NATIONS AND NATIONALISM: QUESTIONING ERNEST GELLNER'S THEORY

Martina Topić

University of Zagreb (Croatia)

Introduction

> "Not all nations are alike to each other. They were not alike in poverty and, they are not alike in wealth" (J.F. Revel 1965 in Gellner 1998:138[1])

Quotation above best draws the only possible conclusion on nation and nationalism. When we speak on these two terms it can be stated that there are theories as much as theoreticians. Nationalism seems to be the most undefined phenomenon regardless of numerous studies conducted in this field. The reason for this is specificity of circumstances in every single state because of which generalized conclusions seem to be rather impossible.

Besides that, "the number of approximately 200 acknowledged nations-states is probably not definite" (Katunarić, 2003:9) regarding the fact that in the world, according to certain information, there are 184 state, but also 5000 ethnical groups, and all of them together make 600 language groups (Kymlicka, 2003).

The confusion on defining national that rules the academic and public circles did not slacken up to today and the consequences of the lack of understanding are dating up to 14th century (see Anderson, 1990). However, its worst form these consequences have gotten during WW II with the attitude of Germany on German national bounding: "Nazis have skillfully used the confusion of meaning in regard to national question that followed the Peace agreement in Versailles in 1919 with which the Austrian and Turkish empires were destroyed" (Katunarić[2], 2003:99).

This sounds familiar if one takes consideration of Croatia's so called 'Homeland war' when the ruling machinery made of Serbs the historical enemies although before the war from the nineties Croatia and Serbia never had a war, and with which even now when the war is long finished there is an animosity towards supposed 'ultimate enemy' with which the peace initiative is significantly diminished.

---

[1] All quotations of Gellner's work from 1998 refers to the Croatian translation of the book 'Nations and Nationalism' and all translations in quotes are mine. Other quotations of Gellner are from the original titles.

[2] All work of Vjeran Katunarić quoted in this article is written in Croatian and the translations are mine.

Additionally, with unclear defining of the nation in terms of right to self-determination many questions arisen and many opportunities for various interpretations opened up since it has remained unclear if the boarders of the nation should be identical with boarders of the state (Katunarić, 2003). Precisely because of these reasons nationalism from movement for self-determination often becomes a violent movement for cleansing everything different from the nation that declares sovereignty over certain area.

Regarding differences in interpretations, this paper critically accesses national thought of Ernest Gellner who, according to the attitude of this paper, enforces somewhat too general assumptions on the creation and the development of nations and nationalisms.

Firstly, Gellner has enforced the vision of industrialization and cultural homogeneity as dominant means for the emergence of nationalism (Mouzelis, 2007: 132) which can be criticized on several examples.

Second critique of Gellner's theory is the system of official education. This view is called as functionalist for "this immediately converts the impression that the needs of 'Industria' are illegitimately transformed into causes which more or less automatically create nationalism" (Mouzelis, 2000: 160). In that sense, Gellner's crucial questions are: "What is modernity? Why and how did it emerge in 'one small part of Europe, and on one occasion only'? (Gellner 1989: 4) And what were the structural causes of its current shape?" (Malešević, 2007: 142).

The issues questioned in this paper are thus Gellner's view of nationalism emerging after industrialization, non-existence of nationalism without the state; the system of the state education as a means of enforcing nationalism and cultural and national homogeneity.

Development of Nationalism

Development of nationalism and its uplift is placed in 19th and 20th century and nationalism has not lost its strength not even in the 21st century.

According to some views, term nationalism was firstly used by Augustine Barruel in 1789 (Smith, 2001) who stated that nationalism is an expression of Masonic spirit. Supporters of nationalism, according to this view, love towards mankind replaced with love towards the nation, and with that they encouraged violence towards those that do not belong to the nation (Prpić, 1998). According to other view, term nationalism was firstly used by Johann Gotfried Herder (Schafer, 1972).

Nation, as we know today, generally tends to be considered as a product of the French revolution when nation got the right to create laws, according to which it will live, by itself.

First approaches to studies of nations and nationalism were of primordial and perennial nature. Therefore, protagonists of that attitude thought of nation partially as by accepting basic foundations of nationalist ideologies. This was notable in their languages in which they often equaled race with nation. That attitude Smith (2003) calls as perennial attitude.

This has been rejected by modernist approach that questioned claims of perennial's on ancient background of nations and their natural character. Furthermore, for modernists, nations are reasonably new phenomena made possible by the conditions coming out from the modern age. Therefore, perennials thought of nation as of primordial and eternal that we possess as we possess eyes and the power of speech whereas modernists explain nation as political nature and active role of citizenship in building the nation. Nations are therefore build, and not given by birth. This would mean that nations are territorial political communities, primary political connection and main object of loyalty of their members, main political actors on international scene, creations of its citizens, and especially of their elites and leaders and they are also the only shape of societal and political development (Smith, 2003).

Primordialism can best be summarized as a view of nation having certain characteristics as mandatory and possessing them as we possess eyes and ears. Geertz (1963) summarizes these characteristics as: assumed blood ties, race; language, region, religion and custom. These characteristics are thus, in primordial view, possessed by all members of the nation.

In opposition to these two attitudes stands modernism. Modernist approach lies on the assumption that nations are modern products that came to surface after industrialization and with French revolution. Ernest Gellner claims to be the representative of modernization theory however, his theory has been criticized because of the view that nationalism comes to surface after the industrialization. This is because it is "quite possible to have industrialization without nationalism (for example, the proto-industrialization of several regions in Western Europe), or nationalism without industrialization (as in the nationalistic movements of the Balkans and Latin America in the nineteenth century)" (Mouzelis, 2000: 158).

Opposite to both primordial and modernist approach is the one of Anthony D. Smith. Smith (2001; 2003) complains to both primordialism and modernism for being too exclusive. In his view, drawn from Seaton-Watson's and Armstrong's consideration of nation and national, the dominant approach to the study of nationalism should be ethnosymbolism. This approach, according to Smith, has a distinctive approach for it accepts that nations as we know them today indeed came to surface after the French revolution however, nations should also be researched through their history of ethnies that are precursors to today's nations. This approach also underlines the long lasting of nations (la longue durèe) in difference from the modernists that see nations only as products of modernity (Smith, 1986; 1998[3]; 2000; 2001; 2003; 2003 a[4]). Ethnosymbolic approach Smith divides in several parts: la longue dureé, ethnie and nations, ethnical myths, memories and symbols, ethnical foundations of the nation, roots of nation formation, role of nationalism and persistence and changes of nations. La Longue dureé refers to pre-modern shapes of nations that demand check, and connection with the past, especially ethnical past or pasts, for nation is crucial. There are three ways in which past affects the nation: returning, continuity and appropriation. In regard to this, Smith wants to say that nation must be researched before the era of modernity up to collective identities and communities in pre-modern age (Smith, 2000).

Classical paradigm of modernism is however made as a consequence of the theory of building a nation and this paradigm could be summarized as follows: "1. nations are completely modern-modern in the sense they come from new time or, from the French revolution and in this sense the constituents of nations are new and thus a part of new age of modernity and thus by definition modern; 2. nations are products of modernity or, their elements are not latest or new but they could have appear, and they had to appear, in the process of 'modernization', development of modern conditions and politics of modernization; 3. nations are therefore not deeply rooted in history but they are unavoidable consequences of revolutions that were created by a modern age and, as such, they are tied to their characteristics and conditions, and once when these characteristics and conditions are changed, nations will slowly disappear or become squeezed out; 4. nationalism is build in modernity or, correctly, in the processes of modernization and change to the modern order, so when these processes will come to their ends, nationalism will also get weaken and finally disappear; 5. nations and nationalisms are societal creations and cultural products of modernity, made for the age of revolutions and mass mobilization and crucial for attempts for these processes of fast societal changes to get controlled (Smith, 2003: 21, 22).

In line with this, Smith (2003) calls modernist and perennial paradigms as dichotomy expressed in their contrasting attitudes on the genesis of the nation, and that can be summarized in seven positions that are not exclusive nor do every author that belongs to these two paradigms supports all of these elements. The elements are however examples of two confronted paradigms according to which: "1. For perennial's, nation is

---

[3] Quotations from Smith (1998) are my translations.

[4] Quotations from Smith (2003 a) are my translations.

politicized ethno-cultural society, society of common background, that demands for political acknowledgement to be founded on that basis. For modernists, nation is a territorial political community, civilian community in a front of the law of equal citizens on certain territory; 2. For perennials, nation is a long lasting and ancient, with hundred if not thousand years old history. For modernists, nation is recent and new, a product of completely modern and new conditions, and therefore unknown in pre-modern periods. 3. For perennials, nation is 'rooted' in space and time; built in historical homeland. For modernists, nation is a creation. Its members or segments are 'building' it on purpose. 4. For perennials, nation is people's or regiment's community, community of 'peoples' that reflects their needs and desires. Modernists stand on a position that nation is build on purpose by elites that wanted to influence the feelings of masses to achieve their goals. 5. For perennials, belonging to a nation means possessing certain traits. That is the stadium of existence. For modernists, this means possessing certain capabilities. That is capability for acting. 6. For perennials, nations are unities without stitches, with one will and one character. For modernists, nations are typically cut and divided on a certain number of (regional, class, gender, religious, etc.) groups, out of which every group has its own interests and needs. 7. For perennials, nations are founded on principles of common background and authentic culture. For modernists, the principles of national solidarity need to be searched in societal communication and citizen's status" (Smith, 2003: 22, 23).

O'Leary (2000) additionally names two other theories, such as 'Dark Gods theory' and 'naturality theory' with first seeing nationalism as the sin that motivates human beings and second seeing nationalism through similar reasoning as primordialism and thus, through eyebrows and blood groups that is natural to the citizens of the same nationality sharing the same political unit.

However, certain authors (e.g. Anderson, 1990: 66) are placing nation creation ('nation-ness') in 14th century when certain groups of people started to interconnect amongst themselves via language and that development got its uplift in the 19th century when the European expansion started. Nationalism thus came into existence as a product of the nation that through national movement united different craft, and uniting has been achieved through unification of customs, culture, language and history of a certain group uniting in the nation. With this nationalism is actually defined as means for transferring of one group to nation with common characteristics. However, national movements gained their uplift after WW II. During that time all revolutions that, with their goals, successfully defined in their national framework and used national terminology (Anderson, 1990).

But, although nationalism as a phenomenon places itself in the context of French revolution when it got the strongest uplift for the first time, still people lived in certain groups connected by something even before nationalism occurred.

However, regarding the existence of different crafts, these groups have not been unique but it can be said that on one territory there were more different groups that lived together on the same place.

In line with this goes the claim of Eric Hobsbawn who states that even Marxist movements and states desired to become national in their pure essence and with that they also became nationalist (Anderson, 1990). That would mean, as Anderson observes, that even those states that did not define themselves through nation actually inherited pre-national dynastical states of the 19th century (Anderson, 1990).

According to Anderson, official nationalism in Europe developed in 19th century and "these nationalisms were historically impossible until the occurrence of regimental language oriented nationalisms since they were in their essences replies of ruling groups (…) threaten by excommunication from regimentally imagined communities or marginalization (Anderson[5], 1990:101).

With this, the local elite or regiment "used the symbolical strength of the national identity and language as their trump (…). In mother's tongue, the message of universal monetary language on the ruthless law of the market

---

[5] Anderson's book 'Nation: Imagined community' has been used in its Croatian translation and thus all English translations are mine.

is translated. Mother's tongue takes over the role of sedative in macroeconomic politics as it, during the time of conflict with another nation, had a role of negatively stimulating language" (Katunarić, 1999:106).

Another important characteristic of the nation is the feeling of common belonging of each individual to the group where the individual identifies himself with the group. Pure feeling of identifying with nation is not nationalism as such but nationalism as a phenomenon additionally produces national identity and encourages individuals to identify with the group. Especially because of that Anderson (1990:17) claims that nations are actually imagined political communities and this is because "majority of members of certain nation will never meet majority of members of their nation and not even hear on them however, in the thoughts of every one of them lives a picture of their unity."

On the track of this definition is Ernest Gellner (1998) who also calls nations made up on places where they do not exist but the weakness of this approach is in the fact that Gellner this making up of the nation equalizes with fabrication instead, as Anderson observes, with creating something that does not exist and what is imagined and imagined is still significantly different then purely made up.

As a proof that nation is imagined, an example can be made.

What would happen if all members of one nation would manage to meet each other? Theoretically speaking of course because this is not meaningfully possible regarding the fact that no matter how small the number of members of certain group of individuals could be, this number is always too big, let alone if including Diaspora in a whole story.

In that case, this is if all of them would meet, it is not impossible, in a contrary, it is highly possible, that between members there would come to a conflict and then consequentially to divisions and nation as such would set apart on smaller groups of members who think alike.

New nations that would spread would emerge again however then everybody could again theoretically know each other and a conflict could emerge again, etc., etc.

Therefore, nation is what bounds us however, it bounds us only in symbolical sense and on certain higher level but speaking like this on certain blood connection there could be no discussion. Especially not because we all at least ones in our lives met someone who does not get along with not his or hers closest relatives. With this we can again question the issue of blood and background. It is needless to talk on one whole nation. Therefore, nationalism could be defined as creation of symbolical feeling of connectedness on higher level.

Anderson (1990:121) adds that the language of that imagined community generates and with this generation it builds „specific solidarity". In relation to that, Anderson concludes with example with which he claims that "if radicals in Mozambique speak Portuguese that means that Portuguese is the medium through which Mozambique imagines itself".

Nationalism as a phenomenon is researched by academics that mainly judge it however nationalism firstly occurs in intellectual circles and then it spreads to other parts of certain community. A statement 'if he as an academic thinks that way, what can you expect from the regiment' is often heard in public and with this one actually wants to say that it is expected from intellectuals to be distanced from nationalist ideology and with this attitude, nationalism is determined as something historically wrong. Thus, some authors state that "no respectable author from social sciences share nationalist beliefs but rather analyzes them and grades their influence on building the society, state, international relations, economic development, education and science, etc." (Katunarić, 2003:19). This is the truth however, it is logical that nationalism firstly appears within intellectuals circles regarding the fact intellectuals are those who have the capability of writing and transferring knowledge from which regiment learns and the language is what certain authors consider as means through which nationalism gains uplift. This is to say that increasing the literacy can lead to strengthening of nationalist tendencies inside regiment. By increasing literacy among regiment, publications of intelligentsia become widely available to masses that take over their ideas. This can be explained with phases of creation of the nation according to which in the first phase the idea of nation appears in tight circle of intellectuals and then it be-

comes the basis for political action whilst in third phase it gets transferred to wider masses (see Katunarić, 2003:142).

The reason why today's academic community is not treated as nationalistic can be because intelligentsia does not have to start with its nationalist texts with intention to overgrow in violence however, spreading of those papers in regiment that interprets it in an attempt to transform theory in practice, often results in violence. This is where the non-nationalistic image of intelligentsia and its non-belonging could be coming from, as Katunarić sees it.

Anderson (1990) adds that this certainly stands for Europe of the 19th century, if not for Europe of 20th century as well. By naming various examples of countries (Hungary, Norway, Finland) Anderson claims that nationalism always manifests in the language and since it is the intellectuals that are speaking the language and that are publishing their papers in that language, it makes sense that they are the first founders of nationalism.

Anderson (1990) claims that the starting market was literate Europe in which the publishers, because of the lack of money, started to sell cheap editions on regimental languages and not in languages of higher classes no more.

As another significant factor it is considered to be the reformation that owes its success to the success of the press: "Those languages made foundations for national conches on three different ways: firstly they created unified field of exchange and communication under Latin and above vernacular (…). Additionally, print capitalism strengthened the language which during time attributed to the creation of image of antiquity which is so important in subjective conceiving of the nation (…). Finally, print capitalism created languages different of old governing vernaculars. Some of the dialects have unavoidably been 'closer' to certain print language so they dominated with its final shape" (Anderson, 1990:48).

Early nationalism, if speaking on its language connotation, can indeed be connected with culture or, "early nationalism is indeed mostly cultural and not political fact" (Katunarić, 1999:107).

Gellner on the other hand considers literacy and education as crucial in nation formation. Therefore, he suggests that the minimal requirement for full citizenship is literacy. However, only a national educational system can produce full citizens but that, according to Gellner, also means that educational system has to perform its action in official language that has to be established. In Gellner's opinion, language unification and general education can explain why nationalism moves the masses (Gellner, 1964).

However, Gellner also states the role of clergy that has to be literate in the official languages. In this sense Gellner underlines that "there is a certain obvious connection between the two features of the modern situation: if every men is a clerk, it is a great help of the language in which he is literate to be identified with, or at least fairly close to, the vernacular in which he was reared in the family context. Continuity between the idioms of home and school facilitate the task of education. (…) But, when a total population achieves or approaches literacy, the restriction and the prestige become irrelevant, and the proximity of the languages of writing and of daily speech become an advantage" (Gellner, 1964 in Hutchinson & Smith, 1994: 57).

This 'facilitation of literacy through the use of a vernacular', as Gellner (1964, in Hutchinson & Smith, 1994: 57) calls it, advances nationalism and this clearly, according to him, happened in Europe where it was easier to teach peasants to read and write in their own languages then in Latin for instance. This strengthened the nationalism.

There was also a dichotomy of the language spoken at home and the one spoken in service and in the last instance, the one spoken at work and in educational system prevailed. This also happened, according to Gellner, in Europe.

Nationalism in this sense does not appear immediately for it is necessary for peasant's siblings to get education in the language of educational system and then, with the use of folk, folklore and popular culture, nationalism emerges. Here Gellner sees the aspect of modernization where peasants are getting eroded by educational and industrial system that are modernizing and unifying around common language and all this eventually

creates full citizenship that is ready to involve in nationalistic ideology. However, this modernization as such does not cause nationalism directly but indirectly through its uneven distribution. This is to say that because of uneven distribution nationals of certain nation turn to nationalism.

This can be connected to Supek's (1992) view where people who are unsatisfied with their economic position turn to nationalism for they blame someone else for their problems. This is confirmed, according to Supek, during the WW II when Germans were seduced against Jews blaming them for their lack of economic prosperity.

In Gellner's view, when conditions for nationalistic ideology are met, key role in its enforcement to masses is performed by proletariat and intelligentsia that needs to get involved in nationalism after independence is obtained. This is, according to Gellner, because independence for intelligentsia means good jobs and higher influence whereas for proletariat it means disillusion because national governments tend to be harsher towards newly formed nations then the foreign ones.

Something similar happened in Croatia as well. For example, Croatia has been a member of former Yugoslavia where it had a status of the republic and certain influence. However, nationalistic leaders were not satisfied with it and upon independence from the 1990s they established a system where proletariat indeed faced disillusion and harsh policies, equal or even worse[6] then in Yugoslavia and at the same time they had nobody to complain to for they were prosecuted but this time by their so called 'own' nationals. Therefore, whereas before Belgrade was responsible for everything nowadays there is nobody to blame for problems and those who are critical often end up being accused of so called 'yugo-nostalgia'.

As for the language, Croatia also faced rigorous language policy that tried to distinguish Croatian language from the Serbian although it is very true that two languages are polycentric and thus have the same basis that developed in different directions (Koren, 2007).

In this sense, Croatia met all of these arguments plus the one of Anderson for it established the official Croatian language instead of Serbo-Croatian enforced thus far and this new language, cleansed from Serbian expressions, was enforced in a whole country whose population has been repeatedly convinced that two languages are not the same. Educational system was also affected with this new language policy (plus history teaching that served for indoctrination purposes only) and uneven modernization together with high position of intelligentsia and disillusion of proletariat caused the situation Gellner vividly describes.

Additionally, language also became a means through which Croatian nation is imagined and vernacular culture, folklore, folk and popular culture got eroded with nationalistic and traditional discourse.

It seems that nationalism is always enforced through tradition where customs and culture are aggressively pushed in the public discourse over valuating the importance of the nation and undervaluing the importance of others, primarily former rulers or comrades, as in the example of Croatia.

---

[6] For example women's rights were even significantly decreased from the socialist system and traditionalist polices were endorsed. When four female journalists stood up for women's rights they were lynched by the officials and the media they controlled (Topić, 2009). On the other hand, state companies went through privatization seen as criminal (Petričić, 2000) and people massively lost their jobs however, whereas in former Yugoslavia they were able to blame someone from their fellow nationals, in independent Croatia, due to nationalistic breastfeeding, they had nobody to complain to and those who did faced prosecution. However, these policies are still the reality for the party that declared independence can enforce nearly feudal policies (like in 2009 and 2010) and the population does not go to massive protest against the Government like in the rest of Europe. But, during the only term of the opposition (from 2000 to 2004) only slightest attempt to enforce unpopular policies caused rage amongst citizenship because of which Social Democrats failed in achieving certain goals for they were afraid to be overthrown from the Government. This was because Social Democrats are perceived not to participate in gaining Croatia's independence which is false however, nationalistic Governments from the 1990s presented it to the proletariat this way.

Gellner draws this on the example of Megalomanian empire and Ruritania as its part. In this sense, the first clearly refers to Habsburg's empire and the second to Check republic (Szporluk, 2000). In the 19th century, Megalomania rapidly industrialized however, Ruritania was left out of it and thus, Ruritanian peasants were forced to look for work elsewhere. Due to the language policy, children of Ruritanians assimilated into the Megalomania due to the education they received and even today, when Ruritania is a separate state there are a lot of people in former Megalomania with Ruritanian origin (Gellner, 1998).

However, Ruritanians, in Gellner's view, never thought of their folk culture prior to modernization that caused migration. They started to think about it when they realized the difference between the culture they ended up living in and their culture as well as when they felt the hostility of the new, in this sense high, culture.

Then the Ruritanians realized the difference and the impossibility to gain higher positions if not being properly trained and therefore some of them went back with industrialization coming in Ruritania. Then some sort of conflict occurred for Ruritanians that came back spoke language with different dialect influenced with the one of where they came back from and, as Gellner outlines, this is how Ruritanian nation was born in its concept of contrast. However, this also brought a new culture in Ruritania for this new culture that Ruritanians returnees brought back entered the old, low Ruritanian culture and thus this new culture became some sort of a new high culture eroding the low one.

In this sense, Gellner rejected all theories not enforcing modernist view of nation creation thus, naturalistic theory, Kedourie's theory, Dark Gods theory and primordialistic views as well as liberalism and Marxism[7]. For him, "the preconditions (and maintenance) of nationalism include wide-spread or universal literacy, and a society committed to economic growth through its formal commitment to social mobility-both horizontal and vertical. Industrial society requires effective and widespread context-free communication through a common medium, a 'high culture'" (O'Leary, 2000: 47).

Later (in Nations and Nationalism) Gellner developed three stages of humanity, pre-agrarian, agrarian and industrial whereas he found nationalism growing in the last one for the last one has a state and in Gellner's view there is no nationalism where there is no state for if there is no state there is no common culture, customs and official language. With this, Gellner largely sees nationalism as a modernity issue that comes along with industrialization "and specifically its generalizations of a 'high culture' as a means for effecting a complex and constantly shifting division of labor" (Beissinger, 2000: 169).

Characteristics of Nationalism with particular attention to Gellner's theory

In literature, there are mostly two characteristics of nationalism and these are: nation as a community of citizens and nation as a community of individuals belonging to the same culture. As Prpić (1998) outlines, the first characteristic is attributed with democratic-liberal meaning while the second one is attributed with totalitarianism and dictatorship. With this we are coming to the determination of nationalism as integrative, separatist, economic, cultural and lingual (Prpić, 1998).

---

[7] Naturalist theory largely ties to primordialist view of the nation that Gellner rejected (O'Leary, 2000) or, primordialist view of the nation and enforced a vision that "nationalism is a principle of political legitimacy for us precisely because culture has become so important that 'does not so much underline structure; rather, it replaces it'" (O'Leary, 2000: 42). When identifying the three periods of human development (pre-agrarian or hunter-gatherer, agrarian and industrial) it seems that "the main idea behind his work was to reaffirm the Weberian tripartite vision of social development as against a singular Marxist view; that is, to see history as the interplay of politics, economics and culture rather than solely through the prism of economic modes of production" (Haugaard & Malešević, 2007: 6).

However, determination of nationalism as cultural, having in mind the same language, culture and religion cannot explain the term nation and nationalism. This is because it is absolutely possible for individuals of the same religion to speak the same language and to have a similar tradition but not to be of the same nationality. In this situation a problem of ethnicity and ethnical groups occurs and this leads us to the conclusion that cultural nationalism is indeed totalitarian while the purely territorial, that refers to sovereignty of the certain group of citizens of this or that name, is the democratic-liberal one.

But, two questions are emerging. Why would nation determine itself as an expression of subjective decision of individuals to belong together only based on their joint characteristics or identity? Why nation would not be able to determine itself as an expression of the group of individuals that belonged together before and thus were determined by the nation or some of it frames however, a shift to nation was actually determined by the desire for power?

In other words, is it not possible that desire for power of the group of individuals inside a larger group determined arising of the national question so that with emergence of nation that smaller group from a bigger group became a ruling elite in a new national state?

In that sense, Supek's theory on seeking external or internal enemy seems accurate. According to that theory (Supek, 1992) nationalism turns to racist overreacting and one of important functions of nationalism is removing class conflicts replacing them with internal or external enemy of the people. That was the principle on which German Nationalsocialism was born. That doctrine found internal enemy in Jews that were considered to be responsible for bad economic situation in Germany.

On Croatia's example, Belgrade was always responsible for everything and in one word "self-justifying of new elites to blame others for their own development failure, from former socialism towards famous 'masons' to West, is another line of the same ballade" (Katunarić, 2003:38).

This nationalism, manifested through seeking external enemy is connected with economic situation that is seen differently in different places. Therefore Gellner (1998) considers poverty not to advance nationalism because there can be no imperialism that he sees as an attempt of spreading the high culture to other cultures and as an attempt to subordinate these other cultures by making them lower from it.

Thus, when industrial society enriches, according to Gellner, there is an increase in possibilities for nationalism and imperialism. On the other hand, Supek (1992) believes that bad economic situation affects phenomenon of nationalism and pushes it up to that destructive form since people look for enemy to blame it for its bad economic situation.

For Gellner (1998) conflicts caused by nationalism are conflicts of culture for domination over the territory. It can be thus summarized that attempt for cultural domination is enforced through ethnicity struggling for the state space on which certain culture will live at. In that case, if other culture opposes we have a conflict that is often seen as ethnical. The conflict is ethnical indeed however, its essence, if we treat it like this, is cultural and ethnicity is only a means through which it is made possible. Looking things this way it seems that economic progress goes in favor of the development of certain culture and then it starts to express desire for domination and this then, step by step, transfers to nationalism. This would mean that with development of certain state possibility for nationalism and nationalistic pretensions increases. However, this does not necessarily have to be the case. Certain state can be nationalistic in its orientation but without pretensions towards other territories.

France is for example often seen as, at least, assimilatory if not nationalistic. A couple of years ago, France prohibited usage of English words for internet and computer functions. Looking from the prism of culture as a moving force of nationalism, France is a nationalistic state. But, does this necessary means that France has territorial pretensions towards other European states to spread its culture on?

France in the past did had territorial pretensions towards its colonies on which it spread its culture and language but that very same France is also a founder of European wave of nationalism that came openly to surface after the French revolution and that sough the right to self-determination and the rule of law applying to everyone instead of upper crafts only.

It can be stated that Gellner is partially right in regard to the fact that France as industrial society imperialistically spread its culture on its colonies only to break this same system by revolution with a goal to establish the national state. This can be, on the other hand, seen as spreading its culture and influence over other countries until founding its own national state, as it exists today, has been founded. Therefore, after it established its culture and spread it on others, it started to found a nation as well. From this, it really comes out that culture is an ancestor of nation and that culture is indeed a characteristic of creating a nation. Nation with this is indeed created with a will which is something Gellner states however, the order is somewhat different.

But, Gellner again insists on defining nationalism in line with nation that lives there but in a way that it appears as if "nationalism is actually a general imposing of high culture to the society in which previous lower cultures took over lives of the majority and sometimes of the citizenship as a whole" (Gellner, 1998: 77). This is only partially right and it best shows how there is no complete theory of nationalism that could be applied to all.

For example, if this definition is to be applied to Spain then the situation would be significantly suspicious. In that case we could characterize Spaniards as nationalists imposing their culture to Basque. Spaniards in this sense do not allow Basques to nationally self-determinate themselves and leave Spain. However, this is simply not precisely correct. Spain gave autonomy to Basque with which it 'de facto' acknowledged special status of Basque and its culture. Spain did not impose its 'high culture' regarding the fact that Basques even use their language that is in Basque regions acknowledged as official language together with Spanish (Goenaga, 2001). Only because Spanish is declaratively equal to Basque we can speak of imposing. In one word, Spain imposed its political governing of all provinces included in today's Spain which included Basque as well.

On the other hand, by acknowledging Basque language, Spain acknowledged Basque specialty and culture and with it, the nation as well. Besides that, Basque is also the language of teaching in kindergartens, schools and universities and Basque in their autonomous province also have a Parliament (Goenaga 2001; Jiménez Sánchez 2006) and Basque is therefore technically some version of the state. But, looking through this definition only, it looks as if Basques are not nationalists if we, as Gellner do, define nationalism as imposing of the high culture to the low one. This would then mean that only Spaniards are nationalists and this is not precisely correct either.

Gellner himself states that nationalism is the force that invents dead languages, customs and common history. In that case it is more Basques that are nationalists then Spaniards regarding the fact that they are officially not a separate state and they still have their own language (which is accidentally exactly a dead language similar to Latin and non-understandable to Spanish speakers and then to everybody else too) and their culture, customs and history (Goenaga 2001; Rivera 2001; Urrestarazu 2001).

Basques could also be seen as worst nationalists then Spaniards since in their desires they rat to violence which would mean they are seeking self-determination by force[8]. But, at the same time it is a right of every nation to self-determinate itself and found a state and thus, Spaniards should not oppose to this. In sum, both Spaniards and Basques can be framed as nationalists and Gellner's definition can be applied only partially but not completely.

---

[8] Basques have their separatist organization ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna; in translation Basque homeland and freedom) that is often attacking official authorities with the goal to establish national Basque state. Many consider it as terrorist due to the fact there are atrocities in their diversions however, ETA's targets are never civilians (on purpose) and thus it is primarily separatist organization.

Gellner (1998) also states that „nationalism usually subordinates in the name of so called regimental culture" (p.77) and that "if nationalism works out, it eliminates foreign high culture but then it does not replaces it with local low culture but instead, it again revives or makes up its own local high culture (written, spread by experts), although, this must be acknowledged, somewhat connected to previous regimental style and dialects" (p. 77).

There is something crucially wrong here. Already mentioned Basque is an example of peoples that have its own culture and language that seeks self-determination based on it. It is probably the truth that some of its parts are made up and that founding of unique Basque state would bring certain changes. However, Basque already has autonomy and its own system that functions nearly as a state (see Rivera 2001; Lasagabaster 2001).

In that sense, their culture is already imposed to the Spanish one and only waits to flourish but this culture cannot be considered as a low one regarding the high level of autonomy. But, it is the truth, if looking black and white and if Basque culture is to be considered as a low one (regarding the fact that Basque is not an independent state), and Spanish one (since Spain is a sovereign state) as a high one, that Basque would deem towards becoming a high culture or, it would become a high culture after the independence.

However, the way in which Gellner reasons is simply too generalized. In this sense, it seems as if Basques are nationalists but not the Spaniards too. However, nationalists are both and Spaniards are more imperialists then nationalists if we define imperialism as a desire for expansion of its own culture and creation of superiority over the other cultures. Then we come to the point that Gellner is wrong when stating that the development of industrial society advances the development of nationalism since in other discussions he claims the opposite when he, for example, places Spaniards more-less to the position of non-nationalists.

Nationalism is for Gellner imposition of high culture over a low culture enforced through customs and folklore however, nationalism, according to him, usually claims to be otherwise. This is to say that nationalism claims the protection of folklore and local culture whereas, according to Gellner, it comes basically to the fact that high culture is taking over the low culture. This is because nationalism does not replace the high culture with lower culture, in whose name the battle for self-determination is lead, but with new invented culture that then becomes a new high culture with the old low culture remaining where it was.

In this sense, Gellner is saying that if Basque is to become independent, they would impose new, invented culture instead of the one enforced now when Basque is a part of Spain that can, in this sense, be considered as a high, imperialistic culture.

However, when stating this, Gellner does not justify it correctly because if this is to happen there would still be the question of language that would not be invented for Basques indeed have their own language that would then become the only language in official educational system. In this sense, what would happen if we follow Gellner's theory is that this new educational policy would overwhelm peasantry and proletariat for generations would be educated in this language and in the newly invented culture.

This is a bit difficult to defend as a thesis and especially since we do not know what would happen. However, if applying this to Croatia, a country that gained independence nearly 20 years ago then situation becomes somewhat different. Croatia replaced the Yugoslav culture of brotherhood with nationalistic discourse and educational system largely influenced by nationalistic Government. Pupils were taught in new, purified language and about Croatian culture only. However, tradition has not been purely invented. Simply, old myths and legends and customs were taken out from its local areas to the national discourse. In this sense, Croatia did not invent new tradition and culture but rather overvalued the existing local culture, in Gellnerian sense speaking, low culture.

On the other hand, nationalism can be defined as a movement carried by desire for self-determination that can be founded and therefore positive and also unfounded and thus negative. But, imperialism also comes out from nationalism and thus Spaniards can also be seen as nationalists that are spreading their culture on other peoples while Basques in that case are in a category of people that are seeking self-determination that can be

positive and negative but in this case it could be seen as negative since for creating a Basque state there would be a need for the French territories as well (according to Basque doctrine 4+3=1 meaning that four Basque provinces in Spain together with three Basque provinces in France constitute one unique Basque state; Tatalović 1997).

There is a question emerging here. Is nationalism coming out as an expression for imperialism and thus after economic development of the country or, is nationalism a result of desire for power and territory or, is nationalism a desire for destroying the other based on declaring the cultural equality of one and difference of the other and thus through the attack on those considered to be different?

Reynolds (1984) supports the thesis of Seton-Watson (1977) stating that all nations have history but she also underlines that not all kingdoms were meant to become modern states and in this way there was first the appearance of national consciousness that emerged and caused the creation of the modern nation state. This is in line with Seton-Watson's view that "nations exist when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one" (Seton-Watson, 1977: 5). In this sense, it means that not all kingdoms became states for its inhabitants did not behave as one.

In this sense, Basque was not meant to be the state of looking from Reynolds point of view but at the same time, if looking from the Seton-Watson's point of view, Basque did not behave as citizens of the state which is partially right for Basques desires for the state are founded in the legacy of 'fuerros' that were given to several Basque provinces but only Basque maintained it through out history and these 'fuerros' in a way transformed to today's autonomy (see Rivera, 2001).

Supek (1992) however thinks that "nationalists are in fond of seeing culture as an act of one nation" (p. 88) and in his opinion this is wrong because it is impossible to found out where one culture is coming from.

There is a possibility that certain cultural customs are brought via travelling to other parts of the world but that with time they became a part of local culture that believes to own it. That particularly could have happen in pre-agrarian and agrarian societies discussed by Ernest Gellner.

In Gellner's opinion, mankind went through three phases in its development: pre-agrarian (or hunter-gatherer), agrarian and industrial (Gellner, 1998). Therefore, if one takes for example an agrarian society and beginning of the industrial then on Supek's example one can claim that first two societies that Gellner discusses, people by traveling and moving through different, then nationally unspecified territories, transferred customs from one culture to another and with this we cannot establish what is really a part of culture of one and what of the other nation.

Gellner's claim with which he states that in pre-agrarian and agrarian society there was no nationalism, seems to be wrong. We can take into consideration that during that time, transferring of one custom to another culture was actually a foundation for nationalism that we know today and in which many nations claim rights over the same cultural customs.

Good example for that is the way someone prepares food. For example, Greeks and Croats will offer meals baked under 'peka' (traditional way of baking food in a traditional jar under which there is another jar with food and on that upper jar there is ash and cinder) as traditional Greek or Croatian meals both convinced that it is an ancient characteristic of their cultures. But, in reality these are traditional ways of preparing food in both countries and it is an open question of who brought what and from where.

According to Supek (1992) it is perfectly wrong to underline something as a part of national culture since, according to him, culture always crosses national boarders of the creator. Cultural piece thus becomes the culture of mankind in that moment when it crosses the national boarder and by that it cannot be national. How, for example Little Red Riding Hood, could be considered to be a part of anybody's culture when that story is over told by a whole world just that it calls it differently regarding different languages? That's actually where the problem lies. Differentiating of nations assumes also differences of basic characteristics that are not transfer-

able. In that sense, language can be a part of culture and specialty of one nation while culture cannot do so for we do not know all of the languages however, majority knows for Little Red Riding Hood.

In this case it is worth mentioning Smith's ethnosymbolic theory where Smith differentiates ethnies from nations and he defines ethnie as "a named human population with myths and common ancestors, common historical memories, one or more elements of common culture, connection with homeland and the means of solidarity at least among elites" (Smith, 2000: 65, see also Smith, 1998) while he defines nation as "named human population that occupies historical territory or homeland and shares common myths and memories; mass, public culture; unique economy; unique rights and duties of all members" (Smith, 2000: 63, see also Smith, 1998: 30).

This division, according to Smith, makes possible for us to get an insight in modernism as well as perennialism and also, to a compact insight in the question of nations and nationalism that other approaches, particularly two paradigms, lack.

Ethnosymbolism is however "approach related to central components of ethnical and national phenomena that are social-cultural and symbolical rather then demographic or political. Besides different symbols, such as language, clothes, emblems, rituals and artifacts, these elements are founded in memories, myths, values and traditions and in institutionalized practices from where they are coming out" (Smith, 2000: 66). When speaking on ethnical foundations of the nation, Smith particularly underlines that modernists can answer to the questions 'why is the nation' and 'when is the nation' but not to the questions 'who is the nation' and 'where is the nation'.

For answers to these questions, according to Smith's view, we must turn to ethnosymbolism (Smith 1986; 2000; 2001). Important assumption of ethnosymbolic approach is the need for analyzing the rise of nations in the sense of old ethnical connections and formations, and in this way, different ways of nation formation can be found whereas every research should start from ethnies. In terms of the role of nationalism, Smith believes that it is not sufficient to discuss the power of ideology but to pay special attention to the national symbols.

It is also important to distinguish old and new nations from historical and unhistorical ones in Seton-Watson's opinion because all nations have history that has been broken by conquest (Seton-Watson, 1977).

It is exactly the issue of the national language that is often a question of self-determination of one nation. This particularly applies to Croatia in which certain language expressions are brought to absurd only to increase differences from Serbian language, differences that were not in stake really but at the same time that have been taken as a means of nationalistic language politics (see Koren, 2007).

On the other side, those nations that do not have a possibility of expressing the national specialness through the language express their nationalism more secretly but this does not mean that there is no nationalism in those countries as well. As Matić (2006) correctly notices, majority of those critiques on nationalism are affected by personal prejudices of the author and therefore nationalism is often negatively determined in one context and completely ignored in the other. That is why there is a negative determination of nationalism in Southeastern and Eastern Europe while at the same time there seems to be a stigmatization of nationalism in the West showing western nationalism as patriotism or by completely ignoring it[9].

---

[9] Smith explains the dichotomy between western or civil model of nation versus eastern or ethnical model. In the fist case or, in the case of western or civil model of nation, it is the territorial understanding of nations that must possess compact, founded territories and, people and territories must belong to each other. Besides that, there is an element of 'patrie' or, the community of law and institutions in which there is a unique political will enforced and, there is also a feeling of legal equality among members of the community which means the minimum of mutual rights and obligations of members of the nation and exclusion of their enemies from these rights.

Nations are therefore in the West understood as "communities of culture, whose members are united and not homogenized by common historical memories, myths, symbols and traditions" (Smith, 1998: 25). In this sense, compo-

Ernest Gellner claims that "nationalism is above all political principle that claims for political and national community to be the same" (1998: 21).

Additionally, Gellner underlines that nationalism is a feeling of fulfillment that can be positive if fulfillment is achieved or negative if it does not. These feelings, according to Gellner, encourage the nationalist movement. According to his understanding, ethnical boarders have key defining in defining the nationalism and nations since ethnical boarders cannot cut the political ones and since ethnical boarders inside the state do not share power holders from the rest. According to this definition, as Gellner underlines, it turns out that nationalism is extraordinary negative phenomenon regarding the fact pure ethnical situation unavoidably leads towards violence or, towards murdering or disposing of those belonging to other ethnical group or in the last instance, towards their assimilation.

But Gellner (1998) makes one suspicious conclusion. He claims that not all societies have a state (p. 24) which is correct however, he continues with the statement that "From that it directly derives that the problem of nationalism does not appear in societies that does not have a state. If there is no state, it is obviously not pos-

---

nents of standard western model of nations are historical territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of their members and common civic culture and ideology (Smith, 1998).

However, Smith does not offer this view of nations in Eastern Europe in which in several times, he also includes Croatia. Although Smith protects himself from giving a definite judgment when saying how "every nationalism and every concept of the nation is made of different elements and dimensions, that we choose to distinguish voluntaries and organic, civil and ethnical, primordial and instrumental. No nation, no nationalism, can be seen as only one or another, even if certain moments of one or another of these elements predominates in the basis of national identity" (Smith, 2000: 25). He however, when referring to ethnical nationalism and. in certain (negative) elements, to organic nationalism, underlines Eastern Europe as a representative of this type of nationalism. With that in some examples he also mentions Croatian-Serbian conflicts in Bosnia and the region of former Yugoslavia in general. With this Smith significantly demarcates himself towards an attitude that the area of Eastern Europe in which he includes Croatia as well, is primarily ethnically oriented. With that he does not underlines the period in which this is the case but he states this a priori as if that type of nationalism in this region and Croatia is naturally given through out history. However, this non-western understanding of the nation in Eastern Europe in historical view has "brought in the question of the predominance of western model and complemented it with significant new elements, appropriate to the significantly different circumstances and trajectories of the non-western communities" (Smith, 1998: 26). That non-western model of nation Smith calls as ethnical understanding of the nation whose special characteristic is underlining the community of birth and the birth culture: "While the western concept was establishing that individual must belong to a certain nation but that he can choose to which one, non-western or 'ethnical' concept did not allow that type of liberty. If you are leaving your community or if you emigrate to another one, you unavoidably, organically, remain a member of the community of your birth and you carry its stamp forever. Nation is in other words, before and above all represented by the community of people of the same background" (Smith, 1998: 26). In ethnical model of the nation, nation is a superior family whose pedigree and background is often traced by intellectuals and this is especially present in Eastern Europe. In western model there is also the people however, the people are there a political community that subordinates to common institutions and laws while in eastern, ethnical type of nation instead to the law it subordinates to the vernacular culture, and these are most often languages and customs. Smith here again underlines the role of Eastern Europe with a note that this was present in the early nationalism in that area. In this sense, Smith gives important characteristics of the national identity: "1. historical territory or homeland; 2. common myths and historical memories; 3. common mass, public culture; 4. common legal rights and duties of all members of the nation; 5. common economy with territorial mobility of members of the nation" (Smith, 1998: 40). The more of these attributes certain population possesses, the more it approaches to the ideal type of ethnical community or ethnie. If we look through prism of language in Croatia it is the truth that Croatian nationalism was more expressed then the American or Canadian one. This particularly applies in terms of the behavior towards national minorities but this does not mean that there is no nationalism in the USA or Canada nor it means that Croatian nationalism has to be necessarily negative and American or Canadian necessarily positive. This only means that the problem of nationalism is complex and that it is impossible to make a generalized definition of that term. It is possible for one smaller nation to look for its first self-determination through language and then to look after self-existence while the other its self-determination and self-existence looks in another place, in the case of America through its policy towards East.

sible to ask a question if its boarders are alike to the boarders of the nation. If there is no ruling class, and thus there is no state, it is not possible to ask a question if ruling class and subservient' belong to the same class" (Gellner, 1998: 24).

This statement is suspicious regarding the situation in already mentioned Spain. How to explain Basque and their desires towards independent state that would be formed out of four Spanish and three French regions according to formula 4 +3=1 (Tatalović, 1997). In this sense, there is precisely the question of boarders aside of the independence issue. In this sense, Basques are not only seeking independence from Spain but also the territory that belongs to the French.

On the other hand, Gellner admits that due to nationalism dead languages can be revived and traditions invented with which he also accepts that there can be nationalism before the national state. This is particularly because he also accepts that nations can have a long history prior to becoming independent nations (Gellner, 1998).

With this attitude on invented traditions and languages he is close to Eric Hobsbawn, an author of Marxist orientation. Gellner, in his work, also acknowledged Marxism as a "probably the best starting point for the understanding of the modern world" (Gellner 1965: 126 in Szporluk, 2000: 26). However, "Gellner's first extensive statement on nationalism asserted that both liberalism and Marxism got it wrong" (O'Leary 2000: 41).

On the other hand, famous Marxist, Hobsbawn (1983) enforces a view that all traditions are invented as well as languages that are spoken nowadays and that are significantly different from those spoken by ancestors. Hobsbawn also recognizes the role of unified administration and the role of the so called national economy and the state education that transforms people to citizens that then become inseparable with the state. In terms of invented traditions, Hobsbawn draws from the French Third republic and thus recognizes the invention of the secular primary education, public ceremonies and public monuments. The symbols were also invented, such as tricolor, the Republican monogram and Marseillaise.

Although Basque has autonomy inside Spain they still deem towards independent state and in that they resort to the violence through its organization ETA supported by population that often helps its member in avoiding the official prosecution. So, if we compare Gellner's view according to which problems in nationalistic tendencies can cause unwillingness of the other to accept that, in this case we have a situation in which Spaniards unwillingly fulfill requirements of the Basques and this has as a consequence, the violence. On the other hand, Basques unwillingly accept unique Spanish state with Basque as its founding part. Who is here a nationalist? It can be safely stated both since both have pretensions towards achieving territorial sovereignty under the area covered by País Vasco[10].

However, when we speak on nation and nationalism, in that case we have, as Gellner correctly notices, situation in which nationalism identifies nation and the state and this is incorrect. We can have one nationality and live in a state in which majority is made of people of different nationality. Besides that, there is a possibility of dual citizenship.

People who hold dual citizenship can therefore belong to two nations for passport is officially classified as 'nationality' and in this sense, they can use volunteer option of opting for nationality and national community they want to belong to or, they can decide to belong to both. This is so called western model, as Smith puts it.

According to Gellner's qualification, culture also has determining stake in defining the nation. In his opinion "two men belong to the same nation if and only if they share the same culture by which culture on its side means the system of ideas, signs, connecting and ways of behaving and communicating. Two men belong to the same nation only and only if they acknowledge each other as members of the same nation. In other words men' creates nations; nations are artifacts of human beliefs, loyalty and solidarity" (Gellner, 1998: 27).

---

[10] Word país means state in Spanish.

However, in this case Gellner 'de facto' acknowledged the nationality of Basques and with it he should acknowledge their nationalism or the fact that nationalism exists in the society that does not have its own state but Gellner fails to do that.

Unlikely for Gellner who defines nation as belonging to the same culture that has to be volunteer, Supek (1992) thinks that it is completely wrong to equalize national culture with national territory. Besides that, it is wrong, according to Supek, to define national culture generally since it is firstly defined in line with universal cultural values. According to this understanding national culture would be only the one completely different then any other culture in a whole world and that one does not exist regarding the fact we all share certain common values and customs with certain minor deviation specific for this or that state.

All authors give the meaning in determining nationalism to the role of the language and thus also to the culture. Therefore Gellner (1998) the period of mankind divided on three periods: pre-agrarian (or hunter-gather), agrarian and industrial, as stated before in this article.

In pre-agrarian society, there was an occurrence of literacy that, at the beginning, was not present in all societies and that Gellner considers as "possibility of cultural and cognitional storing and centralization" (p. 28).

However, in that kind of community there are more dialects that individuals use and the government itself is more interested in collecting tax then for homogenizing in language sense. Because of that Gellner considers that in pre-agrarian and agrarian society there are still no classical frames of the nation since it cannot be founded on language as its basis for common culture. Gellner thus makes a conclusion that culture and power are main weapons of the nationalism that regarding the condition in this period cannot function together and create nationalism as we found in 19th century. In this period culture has no strength of nationalism and uplift towards imperialism but it should easily start getting created inside the society.

Industrial society according to Gellner made up the term of progress and professionalization regardless of the present situation in the society. In connection with that there is a term of economic growth that becomes the determination of nationalism according to Gellner. This society also streams towards higher literacy and specialization that leads towards the development of the economic system and the labor distribution and it could be stated, towards the distribution of power.

In one word, according to Gellner, interconnectedness of the state and culture along with economic progress, results with nationalism. Nationalism therefore imposes homogeneity and that homogeneity is, according to Gellner, occurring in the transformation to the industrial society and then there is the occurrence of the real nationalism.

However, according to Gellner, nationalism is not awakening of the nation as it often looks like according to the rhetoric of the nationalists but "a consequence of new frame of societal organizing based on deeply internalized, on education dependent, high cultures protected by their own state" (Gellner, 1998:68). From this Gellner again makes a problematic conclusion according to which "real history of certain nation begins only when it achieves its own state" (p.68). This can be questioned with the example of Basque that exist as people and, according to their view, as a nation as well just that they never achieved the right to self-determination regarding the fact they are, according to some views, the oldest people with the oldest language that is not alike any other language except it reminds on Latin (see Tatalović 1997; Goenaga 2001). With this Basque desires towards national state seem to be legitimate.

However, Gellner, we can state correctly, notices that nations are not something natural in its own essence but something that definitely exists are the cultures. With this, just in other words, Supek would agree as well.

Key characteristic of the nationalism is rhetoric through which nationalism presents itself as ancient or, rhetoric by which certain nation presents itself as ancient with strong cultural strength, history and tradition dating from ancient times. From that, according to Supek (1992) comes out imperialism which means it is the matter of over valuating its own people that should, according to that kind of opinion, should have power over others.

Theoreticians of nationalism often gotten confused by three paradoxes: "1. Objective modernity of nations in the eyes of historians and on the other hand their subjective ancients in the eyes of nationalists; 2. Formal universality of national as socio-cultural concept-in modern world everyone can, has to and wants to 'be' of certain nationalist just like it 'is' of certain sex (…); 3. Political power of nationalism and on the other hand its philosophical poverty and even discursiveness" (Anderson, 1990: 16).

Supek (1992) (in terms of wrong understanding of nationalism as historically wrong) makes a difference between 'open' and 'closed' nationalism with which the first one is modern that tends to the relation with the others while the other one is based on common blood background and underlines blood and race on certain ground as the foundation of the nation. In that sense, according to Supek (1992), American nationalism would be of open type while National Socialism would be of closed type.

In this sense the definition of Ernest Gellner (1998), according to which industrial development means spreading of nationalism is usable since America after industrial development started with imperialist politics towards Middle East while at the same time inside America itself there is no search towards the internal enemy. The enemy is rather sought in external space which is again caused through the imperialist politics of America itself after industrialization.

However, since Gellner connects industrial development with the attempt of imposing the so called high culture to another culture because of the growth of the first culture, Supek would not agree with this because he sees nationalism as a result of economic problems and not of the economic growth.

Nationalism therefore always breaks on people and people, according to Sartori, can have five meanings: "people as approximate majority, when you say 'a lot of people'; people as people as integral majority, when you say 'all people'; people as entity or as 'organic unit'; people as plural expressed through the 'principle of absolute majority'; people as plural expressed through the 'principle of limited majority' (in Supek 1992: 239).

In this sense, nationalistic movements are gladly calling upon the third attitude or, the one which is referring to the organic unit and then on absolute majority (Supek, 1992: 239).

Starting from a motto "if injustice had to be tolerated then it is better to tolerate if to your own people then to the foreigners" (Katunarić, 1999:30), nationalism offers to liberalism and socialism material for general system of producing wealth and political power. At the same time it offers them "a crucial symbolical support by awakening strong and mass belief that everything can come to question expect for the national collective identity in its own state. In that way collectivity is moved and switched from old to the new system of power, from imperialist into socialist and capitalist or the vice versa" (Katunarić, 2003:47).

Instead of Conclusion

After discussion in this paper, it has been shown that nationalism mostly comes to surface from intelligentsia that spreads it through written word with which it creates nation and national state. Language that is a double measure for creating the nation regarding the fact the groups of individuals are connecting between themselves through language that is common to all and through which they communicate however, language connects them through reading papers of the intelligentsia that creates national conscience.

But, after the regiment gets involved in the national story, nationalism usually imbibes negative frame and with this the completeness of the state is in question because no state no matter how ideally might be imagined in its pure essence is not ideal or, it is not ideal after it gets to existence.

Ideal national state, according to the view of nationalists or better, supporter of gathering of the individuals in one national state, is the one that is founded on a principle "one people one state" (Katunarić, 2003:69). However, "the reason for impossibility of achieving the principle 'one people one state' is not in the lack of politically, combatively and nationally aware intellectuals as well as myths 'on holy ground' but means, usually violent, with which new states are built on ruins of the old ones" (Katunarić, 2003:69).

Nationalism served to the liberal West for breaking the Communist and before that for breaking empires while afterwards it changed but it can still be useful but this time in the context of globalization taking from globalization the burden of negative consequences (Katunarić, 2003:80). Especially because of that characteristic certain authors are considering that development in the research and realization of the nationalism is possible only by "making reliable and not a subject to the political conjectures explanation of changes in relation between two societal realities: global system of power and inequality of the nation as collective identity that processes antithesis of that system through the story of unquestionable historical destiny of common life" (Katunarić, 2003:81).

Bibliography

Anderson. B. (1990). Nacija: zamišljena zajednica (Nation: Imagined community). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Beissinger, M. (2000). Nationalism that bark and nationalism that bite: Ernest Gellner and the substantiation of nations. In – Hall, J. A. (ed.) The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, E. (1998). Nacije i nacionalizam (Nations and Nationalism). Zagreb: Politička kultura

Gellner, E. (1964). Thought and Change. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Geertz, C. (1963). The integrative revolution. In – Geertz, C. (ed.) Old Societies and New States. New York: Free Press.

Goenaga, P. (2001). Baskijski jezik (Basque language). Hrvatska revija, Vol.1, No. 3-4.

Haugaard, M.; Malešević, S. (2007). Introduction: an intellectual rebel with a cause. In – Haugaard, M.; Malešević, S. (eds.) Ernest Gellner and Contemporary Social Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawn, E. (1983). Introduction: Inventing Traditions, and Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914. In Hobsbawn, E.; Ranger, T. (eds.) The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: CUP.

Hutchinson, J.; Smith, A. D: (1994). Introduction. In – Hutchinson, J.; Smith, A. D. (eds.) Nationalism. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jiménez Sánchez, J. J. (2006). Nationalism and the Spanish Dilemma: The Basque Case. Politics & Policy, Vol. 34, No. 3: 532-555.

Katunarić, V. (2003). Sporna zajednica: Novije teorije o naciji i nacionalizmu (Questionable society: Latest theories on nation and nationalism). Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk and Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.

Katunarić, V. (1999). Kultura, nacija, razvoj: stvaralački projekt i retorika reakcije (Culture, nation, development: creation project and the rhetorics of the reaction). In: Čačić-Kumpes, J. (ed.) Kultura, etničnost, identitet (Culture, ethnicity, identity). Zagreb: Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Naklada Jesenski i Turk and Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.

Koren, S. (2007). Akademičke bajke (Academic fairytales). Književna republika, Vol. V, No. 5-6: 150-174.

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Multikulturalno građanstvo (Multicultural citizenship). Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.

Lasagabaster, I. (2001). Politička organizacija Baskije (Political organization of Basque). Hrvatska revija, Vol. 1, No. 3-4.

Malešević, S. (2007). Between book and the new sword: Gellner, violence and ideology. In – Haugaard, M.; Malešević, S. (eds.) Ernest Gellner and Contemporary Social Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matić, D. (2006). Je li nacionalizam stvarno toliko loš: slučaj Hrvatske (Is Nationalism really that bad: The case of Croatia). In: Ramet, S. and Matić, D. (eds.): Demokratska tranzicija u Hrvatskoj: transformacija vrijednosti, obrazovanje, mediji (Democratic transition in Croatia: transformation of values, education, media). Zagreb: Alinea.

Mouzelis, N. (2007). Nationalism: restructuring Gellner's theory. In - Haugaard, M.; Malešević, S. (eds.) Ernest Gellner and Contemporary Social Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mouzelis, N. (2000). Ernest Gellner's theory of nationalism: some definitional and methodological issues. In – Hall, J. A. (ed.) The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Leary, B. (2000). Ernest Gellner's diagnoses of nationalism: a critical overview, or, what is living and what is dead in Ernest Gellner's philosophy of nationalism? In – Hall, J. A. (ed.) The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petričić, D. (2000). Kriminal u hrvatskoj pretvorbi: tko, kako, zašto (Criminal in Croatian privatization: who, how, why). Zagreb: Abakus.

Prpić, I. (1998). Foreword to the book 'Nacije i nacionalizam' (Nations and Nationalism) in Ernest Gellner 'Nacije i nacionalizam (Nations and Nationalism). Zagreb: Politička kultura, 1998.

Rivera, A. (2001). Dva stoljeća novije povijesti u Baskiji (Two centuries of new history in Basque). Hrvatska revija, Vol. 1, No. 3-4.

Reynolds, S. (1984). Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe (900-1300). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schafer, B. C. (1972). Faces of Nationalism. New Realities and Old Myths. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Seton-Watson, H. (1977). Nations and States. London: Methuen.

Smith, A., D. (2003). Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, A. D. (2003 a). Nacionalizam i modernizam (Nationalism and modernism). Zagreb: Politička misao.

Smith, A. D. (2001). Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History. Cambridge: Polity press.

Smith, A. D. (2000). The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, A. D. (1998). Nacionalni identitet (National Identity). Belgrade: Biblioteka XX vek.

Smith, A. D. (1986). The Ethnic Origins of Nation. Oxford: Blackwell.

Supek. R. (1992). Društvene predrasude i nacionalizam (Societal prejudices and nationalism). Zagreb: Globus Nakladni zavod.

Szporluk, R. (2000). Thoughts about change: Ernest Gellner and the history of nationalism. In – Hall, J. A. (ed.) The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tatalović, S. (1997). Manjinski narodi i manjine (Minority peoples and minorities). Zagreb: IP "Prosvjeta" i SKD "Prosvjeta".

Topić, M. (2009). Rod i nacija, očuvanje (i kreacija) nacionalnog identiteta kroz rodno diskriminacijsku nacionalističku politiku: Slučaj Hrvatske iz devedesetih (Gender and nation, preservation (and creation) of the national identity through gender discriminatory nationalist politics: The case of Croatia from the nineties), Sociološki pregled, Vol. XLIII, No. 2: 185-207.

Urrestarazu, E. R. (2001). Položaj i integracija Baskije u Europi (Position and integration of Basque in Europe). Hrvatska revija, Vol. 1, No. 3-4.