The Construction of National Identity in Modern Times: Theoretical Perspective

Hüsamettin İnaç
Assoc. Prof. Dr.
Dumlupinar University, FEAS
Political Science And International Relations Department

Feyzullah Ünal
Assist. Prof. Dr.
Dumlupinar University, FEAS
Public Administration Department

Abstract

Identity politics can be seen as the general framework of today's world politics. Ethnic, sectarian, religious and national identities are prominent as the referential points of international politics. Nevertheless, it is not so easy to comprehend what is identity and how the national identity can be built in different socio-political circumstances. In this context, this study argues that identity is a construction and formed in accordance with the exigencies of the existing conjuncture. In line with this argumentation we attempt to elaborate the transition from the ethnic identities into the national one in accompanying the identity formation mechanism and national building strategies in theoretical perspectives.

Key Words: Identity, national identity, identity formation mechanisms, nation-building strategies, identity politics.

1. Introduction

Recent political arena suffers under hesitation and contradictory trends between globalisation and multiculturalism and between localisation and ethnic identities, and seeks monoculturalism in respect of countries and people with similar culture coming together in cultural, social, economic co-operations and strategic alliances with those of different cultures and various civilizations that tend to be left outside of these co-operations because of their 'differences'. In this context, identity question is at the agenda for the people who have a fear to lose their own identities. Identity is a social phenomenon which starts with the identity formation process by means of interaction with the 'other' or against the 'other'. The individual tends to internalise and practice the behaviours, values and norms of the society where he or she has lived in, in order to provide his or her psychological and physical security. In this way, to get an identity one must either identify oneself with someone and/or be perceived as identical to someone else. The continuous and permanent internalisation processes of social setting are resulted in the construction of an individual identity within a social dimension.

2. Definition of Identity

Identity is a description or, in other words, the definition of the existence and belongingness. The identity consists of two pillars: identifier and identified. (Eralp 1997:19) In our concern, the individual is subjected identified as a 'self' and the society is main identifier as an 'other'. It is an alterity, otherness and an ambiguous notion which gets its meaning from what it is not, from the 'other' as Derrida argued: " All identities can possibly exist with their 'differance' (with an "a") There is no culture or cultural identity which does not have its 'other' of the 'self' " (Derrida 1992: 129). Because the identity means to the 'other', it is defined, determined and nominated by the 'other'. Nevertheless, Derrida distinguishes the word "difference" and "differance" as 'the identity as sameness' from 'the identity as equivalence' respectively, which is indicated in his text " 'Difference' in Speech and Phenomena" written for the counter-argumentation to Heidegger's essay "Identity and Difference". On the one hand, differance indicates 'difference' as distinction, inequality, or discernibility; on the other, it expresses the interposition of 'delay', the interval of a spacing and temporalising that puts off until 'later' what is presently denied, the possible that is presently impossible" (Ibid.:130).

It is a very vulnerable point to bear in mind that if the identity is solely defined by the 'other', the distinctive features and otherness dimension of the identified is emphasized and the common points are disregarded. This kind of over-emphasizing leads to hostility, contradiction and discrepancy as well as denying, humiliating and negating the 'other'. However, the construction of any certain identity is an inclusive process with the internalization of the same values of identifier, but it is also an exclusive process with the elimination of other identities. The main problem here is hidden at the responce to the question of "how to realize this exclusion?" In this context, there are several identity narratives presented to the preference of the people in political worries gaining very critical significance. Although it is a fact that identity implies both uniqueness and sameness, according to Martin, one identity cannot be defined in isolation: the only way to circumscribe an identity is by contrasting it against other identities (Martin 1995: 6).

On the other hand, the 'other' may bare both pejorative implications such as "marginality", "lack", and "backwardness" and positive connotations such as "privileged" and "the preferred one" (Kuran-Burçoğlu 2002: 1). However the comprehension of oneself as an 'other', with the others, is always an interpretation. At the same time, the identity narrative borrows from history as well as from fiction and treats the person as a character in a plot (op. cit.: 7). In fact, the person as a character is not separable from its life experience. As Taylor argues identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of the others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or compatible picture of themselves (Taylor 1995: 25).

The phenomena of authenticity, which was defined by Taylor as "the right of people to be acknowledged publicly as what they really are" (Ibid.:149) and the process of identification has a multi-dimensional, dynamic and permanent character. At first, neither individualistic life nor the social / societal stratification can be reduced into the constrained dimension. Thus, the identity is supposed to be multi-dimensional. The multicultural and multi-societal character of the identity requires the necessity of a plurality of people, groups, social confrontations, mutual challenges and profound interactions and, finally, a strong possession is needed for the gained identities and these identities may be redefined in accordance with the conjuncture. However, this socialization process may lead to the creation of the newly constructed identities. The continuity of the process will lead to a permanent character in the identity values as well.

Perspectivity, continuity and dynamism reflect the pluralistic character of the identity, and individuals usually possess more than one identity units and exemplify a variety of identities. As Kymlicka claims, plurality is based on three pillars: One of them is history; human beings have lived as plural and multicultural social units have thus created multicultural identity units throughout the history. Second one is social structure; society has profound, inter-weaved and complicated identities. Third one is identity constructive capacity of the human beings; the identity is profoundly constructed by the thoughtful, planning and conscious people in plural character (Kymlicka, 1998:193-194)**.** The acquisition of the plural identities, such as -popularly known- family, tribe, ethnic group, community, country, *patrie* ('national terrain' in Smith's writings), nation, gender, class and civilization, are constructed within the process of socialization. By the way, different sorts of identities fall into three categories. First one of these categories is the universal identity that is some traits which distinguish the people from the non-people and be shared by all people without any discrimination. Second one is the group identity that is shared identity by some people. Third one is the individual identity that is distinctive and *sui generis* traits of a sole individual (Ibid.:202).

3. Identity Formation Mechanisms

Identity is constructed in accordance with the special condition of the time process and dependent on time and space. The concept of identity is introduced both, the notion of continuity and that of change without making them contradictory; on the contrary, continuity, in so far as it concerns the 'self' in its relation with the 'other', is meaningless without transformation. This transformation is referred to within two factors. First; the authenticities are not natural and given by birth, but constructed within the social and historical framework. Second; the history sense of identity means not only the positioning of identity units within the historical process, but also changing the comprehensive and holistic character of any given common identity unit within the historical perspective. In any certain period of history, a kind of identity might be comparatively more influential over the people.

For instance, while the religious identity was more influential and determinant in pre-modern Europe, with the modernization process the national identity gained very critical significance and evenly universal character spreading over almost all countries. Moreover in today's perspective, the deprivation of national identity for any community is perceived as "unidentified" in many respects. The historical character of identity makes it changeable and temporal, while its sociality enhances its continuity (Martin 1995: 8-11).

What are the affects or influences of the identity which has a social, historical, dynamic, changeable, multi-dimensional, permanent and dependent character? The content of variable and plural identities varies depending on both densities and diversities and their influences over the individuals, and the degrees of necessities and initiative within the conditionality of time and space. For instance, according to Smith, "the universal character of the gender identity lessens its initiative of orienting the common action" (Smith 1990: 5). In this point, it can be claimed that if the unit of identity broadens, its strength of creating pressure over the individual, the coherent process of constructing the identity and the dynamic for common action weakens. As a prolongation of this logic, while the "family" and "community" groups have higher capacity to direct the common action than the "nation", the "civilization" and "empire" are weaker than the "nation" in this respect. Lastly, "the criteria of the strength for the identity preponderance are necessity, urgency, external threat and relative capability as well as its internalization by the given society (Eralp 1997:26).

The formation and the definition of a social identity is based on "objective" and "subjective" elements (Smith 1990: 27). Objective elements are depicted as the properties shared by all members of the social identity unit such as symbols, myths, language, religion, ethnicity, geography, the mode of life, common history, values, traditions, etc. Social identity is shaped by the internalization of these elements by the members of the implied unit, and at the second stage, the preponderant character of the social identity is determined by emphasizing and singling out the priority of one of them (Ibid.:28). For instance, as Smith asserts in his book *The Origins of Nations*, on the one hand, the country and mutual rights and duties are the main priorities in territorial model on the other hand in the ethnic model of nation building; they are the ethnic origin and language. Subjective elements of social identity are defined as the relative indication of to what extent the internalization process of the objective ones is carried out (Smith 1989: 349). A strong and prudent perception of the subjective consciousness is very important for the common features in constructing the national identity.

The social and cultural identities can be grouped in two categories, as "granted" and "gained" identities (Yurdusev 1997: 27). Family, ethnic group, society, community, nation and civilization are 'granted' identities and are created within the socialization process. They are exclusive because of their inborn character. However, the identities chosen by the free will of the individual are 'gained' identities. Nevertheless, the dynamism, continuity and plurality of the identity prevents any certain gained identity to have the power of creating monopoly and absolute authority over the individuals such as the case of conversion, since the voluntary factor and humanitarian interference can be mentioned even in granted identities in some extent. For instance, the national identity as a 'granted' identity is not a natural and spontaneous identifier that emerged in any certain period of the history. Contrarily, the intervention of the modern state shapes the construction of the national identity as Massimo d'Azeglio claims: "We established Italy and now it is time to create the Italians" (Hobsbawm 1991:44).

Belonging to a country has a great influence in adopting, reinforcing or weakening of other identities, such as the social identity. That is, country identity determines the social identity, the same way, and national, religious, ethnic and class – based have a great impact in shaping other identities. The perception of different identities is based on the reciprocity and mutual understanding as well as interaction positioning. A social identity unit generally separates and differentiates the other. Here there is a reciprocal interaction working to find out negative and positive differences of each identity (op. cit.: 29). If the identities are rival and threat each other, the negative emphasis is pointed out. In order to elaborate this fact, the study of the interaction within the history is required.

In psychological respect, the definition of identity depends upon the notions of I, ego, self or personality, identity that are used like synonymous terms in social sciences, such as psychology, sociology and cultural anthropology. Erickson defines it both as "the permanent self-identification within the inside of the person and the reciprocal relationship of a principal character which always share with the others" (Ercikson 1967: 17). For Wheelis it is "the feeling of the unity and wholeness which is based on the harmonization of the behaviour / actions and the value judgements of the people" (Wheelis 1958: 27).

For Fromm it is "the feeling which is required to be an individual and obtained by having the identification with the other groups and persons" (Fromm 1955: 134). For Lichtenstein, there are two kinds of identities. These are "psycho – social identity" and "socio – cultural identity". "Psycho – social identity" has the following three dimensions: objectivity and subjectivity, individuality and sociability, and sameness, otherness and alterity (Ibid.: 134). According to Smith, individual 'self' is originated from four categories. First, "gender" which is the most obvious and constant category that is universal and the origin of the other differences and dependencies. Nevertheless, the gender distinction is relatively weak in creating the collective identification and not enough dynamic because everybody has a distinct gender. Second category is the "terrain or *patrie* or country" category: Local and regional identity is widespread in pre-modern times.

Nevertheless, it is weak because the geographical definition is very difficult and the regions can be broken into local units or they can be varied depending on time and space. Third category is the "socio-economical social class". The class is the unique collective identity and the unique transformer of the history in Marxist theory. In fact, the class-based identity can not constitute a separate category since its organization and awareness of it is a very complicated issue; the criteria and conjuncture is too different to combine, and it is deprived of cultural deepness and sentimental attractivity. Furthermore it is easily seized by the religious and ethnic identities as wider collectivities. Fourth category is the "ethno – religious" identity (Smith 1996: 16-28). Religious identity is originated from the social and communicational scopes and based on the alignment between the culture and cultural elements, such as customs, traditions, symbols, myths and values codified within the social rituals. Religious communities are very involved in the ethnic identities.

In this context, ethno-religious identity is the transformation of any society from religious community into the completely ethnic one. These two identities should be separated analytically despite of the fact that both are capable enough to constitute a community, both have originated from similar criteria of cultural classification and mostly coincides and strengthen each other. Nevertheless the religious diversity leads to delay the emergence of an ethnic unity (Smith 1991: 67-73). Collective social identities can be conceptualized as religion, gender, ethnicity, race, and sexuality. The list is somewhat heterogeneous; such collective identities matter to their bearers and to others in very different ways. Religion, for example, unlike all the others, entails attachments to creeds or commitment to practices. Gender and sexuality, unlike the rest, are both grounded in the sexual body; both are differently experienced at different places and times (Taylor 1994: 150).

Taylor explains the connection between individual identity and collective identity as follows: Each person's individual identity has two major dimensions. There is a collective dimension pertaining to the interaction of their collective identities, and there is a personal dimension, consisting of other socially and morally important features, that are intelligence, charm, wit, cupidity, etc. that are not themselves the basis of forms of collective identity (ibid.: 152).

4. Nation-Building Strategies

Nation and nationalism are two concepts bearing the controversial ideas about the preceding of their tangibility and conceptualization (Ersanlı-Özdoğan 1985:175). Fortunately some data helps us to comprehend the matter. First data is the reality that today's ongoing political unit is nation-state (Bottomore 1987: 59). At the same time, "nationalism is a doctrine accepting the necessity of organizing the people within the realm of nation-states" (Kedourie 1970: 29). Second data is pertaining with the synchronization of the nationalism with the industrialization as well as with the modernization (Gellner 1983: 55). Thus, the nature of the nation-state is related with the answer given to the question of the beginning period of the nationalization process and its persistence.

The starting point of this process is Western Europe. The process fell into two categories. One of them is the unit of nation emerging with the spontaneous products of newly emerged formations and discrepancies brought about by the industrialization and capitalism. Second one is the unit of nation which is formed as a defensive element against the menacing factors coming from the West with the contribution of the imposition of ideas of French Revolution and, thus, which oriented to the unity surrounding with the pre-modern motto of "one language, one culture and one history". French Revolution, as a distinctive feature, brings a new understanding of legitimacy and this legitimacy threatens other absolutist monarchies of the Europe.

The Revolution imposes the idea that the sovereignty belongs to the nation and approves the "self-determination" and the "right of resistance" or changing the regime in case of the violation of the social contract acted between the state and citizen as vested interests (Kedourie 1971: 4). Naturally, the key word in new understanding is "nation". The nation emerges as an actual entity as the first time in history in France and England. Since 10th century, when the cities and regional organizations became leading factors before the churches and feudal relations depending on the flourishing of the trade, feudal frontiers rapidly fuses and natural national borders are established. The constitution of absolutist national monarchies displays their luminous patterns in France, Britain and Spain.

Taking precedence, England and France played a very prominent role at emergence of the absolutist state in 16th century as a result of rapid centralization process as well as the nationalization of the churches with the Reformation movement. Aforementioned absolutist establishment expresses the consensus and balance between the feudal nobility and newly established bourgeois (Anderson 1974: 15-16). For this reason, absolutist state should be understood as a transitory form. As a result of the working money economy (mercantilism), bourgeois comes to power. Nevertheless, this socio-economic power turns as a political stratum in 17th and 18th centuries with the transformation of the states to the constitutional monarchies. This is the brilliant victory of the "tiers etat" (Third Estate). In 17th century England achieves to create the nation and settle and establish her state over the basis of nationality by means of suppressing the ongoing disputes with the governing monarchs and unifying the people who are exposed to be categorized within the castic divisions (Rustow: 1968: 8). Thus, this definition means the comprehension of transferring the sovereignty to the nation, as socially, culturally, economically and politically integrated people.

The state in England, removing the feudal partition with the Norman occupation, ends the power of the church positioning as a non-centralized rival against the absolute sovereignty of state and provides its ultimate submission and acceptance of national obedience. England witnesses the rapid increasing of the capital accumulation, making widespread the manufacture production and settlement of a new understanding of proprietorship over the land within the first half of the 17th century. These developments originate from capital accumulation by the mercantilist expansion of England. This acceleration of social change forces to destroy the political structure of the previous social relations system as expected. The widening of the market turns the whole nation to the one economic unit and, eventually, the monopoly of competition is demolished (Ibid.: 12-22).

Consequently, the absolutist state mechanism establishing the stability between the feudal elements and bourgeois holding the economic dominance with its hand loses its historical function. In this case, the first half of the 17th century is the years of the struggle between two social institutions; on one hand, English patriotism, English Protestantism (Puritanism) as a national sect of the Christianity and economic power of the bourgeois; feudal aristocracy tied with the land possession and resisting against the monetary economy (mercantilism) and England Catholicism (Anglicanism) as official interpretation of the religion, on the other hand. This strife results in the victory of the liberal on the leadership of Oliver Cromwell. The period of 1640 - 1660 when these episodes realize implies the transition to the new political arena and free ground giving chance to flourish the capitalism as a necessity and essential factor for competitive national economy (Hill 1983: 35-88).

These developments came true at the end of the 18th century in France. Apart from England, French political thought developed the philosophic and ideological basis of transition from absolutism to constitutionalism and republic. As Tocqueville, who is a very prominent political sociologist known by his book *Democracy in America*, claims that French Revolution is not a social but political revolution, he means by social revolution the changing in the production, possession and distribution systems (Mardin 1971: 197). Subsequently, French thinkers achieved to get rid of the ancient dynamics of the established social structure with the motto of *"egalité, fraternité, liberté"* (equality, brotherhood and liberty). Because the main target of these principles is to overthrow the monarchs of the Europe, French thinkers envisage the emancipation of the people who bound to be subjected of monarchs by the idea that "the sovereignty belongs to the nation". Under these circumstances, the French nationalism, having the "internal" nature tackles to the matter of settling their own nation-states to the last ladder of the modernization, by having the "external" nature it becomes the producer of the ideology that will separate their national hostiles from the inside. Thus, the most important historical steps to universalize the nationalism are the Napoleonic wars and French Revolution which extends the influence of these ideas towards along with the Germany, Italy, Spain and Russia.

Nationalism is a kind of ideology mainly oriented towards these aims (Ergil 1983: 73);

1. To create a national economy

2. To constitute autonomous national legislative and executive organs and to collect all separatist relations such as regional loyalties and community ties under the control and integration of this organ

3. To create a national culture (the system of common values and expectations) and define an identification depending on the newly created culture.

The distinctive features of the French and English are their possession of spontaneously established national economies and internal market integrities parallel to the rise of capitalism and the shaping of the world economy without needing to direct to the first principle. The weakening of the feudal sovereignty and increasing centralist influence of the absolutist state provides the integrity and unification of the country within the frontiers of the national economy. In this process, the national identity is formed and enhanced the volunteer obedience for the national power represented by the absolutist state. The reached relative welfare in 17th century and the mercantile development to supply this welfare and necessities of the increasing population and the bourgeois turning to the preponderant economic element by empowering with these developments removes the need of absolutist state which functions as a stability/consensus component between previous social relation system and newly established order. In this framework, the real social power replaces its own political strength with the support of wide popular strata and their original ideology.

Thus, the second aim of nationalism, autonomous national body, is constituted as inclusive of "new middle class" and exclusive of all regional power components. The most perfect form of the nation-state, which covers the content of the power, posses the pluralistic structure. For this reason, as Hayes argues, the understanding of "nation" is rather different from the approach of the nationalistic or cultural nation (Hayes 1937: 231). It is based on the assumption that the citizens who share the equal rights and duties have the consciousness of being the part of the same "civilization". Therefore, some elements such as language, sect, religious order and ethnic origin are reduced to secondary rank.

4.1. The Etymological Analysis of the Nation

As it is mentioned above, there is a consensus that the fundamental characteristics of nation are modernity. For this reason, it is inevitable to elaborate the etymological evolution of the term "nation" in order to understand this concept with its all dimensions. In this framework, Habermas argues that the history of term 'nation' mirrors in a peculiar way the emergence of the nation state (Habermas 1995: 255). For the Romans *natio* is the Goddess of Birth and Origin. *Natio* refers, like *gen*s and *populus* and unlike *civitas*, to peoples and tribes who were not yet organized in political associations; indeed, the Romans often used it to refer to 'savage', 'barbaric' or 'pagan' peoples. In this classical usage, therefore, nations are communities of people of the same descent, who are integrated geographically, in the form of settlements or neighborhoods, and culturally by their common language, customs, and traditions, but who are not yet politically integrated in the form of state organization.

This meaning persists throughout the Middle Ages and indeed in the modern times. Even Kant still maintains that 'that group which recognizes itself as being gathered together in a society due to common descent shall be called a nation.' Yet, since the middle of the 18th century, the differences in meaning between 'nation' and 'staatvolk', that is, 'nation' and 'politically organized 'people', have gradually been disappearing. With the French Revolution, the nation even became the source of state sovereignty, for example, in the thought of Sieyes (Kedourie 1971: 6-7). Each nation is now supposed to be granted the right to political self-determination. Indeed, in the 19th century, the conservative representatives of the German Historical School equated the principle of nationality with the 'principle of revolution' (Habermas op. cit.: 255). The thought and concept of "nation" is not used before the 18th century. Spain Royal Academy, for the first time in 1884, used it in modern meaning in the dictionary they had prepared. In this dictionary, 'Lengua Nacional', is defined as "a formal and literary language of a country or a language that is generally used apart from the other nations' languages and dialects" (Hobsbawm 1993: 29). Before this date, the word "nacion" had simply meant the people settling in a kingdom or a country or a province. In addition to other meanings, with this dictionary, the meanings of a "political unit" recognizing a higher / common ruling center and territories are making the state integral core and "people" living in these lands are attributed to the "nacion" (Ibid.: 30).

In this context, the first meaning of the "nation" is implied with the origin and lineage. The findings of the philological researches support this argument. Hobsbawm argues that in an old French dictionary the word 'nation' is related with the naissance (birth), extraction (lineage) and rang (status)" (Ibid.: 30). In Low and High German the word "people" (Volk) evocates similar meanings with the words derived from "*natio*". In any case, there is a complicated interaction between 'volk' and 'natio'. The term "*natie*" in German jargon doesn't mean the Volk, but birth and lineage.

Diderot and d'Alemberte, the French Encyclopedists, define the nation as crowded people who are subjected to the same rule who settle in a particular territory and have a particular border. Sieyes argues that nation is the union of partners who live depending on the same law and be represented by the same legislative power (Sieyes 1982: 17). According to Kedourie, nation is a community from whose executive power the government is responsible (Kedourie 1971: 6-7). German Encyclopedist Zedler claims that the nation with the peculiar and genuine meaning in 1740s implies a group of unified Burgers sharing common conventions, moral values and laws (Zedler 1940: 901). Whereas, volk, as a more inclusive entity, covers people from different nations within the same provinces and states. It means that the people from different nations can live together in the same region even in the same state. Thus, it can be inferred, that there is no essential linkage between nation and territory.

It is inevitable to separate the usage of the word "nation" before and after the age of nationalism and modernization process in order to prevent confusion. The word nation means in middle Ages the Volk (non-politicized public), *ordo* (a strata in the social stratification), *Gesellschalft* (a community and people, bigger than family and smaller than tribe, who displays similarity inborn and bearing the identity of a particular ethnicity) in daily language. *Natio* in ordinary speech originally meant a group of men belonging together by similarity of birth, larger than a family, but smaller than a clan or people. Thus one spoke of the *Populus Romanus* and not of the *natio romanorum* (Habermas 1995:255-263).

The Medieval University is divided into nations as foreigner communities. "The University of Paris had four nations: *l'honorable nation de France*, *la fidéle nation de Picardie, la vénérable nation de Normandie, and la constante nation de Germanie,* ; these distinctions in use within the university, indicated places of provenance, but in no way corresponded either to modern geographical divisions, or indeed to what is now understood by 'nations' (Kedourie 1971: 5). Thus the 'nation de France', referred to speakers of Romance languages including Italians and Spaniards; the nation de Picardie referred to the Dutch, that of Normandie to those originating from North-Eastern Europe, and that of Germanie to Englishmen as well as to Germans proper. By extension, the word came to be used as a collective noun, sometimes in a pejorative sense. Thus Machiavelli speaks of the ghibelline nation, and Montesquieu refers to monks as the pietistic nation. This use of the word as a collective noun persists into the eighteen century, and we find Hume stating in his essay *"Of National Characters"* that 'a nation is nothing but a collection of individuals' who, by constant intercourse, came to acquire some traits in common" (Ibid.: 13-14).

4.2. National Identity

National identity is very complicated and multi-dimensional matter. For this reason every researcher defines and explains this concept by emphasizing its different perspectives. For instance, Breuilly underlines the exclusive character of the national identity by regarding the relations between culture and nationalism distinguishing the nations from each other. On the other hand, Kymlicka refers to the civic nationalism by aiming to pinpoint its inclusive character by respecting the cultural differences. According to Gilroy national identity is a melting pot which has the assimilating character by depending on the notions of citizenship and patriotism. Anderson asserts that national identity is imagined and constructed. Rutherford claims that national identity depends on the uniformity, cultural community and common culture. Calhoun seeks the way to link the national identity to the theory of democracy by means of post-national social formations. Güvenç finds the origins of national identity in the national culture which will be obtained by the socialization processes. Yurdusev establishes a correlation between the national identity and state and he claims that national identity is the yield of nation-building and national ideology. Connor and Smith emphasizes the primordial character of national identity and they use the word 'primordial' in the meaning of its back-ward looking character seeking the myth of national origin. As a contrary, Bradshaw says that the national identity has a forward-looking character and this identity emerges with the politicisation of an ethnic group looking to the future destiny by sharing the same soil of the homeland.

Breuilly, in his book entitled *Nationalism and the State* elaborates upon the relationship between culture and nationalism. For him this relationship always bears the traces of historical, ethical, and political forces that constitute the often shifting and contradictory elements of national identity (Breuilly 1993: 269-270). Central to the construction of right wing nationalism is a project of defending national identity through an appeal to a common culture that displaces any notion of national identity based upon a pluralized notion of culture with its multiple literacies, identities, and histories and erases histories of oppression and struggle for the working class and minorities'. According to Breuilly, "to the degree that the culture of nationalism is rigidly exclusive and defines its membership in terms of narrowly based common culture, nationalism tends to be xenophobic, authoritarian, and expansionist" (Ibid.:270).

Kymlicka does not share the same idea with Breuilly and she claims that nationalism moves closer toward being liberal and democratic to the degree that national identity is inclusive and respectful of diversity and difference: "A civic nationalism that makes a claim to respecting cultural differences does not guarantee that the state will not engage in coercive assimilating policies" (Kymlicka 1995: 17). How nationalism and the nation state embrace democracy must be determined, in part, through the access of diverse cultural groups have to share structures of power that organize commanding legal, economic, and cultural institutions on the local, state, and national level (Ibid.:18). Cultural differences and national identity stand in a complex relationship to each other and point to progressive as well as totalitarian elements of nationalism that provide testimony to its problematic character and effects.

In Gilroy's idea national identity is structured through a notion of citizenship and patriotism that subordinates ethnic, racial, and cultural differences to the assimilating logic of a common culture, or, more brutally, the 'melting pot' (Gilroy 1993: 72). Behind the social imaginary that informs this notion of national identity is a narrowly defined notion of history that provides a defence of the narratives of imperial power and dominant culture. Of course, national identity, like nationalism itself, is a social construction that is built upon a series of inclusions and exclusions regarding history, citizenship, and national belonging. As the social historian Benedict Anderson has pointed out, the nation is an 'imagined political community' that can only be understood within the intersecting dynamics of history, language, ideology, and power. In other words, nationalism and national identity are neither necessarily reactionary nor necessarily progressive politically (Anderson 1991: 13). National identity is always a shifting, unsettled complex of historical struggles and experiences that are cross-fertilized, produced, and translated through a variety of cultures.

Rutherford claims that national identity based on a unified cultural community suggests a dangerous relationship between the ideas of race, intolerance, and the cultural membership of nationhood. Not only does such a position downplay the politics of culture at work in nationalism, but it erases an oppressive history forged in an appeal to a common culture and a reactionary notion of national identity (Rutherford 1972: 42-44). Pitting national identity against cultural difference not only appeals to an oppressive politics of common culture, but reinforces a political moralist that polices 'the boundaries of identity, encouraging uniformity and ensuring intellectual inertia' (Ibid.:47). Calhoun tries to combine the national identity and democracy by using the legal rights. In his words, "in the first instance, national identity must be addressed as part of a broader consideration linking nationalism and post national social formations to a theory of democracy" (Calhoun 1972: 311). That is, the relationship between nationalism and democracy must address not only the crucial issue of whether legal rights are provided for all groups irrespective of their cultural identity, but also how structures of power work to ensure that diverse cultural communities have the economic, political, and social resources to exercise 'both the capacity for collective voice and the possibility of differentiated, directly interpersonal relations.

Güvenç defines national identity as a kind of socialization manner processing that takes part in the individual within any certain community, or, it is a feeling of the state of belonging to any group by means of acculturation (Güvenç 1985: 27). It is the 'we feeling' which is shared by all individuals living within the certain geographical frontiers, in governing of the nation–state and with the creation of a national culture dependent on the historical and cultural perspective" (Ibid.:29). National identity is perceived inevitable for every community within the process of nationalization as the guarantee and base of the national existence. Yurdusev argues that the process of nation building or the construction of a nation can be comprehended within two levels. First of all, the rise of nation-state and second one is the dominance of the national ideology (Yurdusev 1997: 22).

The national ideology enhances the emergence of a general world-view within the framework of a common and widespread 'we feeling' awareness for society. On the other hand, nation-state performs a functioning tool of the self – realization of the national ideology. Connor defines the term "nation" as a mass-based community of belonging and interest, whose members share a back–ward looking sense of common genealogical and geographic roots, as well as forward-looking sense of destiny. As a community of belonging, members typically view the nation as an extended family related by common ancestry, although this belief in a common ancestor is based more on myths and legends than on an appraisal of the nation's history (Connor 1978: 377-400). Most nations are products of inter-ethnic integration. The myth of common ancestry is critically important and the myth reduces the likelihood that nations can be unmade. It makes nations appear as primordial communities that are both natural and eternal. The primordialist depiction of national identity is emphasized by nationalists in order to explain the back-ward looking character of the national identity.

As Smith argues the myths of national origin also typically stress the importance of the nation's geographic roots in some ancestral homeland and often depict the nation as a product of both blood and soil. (Smith 1986; Anderson 1988) This myth of primordial connectedness with the homeland serves one of the main bases for nationalistic claims to territory today. The nation is more than a backward-looking community of belonging; it is also a forward-looking community of interest. That is, future orientation provided by the national identity transforms the nation from a backward-looking ethno-cultural community concerned with preserving the past, into politicized interest group which intents on seizing control of its fate or destiny: National self – determination.

This forward – looking aspect of national identity also has a geographic dimension, since most nationalists assert that in order for the nation to gain control over its destiny, it must gain control over some geographic place. Territory becomes the means through which the nation will fulfill its destiny. Of course, the geographic place that nationalists assert control over is the ancestral homeland (Bradshaw 1997: 10). In this way, the backward and forward-looking dimensions of national identity are intimately connected through the soil of the homeland. In this understanding, the nation is not an ethnic group, nor is it a state, although it is used as a synonym for one or the other. However, the nation is intimately related to both ethnic groups and states. Nations may be seen as ethnic groups that have become forward-looking politicized and territorialized interest groups.

Bradshaw states that the nation is also often referred to as a cultural community whose member shares a set of tangible traits or objective characteristics, such as language, religion, customs and so forth (Ibid.:12). Although this is normally the case, the retention of these objective characteristics is not a necessary condition for the maintenance of national identity, and the existence of a community whose members share a common language, religion, etc is not a sufficient condition in and of itself for the emergence of a national identity. Indeed the loss of one's native language or religious affiliation has often led to not to the demise of one's national identity, but conversely to a rise in national self- consciousness as a reaction against the forcible nature of such assimilation processes.

5. Conclusion

Glancing over both the identity formation mechanisms and the nation-building strategies, one would notice that these two processes are prochial in their sui generis character and they are supposed to be overcome by transnationalism because of the globalism, multiculturalism and neo-liberal ideologies. However, the circulation of the goods, capitals, workers, and money in global perspective led to question the onthological existence of national identity in many respects. Surprisingly the globalism both urge people to seek their local, ethnic, religious and national identitis and as a contrary to this searching process, it made people global citizens because of the necessity to have global networks in order to survive. As a result of this investigation and reasoning, we may emancipate from our local, regional, ethnic and national identities and define ourselves with global identity in very near future.

Bibliography

Alfonsi, A. 1997. The Emerging Stirrings in Western Europe. In *Citizenship and National Identity from Colonialism to Globalizm*, ed. T.K. Oomen, New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Anderson, B. 1989. *Imagined Communitties: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Baker, C. 1999. *Televison, Globalisation and Cultural Identities.* Open University Press.

Balibar E., Wallerstein I. 1995. *Irk, Ulus, Sınıf.* Trans. by N. Ökten. İstanbul: Metis.

Barker, E. National Character and the Factors in Its Formation. In *Citizenship and National Identity from Colonialism to Globalism.* ed. T.K. Oomen, New Delhi: sage Publications.

Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries.* Boston: Cittle, Brown and Co.

Brass, P.R. 1985. *Ethnic Groups and the State.* London: Croom Helm.

Çalış, Ş.H., Dağı, İ.D., Gözen R. ed. 2001. *Türkiye'nin Dış Politika Gündemi: Kimlik, Demokrasi, Güvenlik.* Ankara: Liberte Yayınları.

Delanty, G. 1995. *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality.* Basingstoke: Macmillan

Derrida, J. 1978, *Writing and Differrence.* Chicago: University of Chicago

Deutsch, K. 1966. *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Ericson, E.H. 1967. The Problem of Ego Identity. In *Identity and Anxiety.* ed. M. R. Stein, New York: The Free Press.

Ersanlı, B., Özdoğan, G.G. 1985. Ulus ve Ulusçuluk: Sanayileşme Sürecinde İktidara Seçen Kültür. *Toplum ve Bilim,* 28.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Habermas, J. 1995. Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe. In *Theorizing Citizenship,* ed. R. Beiner. New York: State University of New York Press.

Hayes, C.J.H. 1937. Nationalism. *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences,* 11-12.

Hobsbawm, E. 1991. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, J., Smith, A.D. 1994. *Nationalism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kellas, James G. 1991. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, Hong Kong: McMillan.

Kohn, H. 1944. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background.* New York: Macmillan Company.

Laffan, B. 1996. The Politics of Identity and Political Order in Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 34.

Oomen, T.K. ed. 1997. *Citizenship and National Identity from Colonization and Globalizm.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Rattasi, A. 1994. Western Racism, Ethnicities and Identities in A 'Postmodern Frame.' In *Racism, Modernity, Identity. On the Western Front.*

Smith, A. D. 1981. Nationalism in the Twentieth Century. In *Citizenship and National Identity from Colonization and Globalizm*, ed. T.K. Oomen, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Smith, A.D. 1986. *Ethnic Origins of Nations.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Smith, A.D. 1989. The Origins of Nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 12.

Smith, A.D. 1990. *National Identity.* Harmonds-worth: Penguin Books.

Smith, A.D. 1992. National Identity and the Idea of European Unity. *International Affairs,* 1.

Smith, A.D. 1995. *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era.* UK: Polity Press.

Taylor, C. 1994a. *Multiculturalism Examining The Politics of Recognition*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, C. 1994b. *Sources of The Self: The Making of the Modern Identity.* UK: University of Cambridge Press

Taylor, C. 1994c. The Politics of Recognition. In Multiculturalism, ed. A. Gutmann,

Waever O., Buzan B., Kelstrup, M., Lamartine P. 1993. *Identity, Migration and thw New Security Agenda in Europe.* London: Printer Publisher.

Ward, I. 1994. In Search of a European Identity. *The Modern Law Review,* 57

Weber, M. 1954. *On Law in Economy and Society.* Trans. by E. Shils. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Weeks, J. 1990. The Value of Difference. In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference,* ed. Jonathan Rurhetford London: Lawrance & Wishart.

Wheelis, A.B. 1958. *The Quest for Identity.* New York: Norton.

Wintle, M. 1996. *Culture and Identity.* Avebury: Aldershot

Woolf, S. 1992. The Cosntruction of a European World-View in the Revolutionary Napoleonic Wars. *Past and Present,* 137.

Yinger, J.M. 1994. *Ethnicity: Source of Strength? Source of Conflict?* USA: State University of New York.

Yurdusev, A.N. 1996. Laiklik ve Modern Uluslararası Sistem. *Liberal Düşünce,* 1.

Yurdusev, A.N. 1996. Türkiye'nin Medeniyet Aidiyeti Avrupa Birliği'ne Engel midir? *Söylem,* 3.

Yurdusev, A.N. 1997. Avrupa Kimliğinin Oluşumu ve Türk Kimliği In *Türkiye ve Avrupa: Batılılaşma, Kalkınma, Demokrasi,* ed. A. Eralp, İstanbul: İmge.