given political unit. Today, some scholars of racism prefer to use the concept in the plural racisms in order to emphasize its many different forms that do not easily fall under a single definition and they also argue that different forms of racism have characterized different historical periods and geographical areas. First, a historical, hierarchical power relationship between groups; second, a set of ideas an ideology about racial differences; and, third, discriminatory actions practices. The UDHR recognizes that if people are to be treated with dignity, they require economic rights , social rights including education , and the rights to cultural and political participation and civil liberty. It further states that everyone is entitled to these rights "without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour , sex , language , religion , political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. According to the UN International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination , [18] the term "racial discrimination" shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction, or preference based on race, colour, descent , or national or ethnic origin that has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life. They are born equal in dignity and rights and all form an integral part of humanity. Sociology of race and ethnic relations Sociologists , in general, recognize "race" as a social construct. This means that, although the concepts of race and racism are based on observable biological characteristics, any conclusions drawn about race on the basis of those observations are heavily influenced by cultural ideologies. Racism, as an ideology, exists in a society at both the individual and institutional level. While much of the research and work on racism during the last half-century or so has concentrated on "white racism" in the Western world, historical accounts of race-based social practices can be found across the globe. In studies of these majority white societies, the aggregate of material and cultural advantages is usually termed " white privilege ". Race and race relations are prominent areas of study in sociology and economics. Much of the sociological literature focuses on white racism. Some of the earliest sociological works on racism were penned by sociologist W. Du Bois wrote, "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line. The "newer" more hidden and less easily detectable forms of racism—which can be considered embedded in social processes and structures—are more difficult to explore as well as challenge. It has been suggested that, while in many countries overt or explicit racism has become increasingly taboo , even among those who display egalitarian explicit attitudes, an implicit or aversive racism is still maintained subconsciously. Implicit attitudes are evaluations that occur without conscious awareness towards an attitude object or the self. These evaluations are generally either favorable or unfavorable. They come about from various influences in the individual experience. In thinking about crime, for example, social psychologist Jennifer L. Thus, racist thoughts and actions can arise from stereotypes and fears of which we are not aware. Discourse analysis seeks to reveal the meaning of race and the actions of racists through careful study of the ways in which these factors of human society are described and discussed in various written and oral works. Van Dijk , for example, examines the different ways in which descriptions of racism and racist actions are depicted by the perpetrators of such actions as well as by their victims. These books, and others like them, feed into what has been called the "

white savior narrative in film ", in which the heroes and heroines are white even though the story is about things that happen to black characters. African American writers have sometimes been portrayed in African-American studies as retreating from racial issues when they write about " whiteness ", while others identify this as an African American literary tradition called "the literature of white estrangement", part of a multipronged effort to challenge and dismantle white supremacy in the US. A Genealogy posits modern racism similarly, focusing on the notion of a dominant group, usually whites, vying for racial purity and progress, rather than an overt or obvious ideology focused on the oppression of nonwhites. Often, the two are listed together as "racial and ethnic" in describing some action or outcome that is associated with prejudice within a majority or dominant group in society. Furthermore, the meaning of the term racism is often conflated with the terms prejudice, bigotry , and discrimination. Racism is a complex concept that can involve each of those, but it cannot be equated with nor is it synonymous with these other terms. The term is often used in relation to what is seen as prejudice within a minority or subjugated group, as in the concept of reverse racism. Such aspects are described in this section, although the list is not exhaustive. Aversive racism Main article: The term was coined by Joel Kovel to describe the subtle racial behaviors of any ethnic or racial group who rationalize their aversion to a particular group by appeal to rules or stereotypes. The motivation for the change is thought to be implicit or subconscious. Experiments have provided empirical support for the existence of aversive racism. Aversive racism has been shown to have potentially serious implications for decision making in employment, in legal decisions and in helping behavior. Color blindness race In relation to racism, Color blindness is the disregard of racial characteristics in social interaction , for example in the rejection of affirmative action, as way to address the results of past patterns of discrimination. Critics of this attitude argue that by refusing to attend to racial disparities, racial color blindness in fact unconsciously perpetuates the patterns that produce racial inequality. If race is disregarded in predominately white populations, for example, whiteness becomes the normative standard, whereas people of color are othered , and the racism these individuals experience may be minimized or erased. Xenophobia Cultural racism is a term used to describe and explain new racial ideologies and practices that have emerged since World War II. It can be defined as societal beliefs and customs that promote the assumption that the products of a given culture, including the language and traditions of that culture are superior to those of other cultures. It shares a great deal with xenophobia , which is often characterised by fear of, or aggression toward, members of an outgroup by members of an ingroup. Institutional racism , State racism , Racial profiling , and Racism by country Institutional racism also known as structural racism, state racism or systemic racism is racial discrimination by governments, corporations, religions, or educational institutions or other large organizations with the power to influence the lives of many individuals. Stokely Carmichael is credited for coining the phrase institutional racism in the late s. He defined the term as "the collective failure of an organization to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin". Othering Othering is the term used by some to describe a system of discrimination whereby the characteristics of a group are used to distinguish them as separate from the norm. Spatial difference can be enough to conclude that "we" are "here" and the "others" are over "there". Racial segregation Main article: Racial segregation External video James A. It may apply to activities such as eating in a restaurant, drinking from a water fountain, using a bath room, attending school, going to the movies, or in the rental or purchase of a home. Supremacism In Uncle Sam a personification of the United States balances his new possessions which are depicted as savage children. Centuries of European colonialism in the Americas , Africa and Asia were often justified by white supremacist attitudes. Symbolic racism A rally against school integration in Some scholars argue that in the US earlier violent and aggressive forms of racism have evolved into a more subtle form of prejudice in the late 20th century. This new form of racism is sometimes referred to as "modern racism" and it is characterized by outwardly acting unprejudiced while inwardly maintaining prejudiced attitudes, displaying subtle prejudiced behaviors such as actions informed by attributing qualities to others based on racial stereotypes, and evaluating the same behavior differently based on the race of the person being evaluated. This ambivalence may also be visible for example in hiring decisions where job candidates that are otherwise positively evaluated may be unconsciously disfavored by employers in the final decision because of their race. While

such "subconscious racial biases" do not fully fit the definition of racism, their impact can be similar, though typically less pronounced, not being explicit, conscious or deliberate. In , Japan and its allies declared work for the abolition of racial discrimination to be their aim at the Greater East Asia Conference. The statement condemned scientific racism theories that had played a role in the Holocaust. It aimed both at debunking scientific racist theories, by popularizing modern knowledge concerning "the race question," and morally condemned racism as contrary to the philosophy of the Enlightenment and its assumption of equal rights for all. Supreme Court desegregation decision in " Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka ". Part 1 of Article 1 of the U. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [83] In , the European Union explicitly banned racism, along with many other forms of social discrimination, in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union , the legal effect of which, if any, would necessarily be limited to Institutions of the European Union:

Chapter 2 : The Rise and Fall of the Modern State System

'National Ethnicity' and the Modern State - Eric Kaufmann First of all, I would like to thank the conference organisers, especially Linas Eriksonas, for staging such a theoretically coherent and well-organised conference.

Peri Pamir Introduction The subject of nationalism is extremely complex, not the least because of the many different sources and manifestations of the phenomenon. This paper will deal essentially with certain contemporary forms of nationalism which have emerged or intensified in Europe and the former Soviet Union during the s. In order to place this discussion in perspective, a brief background of the historical experience is provided at the outset as well as a consideration of some of the basic concepts relating to this phenomenon. As the ensuing discussion will show, it is almost impossible to come up with a uniform definition of nationalism. In its historical context, it is an ideological movement aimed at attaining and maintaining the identity, unity through social cohesion and autonomy through national self-determination of a "nation," or a peoples united under a "national" banner Smith, In other words, it is the most potent ideology in nation state building and consolidation. However, as we will seek to illustrate, nationalism, particularly in the contemporary era, has also been a vehicle for disaffected ethnic or cultural communities to voice their dissatisfaction with the status quo. The sources of discontent may be related to a variety of factors such as denial of cultural identity, political discrimination, repression, or economic deprivation. In these cases, it is a movement of minority groups which springs up in reaction to the policies or performance of the central state. At other times, it is a counter-reaction, either on the part of the political authorities, or of threatened social groups, in response to the political authorities, and therefore embodies different objectives. But in most cases, the central state, whether directly or indirectly, plays a key role in manipulating or being the target of nationalist sentiments. Hence, in this paper, nationalism has a broad meaning ranging from being the defining ideology of political movements seeking some form of autonomy or independent statehood; of groups striving to achieve or to improve their cultural, political, social and economic rights within a given state; of protest movements on the part of communities threatened by either state policies or by other social groups; to the core ideology employed by the state to galvanize public support for its policies or to reaffirm its legitimacy. The typology offered attempts to distinguish between these various contemporary manifestations of nationalist sentiment and discusses their impact on democracy as a means of distinguishing between the progressive and reactionary forms of nationalism. Historical and Conceptual Background The historical paradoxes of nationalism To understand the contemporary forms of nationalism, it is useful to keep in mind the paradoxical goals which this ideology has served in the historical process of nation state building. Eighteenth and nineteenth century European nationalism was a unifying force which brought together people of diverse backgrounds at the price of subordinating their ethnic identities to the larger territorial unit dominated by the secular state. The background to this evolution went back to the emergence of the secular state following the decline of the feudal and the rise of the industrial system, when effective power shifted from the unity of Church and State to that of Nation and State. Consequently, ethnic loyalties, which sometimes transcended the boundaries of these states, were seen to be subversive and every attempt was made to suppress them. The dominant ideology became that of nationalism, which idealized the secular state and deprecated the maintenance of any linguistic, religious or other sentiments that might conflict with loyalty to it. Nationalism became synonymous with patriotism Richmond, A similar trend followed the creation of nation states after the collapse of the multinational Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires in the aftermath of World War I. In the Balkans, in particular, nation states were created often with little or no regard for the rights and aspirations of the substantial ethnic groups trapped within their borders. The principle of state sovereignty, which evolved from the legitimization of national self determination made these new nation states as unsympathetic to demands for self determination from dissatisfied groups within their jurisdiction as were the Romanov, Habsburg and Ottoman rulers to the national claims that were advanced against their rule in the 19th century. The aftermath of the decolonization process and the creation of nation states in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific after followed a similar pattern. Those states which achieved their independence through the

principle of self determination held the view that a broader definition of the concept could become counterproductive. Hence the paradoxical qualities of nationalism in its modern historical expression reside in the fact that it has served several conflicting purposes. It has acted as the principal ideology which enabled nations to seek self determination and political statehood. It also provided the subsequently created states with the ideological justification for holding "the nation" together. And third, it has enabled dissatisfied minority or ethnic groups within the nation states to challenge state authority by questioning its claim to legitimacy which, in a democratic system, formally rests on the doctrine of self determination and popular sovereignty. Hence, nationalism, in this sense, has ironically contributed to the formation, and survival as well as to the dismemberment of nation states. The relationship between each of these concepts as they relate to nationalism are discussed below. Self determination, national sovereignty and international responsibility The concept of self determination, as articulated in the Charter of the United Nations Art. Consequently, the principle of territorial integrity and respect for existing frontiers or the preservation of the unitary state as a major factor of international stability predominated over the right to self determination where this implied the dismemberment of existing states and secession. However, advances in the field of democracy and fundamental freedoms over the last decades, accompanied by the growing consensus that the use of force is neither desirable nor effective in stifling aspirations for self determination, have led to situations where conflicts between the concept of self determination and the unitary state have become increasingly more difficult to resolve. The experience of the Kurds, the Slovenes, the Croats and the Bosnians has demonstrated that separatist pressures can no longer be regarded as strictly internal affairs, especially since the resistance to their struggle has had the effect of invalidating the fundamental assumption linking territorial inviolability - and, implicitly, the denial of self determination - to international peace and stability. Consequently, the human rights performance of a state, including its treatment of its minorities, is steadily becoming a matter of legitimate international concern. Embodied in this attitude is the developing consensus, strengthened since the Gulf war experience, that state sovereignty can no longer provide governments immunity in cases of violations of human rights, particularly in its repression of its minorities. Another related issue is the changed world environment since the end of the cold war in Europe. Whereas before the cause of ethnic minorities was often exploited by the superpowers or their allies as a way of obtaining geopolitical leverage e. While this may be the case, there is also much confusion as to who has right to self determination, where the limits of national sovereignty and unity lie, and whether and when the territorial integrity of nation states should remain unconditionally unchallenged. What are the main overriding criteria for self determination and independent statehood? Are there any legal distinctions between the rights of those minorities which belong to a group which already has a state e. Does the right to self determination include the right to secession and independent statehood? When should the international community recognize the rights of a peoples to decide on its own international status, and when should the territorial unity of the nation state be protected as reaffirmed in the Helsinki Final Act? Nations and nation states It would appear then that the drive for self determination, which has acted as the principal inspiration for many modern day nationalist movements, challenges the legitimacy of the state by placing in question its claim to represent the popular will of the nation. We will now turn to the dynamic between the nation and the state as a means of understanding the basis for what is broadly known as ethno-nationalism. Part of the confusion concerning the nature of the relationship between nation and state arises from the different sometimes overlapping meanings ascribed to the former concept depending on the particular context, which are briefly enumerated below: Given these definitions, a "nation or multi-national nation state" can connote: The nationalist belief, as expressed by Guiseppe Mazzini in the 19th century, maintained that every nation each particular ethno-linguistic group had the right to form its own state, and that there should be only one state for each nation. This claim has been historically impractical since, by current accounting, there exist practically no ethno-linguistically homogeneous nations. The territorial distribution of the human race is older than the idea of ethnic-linguistic nation-states and therefore does not correspond to it. Development in the modern world economy, because it generates vast population movements, constantly undermines ethnic-linguistic homogeneity. Multi-ethnicity and plurilinguality are quite unavoidable, except temporarily by mass exclusion, forcible assimilation, mass expulsion or genocide - in short, by coercion Hobsbawm, In

reality, therefore, the definitions are not so clear cut as states are generally multinational and hence, rarely homogeneous and nations are quite often polyethnic. Nationalism in the Contemporary Era A number of contemporary developments, one pertaining to the European continent and the former Soviet Union, the other occurring on a world scale but affecting Europe closely, provide some basis for our understanding of the resurgence of nationalism in modern times. Expressing itself in the form of nationalist or self determination movements, notably in the Balkans and in several republics of the former Soviet Union, these groups have been seeking protection of minority rights, territorial autonomy or sovereign statehood. It is interesting to note that both trends have had the effect of challenging state sovereignty, though the tendency towards fragmentation - or the weakening or collapse of central political authority - has also delivered a direct blow to the concept of the territorial integrity of the nation state. The other development has its origins in the increase in international migration as a result of global economic and political developments. Over the last decade or so, Europe has become a main destination for people fleeing economic and political distress, traditionally from the South but increasingly from Eastern Europe. This development, in turn, has created fertile ground for the emergence of xenophobic right-wing groups in Western Europe which are exploiting economic discontent to justify hostility to "outsiders" perceived as competing for limited resources. As we will see later, the xenophobic reaction is not confined to Western Europe, but has come to the fore as a platform of protest in the economically unstable former socialist societies as well. Contemporary forms of nationalism: Because of the diversity of the conditions, it is manifested in many different forms which makes it difficult to draw clear distinctions between them. Nevertheless, to the extent possible, the following analysis will concentrate on three broad - and sometimes overlapping - contemporary varieties, namely, state nationalism, ethno-nationalism and, finally, what we call "protest" nationalism, encompassing both right-wing nationalist movements in Europe and the former Soviet Union as well as the phenomenon of religious fundamentalism. Given the background of the preceding section, which has sought to establish the relationship between certain key concepts, we will try to show that in each case nationalism is a reaction to something which is directly or indirectly related to the policy or the performance of the state. State nationalism In a practice widely resorted to by governments, state nationalism embraces the nation as a whole, thus transcending ethnic distinctions. It is the creation of mass public sentiment in favor of the state and is used by the latter to mobilize popular support for its policies most prominently in wartime or to reaffirm its legitimacy. State nationalism can be expressed in a multitude of ways. Most prominently, it is an instrument wielded in the process of nation state building where the state is created and sustained around the concept and the glorification of the nation e. It can also allude to state manipulation of nationalist ideology to promote unity against external opposition e. Externally, it can refer to policies aimed at extending the territory of the state into areas which the state claims as belonging to its nation e. Internally, one could describe as nationalist actions taken by the state against specific groups or individuals amounting to a denial of cultural pluralism and justified on grounds of the anti- or un-national "unpatriotic" character of those groups or individuals e. Ethnicity and Ethno-nationalism 6 Although no common definition of ethnicity exists, it is generally described as the awareness on the part of a particular community of having a separate identity on the basis of common history, race, language, religion, culture and territory. Where that community constitutes a minority, which is often the case, ethnicity is also used synonymously with minority or identity groups, which is sometimes also loosely extended to migrant or refugee communities. Most ethnic groups are oriented towards recognition and expression of their cultural identity and the protection of their rights as a group to share in the benefits of the state in which they live. An increasing number, however, are seeking various forms of political recognition or autonomy. Irrespective of the regions involved, the complaints appear to be the same: Broadly speaking, therefore, ethnicity becomes a form of nationalism when it assumes a political and often territorial dimension that challenges the status quo, and, in some cases, the legitimacy and stability of the state in question by becoming a catalyst for intra- or inter-state conflict. Some would argue that the most dynamic ingredient of nationalism is ethnicity; indeed, that nationalism is in essence the political expression of ethnicity. It is clear that ethnic divisions have existed since time immemorial. Conflicts or tensions have been present even when apparently latent and grievances nursed for generations. What concerns us here are the factors which have given rise to contemporary

ethno-nationalism, some of which are enumerated below. At the national level, the resurgence of ethno-nationalism can be sought in the failure or inability of the modern nation state to serve the national community and to meet the needs of its minority populations in terms of an equitable distribution of resources and opportunities. Economic deprivation and disparity, as witnessed in numerous cases, has often acted as a powerful catalyst igniting the flame of nationalist revolt and in crystallizing a sense of ethnic identity. Not only does the denial of cultural and political rights and the lack of active power-sharing for minority groups through constitutional arrangements fail to close the poverty gap, but this failure combines, in some cases, with frustration over the slow development of democratic forms of government - a combination that helps to explain some of the political bases for ethnic resurgence. Furthermore, the tendency of the modern nation state to resort to political discrimination, repressive action e. Such actions invariably result in strengthening aspirations for separate ethno-national identity. A related consequence of state policies also resulting in ethno-nationalism happens when migrant communities fleeing ethnic, political and economic victimization settle in the more industrialized societies and create new hybrid cultural identities distinct from the society in which they have settled. The growing hostility to their presence frequently expressed through racist rejection is leading these groups to declare their specificity and to rally around different forms of cultural or political expression. Though most Muslims in Western Europe numbering over 8 million say they want to integrate, it can be argued that it is the enmity and coldness of the native European populations which push them to assert their identity through religious and cultural differences. In Central and Eastern Europe, on the other hand, the principal stimulus for ethnic revival springs from the multinational and multiethnic composition of most of the societies in the region. Such reactions have invariably sprung from or led to repressive government policies, thereby periodically creating serious tensions between the states or communities concerned. In addition, almost all the countries harbor revisionist claims against one another. However, although such tensions have occasionally strained inter-state relations since World War II, they have never jeopardized national and regional stability to the extent witnessed since the collapse of the socialist state system, the war in Bosnia being its most tragic illustration. The situation in the former Soviet Union is analogous, demonstrated most dramatically by the liberation struggle of the Chechen people and the inter-ethnic conflicts within the Transcausian republics. Several reasons are ascribed to this development, some of which are outlined below. The "deep freeze" effect: Others claim that it is the disintegration of central power and not the strength of national feeling that has forced certain republics, such as Khazakstan and Macedonia which did not previously dream of separation, to assert their independence as a means of self-preservation Hobsbawm, Or, stated differently, nationalism, in this case, becomes a means of filling the political void left by the rapid breakdown of central political authority, or of retrospectively celebrating new-found statehood. The seeming inability of the nation state to satisfy the demands of ethno-cultural minorities and the lack of an accepted international premise for the recognition of self determination as in the case of Chechenya no doubt constitute additional reasons for the eruption of ethnic tensions in the region.

Chapter 3 : Racism - Wikipedia

Xinjiang and the Modern Chinese State views modern Chinese political history from the perspective of Han officials who were tasked with governing Xinjiang. This region, inhabited by Uighurs, Kazaks, Hui, Mongols, Kirgiz, and Tajiks, is also the last significant "colony" of the former Qing empire to remain under continuous Chinese rule throughout the twentieth century.

The inherited English language term for this concept is folk , used alongside the latinate people since the late Middle English period. In Early Modern English and until the midth century, ethnic was used to mean heathen or pagan in the sense of disparate "nations" which did not yet participate in the Christian oikumene , as the Septuagint used ta ethne "the nations" to translate the Hebrew goyim "the nations, non-Hebrews, non-Jews". In Classical Greek , the term took on a meaning comparable to the concept now expressed by "ethnic group", mostly translated as " nation , people"; only in Hellenistic Greek did the term tend to become further narrowed to refer to "foreign" or " barbarous " nations in particular whence the later meaning "heathen, pagan". The sense of "different cultural groups", and in American English "racial, cultural or national minority group" arises in the s to s, [6] serving as a replacement of the term race which had earlier taken this sense but was now becoming deprecated due to its association with ideological racism. The abstract ethnicity had been used for "paganism" in the 18th century, but now came to express the meaning of an "ethnic character" first recorded The term ethnic group was first recorded in and entered the Oxford English Dictionary in The process that results in the emergence of an ethnicity is called ethnogenesis , a term in use in ethnological literature since about Depending on which source of group identity is emphasized to define membership, the following types of often mutually overlapping groups can be identified: Definitions and conceptual history[edit] Ethnography begins in classical antiquity ; after early authors like Anaximander and Hecataeus of Miletus , Herodotus in ca. The Greeks at this time did not describe foreign nations but had also developed a concept of their own "ethnicity", which they grouped under the name of Hellenes. According to "Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World: Science, politics, and reality", in Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World: Science, Politics and Reality: They regard ethnicity as a product of specific kinds of inter-group interactions, rather than an essential quality inherent to human groups. One is between " primordialism " and " instrumentalism ". In the primordialist view, the participant perceives ethnic ties collectively, as an externally given, even coercive, social bond. Constructivists view national and ethnic identities as the product of historical forces, often recent, even when the identities are presented as old. This is in the context of debates over multiculturalism in countries, such as the United States and Canada, which have large immigrant populations from many different cultures, and post-colonialism in the Caribbean and South Asia. Secondly, this belief in shared Gemeinschaft did not create the group; the group created the belief. Third, group formation resulted from the drive to monopolise power and status. This was contrary to the prevailing naturalist belief of the time, which held that socio-cultural and behavioral differences between peoples stemmed from inherited traits and tendencies derived from common descent, then called "race". To Barth, ethnicity was perpetually negotiated and renegotiated by both external ascription and internal self-identification. He wanted to part with anthropological notions of cultures as bounded entities, and ethnicity as primordialist bonds, replacing it with a focus on the interface between groups. He also described that in the first decades of usage, the term ethnicity had often been used in lieu of older terms such as "cultural" or "tribal" when referring to smaller groups with shared cultural systems and shared heritage, but that "ethnicity" had the added value of being able to describe the commonalities between systems of group identity in both tribal and modern societies. Cohen also suggested that claims concerning "ethnic" identity like earlier claims concerning "tribal" identity are often colonialist practices and effects of the relations between colonized peoples and nation-states. Sometimes these contradictions are destructive, but they can also be creative and positive. Thus, anthropologist Joan Vincent observed that ethnic boundaries often have a mercurial character. Approaches to understanding ethnicity[edit] Different approaches to understanding ethnicity have been used by different social scientists when trying to understand the nature of ethnicity as a

factor in human life and society. Hall observes, World War II was a turning point in the ethnic studies. The consequences of Nazi racism discouraged essentianlist interpretations of ethnic groups and race. Ethnic groups came to be defined as social rather than as biological entities. Their coherence was attributed to shared myths, descent, kinship, a common place of origin, language, religion, customs and national character. So, ethnic groups are conceived as mutable rather than stable, constructed in discursive practices rather than written in the genes. For them, the idea of ethnicity is closely linked to the idea of nations and is rooted in the pre-Weber understanding of humanity as being divided into primordially existing groups rooted by kinship and biological heritage. This theory sees ethnic groups as natural, not just as historical. It also has problems dealing with the consequences of intermarriage, migration and colonization for the composition of modern day multi-ethnic societies. In this way, the myths of common biological ancestry that are a defining feature of ethnic communities are to be understood as representing actual biological history. A problem with this view on ethnicity is that it is more often than not the case that mythic origins of specific ethnic groups directly contradict the known biological history of an ethnic community. Accordingly, ethnicity emerges when it is relevant as means of furthering emergent collective interests and changes according to political changes in the society. Examples of a perennialist interpretation of ethnicity are also found in Barth, and Seidner who see ethnicity as ever-changing boundaries between groups of people established through ongoing social negotiation and interaction. According to Donald Noel, a sociologist who developed a theory on the origin of ethnic stratification, ethnic stratification is a "system of stratification wherein some relatively fixed group membership e. According to Donald Noel, ethnic stratification will emerge only when specific ethnic groups are brought into contact with one another, and only when those groups are characterized by a high degree of ethnocentrism, competition, and differential power. Some sociologists, such as Lawrence Bobo and Vincent Hutchings, say the origin of ethnic stratification lies in individual dispositions of ethnic prejudice, which relates to the theory of ethnocentrism. In other words, an inequality of power among ethnic groups means "they are of such unequal power that one is able to impose its will upon another". The different ethnic groups must be competing for some common goal, such as power or influence, or a material interest, such as wealth or territory. Lawrence Bobo and Vincent Hutchings propose that competition is driven by self-interest and hostility, and results in inevitable stratification and conflict. It holds that ethnic groups are only products of human social interaction, maintained only in so far as they are maintained as valid social constructs in societies. They hold that prior to this, ethnic homogeneity was not considered an ideal or necessary factor in the forging of large-scale societies. Ethnicity is an important means by which people may identify with a larger group. Many social scientists, such as anthropologists Fredrik Barth and Eric Wolf , do not consider ethnic identity to be universal. Members of an ethnic group, on the whole, claim cultural continuities over time, although historians and cultural anthropologists have documented that many of the values, practices, and norms that imply continuity with the past are of relatively recent invention. Some other criteria include: Park in the s. This theory was preceded by over a century where biological essentialism was the dominant paradigm on race. Biological essentialism is the belief that white European races are biologically superior and other non-white races are inherently inferior. This view arose as a way to justify slavery of Africans and genocide of the Native Americans in a society which was supposedly founded on freedom for all. This was a notion that developed slowly and came to be a preoccupation of scientists, theologians, and the public. Many of the foremost scientists of the time took up idea of racial difference. They would inadvertently find that white Europeans were superior. One method that was used was the measurement of cranial capacity. Park outlined his four steps to assimilation: Instead of explaining the marginalized status of people of color in the United States with an inherent biological inferiority, he instead said that it was a failure to assimilate into American culture that held people back. They could be equal as long as they dropped their culture which was deficient compared to white culture. They argue in Racial Formation in the United States that ethnicity theory was exclusively based on the immigration patterns of a white ethnic population and did not account for the unique experiences of non-whites in this country. Or they must be stubbornly resisting dominant norms because they did not want to fit in.

Chapter 4 : Ethnicity, Culture, and "The Past"

'A very valuable addition to the library of anyone who is interested in ethnic relations and nationalism.' - International Affairs;The author deals with the problem in political theory of how modern nation states must be structured in order to realise the two separate goals of equality of opportunity and the recognition of cultural diversity between groups.

This work is protected by copyright and may be linked to without seeking permission. Permission must be received for subsequent distribution in print or electronically. Please contact mpub-help umich. It is understandably difficult to determine in generalâ€"and even in a concrete individual caseâ€"what influence specific ethnic factors. Even "peaceful" societies like the United States are not immune to it, although it only infrequently erupts into open conflict and violence and then only briefly. But despite its ubiquityâ€"or perhaps because of itâ€"ethnicity and ethnic conflict are not particularly well-understood, either by the public or by many scholars. This is due both to terminological confusion and to inadequate knowledge of the details and background of specific cases. Ethnicity and ethnic conflict are particularly fertile subjects for conflation of categories, mystification of facts, and general demagoguery, in no small part because the issues, as in the U. This essay is dedicated to clarifying some of these confusions and to presenting some of the information crucial to understanding these momentous social forces. Some of the most perplexing problems arise from the vagueness of the term and phenomenon called ethnicity, and from its indefinite and ever-expanding domain. One of the central arguments of this essay will be that ethnicity is not a single unified social phenomenon but a congeries, a "family," of related but analytically distinct phenomena. The foundations of ethnicity, the "markers" of ethnicity, the history of ethnicity, the aims and goals of ethnicityâ€"these vary from case to case. For instance, in one circumstance religion may be the decisive distinction between two ethnic groups say, in Northern Ireland , while in another language or history or race or any number of other qualities may serve the same function. Even within one case of ethnicity or conflict, the referents or the emphasis on referents of the groups concerned may shift over time. Further, not all culturally-distinct groups are ethnic groups precisely, and in an odd paradox not all ethnic groups are culturally-distinct groups; the relation of ethnicity to "culture" is less than perfect. Not all ethnic groups are ancient and organic social entities; some can make the claim, while others are noticeably recent. Finally, not all ethnic groups are in conflict, not all conflicts are equal in intensity, and not all conflicts seek the same ends. This very elusiveness of ethnicity is largely responsible for its expandability, which is largely responsible for its utility in the modern world. When is a group an ethnic group? There are no hard-and-fast rules or standards by which to judge. The answer, as unsatisfying as it is, is that social collectivity, of any nature and antiquity, can don the mantle of ethnicityâ€"one of the most elastic of social conceptsâ€"and stake a successful claim to identity and rights as a group. The point is this: Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups Ethnicity is, at first glance, the process or phenomenon which underlies or gives rise to ethnic groups. George DeVos defines it as the "subjective symbolic or emblematic use of any aspect of culture [by a group], in order to differentiate themselves from other groups. Ethnicity is a social and psychological process whereby individuals come to identify and affiliate with a group and some aspect s of its culture; ethnicity is what emerges when a person, as affiliated, completes the statement: It is also mobilization around differenceâ€"a camaraderie with or preference for socially-similar others. It is in this sense a "familial" kind of relationship, with emotional characteristicsâ€"a bond, a tie, a sentiment, an attachment. It is even regularly likened to kinship, as a kind of kinship writ large. David Horowitz writes that, based on the primacy of birth and shared origin, "ethnicity and kinship are alike. The language of ethnicity is the language of kinship. This much being said, there is much diversity within the phenomenon of ethnicity. One of the first things that ethnographers of ethnicity discover is that the strength and significance of ethnicity vary between individuals and groups, as well as over time for any particular individual or group. Some ostensibly ethnic groups say, some indigenous people or urban minorities with authentic shared origins and culture have little ethnic feeling, and other groups with much less in common have strong feelings. Not only that, but a group may have vibrant, even militant, ethnicity at one moment in time and much less so at a later moment, or vice versa. And of course, in any particular group some individuals have powerful ethnic sentiments while others do not, and

some individuals with powerful sentiments engage in ethnic-based confrontation and violence, while others do not. Ethnicity is, thus, subjective, even while it is based on, refers to, or invokes "objective" or shared cultural or historical markers. No ethnic group treats all aspects of its culture or history as markers of its identity; it would be awkward if not impossible to do so, and besides, for any group, some elements of its culture will be the same as those of another group, thus defeating the purpose of distinguishing it from the other group. What is more, for any one group, the parts of culture which it chooses and uses may vary over time, from religion at one stage to language at another to class or some other. A group which is distinct in some way may not be aware of or mobilized around that distinction and may not use it for any social or political purpose again, all groups are distinct in some ways: For example, the difference between "ethnicity" and "ancestry" has been highlighted by some students of ethnicity. By the same token, a group may overlook differences in the pursuit or definition of its ethnicityâ€"in fact, ethnicity generally demands the overlooking of internal differentiations. Mexican-Americans, Cuban-Americans, Puerto Rican-Americans, and all of the other "Hispanic"-Americans are distinguished by a tremendous variation of society and culture and of economic class in the U. The same can be said of "Asian-American," an even more diffuse term, since the groups so encompassed do not even share language. In fact, many Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans have not affiliated with those ethnic identities and still conceive of themselves in more particularistic, local terms; they have not yet? To a certain extent, "ethnicities" are labels, often labels created for administrative purposes. Labels can be made and unmade and remade. The shift from "black" to "African-American" in the U. And, since any trait, large or small, can be a marker and the basis of a label and an ethnicity, it is possible to see today a move to create new labels and "ethnicities" such as "mixed race. Accordingly, if a group is not conscious of or organized in terms of its characteristics, then there is no ethnicity, no matter how distinct it may be. Many indigenous peoples, radically distinct from any other groups, did not and do not have "ethnic consciousness. People who live their culture unproblematically tend not to be "ethnic" in the proper sense of the word. In other words, ethnicity is not and cannot be an objective phenomenon. There is, first and foremost, no one-to-one correspondence between culture and ethnicity. Cultural differences alone do not ethnicity make; culture, or cultural difference, becomes ethnicity if and when a group takes it up and uses it in certain specific and modern ways. Naturally, too, ethnicity does not always or necessarily make for conflict; certain kinds of ethnicity in certain situations with certain catalyzing events make conflict out of ethnicity. Thus, small differences in culture may make for large and contentious differences in ethnicity, while large differences in culture may lead to small or no ethnic differences or conflicts. If scholars want to understand ethnicity, they will not succeed by merely listing the empirical cultural traits of groups which in itself is not as simple as it sounds or describing their empirical or "true" history. In concluding this section, it is well to remember that not all instances of ethnicity will be the same. In terms of cultural markers, inter-group relations, and intra-group subjectivity, there is in actuality not one ethnicity but many. Milton Yinger offers a schematization of this variety, finding eight types of ethnicity depending on three variables which are only indirectly related to objective cultural characteristics: The eight resulting types become: Ethnic Group It goes without saying that ethnicity is not the only way to affiliate, organize, or categorize human beings. Nor is ethnicity the only source of conflict in the world, even between "cultural" groups loosely construed. For example, the ongoing problems in Algeria would hardly, under normal circumstances, be considered "ethnic" in nature. Religious, political, economic, ideological, gender, and other kinds of groups can have the same quantity of cohesion, salience, and even animosity and conflict as "ethnic"groups, and it is very inadvisable to confuse the disparate types. What, then, is an ethnic group? It is one of the types of human social collectivity, named identity-groups, based on some shared quality of social behavior, thought, or feeling. One of the main problems for social scientists is the specification of its difference from or relation to other social collectivities such as "nation," "people," "society," "tribe," "minority," "race," or "class. A discussion of terminology like the one which follows may seem sheer pedantry, but it serves two critical functionsâ€"to clean up conceptual sloppiness which interferes with description and comparison, and to articulate issues of "unit of analysis" which are increasingly important in anthropology and other social sciences. In, if not the first, then the classic definition of ethnic group, Max Weber describes it as one of "those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent

because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists. Schermerhorn has defined ethnic group as "a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood. A necessary component is some consciousness of kind among members of the group. Most basically, they return always to difference, however conceived or however employedâ€"to a difference between groups which is apparent and important to the members of the groups. The crucial domain of difference is culture or more precisely some part of a shared culture; some theorists also allow that physical or "racial" traits may figure into ethnic groups, but this is not always the case, and even when it is those traits, in the modern phenomenon of ethnic group, are inscribed with "cultural" significance. Origin and descent are frequent idioms in positing this group identity, and, even more critically, an ideology of continuity with that past, that "traditional culture," or that blood or kinship line is regularly maintained. It is unimportant whether these views are true or demonstrable. Ultimately, the group is based more on its "consciousness" or "awareness" of difference and shared traits and past than on the objective quality of those traits. Further, the various definitions emphasize the relational quality of ethnic groups; an ethnic group is a "culturally distinct" segment of a larger social whole. It is impossible, or better yet nonsensical, to think of an ethnic group in isolation from other groups or "at home" in a culturally homogeneous society or state for example, Japanese are not an "ethnic group" in Japan. Arguably, then, groups which are not part of a larger social whole cannot be "ethnic" in the strict sense of the word; fortunately for us, there are few if any such groups in the world today although in the past some indigenous societies probably qualified, but not all of them. Fredrik Barth helped shift the attention away from the "contents"â€"that is, the list of traitsâ€"of ethnic groups to their "boundaries" and relations. They conceive of ethnic groups as moving, as movements, in the sense of "doing something about" their culture or social situation, having some goal; an ethnic group at rest, without an agenda, is almost a contradiction in terms. Ethnic groups thus differ in terms of the nature and direction of their movement; as an illustration, Ted Gurr and Barbara Harff note four types of "politically active ethnic groups" which raises the question of whether there are politically inactive types including ethnonationalists, indigenous peoples, communal contenders, and ethnoclasses. Each type differs in such characteristics as size, geographic distribution, relation to other ethnic groups and to government, relation to the economy and class system, and political aims. Thomas Eriksen too identifies four types: Clearly, then, ethnic groups are multifarious things, with a problematic relation not only to each other but also to the "culture" and "origin" or "descent" which they brandish. Conventionally, however, much of this subtlety is lost, and ethnic groups are conceived as conceptually uniform from one to another, continuous with their own culture and history "ancient," "fixed," "primordial," and other such words , co-terminous with their culture "bounded," "discrete," and so on , and fundamentally different from other types of groups. These are some of the fallacies that I aim to dispel. First, "it would be misleading to state simply that ethnic groups are identical with cultural groups," [14] for all the reasons I raised already. This flies in the face not only of popular wisdom but also of the founding principle of anthropologyâ€"that discrete culture-bearing units, true to their original cultural state i. These units were deemed societies or even worse tribes and were the unit of analysis of choice in early anthropology. In fact, continuity and discreteness are ideologies of ethnic groups and not necessarily veritable qualities of such groups. To go even further, it might be argued that the ideology of cultural continuity and discreteness is the essential distinguishing characteristic of ethnic groups and their permutations as opposed to other human collectivities. A century of observation has taught us that, while some ethnic groups may indeed be ancient, others are brand new; and not only the groups but also the "cultures" or "traditions" or "heritages" to which they refer can be of recent vintage. It is not, as I have stated, important that the "memory" of the "past" be true, only that it be strong and convincing. Andrew Greeley goes so far as to say "that if there are no differences supposedly rooted in common origin by which people can distinguish themselves from others, they will create such differences. Part of the mystification of ethnic groups and ethnicity is that they exist apart from any instrumental ends or interests. The group would still be a group independent of such crass considerations as economics and politics because the group is premised on more ancient, more noble, more

authentic grounds than those. While this may be true for some ethnic groups, it is ideological for all of them, and even the old authentic groups would not be "ethnic" groups without the politicization and "economization" to coin an awkward phrase of their cultures.

Chapter 5 : Ethnic group - Wikipedia

'National Ethnicity' and the Modern State. Eric Kaufmann The theme of this book, Traditions of Statehood, is a fascinating one. I am especially pleased to see a focus on the interplay between ethnicity and the state.

Sweden is a country I have visited many times during my lifetime, and holds special significance for me since my father was born in Stockholm and has relatives here. Moreover, Sweden and my country, Canada, share many things in common, notably ice hockey, the forest industry, and an identification with the Northern landscape. The theme of this conference, Traditions of Statehood, is a fascinating one. I am especially pleased to see a focus on the interplay between ethnicity and the state. This line of enquiry has not been subject to much academic scrutiny in the English language. Instead, the focus has been on nations and nationalism. Specifically, the ethnic-civic prism has been used to interpret national identity, a useful shorthand dichotomy, but one which obscures a great deal in scholarly terms. On the empirical side, while I strongly endorse the analytical stance provided by this conference, my paper provides a counterpoint to the more optimistic claims of those who view state traditions as an alternative to dominant ethnic narratives. My main contention here is that traditions of statehood usually do not stand outside of dominant ethnicity, but instead help to constitute it. Ethnic minorities and liberals have tried to prise apart the purely political traditions of state in a bid to carve out a more inclusive society. However, this technique has often failed to gain mass acceptance within the dominant ethnic group. Second, we should conceive of traditions of statehood not as a force unto itself, but rather as a resource which nationalists can use, similar to language, geography, religion, architecture or history. These resources rarely determine the character of nationalism. Rather, social actors - whether of cosmopolitan or nationalist stripe - interpret these resources in either an inclusive or exclusive direction. To be sure, there are limits on the fungibility of particular resources. In terms of traditions of statehood, for instance, pre- modern political memories are often too closely associated with the dominant ethnie to be credible as civic templates. This involves the scope of the claims advocated by state-nationalists. Likewise, traditions of state tend to share cognitive space with supra-national identities that place a further limit on the power of state traditions. Accordingly, I tend to favour a limited state-national identity which is expressed through state institutions. Dominant ethnicity, which also draws on these traditions, is best channeled through voluntary associations and private cultural activity. Let us commence with the empirical question of the power of traditions of statehood. Influenced by nineteenth century Romanticism, the emphasis was placed on the genealogical continuity of the community through historical time, as well as the bottom-up or instinctive geist of the nation as expressed in language and culture. The ethnic-civic distinction continues to underpin much of the core literature in the field. Smith ; ; , Rogers Brubaker , Liah Greenfeld , and Michael Ignatieff have all relied heavily on this dichotomy. Here, he traces the difference between French and German citizenship practices to a divergent set of cultural idioms which developed in the late nineteenth century and created a path-dependent social force that continued into the late twentieth. However, more recent research has come to contest this simplified view, suggesting the need for a finer-grained typology. All of which suggests the centrality of fluidity rather than continuity. Well, a generous interpretation of the notion of statehood traditions assumes a Brubaker-style logic in which these traditions have historicist power independent of ethnicity. In other words, an orthodox reading of the importance of political memories equates very nearly with the civic-nationalist argument that some national idioms are political while others are more ethno-cultural. I think this conception cannot withstand empirical scrutiny. However, there are limits to this malleability and one needs to also avoid the constructionist pitfall of granting too much freedom to social actors. To illustrate, I will first consider some theoretical counterarguments to the civic nationalist reading of traditions of state, then move to a discussion of particular examples - notably the United 5 States, France and Switzerland - all societies with long traditions of modern statehood which might be considered paradigm cases for civic nationalism. However, these memories are also viewed as critical for defining the ethnie. The political unit in question might have been a tribal confederation, as in the Zulu, early Israelite or Irish cases. Another option is empire: Persians, Greeks, Arabs, Turks and Russians - all pay tribute to their imperial heyday. City-states can

even serve as a template - as with the Italians and Greeks. In fact, if 6 we think about it, we will recognise that many ethnic groups press more than one of the aforementioned political memories into service. The above underlines the fact that we need to question the distinction between traditions of statehood and political memories more generally. As the focus of latter- day nationalists roves from city-states and tribes through empires and kingdoms to baronies, absolutist states and the modern state, political traditions evolve. To speak of traditions of statehood per se, to restrict our scope to the modern state alone, is to deprive many nations of their most evocative and romantic myths and memories. In a few cases - notably France, the United States, Ukraine and the Baltic states, memories of independent modern statehood are infused with emotional depth and popular resonance. But as I mentioned earlier, it would be a great mistake to see these memories as exclusive of earlier forms. In the Ukraine and Baltic, interwar independent statehood traditions are vital, but lines are still drawn back to shadowy kingdoms or earlier political formations, which are felt to endow the dominant ethnie with greater cultural substance. The two appear commingled in virtually every ethnic myth-symbol complex and are not 7 easily disentangled. In short, there are both genealogical and political elements within ethnicity itself. The idea of Scottish Bengalis identifying with Robert the Bruce, Arab Israelis invoking the ancient kingdom of Israel or Swedish Kurds looking to the Swedish kingdom under King Gustav Adolf seems to me only to confirm the irreducible linkage between dominant ethnicity and traditions of particularly pre-modern statehood. We can often spot mytho-symbolic continuities between dominant ethnic groups and the modern nation-states they lay claim to - not least through the sharing of similar name i. I am only intimating that it is easier to render an ethnic than a civic reading of pre-modern traditions of state, but this does not mean that the latter is impossible. What I would suggest, though, is that a civic reading of statehood 8 traditions requires a liberal effort that runs against the grain of popular understanding. In that sense, I think that such a project would have difficulty in supplanting dominant ethnicity, though it might be able to serve broadly as a source of unity for the state and as an important secondary identity for many. One of the themes of this conference is the potential for latter-day nation-states to draw upon the purely political traditions of statehood which exist in the modern or early- modern periods. What I now wish to consider are a number of studies of concrete cases - examples of where traditions of statehood are conspicuous and illustrious and therefore most promising in their potential for realising inclusive, post-ethnic nationhood. However, we shall see that, even in these instances, there are considerable limits inherent in the idea of traditions of statehood. The cases under study will consist of, respectively, the United States, France and Switzerland. Lipset ; Zelinsky ; Greenfeld 9 Yet a close reading of American history suggests that American nationalism displays a blend of ethnic and statist traditions in its symbolic repertoire - elements which are often conflated. The obvious exclusion - until recently - of black slaves, Chinese railroad workers, Hispanic agricultural labourers and, to a lesser extent, native Indians and Eskimo from the historiography of the nation is a point that has been made by many. Even today, many actors and popular musicians adopt Anglo-Saxon surnames while only two of the forty-five American presidents have been of non-WASP origin, notably Eisenhower and Kennedy The congruence between traditions of state and ethnicity is nearly as strong. Between and , this new interpretation gained ground among the American elite. After it emerged triumphant as immigration policy was reformed to eliminate ethnic bias and black Americans in the South gained important civil rights. These were either economic liberals of the right like Seward or Taft, or libertarian leftists like the Liberal Progressives, Young Intellectuals and Muckrakers. In essence, traditions of statehood like the Declaration of Independence, Constitution and Flag were malleable resources in the hands of conservative ethno- nationalists and liberal-cosmopolitans. The tug of war between these two ideological forces led to a national consensus which increasingly centred on traditions of state after WWII. This does not mean that the United States is an inherently civic nation, but rather suggests that liberals will always interpret traditions of state differently from their ethnic 11 adversaries. If liberal-cosmopolitans were to become totally triumphant, then those statehood traditions would be dispensed with altogether and the state-national project downgraded in favour of a cosmopolitan project like the EU. If, on the contrary, traditions of state are an independent source of social power running counter to ethnic traditions, one might have expected a state vs. However, few traditionalist conservatives were seduced by the appeal of a purely state nationalism. Moreover, ethnic and

statist traditions seemed to be intertwined. Evidently loyalty to the state and dominant ethnicity could not be so easily separated. Let us not be too pessimistic, however. Traditions of statehood have countered ethnic traditions in other cases, and have often worn a conservative cloak. One thinks here of Orthodox Jewry, which long opposed the Zionist idea of establishing a Jewish state. So the political memory of, or nostalgia for, statehood even multi-ethnic statehood can act as a conservative tradition which may oppose the designs of upstart 12 ethno-nationalists. In established states, the imperative for unity is often the catalyst for a top-down state-nationalist conservatism which may run counter to the ethno-national cause. In the American case, one could catch glimpses of the state-unity imperative in the official rejection of ethnic nationalism during World War II which sought to counter the Japanese claim of the U. It joined forces with established commercial interests and southern plantation owners in defense of free immigration from China in the period. Here traditionalist ideas about divine providence and non-interference held sway over dominant ethnicity. At the same time, however, once can see how traditions - whether of state or ethnie - are resources which are appropriated very differently by conservative or liberal social actors. Even myths of genealogical ancestry can emphasise either mingling or a unitary pedigree. France The French case presents another instance of where a glorious tradition of modern statehood, namely the Revolution, did not prevent the recrudescence of dominant ethnicity. This first became evident during when the Jacobin authorities turned against foreign revolutionaries and revoked their citizenship. Meanwhile, linguistic diversity quickly came to be subordinated to the aim of linguistic centralisation and homogeneity. If you visit the Palace of Versailles today, you can walk through a room whose grand paintings mark the great moments in French history. Consider the issue of language. This can be a hallmark of either statehood or ethnicity. In Eastern Europe, the stress on language as opposed to political affiliation is seen as the crux of ethnic nationalism. Thus when the French insisted on linguistic homogeneity after , this might have been motivated by a desire to exclude non-ethnic French and assimilate linguistic peripheries into the French ethnic homeland. Yet, given the partly acquired, voluntary nature of language - as opposed to descent - it can serve to render the nation liberal and flexible in its attitude to ethnic boundaries. On the one hand, the Gauls, like the Anglo-Saxons in England, were once linked with liberalism in that they were seen to represent the disenfranchised common people as against their Frankish or Norman aristocratic overlords. Switzerland While the American and French cases are among the best known examples of glorious-yet-inclusive traditions of statehood, one should not forget the Swiss. Here, too, one can find a powerful tradition of statehood, namely that of the Swiss Confederation, celebrated as the only bulwark against feudal monarchy in pre-modern Europe. Moreover, the multi-linguistic nature of Swiss society appears to rule out any recourse to dominant ethnicity. Nonetheless, upon closer inspection, we can find the same organic trajectory as in the American and French cases. To begin with, as Zimmer notes, foreigners were gradually sidelined from participation in Swiss patriotic institutions like the Helvetic Society during Liberals still rested their conception of citizenship on the republican ideals of the Enlightenment, but, as the challenge of Italian, French and German nationalisms mounted after , this changed. In combination with the new Romantic sensibility which placed the accent on primitive nature, Swiss intellectuals stressed the notion of the Swiss as Homo Alpinus, a mountain people shaped by the geography of the Alps. While few would go so far, most concurred with the idea 16 that the Alpine experience shaped a common national character. For it is in the Catholic heartland that the Swiss-German collective memory of resistance to the Habsburgs has greatest popular currency.

Chapter 6 : 'National Ethnicity' and the Modern State | Eric Kaufmann - calendrierdelascience.com

Ethnic Challenges To the Modern Nation State by NA NA Original essays examine ethnic challenges to the modern nation-state and to moderninty itself, on the philosophical, political, and social levels.

Chapter 7 : 'National Ethnicity' and the modern state - CORE

The Rise and Fall of the Modern State System. Daniel J. Elazar. Given practical form by the new nation states of

Western Europe such as France in the late Middle Ages or Prussia in the nineteenth century, the old state system rested on the idea that by concentrating power in a single head or center, the state itself could be sufficiently controlled and its environment sufficiently managed to.

Chapter 8 : Project MUSE - Citizenship, Ethnicity, and Education in Modern Greece

The modern African state is the product of Europe, not Africa. To attempt at this late date to return to ancestral identities and resources as bases for building the modern African nation would.

Chapter 9 : â€¢ U.S. population: ethnic groups in America and | Statista

The author deals with the problem in political theory of how modern nation states must be structured in order to realise the two separate goals of equality of opportunity and the recognition of cultural diversity between groups.