

I. INTRODUCTION

Cederman confronts the neorealist tendency to confuse statehood and nationhood. The state and the nation are not necessarily aligned. In the post-Napoleonic period, foreign policy was no longer in the hands of a small elite but crucially dependent on popular support, thus undermining the utility of a realist view of “equal states”: “thus, paradoxically, nationalism undermines the realist notion of national interest” (136).

Cederman challenges IR theorists to deal with cultural phenomena by uncovering nationalism as a process in its own right.

II. A TAXONOMY OF NATIONS AND STATES

Neorealism exaggerates internal state cohesion: processes of state formation and nationalism do not often coincide. The sequence matters: “if the state arrives first, nation-building acquires a completely different character than in the opposite case” (138).

Cederman moves from the Waltzian model of the state system by “dissolving the conceptual glue that holds the nation-state together [which] opens the door for a spectrum of possibilities between anarchy and the nation-state” (138). He devises a 2x2 taxonomy of nationalist situations with the horizontal and the vertical dimensions corresponding to the state and the nation respectively. The horizontal dimension reflects power relationships and enforcement; the vertical to culture and identity.

Case 1: three ethnic communities that lack common political institutions – State Absent/
Nation Absent (SA/NA)

Case 2: three form a common multinational state – State Present/Nation Absent (SP/NA)

Case 3: cultural convergence, no common political framework – SA/NP

Case 4: state and nation converge – SP/NP

Neorealism overlooks the mixed cases (2 and 3). Nationalism “which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent” (Gellner) leads to horizontal shifts: 2→1, i.e. secession; 3→4 i.e. unification (140).

III. THREE TYPES OF NATIONALISM

Cederman uses examples from Europe to illustrate his three types

A: State-Initiated Nationalism: 1→2→4

Old Western nation states like France and England which form the state through conquest (step 1) and then eliminate cultural differences from the center out to the periphery (step 2).

B: Unification Nationalism: 1→3→4

Central and Southern states like Germany and Italy. Step 1: culturally mediated mobilization. Step 2: self-interested campaigns by single core states

C: Separatist Nationalism: 2→1

The secession of Eastern European nations from empires. Also potential for irredentism (combination of disintegration and integration as it involves a state claiming for its own a province allegedly of the same culture from an adjacent multiethnic state): 2→1→3→4.

These European models are replicated around the world, increasingly in post-colonial countries in the form of separatist nationalism. In non-European contexts, the balance between state-initiated and separatist nationalism is particularly important.

IV. NATIONALIST MOBILIZATION AND COORDINATION

But Cederman warns against the reification of the nation. The shifts are not sudden leaps but specific historical processes. In an era of nationalism, the center of a multinational state can either succeed in building a nation-state by assimilating the periphery nations - 2→4, or it will slide into secession. The power balance between the center and the periphery is important. To succeed in seceding, the peripheral population must be

- a) aware of its cultural distinction from the imperial center – that is, politically mobilized
- b) coordinated

“Nationalism is not just a claim of ethnic similarity but a claim that certain similarities count *as* the definition of political community”.