

Karl-Reinhart TRAUNER

Patriotism versus Nationalism: A Historical Approach

The United States of America (USA) is a union of states—but what, then, is the United Nations (UN)? The USA is one state in the UN, beside other states. So what is the difference between a state and a nation? Even though the UN is much younger than the USA, the term state is a much younger term than nation.

1. What is the Difference between the United States and the United Nations?

States (in the modern understanding) have been in existence since the period of Enlightenment, ie. for about two hundred and fifty years. Previously, there were lands governed by rulers (emperors, kings, or sovereigns). The ancient Latin state was an *imperium* (empire), whereby the term *imperium* is related to “law and order” and also to “authority.”

Imperium is the name for a land or community seen with the eyes of a ruler or the ruling class; seen with the eyes of those living in this imperium for whom community was a principal part of their identity, the empire was (probably) a *patria*.

The term *patria* is related to *pater* (father) and it is a place where your parents live—here you were born, and here is the place for your family. *Patria* is security, law and order, and ultimately home.

Patriotism, according to the classical definition given by Johann Moritz GERICKE in 1782, is “this strong inner impulse that directs its attention to the best of the state, and attempts to promote its prosperity by all possible means.”¹

Just before, birth was mentioned; “birth” in Latin is *natus*. *Natio* means “birth” or the goddess of birth, but also an ethnic group—but not a state. In this sense “nation” was not used in ancient times.

¹ *Patriotism*. www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patriotism.



“State” has its origin in the Latin word *status*: standing, state, condition. In the seventeenth century, the English words “state”, the German word “Staat”, as well as the French “état”, emerged from the Latin term “status”.

But the system of the Estates (*ständische Ordnung*) is much older. Under this system, political participation in government and privileges were bound to noble landowners (sovereigns), the upper clergy, and the cities—these were the so called estates—at (imperial) diets (Reichstag). These estates strengthened their power during the XIVth and XVth centuries. The result was a dualistic federal-central (estate-state) system that functioned until the XVIIth century.²

The medieval *Roman Empire*—from the XVth century on called the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (*Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation*)—was a collection of states, united under an Emperor elected by various Germanic (and other, for example Slav) states.

2 KINDER Hermann – HILGEMANN Werner, *The Penguin Atlas of World History*. London, 2003.

It was not a nation state and could never have become one due to its internal structure and differing interests within. The Empire had two main functions: the first was defence, the second justice.

For the first time, the term *nation* appears in European history in connection with universities. Students of the same origin and birth assembled and lived together in associations, forming a “nation (birth).”

At the Charles university in Praha, for example, the *Polish nation* was made also of Prussians, Silesians and Germans living in Poland; the *Bohemian nation* comprised the Czechs, Moravians, Magyars, and Southern Slavs; the *Bavarian nation* included, besides the Bavarians, also the Swabians, the Franks, the Hessians, the Rhinelanders, and the Westphalians; and to the *Saxon nation* belonged Northern Germans, Danes, Swedes and Finns.³

Each *natio* was associated with certain colours, and every student wore a coloured ribbon representing his *nation*. These ribbons were one of the predecessors of the modern flags of our states.

This brief presentation of about one thousand years shows that the different terms have undergone development. Even though “state” and “nation” have nowadays almost similar meanings, it was not so two hundred and fifty years ago.

In the year 1776, when the United States of America was constituted with the *Declaration of Independence*, it was not possible to found a Union of Nations, as *nation* was not a term for state. So the United States of America was founded in second half of the XIXth century and the United Nations only in 1945.

2. Self-confident Humankind as the Basis of Modern Society

The question of the character of nationalism or patriotism is the question of one’s identity. Nationalism and patriotism are political manifestations of an identity that exists as a personal and a group identity.

In the West, the Protestant Reformation started identity politics. Martin LUTHER (1483–1546) argued that salvation could be achieved only through an inner state of faith, and attacked the Roman Catholic emphasis on deeds—that is, exterior conformity to a set of rules

³ BUSCHINGER Danielle, *Einige Bemerkungen zum Begriffsfeld “Nation” im Mittelalter: Von der natio zur Nation (Some Remarks on the Term “Nation” in Mediæval Times: From Natio to Nation)*. In *IABLIS: Jahrbuch für europäische Prozesse*. 2005. http://www.iablis.de/iablis_t/2005/buschinger05.html.

established by the Church. The Reformation thus identified true religiousness as an individual's subjective state, thereby dissociating inner identity from existing social practice.⁴

About two hundred and fifty years after the Reformation, the French philosopher Jean-Jacques ROUSSEAU (1712–1778) argued that there was a great difference between our outward selves, which were the accretion of social customs and habits acquired over historical time, and our true inner natures. ROUSSEAU stated that one could reach happiness only by recovering one's inner authenticity.⁵

So the nation was a unit created by the free choice of different individuals. It pronounced the ideals of the Age of Enlightenment—universalism and rationality. It represented the common interests against particular interests.

At the festival of federation at Dijon on May 18, 1790, the Abbé Jean-Baptiste VOLFIUS (1734–1822), the future Constitutional Bishop of the Côte d'Or, defined fatherland as being “not at all this soil on which we live, these walls which have seen our birth. The true fatherland is that political community where all citizens, protected by the same laws, united by the same interests, enjoy the natural rights of humans and participate in the common cause.”⁶

The idea of the authenticity was further developed by Johann Gottfried HERDER (1744–1803),⁷ who argued that inner authenticity lies not just in individuals but also in peoples, in the recovery of what we call today *folk culture*.

HERDER also stated an intimate dependence of thought on language. In his research, he found out that peoples from different historical periods and cultures often vary pronouncedly in their concepts, beliefs, and so on.

The different languages could be seen as an example. For HERDER, thought is dependent on and bounded by language. Thus, HERDER's way of thinking differs from that in the French and Anglo-American traditions.

The “fathers” of modern nationalism, ROUSSEAU and HERDER, were

4 FUKUYAMA Francis, *Identity, Immigration, and Liberal Democracy*. Journal of Democracy 2006/2. 7. Also: TAYLOR Charles, *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, 1994.

5 NÜBEL Birgit, *Zum Verhältnis von 'Kultur' und 'Nation' bei Rousseau und Herder* (About the Relationship between “Culture” and “Nation” in Rousseau and Herder). http://goethezeitportal.de/db/wiss/herder/nuebel_rousseau.pdf. Also: *Nationalism*. In WIENER Philip P. (ed.), *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*. New York, 1974. III., 324–339. <http://flowerdew.org/cgi-local/DHI/dhi.cgi?id=dv3-42>. Also: CVETKOVSKI Nikola, *Nationalism and Ethnicity: A Theoretical Overview*. Aalborg, 1999. <http://www.caucasus.dk/publication5.htm>.

6 Quoted in: *Nationalism*. III. 326.

7 BARNARD Frederick M., *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism*. Oxford, 1965. Also: BEISER Frederick C., *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism*. Cambridge, 1992. Also: *Johann Gottfried von Herder*. In *Stanford Encyclopædia of Philosophy*. Stanford, 2001. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/herder>.

also cosmopolitans and internationalists. Deeply attached to their *patria*, or their native language and tradition, they regarded the whole of humankind as a greater and higher fatherland at the same time.⁸

The nationalists of that period, persons like Jules MICHELET (1798–1874) in France, Giuseppe MAZZINI (1805–1872) in Italy, or Adam MICKIEWICZ (1798–1855) in Poland, and many others, saw nationalism as a ubiquitous movement.

But nevertheless, “many nations have been formed in the first place around a dominant ethnic group, which annexed or attracted other ethnic groups or ethnic fragments into the state to which it gave a name and a cultural charter.”⁹

3. Female and Male Approach to the Topic

The precise translation of “*patria*” is “fatherland” (not in its misuse by the Nazis), but it is interesting that most of us speak of a “mother tongue.”

The *fatherland* is a matter of brain, of law and order, of politics, of duty and being conscripted, a matter of borders and passports—sometimes of defending the borders and the interests of the state.

The mother tongue, on the other hand, can be seen as a synonym of *culture* as such, and is a matter of heart, of feeling home where one belongs. Like religion, culture is a matter of inner identity. Culture and nation are—according to Herder—almost similar, and the Latin “nation” in translation means “birth,” which is also connected with the “female” element.

4. The Birth of *Nation*

When the French Revolution of 1789 changed France from the bottom up, in Central Europe the Roman-German Empire still existed. It consisted of many different principalities, eg. Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, Prussia, Hesse, Austria, Hanover, Oldenburg, and Saxony. The most important principality was Austria.

The Habsburgs, the Austrian sovereigns, were normally also German Emperors, but this leading role was desired more and more by Prussia. Bonaparte NAPOLEON’s invasion of Germany generated the idea of *Volk und Vaterland* (nation and fatherland) that drove the *Wars of Liberation* (Befreiungskriege) in 1813–15.

⁸ Nationalism. III. 325.

⁹ SMITH Anthony, *National Identity*. London, 1991. 39.

The philosopher Johann Gottlieb FICHTE (1762–1814) proclaimed, in his *Addresses to the German Nation* (Reden an die deutsche Nation) of 1807–1808 about the national struggle against France, that the very idea of being German was connected with the idea of both physical and mental freedom.

The Prussian society was not willing to accept French foreign rule. Large parts of the Prussian Army changed to the Russian side—eg. the famous marshall Gebhard LEBERECHT VON BLÜCHER (1742–1819)—and in Sankt Petersburg an exile society was established under the leadership of Heinrich Friedrich Karl REICHSFREIHERR VOM UND ZUM STEIN (1757–1831).

The official Prussia fought on the French side, but the “true” Prussia fought against France. State and (cultural) nation became different characters; nation as a cultural and societal term describes similarly what is now called *civil society* (Zivilgesellschaft), in addition to the official policy.

Therefore nationalism often was (up until the twentieth century) not seen as political matter; but when such ideas were realized, they became policy. Nation and state can mean the same, but they can also have different, sometimes almost opposite, meanings.

5. Nationalism and Liberalism

With the Congress of Wien, a conflict situation was born: the old states still existed, but the thinking of many people had changed, generating new developments. The era of *nationalism* and national movement(s) had begun.

Different nations aspired to be transformed to official state structures, replacing the existing states. *Nation states* were to be established. The whole of Germany was to become the state of “Germany.” In Europe, from the early to mid nineteenth century, the ideas of nationalism, socialism and liberalism were closely intertwined. Nationalism went along with *liberalism*.

An important remark has to be made: something “national” is often not in line with something “nationalistic,” and one has to distinguish between these two phenomena very carefully. A *national* movement aims basically at positive goals for its nation: it tries to strengthen cultural identity based on similar ethnic and cultural backgrounds, sometimes aiming at the unification of all members of the nation.

A *nationalistic* movement tries to realize such ideas at the cost of other nations or by oppressing and expulsing members of other

nations. *Nationalism* may have a national or nationalistic character.

The emergence of national ideologies was not characteristic for Germany alone. Movements aimed at the unification of a nation sprang up across Europe. The names of different movements began with the Greek word “pan-” which means “all, everybody.”

All members of the nation should come together. For identity, the membership of a (cultural) nation is the decisive point, not membership of a special country or state. (Cultural) nationalism had won over patriotism; even national feelings had not forcibly stood in contrast to patriotism.

It is not surprising that the name of the movements is a Greek word. The writer Friedrich HÖLDERLIN (1770–1843) glorified the “free people of the Greeks.” In the War of Liberation from 1821 to 1829, the Greeks tried to attain independence and autonomy.

In the end, the Greek concept of *Pan-Hellenism* was successful. Similar national liberal movements and political attempts could be found in other parts of Southern Europe (Spain, Portugal, Naples and Serbia).

In Central Europe, a young Slovak student, Ján KOLLÁR (1793–1852), became the “creator and herald of *Pan-Slavism*,”¹⁰ he later became a professor of theology and a famous Slovak writer.

The conception of Pan-Slavism was the political unification of all Slavs; a Pan-Slavic Empire was its ultimate political vision. From a certain perspective—but not for the same ideological reasons—the later Warsaw Pact was partly the realisation of these Pan-Slavic dreams (even though it contained other, non-Slav nations, too).

More successful than the Slavic nations were the Italians in the nineteenth century. In 1861 the all-Italian (Pan-Italian) parliament in Torino proclaimed Roma the capital, and confirmed VITTORIO EMANUELE II (1820–1878) as King of Italy.

The last important part of Northern Italy under Austrian government was Venezia. In 1866 Italy reached an alliance with Prussia, which defeated Austria in the Battle of Hradec Králové (Königgrätz). In the Peace of Wien, Italy was awarded Venezia, but gave up its claims for Southern Tyrolia. In 1870 the Papal State (Vatican) was occupied by Italy.

The Austro–Prussian War of 1866 was an important step on the way of setting-up *Germany*. The first step was the German–Danish War in

10 SCHWARZ Karl, *Von Budapest nach Wien: Streiflichter zur Biographie Ján Kollárs* (From Budapest to Wien: Passing Rays for a Biography of Ján Kollár). In BARTON Peter F. (ed.), *Kirche im Wandel: Studien und Texte zur Kirchengeschichte und Geschichte* (Changing Church: Studies and Texts for Church History and History). Wien, 1994. II/13. 102.

1864. Prussia, together with Austria, defeated Denmark, and Prussia gained control over Schleswig.

Despite this political success, there was a deep dissension between WILHELM I. (1797–1888), and his famous chancellor, Otto VON BISMARCK (1815–1898) about the title of the new Emperor. WILLIAM became “German Emperor” and not—as he had wished—“Emperor of Germany.”

But BISMARCK followed the rules of his *Realpolitik*. He knew that politically it was not possible to unite all Germans, especially not those who lived in Austria.¹¹ So the (Second) German Reich was unable to fulfil the dreams of the Pan-German movement, even though BISMARCK as “founder of a German Reich” was seen as a national hero.

6. The Old Emperor and his Nationalities

The Austrian Empire—after 1867 the Austro-Hungarian monarchy—consisted of many different nations, or as they were called officially, “nationalities.” Slovakia may be a good example of the multiethnic situation.

Today the majority of the inhabitants of Slovakia are ethnic Slovaks (eighty-six percent). Magyars are the largest ethnic minority (approximately ten percent), and are concentrated in the Southern regions of the country; and only 0.1 percent of the population is German.

Due to his personal political understanding, the motto of FRANZ JOSEPH (1830–1916) was *Viribus Unitis* (with united forces). He embodied the old ideal of an Empire standing over all nationalities, and therefore he had problems dealing with the developments of the late nineteenth century.

Emperor FRANZ JOSEPH was the *pater patriæ* (father of the fatherland, in the sense of state). His majesty and his army were the clips of a state of different nationalities that were drifting apart. Many leading politicians of the different nationalities had no interest to work “with united forces” for a better multi-ethnic Austria.

They worked passionately for nation states of their own. And they found their home in their nation or nationality. This was their new “patria,” not Austria or Austria-Hungary. Nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe did not fit into the existing state patterns.

The *Pan-Slavic movement* originally tried to establish a Slavic

¹¹ German is used here also for German-speaking people of Austria(-Hungary) and in other countries, as it is done also in the scientific description: WANDRUSZKA Adam – URBANITSCH Peter (eds.), *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918* (The Habsburg-Monarchy 1848–1918). Wien, 1973ff.

Empire under Russian (or Polish) leadership. Therefore the Slavic nationalism of the Austro-Hungarian Empire worked against all central tendencies of Wien.

Pan-Slavism, however, did not experience much success until the First World War. In the times of the monarchy, Slavic nationalities worked for more independence from Wien (and Budapest), and more rights, similar to the Magyars. In 1867—after the lost battle of Hradec Králové—they received important aspects of political independency.

The *Compromise* (Ausgleich) of 1867 between Austria and Hungary established the Austro-Hungarian *dual monarchy* (Doppelmonarchie), including joint foreign policy, finances and military, but retaining separate constitutions, administrations, legislatures, and additionally a distinct military force.

Even though the Italian unification was politically completed in 1866 with the Peace of Wien (and later on with the occupation of Roma in 1870, finally), the Pan-Italian movement did not end.

In the Peace of Wien, Italy gave up its demands for Southern Tyrolia (Trentino) and Istria, which became now the main objects of the *irredenta*, the national movement formed about 1878 to secure the incorporation of regions, Italian in speech and ethnic group but subject to other governments, in Italy.

The *irredenta* gave name to another important term of the political situation of the late nineteenth century—*irredentism*. An *irredentist* refers to any person or party that advocates the division of the state, aiming at a (re)union with another state because of national motives. Nationalism is the reason for the active fight against the state people belong to. Nationalism and patriotism were opposing tendencies in this context.

German nationalism in Austria developed a special dynamic after the foundation of the (Second) German Reich in 1871, which could not integrate the Austrian Germans into a nation state of Germans.

Most of the German parties of Austria accepted this situation as Realpolitik, but not the (radical) Pan-German movement. The Pan-German party (with its original name the “Alldeutschen,” a correct translation of “Pan-Germans”), under its leader Georg SCHÖNERER (1842–1921), had irredentist tendencies and plead for a unification of at least the German parts of Austria with the German Reich. This would have naturally meant the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

7. Nation and Religion

Religion is sometimes used as a defining factor for a nation. In the middle of the nineteenth century, theology and politics were closely connected. Sometimes religion was estimated as a special part of the national culture.

“The idea of being a people chosen by God, a people to whom God had promised a specific land, whose original inhabitants lost their right to the land—though it was truly the land of their ancestors—and of God fighting on the side of “God’s” people, has been one of the most dangerous elements of nationalism inherited from Old Testament times and the history of the conquest of Canaan.”¹²

The cultural approach to “nation” is based upon a vague and semi-mystical concept of folk and folk culture. *National Protestantism* (Nationalprotestantismus) proceeds from a mutual dependence of Protestant denomination(s) and nationalism.

But the connection of nation and denomination (or religion) is not only a historic German problem. Most of the states—even those with a constitutional *Church (Religion)–State separation* (Trennung von Staat und Kirche)—have official religious holidays, such as Christmas or Easter, which are seen by some to promote cultural bias.¹³

The United States of America (USA), for example, has “God” (or a symbol of God) on its coinage and in its Pledge of Allegiance. And magnets on cars saying “God Bless the USA” became a popular way to display patriotism in the USA during many elections.

Irish nationalism traditionally sees Catholicism as an Irish national characteristic, in contrast to the largely Protestant British Empire that usually recognized the Protestant minority in Ireland as Irish too.

And some religions are specific to one ethnic group, notably maybe Judaism. Nevertheless the Zionist movement generally avoided a religious definition of the “Jewish people,” preferring an ethnic and cultural definition.

Religious nationalism characterized by communal adherence to Eastern Orthodoxy and national Orthodox Churches is still prevalent in many states of Eastern and South Eastern Europe and in the Russian Federation. The war in Kosovo is a national one between Albanians and Serbs, but also a religious one between Muslims and Serbian Orthodox.

¹² *Nationalism*. III. 325.

¹³ Today in Austria there are only two non-religious holidays: 1st of May, the State Holiday (Staatsfeiertag), which was in former years called the day of the work (Tag der Arbeit); and the 26th of October, the National holiday (Nationalfeiertag), in remembrance of becoming independent after the Second World War.

8. From Ethnic to Racial

Nationalism adopted new characteristics as a result of the rise of natural sciences in the nineteenth century. *Biologism* tried to describe the world and its development only by natural means. The *eugenics* movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was inspired by Arthur Comte DE GOBINEAU's (1806–1882) *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1853–1855) and Georges Vacher DE LAPOUGE's (1854–1936) anthroposociology. It claimed that biological inferiority of certain groups is self-evident.

GOBINEAU proclaimed—in contrast to HERDER's philosophy—the inequality of human races. To him, the highest race was the Teutonic race, of which he claimed the French aristocracy of Frankish origin to which he belonged as the noblest specimen. Furthermore, racial identity depended upon “purity of blood.”

Both authors posited the historical existence of national races, such as German and French, branching from basal races supposed to have existed for millennia, such as the Aryan race, and advocated that political boundaries should mirror the supposed racial ones. Also in Charles DARWIN's most controversial book, *The Descent of Man* (1871), he made strong suggestions of racial differences and European superiority.

In connection with Judaism, anti-Judaism and cultural anti-Semitism became racial anti-Semitism. Although in the nineteenth century, nobody thought that genocide, riots and expulsions of members of other “races” would take place.

Anti-Semitism as a specific form of racism was an important political issue of *National Socialism* of the *National Socialist German Workers Party* (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, NSDAP), often abbreviated as Nazis under the leadership of Adolf HITLER (1889–1945).

One of the major characteristics of the Hitler Reich was racism based on biologism. “One of HITLER's favourite sayings was, ‘Politics is applied biology.’ HITLER's ideas of racial purity led to unprecedented atrocities in Europe. HITLER and others enacted race laws used to persecute and murder millions of Jews, who were seen as a race.”¹⁴

The Great German Reich became one of the greatest catastrophes of the twentieth century, which was in fact rich in catastrophes. It was not only the death warrant for millions of Jews, but also for millions of civilians and soldiers from a long list of states.

14 Race. In Wikipedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Race>.

9. The Century of Refugees

After 1918, the nationalities of Austria-Hungary became independent of Wien and Budapest and formed the *successor states* (Nachfolgestaaten) of the Danube Monarchy. The Czechs (before part of Austria) and the Slovaks (before part of Hungary) came together in Czechoslovakia. Transcarpathia went to the Soviet Union.

The Poles of the Monarchy joined the newly established Poland, Transylvania (before part of Hungary) went to Romania, and the Southern Slavic nations, such as the Slovenes and the Croats became part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (SHS-state). The rest composed Austria and Hungary, now independent from each other.

The successor states, however, were not nation states in the strict sense of the word. Czechoslovakia may be taken as one of the possible examples. The new state was a politically and denominationally heterogeneous unit.

It had a population which, besides Poles and Jews, was composed of forty-six percent Czechs, twenty-eight percent Germans, thirteen percent Slovaks, eight percent Magyars and three percent Ukrainians and Ruthenians.¹⁵

National conflicts were unavoidable, but not only in Czechoslovakia. On the other hand, some decades later, hundreds of thousands of Poles had to leave their home and settle in the so-called *General Gouvernement*.

In 1940–1941, about two million Eastern Poles were resettled in Northern Russia. In addition, Germans and “unreliable” peoples (Estonians, Lithuanians, Kalmuks, Caucasians, Tatars) were deported to Siberia by the Soviet authorities.

These are just a few examples of forced wartime resettlements, but following the end of the Second World War the deportations and migrations did not stop. The twentieth century has the unmerciful epithet of the “century of the refugees.”

About thirty million Europeans—sixty percent of them Germans—lost their homeland. Most ethnic and national borders coincide since that time, also in Central and Eastern Europe. So these population transfers ended a development that had begun about fifty years before: the establishment of nation states.

¹⁵ The numbers are taken from KINDER – HILGEMANN. II. 157.

10. Nations and Civilizations

The understanding of “nation” as a state was generally accepted, and “nationalism” was put on the same level as “patriotism.” (Cultural) “nationalism” was estimated as failed ideology, and nationalism as a philosophy of life lost its importance, even cultural nationalism could be ostracised for “political correctness.”

The Anglo-American culture became dominant, and thus the Anglo-American sense of the term prevailed. And there was no (or only little) difference between (cultural) nation and state anyway.

This development, especially the pressure on national feelings, also had consequences for patriotism. The crisis of societal solidarity, in its structured form of a state, is a wide-spread phenomenon today. Being critical towards the state and its official representatives is en vogue.

But the post-war situation is changing, caused not only by the breakdown of the bipolar world order in the end of the eighties, but especially by new cultural nationalisms, the replacement of the political role of European states by the European Union (EU), and the replacement of the cultural role of the nations by “civilizations.”

First, in the postmodern situation, the phenomenon of national consciousness, until now presumed dead, is rising again. Since the Second World War and the post-war period, “ethnic cleansing has occurred in the Balkans and Rwanda. Ethnic cleansing might be seen as another name for the tribal warfare and mass murder that has afflicted human society for ages, but, in modern times, atrocities have regularly been associated with the attempted use of racial inferiority claims to dehumanize some groups. Claiming a scientific basis for negative evaluations can give greater credence to such an ideological agenda.”¹⁶

Second, the decreasing importance of states in Europe goes along with the establishment of the European Union (EU), which holds a state character through special treaties (or perhaps some day a constitution), even though some states (like Poland or Great Britain) emphasize the importance of full state sovereignty. But, as a matter of fact, no state of the EU is entirely autonomous.

On the other hand, the EU is a highly inhomogeneous area, not only due to the ethnic situation: within the EU there are over five hundred ethnic groups.¹⁷ In the EU, thinkers such as Jürgen HABERMAS (1929-) have advocated a European-wide patriotism.

¹⁶ Race. In *Wikipedia*. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Race>.

¹⁷ *Eurominorities*. <http://eurominority.org/version/eng>.

But patriotism in Europe is usually directed at the nation state, and often coincides with euroscepticism. Still, state-bound patriotism seems to be replaced little by little by a European patriotism: Europe becomes the character of a “patria.”

Third, it seems that in the world order larger homogeneous and complex political units, like the EU are coming into being. But these larger units may also get into conflict with each other. This issue has been disputed mostly in recent years, especially since the terrorist attacks in the US on September 11, 2001.

The basic theory was written by Samuel P. HUNTINGTON (1927–), first in 1993 in a Foreign Affairs article titled *The Clash of Civilizations?* HUNTINGTON later expanded his theses in a 1996 book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*.¹⁸

His research deals with the nature of global politics in the post-Cold War period that is characterized by cultural conflicts. In his theses, HUNTINGTON argues that the primary axis of future conflicts will be along cultural and religious lines. Such “civilizations” may consist of states and social groups, such as ethnic and religious minorities.

For the clash of civilizations the widespread Western belief in the universality of the Western values and political systems is—according to HUNTINGTON—naïve, and he argues that continued insistence on democratization and other “universal” norms will only further antagonize the civilizations.

A clash could happen in yet another way, because as HUNTINGTON has shown, there are no geographic blocks of civilizations in Europe anymore, but the “civilizations” are mixed and live side by side in the same area. The riots in France, lasting officially for twenty-one days during October and November 2005, have indicated what such a scenario could be like.

Regardless of how we perceive HUNTINGTON’s theory, it seems that “civilizations” replace (cultural) nations as the larger units in a globalized world. On the other side, however, the reaction of some states to the “clash of civilizations” will be an increasing patriotism.

In the USA, scholars were required to swear an oath on the state, and the so-called Patriot Act (“Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act”) is supposed to minimize national danger caused by an internationally operating terrorism.

18 HUNTINGTON Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations?* Foreign Affairs 1993/3. Also: HUNTINGTON Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, 1996.

The Patriot Act “encourages information sharing by breaking down the wall between law enforcement and intelligence,” President George W. BUSH declared in June 2005, which helps to “bring terrorists to justice”¹⁹.

In the eyes of many Europeans, as well as some circles in the USA,²⁰ one of the main problems of the “Patriot” Act is that in the name of patriotism the rights of civilians of the “patria” are reduced.

With such a paradigm of state in view, the paradigm prevailing since the period of Enlightenment (and the establishment of the USA and the French Revolution) that a state should guarantee a maximum of civil rights and liberties for all people and peoples in it could change substantially.

Suggested Reading

BARTON Peter F. (ed.), *Kirche im Wandel: Studien und Texte zur Kirchengeschichte und Geschichte* (Changing Church: Studies and Texts for Church History and History). Wien, 1994.

BARNARD Frederick M., *Herder's Social and Political Thought: From Enlightenment to Nationalism*. Oxford, 1965.

BARTON Peter F. (ed.), *Kirche im Wandel: Studien und Texte zur Kirchengeschichte und Geschichte* (Changing Church: Studies and Texts for Church History and History). Wien, 1994.

BEISER Frederick C., *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism*. Cambridge, 1992.

CVETKOVSKI Nikola, *Nationalism and Ethnicity: A Theoretical Overview*. Aalborg, 1999.

FUKUYAMA Francis, *Identity, Immigration, and Liberal Democracy*. *Journal of Democracy* 2006/2.

HUNTINGTON Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations?* *Foreign Affairs* 1993/3.

HUNTINGTON Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, 1996.

KINDER Hermann – HILGEMANN Werner, *The Penguin Atlas of World History*. London, 2003.

SMITH Anthony, *National Identity*. London, 1991.

TAYLOR Charles, *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, 1994.

WANDRUSZKA Adam – URBANITSCH Peter (eds.), *Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848–1918* (The Habsburg-Monarchy 1848–1918). Wien, 1973ff.

WIENER Philip P. (ed.), *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*. New York, 1974.

Karl-Reinhard TRAUNER holds doctorates in theology and history; he is the senior chaplain of the Protestant military chaplaincy of the Austrian Armed Forces. His email address is ev.ms-wien@gmx.at.

19 The White House – President George W. Bush Fact Sheet: *The Patriot Act Helps Keep America Safe*. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/06/20050609.html>.

20 Centre for Constitutional Rights, *The State of Civil Liberties: One Year Later New York*. http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew/civil_liberties.asp.