1
Concepts

If there is one point on which there is agreement, it is that the term 'nationalism' is quite modern. Its earliest recorded use in anything like a recognizably social and political sense goes back to the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder and the French counter-revolutionary cleric, the Abbé Augustin de Barruel at the end of the eighteenth century. It was rarely used in the early nineteenth century; in English, its first use, in 1836, appears to be theological, the doctrine that certain nations are divinely elected. Thereafter, it tended to be equated with national egotism, but usually other terms, such as 'nationality' and 'nationalness', with the meanings of national fervour or national individuality, were preferred.[1]

The Meanings of 'Nationalism'

It was really only during the last century that the term nationalism acquired the range of meanings that we associate with it today. Of these usages, the most important are:

(1) a process of formation, or growth, of nations;
(2) a sentiment or consciousness of belonging to the nation;
(3) a language and symbolism of the nation;
(4) a social and political movement on behalf of the nation;

(5) a doctrine and/or ideology of the nation, both general and particular.

The first of these usages, the *process of formation* of nations, is very general and itself embraces a series of more specific processes which often form the object of national*ism* in other, narrower senses of the term. It is therefore best left for later consideration when we look at the term 'nation'.

Of the other four usages, the second, *national consciousness or sentiment*, needs to be carefully distinguished from the other three. They are, of course, closely related, but they do not necessarily go together. One can, for example, possess considerable national feeling in the absence of any symbolism, movement or even ideology on behalf of the nation. This was the predicament in which Niccolo Machiavelli found himself when his calls to Italians in the early sixteenth century to unite against the northern barbarians fell on deaf ears. On the other hand, a group could exhibit a high degree of national consciousness, but lack any overt ideology, let alone a political movement, on behalf of the nation, though it is likely to possess at least some national symbols and myths. The contrast between an organized ideological movement of nationalism, on the one hand, and a more diffuse feeling of national belonging, on the other, is sufficiently clear to allow us to treat the concept of national consciousness or sentiment separately from that of nationalism, even if in practice there is often some degree of overlap between them.[2]

The term national*ism*, therefore, will be understood here as referring to one or more of the last three usages: a language and symbolism, a sociopolitical movement and an ideology of the nation. That each of these nevertheless presupposes some measure of national feeling, certainly among the nationalists themselves, if not the designated population at large, needs to be borne in mind; for it serves to connect the more active and organized sectors to the usually much larger, more passive and fragmented segments of the population.

As a *sociopolitical movement*, nationalism does not differ, in principle, from others in terms of its organizations, activities and techniques, except in one particular: its emphasis upon cultural gestation and representation. The ideologies of

nationalism require an immersion in the culture of the nation – the rediscovery of its history, the revival of its vernacular language through such disciplines as philology and lexicography, the cultivation of its literature, especially drama and poetry, and the restoration of its vernacular arts and crafts, as well as its music, including native dance and folksong. This accounts for the frequent cultural and literary renascences associated with nationalist movements, and the rich variety of the cultural activities which nationalism can excite. Typically, a nationalist movement will commence not with a protest rally, declaration or armed resistance, but with the appearance of literary societies, historical research, music festivals and cultural journals – the kind of activity that Miroslav Hroch analysed as an essential first phase of the rise and spread of Eastern European nationalisms, and, we may add, of many subsequent nationalisms of colonial Africa and Asia. As a result, 'humanistic' intellectuals – historians and philologists, artists and composers, poets, novelists and film directors – tend to be disproportionately represented in nationalist movements and revivals (Argyle 1969; Hroch 1985).[3]

The *language and symbolism* of nationalism merit more attention, and their motifs will recur throughout these pages. But, despite considerable overlap with symbolism, the language or discourse of nationalism cannot be considered separately, since they are so closely tied to the ideologies of nationalism. Indeed, the key concepts of nationalism's distinctive language form intrinsic components of its core doctrine and its characteristic ideologies. I shall therefore consider this conceptual language under the heading of ideology in chapter 2.[4]

The *symbolism* of nationalism, on the other hand, shows such a degree of regularity across the globe that we may profitably extract it from its ideological framework. A national symbolism is, of course, distinguished by its all-encompassing object, the nation, but equally by the tangibility and vividness of its characteristic signs. These start with a collective proper name. For nationalists, as for the feuding families of Verona, a rose by any other name could never smell as sweet – as the recent dispute over the name of Macedonia sharply reminded us. Proper names are chosen, or

retained from the past, to express the nation's distinctiveness, heroism and sense of destiny, and to resonate these qualities among the members. Similarly with national flags and anthems: their colours, shapes and patterns, and their verses and music, epitomize the special qualities of the nation and by their simple forms and rhythms aim to conjure a vivid sense of unique history and/or destiny among the designated population. It matters little that to outsiders the differences between many flags appear minimal, and that the verses of anthems reveal a limited range of themes. What counts is the potency of the meanings conveyed by such signs to the members of the nation. The fact that every nation sports a capital city, a national assembly, a national coinage, passports and frontiers, similar remembrance ceremonies for the fallen in battle, the requisite military parades and national oaths, as well as their own national academies of music, art and science, national museums and libraries, national monuments and war memorials, festivals and holidays, etc., and that lack of such symbols marks a grave national deficit, suggests that the symbolism of the nation has assumed a life of its own, one that is based on global comparisons and a drive for national salience and parity in a visual and semantic 'world of nations'. The panoply of national symbols only serves to express, represent and reinforce the boundary definition of the nation, and to unite the members inside through a common imagery of shared memories, myths and values.[5]

Of course, national symbolism, like nationalist movements, cannot be divorced from the *ideology of nationalism*, the final and main usage of the term. The ideology of nationalism serves to give force and direction to both symbols and movements. The goals of the sociopolitical movement are defined not by the activities or the personnel of the movement, but by the basic ideals and tenets of the ideology. Similarly, the characteristic symbols and language of nationalism are shaped by the role they play in explicating and evoking the ideals of the nation and furthering the goals laid down by nationalist ideology. So, it is the ideology that must supply us with an initial working definition of the term 'national*ism*', for its contents are defined by the ideologies which place the nation at the centre of their concerns and purposes, and

which separate it from other, adjacent ideologies (see Motyl 1999: ch. 5).

Definitions

Nationalism

The ideology of nationalism has been defined in many ways, but most of the definitions overlap and reveal common themes. The main theme, of course, is an overriding concern with the nation. Nationalism is an ideology that places the nation at the centre of its concerns and seeks to promote its well-being. But this is rather vague. We need to go further and isolate the main goals under whose headings nationalism seeks to promote the nation's well-being. These generic goals are three: national autonomy, national unity and national identity, and, for nationalists, a nation cannot survive without a sufficient degree of all three. This suggests the following working definition of nationalism: 'An ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a population which some of its members deem to constitute an actual or potential "nation".'

This is a working definition based on the common elements of the ideals of self-styled nationalists, and it is therefore inductive in character. But it inevitably simplifies and extracts from the many variations in the ideals of nationalists, and assumes thereby something of a general, ideal-typical character. This definition ties the ideology to a goal-oriented movement, since as an ideology, nationalism prescribes certain kinds of action. Nevertheless, it is the core concepts of the ideology that define the goals of the movement and thereby differentiate it from other kinds of movement.

However, the close link between ideology and movement in no way limits the concept of nationalism only to movements seeking independence. The words 'and maintaining' in the definition recognize the continuing influence of nationalism in long-established, or in recently, independent nations. This is important when it comes to analysing, as John Breuilly

has done, the 'renewal nationalisms' of national states and their governments (Breuilly 1993).

The definition I am proposing presupposes a concept of the 'nation', but it does not suggest that nations exist prior to 'their' nationalisms. The words 'or potential "nation" ' recognize the many situations in which a small minority of nationalists who possess a general concept of the abstract 'nation' seek to create particular nations 'on the ground'. We often find nationalisms without nations – their nations – especially in the postcolonial states of Africa and Asia. Such nationalisms are not limited to the attaining of independence, or more generally, to political goals. They cover, as we shall see, important areas of culture and society; the ideal of national identity, in particular, relates to cultural issues that other ideologies neglect – and every nationalism pursues the goal of national identity in varying degrees. But, always, they come back to the ideal of the nation.[6]

Ethnie *and nation*

How then shall we define the concept of the 'nation'? This is undoubtedly the most problematic and contentious term in the field. There are some who would dispense with it altogether. Charles Tilly described it as 'one of the most puzzling and tendentious items in the political lexicon' (1975: 6), and preferred to concentrate on the state – a concept not without its problems, either. More recently, Rogers Brubaker has warned us of the dangers of reifying the concept of the nation, by seeing nations as 'substantial, enduring collectivities'. We should, he argues, rather 'think about nationalism without nations', and see 'nation as a category of practice, nationhood as an institutionalised cultural and political form, and nationness as a contingent event or happening' (1996: 21).

There are two kinds of answer to such misgivings. The first operates within the circle of nationalist ideology. On this reading, nationalism highlights the popular sentiments evoked by the idea of the nation; in this ideological discourse, the nation is a felt and lived community, a category of behaviour as much as imagination, and it is one that requires of the members certain kinds of action. Hence, its 'substance'

and 'endurance', as in other kinds of community, reside in its repeated consequences, and the analyst has to take account of this felt reality through a separate concept of the nation, without seeking to reify it.[7]

The second answer touches on a wider problem. If the concept of the nation predated the ideology of nationalism, then we can no longer characterize it simply as a category of *nationalist* practice. If, further, we can envisage even a few premodern nations before the advent of nationalist ideologies in the late eighteenth century, then we shall need a definition of the concept of the nation which is independent of the ideology of nationalism, but is nevertheless consonant with it. Here lies the greatest problem, and the most insuperable divide, in the study of nationalism.[8]

Definitions of the nation range from those that stress 'objective' factors, such as language, religion and customs, territory and institutions, to those that emphasize purely 'subjective' factors, such as attitudes, perceptions and sentiments. An example that stresses 'objective' factors comes from Joseph Stalin: 'A nation is an historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture' (1973: 61). An example of a more 'subjective' definition of the nation comes from Benedict Anderson: 'it is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign' (1991: 6).

These definitions undoubtedly isolate important features of the concept of the nation, yet objections can be made to both. Insofar as the 'objective' definitions are stipulative, they nearly always exclude some widely accepted cases of nations, sometimes quite intentionally. As Max Weber (1948) showed, purely 'objective' criteria of the nation – language, religion, territory and so on – always fail to include some nations. Conversely, 'subjective' definitions generally take in too large a catch of cases. Emphasizing sentiment, will, imagination and perception as criteria of the nation and national belonging makes it difficult to separate out nations from other kinds of collectivity such as regions, tribes, city-states and empires, which attract similar subjective attachments.[9]

The solution generally adopted has been to choose criteria which span the 'objective–subjective' spectrum. This strategy

has yielded many interesting and useful definitions, but no scholarly consensus. Most students of the subject have, nevertheless, agreed on two points: a nation is not a state and it is not an ethnic community.

It is not a state, because the concept of the state relates to institutional activity, while that of the nation denotes a type of community. The concept of the state can be defined as a set of autonomous institutions, differentiated from other institutions, possessing a legitimate monopoly of coercion and extraction in a given territory. This is very different from the concept of the nation. Nations, as we said, are felt and lived communities whose members share a homeland and a culture.

It is not an ethnic community because, despite some overlap in that both belong to the same family of phenomena (collective cultural identities), the ethnic community usually has no political referent, and in many cases lacks a public culture and even a territorial dimension, since it is not necessary for an ethnic community to be in physical possession of its historic territory. A nation, on the other hand, must occupy a homeland of its own, at least for a long period of time, in order to constitute itself as a nation; and to aspire to nationhood and be recognized as a nation, it also needs to evolve a public culture and desire some degree of self-determination. On the other hand, it is not necessary, as we saw, for a nation to possess a sovereign state of its own, but only to have an aspiration for a measure of autonomy coupled with the physical occupation of its homeland.[10]

If in practice the line between nations and ethnic communities (or *ethnies*, to use the French term) is not clearcut, we still need to retain the conceptual distinction between them, as David Miller correctly urges. Yet his own definition of the nation (or 'nationality', as he prefers to call it) as 'a community (1) constituted by shared belief and mutual commitment, (2) extended in history, (3) active in character, (4) connected to a particular territory, and (5) marked off from other communities by its distinct public culture' (1995: 27), besides tending to the subjective end of the spectrum (it might, after all, apply to city-states and even tribal confederacies), brings the concept of the nation very close to that of the ethnic community. *Ethnies* are also constituted by shared beliefs and

Table 1.1 Attributes of *ethnies* and nations

Ethnie	*Nation*
Proper name	Proper name
Common myths of ancestry, etc.	Common myths
Shared memories	Shared history
Cultural differentia(e)	Common public culture
Link with homeland	Occupation of homeland
Some (elite) solidarity	Common rights and duties
	Single economy

commitment, have shared memories and continuity, engage in joint actions, and are usually connected to a particular territory, even if they do not occupy it. The only major difference is that ethnic communities generally lack public cultures. Nevertheless, Miller's definition highlights some of the main attributes of nations: the fact that they are communities, that they have shared beliefs or myths, that they have histories and that they are linked to particular territories. Can we extend this definition so as to highlight both the overlaps and the differences between nations and *ethnies*?

I propose to define the concept of nation as 'a named human community occupying a homeland, and having common myths and a shared history, a common public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members'. The concept of *ethnie* can in turn be defined as 'a named human community connected to a homeland, possessing common myths of ancestry, shared memories, one or more elements of shared culture, and a measure of solidarity, at least among the elites'.[11]

While we may employ them as working definitions, these are really summaries of pure or ideal-types of 'nation' and '*ethnie*', derived from a stylization of the respective beliefs and sentiments of elite members of *ethnies* and of nations. They do not list common denominators. For this reason, they tend to highlight their distinctive elements and the key differences between them. These can be more easily grasped by setting out the attributes of both kinds of collective cultural identity, as shown in table 1.1. That ethnic communities and

nations belong to the same category of phenomena is made plain by the upper half of the table: nations, like *ethnies*, share the attributes of collective names, common myths and shared memories. On the other hand, the lower half shows that nations are differentiated by their attributes of common rights and duties for members and in having a single economy. Moreover, in the ideal type, nations *occupy* the homeland, whereas ethnic communities may be only linked – symbolically – to theirs. Similarly, *ethnies* need not have a public culture, only some common cultural element – it could be language, religion, customs or shared institutions – whereas a common public culture is a key attribute of nations. In this connection, even the third attribute undergoes a change – from the various memory traditions found in *ethnies* to a codified, standardized *national history*.[12]

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to read into this distinction any overall evolutionary sequence. After all, in the contemporary world we find many *ethnies* alongside, or within, nations, and it is at least a moot point whether some nations can be found among the many *ethnies* of premodern epochs. What can be said now, and I shall elaborate on this later, is that the ideal type of the *ethnie*, with its looser organization, is the more generic concept and the nation is the more specific; but that, in becoming more 'specialized', the nation, even in those cases where it originated from a pre-existing *ethnie*, also becomes more inclusive, more complex and less tied to its original ethnic base. The key to this paradox, as we shall see, lies in the transformation of the relationships between ethnicity and culture, and between culture and politics.

All this is rather abstract and theoretical. When we move from ideal-types to empirical instances, we find approximations and exceptions. A good example is the 'diaspora nation'. Strictly speaking, there can be no such phenomenon: a nation, as we saw, occupies its homeland, but *ethnies* may wander the earth. But, what about communities that can claim to have been nations, but which, like the Armenians and Jews, for centuries did not occupy their homelands, having lost their independent states? Can we reasonably say that they ceased to be nations, when they so clearly continued to preserve their public religious cultures and common rights

and duties, and even found a new economic niche? It is a question that admits of no easy answer, and it suggests that we must use our ideal-types and the distinction between *ethnie* and nation with care.[13]

Then there are the cases of 'polyethnic nations' which comprise separate *ethnies* that have for one reason or another come together, or been forced together, and have forged a common history and shared political memories. In Belgium, Switzerland and Spain, separate *ethnies* continue to coexist within a (federal) state and their members claim both a separate ethnic and a common national identity. In the Swiss case, for example, some of the Jurassiens aspired to cantonal independence from Berne, but their aspirations were clearly bounded by a Swiss 'national identity' and political horizon. The Swiss can in general boast a definite public culture, a bounded homeland, a single economy and common rights and duties for all citizens, while even the French and Italian-speaking cantons have accepted some of the *Innenschweiz* founding myths and historical memories of the old Confederation (*Eidgenossenschaft*). More complex issues are presented in Spain and Belgium by those *ethnies* – Basques, Catalans and Flemish – that either constitute nations by the above criteria or aspire to nationhood. Can we conceive of 'nations within nations', a Flemish or a Catalan nation within a Belgian or a Spanish nation? Or is it legitimate and useful to speak of nations only within 'national states'? (see Petersen 1975; Steinberg 1976).

National state

This last is the position of those who stipulate a strictly ethnicist definition of the concept of the nation. A good example is the seminal work of Walker Connor, for whom the concepts of nation and nationalism must be sharply distinguished from those of state and patriotism. So, he would speak of a Belgian or Spanish 'patriotism' – that is, loyalty to the larger territorial state and its institutions – and contrast it with a Flemish or Catalan 'ethno-nationalism'; the latter he defines as a psychological bond of ancestral relatedness, stemming ultimately from kinship sentiments – even if the myth of

origins fails (as it so often does) to correspond to real, biological descent. By a similar logic, Connor sees a British state patriotism coexisting with English, Scots and Welsh ethno-nationalisms (1994: 102, 202).

I am not sure that such a sharp distinction, however useful analytically, can be maintained. To take this last example: in practice, the English have always found it impossible to distinguish their own English ethno-nationalism from a British patriotism, which they conceive of equally as their 'own'. This is not simply an imperialist reflex. Rather, it reflects the way in which British patriotism was felt in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to be a 'natural' extension of English ethnic nationalism; and how a British nation came to be viewed by the English, and not a few Scots ('North Britons'), as a coming together of the various nations inhabiting a united kingdom – despite considerable continuing resistance to English dominance. If we recall the frequency of nationalisms without nations, does it invalidate the idea, and the historicity, of a British nationalism (as opposed to a British patriotism, in Connor's sense), if ultimately an integrated British nation failed to materialize? (Kearney 1990: chs 7–8; Colley 1992: ch. 1).[14]

Similar conceptual problems beset the French case, where the process of integration, or at least acculturation, seems to have gone further. Bretons, Basques, Alsatians and even Corsicans may not aspire to independent statehood (except for a minority), though their movements have at times revealed a desire for some self-determination, at least in the cultural and economic fields. But where does this leave the French? Can a dominant French ethno-nationalism be distinguished from an equally hegemonic French state patriotism? How can we in practice separate the French nation from France, the national state, when so many of the key symbols of French nationalism are political? (see Gildea 1994).

No doubt, the French example, which has been so influential in other contexts, has inspired the tendency to conflate state and nation and has helped to popularize the notion of the 'nation-state'. There are two problems with this compound term. The first concerns the relationship between the two components. Too often, theorists see the state as dominant, with the nation as a kind of junior partner or qualify-

ing adjective. Little attention is then given to the dynamics of the nation. As for nationalism, it becomes a psychological epiphenomenon, a concomitant of state sovereignty. The second problem is empirical: in practice, as Walker Connor pointed out some time ago, the monolithic 'nation-state' – where state and nation are exactly coextensive, where there is just one nation in a given state and one state for a given nation – is rare; nearly 90 per cent of the world's states are polyethnic, and about half of these are seriously divided by ethnic cleavages (Connor 1972; Giddens 1985: 216–20).

In the circumstances, it might be better to opt for a more neutral descriptive term, such as 'national state', defined as 'a state legitimated by the principles of nationalism, whose members possess a measure of national unity and integration (but not of cultural homogeneity)'. By making national unity and integration a variable, such a definition avoids the problem of 'national incongruence': the fact that the boundaries of nations and the borders of states in so many parts of the world fail to correspond. In similar vein, we might speak of 'state-nations', where polyethnic states aspire to nationhood and seek to turn themselves into unified (but not homogeneous) nations through measures of accommodation and integration. This is the situation of several states in Africa and Asia, created out of colonial territories and retaining colonial boundaries and institutions (and often their *lingua franca* for administrative purposes).[15]

National identity

The last term in the field of national phenomena that I want to consider is that of 'national identity'. Its popularity is relatively recent, and it has replaced earlier terms such as 'national character' and, later, 'national consciousness', which were widely used in the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Why this should be the case is unclear. Perhaps the present widespread concern with identity is part of a broader trend of contemporary individualism; it may, equally, reflect the anxiety and alienation of many people in an increasingly fragmented world (see Kemilainen 1964; Bhabha 1990: ch. 16).

Like other terms in the field, that of 'national identity' denotes both a central ideal of the ideology of nationalism, and an analytical concept. I shall return to the nationalist ideal in the next chapter. For the moment I want to suggest a working definition for a concept that is so widely used today: 'the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations, and the identifications of individuals with that pattern and heritage and with its cultural elements.'

Crucial to this definition are two relationships: the first, between collective and individual levels of analysis, and the second, between continuity and change of identity. Too often, one of these components is emphasized at the expense of the other; we need to maintain the balance between them if we are to make sense of the notion of national identity.

Levels of identity We hear today a great deal about the 'situational' character of ethnic and national identities, and the prevalence in the modern world of 'multiple identities'. According to this fashionable view, we identify with a variety of collective affiliations – families, gender categories, regions, occupational groups, parties, confessions and *ethnies* – and can move from one to the other, often quite easily, as circumstances require. We can, at one and the same time, be wives or husbands, Christians or Muslims, professionals or manual workers, as well as members of particular regions and ethnic communities, invoking our membership of these collectivities for certain purposes. So, each of us has multiple identities, from the most intimate family circle to the widest circle of humanity; and, further, in a free society many of these identities become increasingly symbolic and optional (see Gans 1979; Okamura 1981; Hall 1992; Eriksen 1993).

But this is to look at collective identities only from the standpoint of the individual member. It is also possible to consider such identities as cultural collectivities, and, in some cases, communities defined by shared memories and myths, and common values and symbols. These two levels of analysis, the individual and the collective, are often confused and need to be kept distinct. While cultural collectivities and communities are composed of individual members, we cannot

reduce them to a simple aggregate of individuals who share certain traits or who live together. There is so much more to these collective identities in terms of their shared values and norms, memories and symbols. Conversely, the actions and dispositions of individual members cannot be predicted from an analysis of the features of a particular community or collective identity; the latter can only tell us something about the contexts of members' dispositions and the constraints on those members. That is why it is so important to keep these two levels of analysis of collective identity separate (see Scheuch 1966).

The case is strongest where the collective identity is based primarily on cultural elements, as in the case of castes, ethnic communities, religious denominations and nations. Whereas other types of collective identity, such as classes and regions, function as interest groups and therefore dissolve more easily when they have attained their object, cultural collectivities are much more stable because the basic cultural elements from which they are constructed – memories, values, symbols, myths and traditions – tend to be more persistent and binding; they represent recurrent elements of collective continuity and difference. These elements are embodied in collective memories of great exploits and personages, values of honour, justice and the like, symbols of sacred objects, food, dress and emblems, myths of origins, liberation and chosenness, and traditions and customs, rituals and genealogies. In these cases, the collective cultural element is particularly salient and durable, and needs to be analysed separately from issues of individual identification.[16]

Hence the two parts of my proposed working definition: the first part defines the mechanisms of cultural continuity and change on the collective level, while the second focuses on the individual member's relationship to the collectivity.

Continuity and change The above analysis may give the impression that collective cultural identities are somehow fixed or static. That is very far from being the case. True, we are dealing here with long-term constructs, but these are not essences or fixed quantities of traits. Cultural identities and communities are as much subject to processes of change and dissolution as everything else, and these changes may be

gradual and cumulative, or sudden and discontinuous. The only difference from other kinds of collective identity is the generally slower rate and the longer time-span of the rhythms of cultural change, which as a result require methods of analysis over the *longue durée*.[17]

That is why the proposed definition refers to processes of 'reinterpretation' of the pattern of memories, values, symbols, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations. Today, we are particularly aware of how the components of national identities change, but this is a process that occurs in every generation, as external events and internal realignments of groups and power encourage new understandings of collective traditions. This process of 'ethno-symbolic reconstruction' involves the reselection, recombination and recodification of previously existing values, symbols, memories and the like, as well as the addition of new cultural elements by each generation. Thus, the 'heroic' vision of national identity, with its themes of struggle, liberation and sacrifice typical of newly independent nations or 'state-nations', may, in the next generation, cede place to a more open, pragmatic and utilitarian version of the nation's identity, stressing such themes as entrepreneurial ability, organizational skills and tolerance of diversity, themes that can be traced back to alternative ethnic traditions in the nation's history.

Hence, change is built into the definition of national identity, yet it is change that operates within clear parameters set by the culture and traditions of the nation in question and its distinctive heritage. It could not be otherwise. Insofar as identity connotes a measure of stability, of sameness over time, change can only operate within clear boundaries. Even if change is sudden and disruptive, short of total destruction of the nation, it will produce new elements that can be culturally assimilated by the membership; even revolutions tend to return to what the functionalists termed a society's 'central values'. It is the same with the transformation of nations, and it allows us to assume that the 'daily plebiscite' that constitutes the nation does in fact preserve it sufficiently for us to speak of the same nation from one generation to the next.