A DISCUSSION ON ETHNIC IDENTITY

Gökhan BACIK*

After the end of the cold war a new wave of expectations has come to the forefront. Accordingly, many substantial concepts and institutions are, and will be, changing. Of all discussed concepts and institutions, some of them, such as nation states, are now part of the ongoing discussions. However, considering the various sides of these ongoing discussions, one should note that the main discussion around the concept of identity – identification theory – constitutes a large portion of the above-mentioned disputation. Why? The difficulty of giving a clear answer to this question is obvious. However, we may refer to the nature of the same process. Accordingly, the process that we are talking about includes some contradictions. These contradictions intensify with the definition of the identity formation. Consequently, the same process and the developments may give way to some contradicting results. For example, with the positive effect of globalisation we are talking about the de-functioning of nation states. At the same time, however, the role of sub-identities, such as ethnic ones, is increasing paradoxically. From this stance, we have two independent tendencies: one that increases the commonalities of the world nations, and the other one that makes much more clearly the differences of the sub-identities.

Within these margins of the global line of action, some concepts deserve a re-evaluation since they have become the determining facts of our political/international system. We have had these concepts for more than centuries, and we will continue to have them in the future. However, what makes them important is the changing role/meaning of these 'old,' or known, concepts/values. In the words of Sir Ernest Barker:

> The self-consciousness of nations is a product of the nineteenth century. This is a matter of the first importance. Nations were already there; they had indeed been there for centuries. But it is not the things which are simply 'there' that matter in human life. What really and finally matters is the thing that is apprehended as an idea, and, as an idea, is vested with emotion until it becomes a cause and a spring of action. In the world of action apprehended ideas are alone electrical; and a nation must be an ideal as well as a fact before it can become a dynamic force.[1]

The same, said above for the self-consciousness, can be said for the role of ethnic identities. Ethnic identities have always been effective. People from the very beginning have identified themselves and their societies to other people by using their ethnic-oriented motives and values. However, as it was mentioned in Barker's words, the set of ethnic values, though they have always been an inseparable part of society, have become much more active in the recent decade . To re-emphasize the emerging role of ethnic identity studies as well one can easily read Esnam's introductory sentences to his book, *Ethnic Politics*:

> Glance at headings in the early 1990s: pitched battles between Serbs, Croats and Muslims in Bosnia, between Sinhalese and Tamils in Sri Lanka, between Muslims and Christians in northern Nigeria, Read of IRA bombings in London, of threatened genocide by Arabs against Dinka in Sudan, of riots involving African-Americans, Whites, and Koreans in Los Angeles. The ethnically defined successor states of the defunct Soviet Union contain restive minorities whose competing claims and status must be confronted and managed. Canada is threatened with the peaceful secession in Quebec, led by the French-speaking majority, now "masters in their own homeland"; India is coping with a violent

Sikh secessionist movement in the Punjab; the minority Sunni Arab regime in Iraq struggles to maintain control over rebellious Kurds and Shi'a Muslims; Belgium has periodically tedious negotiations between representatives of its Walloon and Flemish peoples; French and German public affairs are roiled by conflicts over the status of large immigrant diasporas,. The catalog of brutally violent and of more or less civic manifestations of ethnic conflict includes all continents. [2]

The Subject

The role of ethnicity in the process of the construction of national identity can be evaluated from various points of view. Before dealing with the role of ethnicity in this process, we should study the theories of national identity. By studying various theories on the problem of national identity, one can try to analyse the role of ethnicity. In general, there are two types of nationalism typologies. These can be listed as ethnic nationalism and civic nationalism. [3] In each case, the role of ethnicity emerges in a different way. In the following pages, each typology of nationalism will be discussed.

Ethnic Nationalism

In the words of Charles A. Kupchan, "Ethnic nationalism defines nationhood in terms of lineage. The attributes that members of an ethnically defined national grouping share include physical characteristic, culture, religion, language, and a common ancestry. Individuals of a different ethnicity, even if they reside in and are citizens of the nation state in question, do not become part of the national grouping." [4] According to Anthony Smith, nations always need ethnic elements. [5] Examining the definition from the origin of the words, "the word nation comes from the Latin and, when first coined, clearly conveyed the idea of common blood ties."[6] The word nation is derived from the "past participle of the verb *nasci*, meaning to be born," yet "the Latin noun, *nationem*, means breed or race."[7] (Remembering the word nascent we still use today in English) For example, "At some medieval universities, a student's *nationem* designated the

sector of the country from whence he came." Again following the history of the word, in the late thirteenth century when the word was first introduced to English, "it was with its primary connotation of a blood related group." It was not an exceptional case to correlate nation with blood in history. The famous motto of "think with your blood" (Bismarck) represents succinctly this dimension. Accordingly, even in the last century, some understood race as a synonym for nation. In ethnic nationalism, the set of values has the priority over all other kinds of references. Again, in ethnic nationalism it is not important how you feel yourself. The only label you deserve is what you are with the blood you bear. The British poet Swinburne (1837-1909) once wrote:

> *Not with dreams but with blood and with iron,*
>
> *Shall a nation be moulded to last .*[8]

On the other hand, when considering some concrete samples the difference may be seen best in a comparative look at the cases of France and Germany. According to Rogers Brubaker, "If the French understanding of nationhood has been state centred and assimilationist, the German understanding has been Volk-centred and differentialist."[9] In the French model, the word assimilation is very important. The adoption of any typology of nationalism also influences the construction of state and nation relations. In a state where ethnic nationalism is the key word, many would think that their state created their nation. The ethnonationalist typology in one way strengthened the role of the state against the people. Within this context, can we use the formula of ethnic nation? Milton Esman defines an ethnic nation as, "a politicised ethnic community whose spokesman demand control over what they define as their territorial homeland, either in the form of substantial autonomy or complete independence." [10]

The ethnic way of nation formation produces several hard conclusions. In an ethnic group identity construction, "Outsiders are naturally not comparable to insiders: the others cannot be converted or adopted, they are not guilty for committing a wrong choice, they cannot be educated, developed or even understood, they are simply unalterably different. This difference often conveys inferiority and danger at the same time. Strangers are frequently perceived as demonic and a threat to the collectivity." [11]

It is a widely shared belief that ethnic nationalism is, in nature, closed to the social cleavages. In other words, ethnic nationalism may be conflict-producing mould when a country includes several ethnic groups. To be understood, one may deal with some concrete samples. In the process of nation building, the chosen typology affects the stability in such a country. According to Bloom, "By nation-building we mean both the formation and establishment of the new state itself as a political entity, and the processes of creating viable degrees of unity, adaptation, achievement, and a sense of national identity among the people." [12] However, the same process should create the psychological creation of the nation as well.[13] As mentioned several times before, the typology adopted in the national identity construction is important. Since there may exist several other ethnic groups within a country, the nature of nationalism typology would produce its own structural results. Before looking at concrete samples, one should be reminded that the nation building, or the process of national identity construction, has no end. Why? To quote William Bloom, "There are always individuals and ethnic groups who, for one reason or another based in previous identifications, do not identify with the nation-state." [14] In this regard, the Kurdish question may be analysed as a good case. It may be rejected, however, from various points of view that the process of nation building in the Turkish case has been somehow ethnic oriented. In

1925, the Turkish Minister of Justice, Mahmut Esat Bozkurt, made a well-known declaration: "Only the Turkish nation has the privilege of demanding national rights in this country. There is no possibility that other ethnic groups' demands for such a right will be recognised. There is no need to hide the truth. The Turks are the sole owners and the sole notables of this country. Those who are not of Turkish origin have only one right: to serve and to be the slaves without question of the noble Turkish nation." [15] This quotation may be disputed by some since these sentences might not reflect the general opinion of the Turkish state. However, re-reading the words of Bozkurt, one should notice some interesting facts. Bozkurt used very interesting words while formulating his opinions. His choices includes "national rights," "other ethnic groups," "noble nation," etc. In other words, Bozkurt made a plain formula of ethnic nationalism by using some well-known words from the terminology of nationalism. "This view," writes Jack Eller, "eventually gave way to a race ideology, however, and Turkey was to be the national home of this race exclusively."[16]

Ethnic nationalism, along with the above-mentioned conclusions, also gives way to some indirect social results. Of all of these results, cultivating a myth of ethnic election is worthy to mention. The myth of an elected nation may emerge from various historical and social conditions. For example, a pure myth of ethnic election that was seen in the case of National Socialism in Germany is not the same that has been seen in the case of Israel. What is the rationale of this feeling? Is it religion ("So, now obey me and keep my agreement. Do this, and you will be my own possession, *chosen from all nations*" The Old Testament, Exodus 19/5), or history (golden age)? Anthony Smith explains the roots of this feeling from a functional point of view. Accordingly, "The members of ethnic community must be made to feel, not only that they form a single

super-family, but that their historic community is unique, that they possess what Max Weber called 'irreplaceable culture values,' that their heritage must be preserved against inner corruption and external control, and that the community has a sacred duty to extend its culture values to outsiders."[17] This social feeling is also a contemporary fact in various societies. Gil Merom, in *Israel's National Security and the Myth of Exceptionalism,* states that "members of social groups tend to develop their sense of collective identity on the basis of two kinds of perceptions: perceptions of shared attributes within the group, and perceptions of the difference between these attributes and those of other social groups."[18] The case is also valid for Israel since the Israeli people perceive themselves as *am nivchar* (chosen by God), yet they perceive themselves as the *la'goyim* (light unto the nations). This perception has a Biblical background and tradition. David Ben-Gurion, in 1950, underlines this perception succinctly, "We do not fit the general pattern of humanity."[19] In another speech he formulates the difference as follows, "Our supreme quality, our intellectual and moral advantage, singles us out even today, as it did throughout the generations." [20]

Civic Nationalism

"Civic nationalism defines nationhood in terms of citizenship and political participation. Members of a national grouping that is defined in civic terms share participation in a circumscribed political community, common political values, a sense of belonging to the state in which they reside, and, usually, a common language." Thus, "A citizen is a national, regardless of ethnicity and lineage."[21] Looking at another definition by Sasja Tempelman, "Civic construction of collective identity, here the core of collective identity is not natural, but is seen as a historically developed continuous

flux, although some parts are more robust than others. As most rules are implicit and difficult to separate from the praxis of everyday life, boundaries are diffuse and undefined." Consequently, "outsiders can become members of the civic community, but only by participating in the local practices and institutions and by slowly adopting the customs and even the modes of reflexive criticisms thereof." [22]

In civic nationalism, the set of givens is not important as it is in ethnic nationalism. In the words of Michael Ignatieff, "The civic nation is a community created by the choice of individuals to honour a particular political creed." [23] There are naturally some sets of values and principles, however, that are not given but constructed by the will of people in the course of history. The widely celebrated formula of Benedict Anderson, *imagined communities*, summarises the core of civic nationalism. From his point of view, nationalism (and other related definitions such as nation-ness, nationality as well) is a *cultural artefact of a particular kind*.[24] So a nation may easily be named as a political project. It does not depend on a given set of values, but it is the outcome of our perceptions and imaginations. It is worth quoting at length the words of Wicker here to summarise the core approaches of civic nationalism:

> ...there is no such thing as an ethnic, cultural, or national essence; formations which appear as ethnic groups, as cultures, or as nations should no longer be considered as supra-subjective wholes that generate and determine human action. Instead, they should be interpreted as the products of history, therefore as resulting from concrete acts that are motivated by people's interests. Such formations are constructions naturalised by social actors in the interest of their own social standing; only then are they equipped with a coherent history and a homogenous, territorial character. What social scientists are expected to do according to this theoretical canon, then, is to examine which social actors participate in generating such concepts of ethnicity, culture and nation, and to locate the strategies and processes of construction that are used to make such totalities become real. Thus like social classes ethnic groups,

cultures and nations are thought to exist not in themselves but only for themselves." [25]

In the same regard, it is an expected outcome that in civic nationalism the other ethnic groups may feel better since the bounding element is not related to blood or race. We can also compare ethnic and civic nationalism in a table produced by Tempelman:[26]

	Core of identity	Basis of membership	Vision of outsiders	a-External relations and b-mode of exclusion
Ethnic	Natural features	Sharing features	Absolutely different	a-Mutual hostility b- external eviction, internal homogenisation
Civic	Fuzzy routines and traditions	Implicit familiarity	Unfamiliar	a-interaction b- differential

Ethnic Identity Formation

There are several contending theories about ethnic identity formation. Considering the basic tenets, these theories resemble those of nationalism. Delineating theories of ethnic identity formation, the role of ethnic identity in the process of national identity formation may be enlightened. Whatever the case, at the core all kinds of grouping identity formations may be studied on the basis of collective identity. From what kind of process a collective identity comes to being is essentially important for us. Bernhard Giesen, in *Intellectuals and the Nation,* describes the process of collective identity construction. *The construction of boundaries* is the primary stage since "they mark the difference between inside and outside, strange and familiar, relatives and non-relatives, friends and enemies, culture and nature, enlightenment and barbarism."[27] Another topic is the depiction of a *mediating realm.* "The mediating realm is the

location of identity in perception and consciousness: the centre, the present, the subject."[28] *Original referent is* the set of other important facts to construct a collective identity. By doing so, "collective identity can become the object and theme of a particular reflexivity that locates identity within the structure of an interpretation of the world."[29] The following duty is the definition of *code, process and situation.* "Codes are purely symbolic structures, in no way bound to a location in space or temporal limits. Processes, by contrast, are ordered not only symbolically, but also temporarily. And situations, besides having a symbolic structuring and a temporal dimension, also include a spatial location."[30] The process of this construction reaches to the end by following stages of *the situational construction of difference* and *self-production of collectivity.*

The word "ethnicity" has an interesting historical background. Its first appearance in the Oxford English Dictionary occurred in 1972. According to Eriksen, "Its first usage is attributed to the American sociologist, David Riesman, in 1953."[31] However, the old version of the same word, ethnos, meant heathen or pagan. Again according to Eriksen, "The word was used in this sense in English from the mid-fourteenth century until the mid-eighteenth century, when it gradually began to refer to racial characteristics."[32] During the Second World War, the same term depicted the Jews, Italians, Irish and other people in the United States. But, considering its various usage in the several texts during the course of history, it seems much more interesting. Looking from the perspective of language – especially English – there are some problems. "It comes from the Greek term *ethnos*, and survives as a fairly common intellectual's word in modern French, *ethnie*, with the associated adjective *ethnique*. The possible noun expressing what it is you require to be *ethnique*, *ethnicite* is still not common in modern French. The adjective exists in modern English as ethnic, with a

suffix added to give ethnicity. One of the problems for English speakers is that the concrete noun from which it is derived does not exist in our language. We have no *ethnos*, no *ethnie*."[33] Surprisingly, in the very early using of the word, it was not applied to people. In Homer, "It was used to describe large undifferentiated groups of either animals or warriors. Frequently, *etnos* is used for an animal multitude (bees, birds, or flies)..." Following Tonkin and the others:

> Aeschylus uses ethnos to describe the Furies and also the Persians. Sophocles uses it for wild animals. Pindar, again in very early recorded use, employs the term to describe groups of like people, but again people whose location or conduct put them in some way outside the sphere of Greek social normality. Aristotle uses it for foreign or barbarous nations, as opposed to Hellenes. When Heredotus describes the Greeks in the famous passage ethnos is *not* term he employs. Romans writing in Greek under the Empire, use the term to describe a province, or the provinces in general-areas that were, that is, not Rome.[34]

On this basis the question to be answered is, What is an ethnic group? According to Esman, "Ethnic identity refers to a community that claims common origin, often including common descent or fictive kinship; that possesses distinctive and valued cultural markers in the form of customs, dress, and especially language; and that traces a common history and expects to share a common destiny."[35] According to Adrian Hastings, the same term refers to "the common culture whereby a group of people share the basics of life –their cloth and clothes; the style of houses; the way they relate to domestic animals and to agricultural land; the essential work which shapes the functioning of a society and how roles are divided between men and women; the way hunting is organized; how murder and robbery are handled; the way defence is organised against threatening intruders; the way property and authority are handed on; the rituals of birth, marriage and death; the customs of courtship; the proverbs, songs, lullabies; shared history and myth;, and the beliefs in what follows death and in God,

gods or other spirits."[36] One can also list several other definitions. Instead, to be sure, one should consider the related theories on the construction of ethnic groups. To a large degree, there are two contending theories of ethnic identity formation: primordialist approach and instrumentalist approach. It may be argued as well that, with the globalisation movement, another type of approach has come to the forefront, which is called universal mode. In this paper this emerging mode is omitted.

Primordialism: The Story of Given Identity

The primordialist approach claims that an ethnic group emerges from given features.[37] Seen from this point of view, they are the natural, given or unchangeable facts that determine the formation of an ethnic group. "A primordial attachment means one that stems from the givens – or, more precisely, as culture is inevitably involved in such matters, the assumed givens – of social existence (immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly), but beyond them the given-ness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices."[38] However, one should ask here, What are these givens? Again quoting Greetz, the set of givens can be enlisted as follows: assumed blood ties, race, language, region, religion, and custom.[39] All these make up the set of primordial boundaries. "Primordial boundaries cannot be moved socially, and passing them is extremely difficult." [40] Primordialism has been criticised by various scholars. Of these scholars, Jack Eller and Reed Coughlan wrote the widely known article that disfavoured primordialism. In their article, *The Poverty of Primordialism,* they rejected the basic tenets of the primordialist approach. According to them, one cannot claim the existence of a set of given facts that have no social source

because all concepts that make up any kind of group identity are socially constructed. They also criticised the ineffability and affectivity of the primordialist school. In their conclusion, they claimed, "primordialism is a bankrupt concept for the analyses and description of ethnicity." [41] However, the discussions never find the end. One of the well-known platforms for all these discussions has been the *Ethnic and Racial Studies* journal. Shortly after the appearance of *The Poverty of Primordialism,* Steven Grosby responded by another famous article, *The Verdict of History: The Inexpungeable Tie for Primordiality- a response to Eller and Coughlan.* [42] Grosby, in his response, claimed that Eller and Coughlan misunderstood the primordialist approach. According to Grosby, there are a set of given values by using those of an individual to participate in history. "The individual participates in these given, a priori bounded pattern. The patterns are the legacy of history; they are tradition. Ethnic groups and nationalities exist because there are traditions of belief and action towards primordial objects such as biological features and especially territorial location." [43] Including the author of these pages, most scholars and students of ethnicity have come to state that collective identity is a constructed formation. However, is it to mean there is no given value or suchlike fact? Etienne Balibar asks, "How can ethnicity be produced? And how can it be produced in such a way that it does not appear as fiction, but as the most natural of origins?" [44] He makes a conclusion that would be appreciated by most of the primordialists. "History shows us that there are two great competing routes to this: language and race." [45]

How can I be exactly true when I claim I am a Turk? My father can be a Turk. So is my mother. However, who can claim my grandfather's father was also a Turk? Is it satisfying proof to claim an origin? As the time goes on, the origins also mix with

each other. In this stance it is meaningless to claim one's origin since even we do not know his name, i.e., my grandfather's father. In this regard, even the common descent of the ethnic group is a myth.[46] Such an approach creates a well-known solution: "Ethnicity is both primordial and instrumental." [47]

Instrumentalism: The Story of Constructed Identity

No matter what my origin is, no matter what my 'given' features are, it is my own right to choose the group in which I would participate.[48] This introductory sentence summarises the instrumentalist approach. In other words, the instrumentalist 'school' claims that there is a strong flexibility in the course of history about the formation of ethnic identities. Yet according to the instrumentalist approach, there is no real other. The boundaries are extremely flexible. There is a normal interaction with the other groups. The instrumentalist approach rejects the alleged roles of race, origin, and even language. The instrumentalists say to us: You are what you feel yourself. Instrumentalism does not reject the subjective differences. It is noteworthy to remember here De Vos' definition. He once wrote, "Ethnicity is a sense of ethnic identity that consists of the subjective, symbolic or emblematic use of by a group of people...of any aspect of culture, in order to differentiate themselves from the other groups."[49]Accordingly, one should notice the subjective choice rather than determining hard givens. Therefore, any kind of distinguishing feature of an ethnic group fails to endure, but this failure does not always mean the failure of the survival of an ethnic group. "Despite the fact that European culture, civilisation, and science have, for centuries, been dominated increasingly by the three languages, English, French, and

German," writes Brass, "this has not prevented the growth of linguistic diversity in Europe from 16 (standard) languages in 1800 to 30 in 1900 and to 53 in 1937." [50]

This time, since one accepts the instrumentalist approach, there are other questions to be answered. Who can challenge/lead this process of formation? What is the role of the leader(s)? On the other hand, instrumentalism is not the total rejection of the concept of given. There may be really a given descent; however, it is not a matter of fact for the instrumentalist. It may be actually existing or putative. A good example illuminates the crux of the problem. "Although the French are popularly believed to be of Celtic descent and the Germans of Teutonic origin there are scientists, like M. Jean Finot, who maintain that if it is absolutely necessary to attribute Celtic descent to any European people, that people must be not the French but the Germans, while the French, on the other hand, are more Teutonic in blood than the Germans."[51] The crux of the problem is personal/social feeling and perception. To Weber there may be a subjective belief in common descent, "however it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists."[52] To Schermerhorn, the belief of common descent may be putative rather than real, but what must exist is "some consciousness of kind among membership of the group."[53] Needless to say, this consciousness may be gained or re-gained again by the others.[54] It means we have turned to Berghe's point. The definition is both instrumental and primordial.

Nationalism-National Identity and Ethnic Identity Formation

In the last part of my article, the relationship between nationalism-national identity and ethnic identity formation will be under consideration. What kind of relationship can be found between the formation of an ethnic identity and that of

national identity? The answer depends on the typology of nationalism valid in a country. For example considering Connor's classification of nations, in the type of *proper nation* – the largest human grouping characterised by a myth of common ancestry – the role of ethnic identity formation, for example rather than civic, is naturally important.[55] If there were a dominant group in a country that makes the majority of the total population, the ethnic identity formation of this group eventually would shape the national identity formation process of the nation.[56] If this majority chooses an ethnic nationalism, it directly produces social disturbances for the minority/other groups. In a *proper nation* where ethnic nationalism is chosen, there should be some difficulties for the other group/groups. In ethnic nationalism, the most principle given is the common descent myth. This myth, beyond its conventional functions, creates some other important situations. In congruent with the common myth discourse, a national history is constructed. The national state has its national history despite the fact that history has no exceptional offers for nations, groups or persons. Any nation's members adopting ethnic nationalism want to believe that they have existed since the very early stages as a political or social unit. The myth of endurance is important. "We were/are and will be having our cohesive unit/nation."

On the other hand, if we are talking about a *proper nation* and the other group, we should check some other related subjects. In a country where there is a majority depending on a common ethnic formation and where there is a minority depending on a different ethnic formation, the process may become drastically different. The clash between two sides may give way to the revolutionary stage thenceforward and may produce a cessation. In which circumstances does an ethnic group become state-claiming? To me, the first condition is the implementation of ethnic nationalism, since

only under civic nationalist policies several groups may live together. According to Kuchan, there are several conditions that foster the state claims of ethnic groups: loss of state capacity (including both political and economic), treatment of minorities (how the majority, *proper nation,* interacts with its minority citizens*)*, historical rivalries and hatreds (waiting to happen, the fragmentation of Yugoslavia), contagion and emulation, social change and identity formation.[57] On the other side, the response of states against such state-claiming ethnic groups also differs from time to time. No state welcomes any kind of challenge towards its unity. However, if there is such an acute problem, there lies two natural ways. "It can attempt to eradicate (genocide, expulsion, population exchanges, use of power: Nazi Germany, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Stalin Russia: Greek-Turkish exchanges in the 20s) the ethnic differences in its territory, or it can choose to accommodate the demands that stem from these differences." [58]

In sum ethnic identity formation brings out its social and political outcomes due to the nature of the process, social and political environment and actors. Hence, in each different case it plays a different role. If it is a country that has taken over the legacy of an empire like Turkey, the relationship between ethnic identity formation and national identity formation may somehow be perplexed since one here can not talk about a single ethnic identity formation. On the other hand ethnic nationalisms usually prefer to adopt the historical legacy of former ethnic identity formation since they usually depend on a historical ethnic identity what becomes later *proper nation.* In civic nationalism form, since the commons do not only include givens, on year by year base the legacy of ethnic identity formation(s) incline to become socially extinct. In various countries such as the United States and Canada where migration has been a historical event, talking about an

ethnic formation base is hardly possible since to set up such a 'common' among various

groups is really difficult.

***Gökhan Bacik** is lecturer in the department of international relations at Fatih

University

Notes

[1] Cited in Walker Connor Connor, Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 4.

[2] Milton J. Esman, Ethnic Politics, (London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1994), p. 1.

[3] Needless to say, there are several other classifications as well. For example in James Kellas' classification there are ethnic and social nationalism. The latter may be named also civic. According to Kellas social nationalism "based on a shared culture, but not on common descent. It is inclusive in the sense that anyone can adopt that culture and join the nation, even if that person is not considered to be a member of the ethnic nation." See: James G. Kellas, The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity, (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), p. 65

[4] Charles A. Kupchan, " Introduction: Nationalism Resurgent", in Charles A. Kupchan (ed), Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe, (London: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 4.

[5] Anthony D. Smith, Milli Kimlik, (Istanbul: Iletisim, 1994), p. 71.

[6] For this and following quotations on the history of the word nation: Walker Connor Connor, Ethnonationalism The Quest for Understanding, (New Jersey: Princeton, 1994), pp. 94-95.

[7] Random House Webster's Dictionary writes: [1250-1300; ME < L natio birth, people, nation = na-, base of nasci to be born + -tio - TION]   Derived words --na'tion-hood , n. --na'tion-less, adj.

[8] Cited in Walker Connor, op cit., p. 210.

[9] Rogers Brubaker, Citizenship and Nationhood, (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1992), pp. 1-3.

[10] Milton J. Esman, Ethnic Politics, (London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1994), p. 27.

[11] Sasja Tempelman, "Constructions of Cultural Identity: Multiculturalism and Exclusion", Political Studies, XLVII, 1999, p. 18.

[12] William Bloom, Personal Identity, National Identity And International Relations, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 55.

[13] Ibid., p. 56.

[14] Ibid., p. 63.

[15] Cited in Robert Olson, The Kurdish Question and Turkish-Iranian Relations From World War I to 1998, (Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1998), pp. 18-19.

[16] Jack David Eller, <u>From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict: An Anthropological Perspective on International Ethnic Conflict,</u> (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1998), p. 171.

[17] See: Anthony D. Smith, "Chosen peoples: Why ethnic groups survive", <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies</u>, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 440-449.

[18] Gil Merom, "Israel's National Security and the Myth of Exceptionalism", <u>Political Science Quarterly</u>, Vol. 114, No. 3. http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/psq/psq_fall99.html

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Kupchan, op cit., p. 4.

[22] Tempelman, op cit., p. 18.

[23] Cited in Bernard Yack, "The Myth of Civic Nation", in Ronald Beiner (ed.), <u>Theorizing Nationalism</u>, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 104

[24] Benedict Anderson, <u>Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,</u> (London-New York: Verso, 1991), p. 4.

[25] Hans-Rudolf Wicker, "Introduction: Theorising Ethnicity and Nationalism" in H. R. Wicker, <u>Rethinking Nationalism & Ethnicity The Struggle For Meaning and Order in Europe,</u> (Oxford-New York, Berg, 1997), p. 1.

[26] (table)[?] Tempelman, op cit., p. 19.

[27] For all quotations mentioned in my text from Giesen on the formation of collective identity see: Bernhard Giesen, <u>Intellectuals and the Nation Collective Identity in a German Axial Age,</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 13-23.
[28] ibid.
[29] ibid.
[30] ibid.

[31] Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex<u>, The Ethnicity Reader Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration,</u> (Oxford: Polity Press, 1999), p. 33.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Elisabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, Malcom Chapman, <u>History and Ethnicity</u>, (London: Routledge, 1989), pp. 11-12.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Esman, op cit., pp. 15-16.

[36] Adrian Hastings, <u>The Construction of Nationhood Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism,</u> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 167.

[37] It is apt here to remember Fredrik Barth's famous equation, a race = a culture = a language = a society = a unit. Primordialism depends on such determining and fix equations.

[38] Clifford Geertz, "The Integrative Revolution", in C. Geertz, (ed) <u>Old Societies and New States</u>, (New York: Free Press, 1963), pp. 109-110.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Giesen, op cit., p. 27.

[41] This famous article appears in Ethnic and Racial Studies. See: Jack Eller and Reed Coughlan, "The Poverty of Primordialism", <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies,</u> (Vol. 16, No. 2, 1993.

[42] Steven Grosby, "The Verdict of History: The Inexpungeable Tie for Primordiality- a response to Eller and Coughlan," <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies,</u> Vol. 17, No. 2, 1994.

[43] ibid.

[44] Etienne Balibar, "The Nation Form: History and Ideology", in Etienne Balibar & Immanuel Wallerstein, <u>Race, Nation, Class Ambiguous Identities,</u> (London-New York, Verso, 1991), p. 96.

[45] ibid.

[46] Pierre Van Den Berghe, "Does Race Matter?", <u>Nations and Nationalism,</u> Vol. 1, No. 3, 1995, p. 360.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Remembering the fix equations of Barth (see footnote 31) in instrumentalist approach there is no kind of such equations. So nobody knows what a race equals. In other words a race = ? (undeterminable) since the time and the conditions may determine several alternative results/identifications.

[49] Cited in Paul R. Brass, <u>Ethnicity and Nationalism,</u> (London: Sage, 1991), pp. 18-19.

[50] Ibid.

[51] This paragraph is from Bernard Joseph. Cited in Conner, op cit., p. 215.

[52] Eller, op cit., pp. 12-13.

[53] ibid.

[54] When it comes to consciousness one should remember that beyond this traditional debate over the approaches of primordialism and instrumentalism, some claim the real reason of such distinctions have been even class/religion/sect consciousness.

[55] Eller, op cit., p. 18.

[56] For this definition see: Ma Shu-yun, "Reciprocal Relation Between Political Development and Ethnic Nationalism", <u>Social Science Journal,</u> 1999, (Vol. 36, No. 2), pp. 369-379.

[57] Kuchan, op cit., pp. 8-10.

[58] Martijn A. Roessingh, <u>Ethnonationalism and Political Systems in Europe,</u> (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1996), p. 26.