



ECPR WORKSHOP application form

## APPLICATION FORM FOR PROSPECTIVE WORKSHOP DIRECTORS

**Title of proposed workshop:**

**National Minorities and New Nationalizing States in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. A Comparative Study on Minorities Worldwide**

**Subject area:**

**Nationalism, Minorities, State-Building, East and Central Europe, Asia, Africa.**

**Abstract of proposed workshop. Maximum of 250 words (suitable for publication in the academic program leaflet and on the ECPR web site):**

The twentieth century has been marked, amongst other developments, by the emergence of new independent states. Indeed, while first waves of national revolutions spread into Europe during the nineteenth century, new states were created in the wake of the breakup of big ensembles during the past century. Such was the case of Eastern and Central Europe: new countries gained independence in a first wave after the First World War and in a second wave after the Communist failure. Furthermore, other national constructions were to be seen everywhere in the world, when decolonization encouraged national moves and aspirations.

As Anthony Smith pointed out, despite the assertion of many authors that the Nation-State is in decline, most of the recently established countries actually followed the lines of the classical model of the nineteenth century Nation-State (Smith, 2001). With this as a starting point, this workshop intends to analyze the process of adoption and adaptation in these countries of a model often considered outdated.

The discussion will follow two main lines. First, it will tackle the way national identity is constructed in these "nationalizing states" (Brubaker, 1996) and the influence it has on "national minorities" living in these states. Second, it will focus on analyses of how national minorities perceive discourses and the policies of the elites of the nationalizing states and the kinds of mobilizations they engender.

**Name of workshop director(s):**

**Pr. Jean-Michel De Waele (Université libre de Bruxelles) and Pr. Antoine Roger (Institut d'Etudes Politiques Bordeaux)**

**Name and address of institution(s):**

**De Waele, Jean Michel**

Cevipol – CP 124  
Université libre de Bruxelles  
Avenue Jeanne, 44  
1050 Brussels  
Belgium

jmdewael@ulb.ac.be  
Tel : +32 (0)2 650 44 81  
Fax : +32 (0)2 650 31 38

**Roger, Antoine**

UMR 5116 Spirit  
Institut d'Etudes Politiques Bordeaux  
11, Allée Ausone  
33607 Pessac  
France  
a.roger@sciencepobordeaux.fr  
Tel : +33 (0)5 5684 42 87

## National Minorities and New Nationalizing States in the 20th and 21st Centuries: A Comparative Study on Minorities Worldwide

### 1. National Minorities and New Nationalizing States

#### 1.1. Outline of the Topic

The twentieth century has been marked, amongst other developments, by the emergence of new independent states. As first waves of national revolutions spread into Europe during the nineteenth century, new states were created following the breakup of big ensembles during the past century. Such was the case of Eastern and Central Europe, where, new countries gained independence in a first wave after the First World War and also in a second wave after the Communist failure.

Despite the assertion of many authors that the Nation-State is in decline, nationalism remained on the agenda (Smith, 2001) and has continued to play the role of a "quasi religion" (Smith, 1994). Most of the recently established countries actually followed the lines of the classical model of the nineteenth century Nation-State in dealing with their national minorities. With this as a starting point, this workshop intends to analyze the process of adoption and adaptation in these countries of a model often considered outdated.

The newly independent Kosovo could be regarded as the last manifestation of this particular phenomenon. Indeed, while an Albanian national minority asked for secession from a perceived nationalizing Serbia, a new Serbian national minority is now a part of the new nationalizing state of Kosovo. Similar processes were observed previously in post-communist Europe: among others, we can identify this phenomenon with Hungarians in Romania, Poles in Ukraine, Gagauzi in Moldova, Russians in the Baltic States, not to mention the breakups of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

The issue appears even more striking when the presence of the same national minority, yet in different nationalizing countries, does not have the same effect. For instance, the situation of the Russian diasporas in Latvia is wholly different from their counterparts in Estonia, in Ukraine, or in Kazakhstan (Zevelev, 2001; Juska, 1999).

While Brubaker's theory focuses on Eastern Europe and other scholars have been concerned with the fall of the Soviet Union (Bunce, 2005; Motyl, 2001; Beissinger, 2002), national constructs were to be seen everywhere in the world, when decolonization processes encouraged national moves and aspirations. Consequently, the existence of national minorities in nationalizing states can also be observed in Africa and Asia. While, post-colonial states in Africa

and Asia deprive minorities of resources and rights, after colonization and independence, European languages have been promoted as languages of national state identification. Again, nations have been produced by nationalism. Kenya or Nigeria show evidence of this process. (Phillipson, 1999)

Similarly the end of the British mandate on Palestine in 1948 was followed by the establishment of Israel as the nation state of the Jewish people. This state conception has had a great impact on both Palestinians of the occupied territories, as well as on their counterparts who were incorporated into the new state and hence, became a national minority (Smootha 1978, Lustick 1980).

More recently East Timor proclaimed secession in 1999 and was recognized as an independent state in 2002. The conflict preceding its independence indicated the strength of nationalism on the island, as people refused to be further subordinated to the Indonesian state to which East Timor had belonged since the end of the Portuguese colonial administration in 1975.

Starting from these observations, the workshop will follow two main lines: first, it will address the way national minorities are treated by the state they live in and the influence it has on their status; second, it will focus on analyses of how national minorities perceive discourses and the policies of the elites of nationalizing states and the types of mobilizations they engender.

From this perspective, national minorities are not simply seen as an 'ethnic group' but as related to a political stance characterized, following Brubaker, by three elements: the public claim to membership in a different ethno-cultural group; the demand for state recognition of this distinct ethno-cultural nationality; and the assertion of certain collective cultural or political rights (Brubaker, 1996).

National minorities "have typically responded to majority nation-building by fighting to maintain or rebuild their own social culture, by engaging in their own competing nation-building." (Kymlicka, 2001) However, the kind of mobilization taken by the minority group depends on diverse elements linked to the competition over legitimate representation of the group (Brubaker, 1996), which can lead to different and sometimes concurrent strategies and discourses.

The politicization of ethnic identity is thus state-promoted in a process of cultural homogenization (Gellner, 1983), while a process of differentiation can also be engaged, as shown by Schrad for Karelia and Moldova (Schrad, 2004).

In the study of the interaction between nationalizing states and national minorities, what also needs to be taken into account is what Brubaker terms 'external national homelands' (Brubaker, 1996). These entities, which have also been referred to as 'kindred states' (McAdam, Tarrow, Tilly, 2001), 'ethnic homeland' (Tolz, 1998), or 'compatriot nations' (Schrad, 2004), interact with national minorities and nationalizing states. The assumption of the 'homeland' is, as Brubaker puts it, the "axiom of a shared nationhood across the boundaries of state and citizenship and the idea that this shared nationhood makes the state responsible, in some sense, not only for its own citizens but also for ethnic co-nationals who live in other states and possess other citizenships."

Here too, the understanding and the promoted mobilization vary and are submitted to debate (Brubaker, 1996). Furthermore, other international actors need also to be envisaged in this particular framework, such as international organizations, which may shape the relationship between a national minority and the nationalizing state. (Johns, 2003) This workshop does not confine itself to the analysis of East European cases only, but rather intends to cover national minorities in a geographically diverse selection of young nationalizing states, i.e. those which emerged during the

20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Not restricted to a particular geographical region, the workshop aims to take into account cases from Europe, Africa, and Asia. Widening the scope to include world cases should give new invigoration to a discussion, which generally focuses on specific areas. Indeed, through a comparative and dynamic perspective, the analysis of such situations as Russian minorities in Latvia, Tamouls populations in Sri Lanka or Arabs in Israel should lead to interesting conclusions over convergence and divergence of nationalizing states-national/minorities relations.

### 1.2. Relation to Existing Research

This new workshop relies upon a vast body of theoretical scholarship on nationalism and ethnicity, but also more specifically upon the work developed after the fall of communism in Eastern and Central Europe. Nevertheless, as noted before, this workshop offers a new perspective on these national phenomena by cross-cultural analysis of a set of similar processes, which emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries throughout the world, including in Africa and in Asia. By comparing processes, which occurred in Europe, Africa and Asia, the analyses of the papers and the general discussions of the workshop could help further understanding of a feature often seen in the framework of a single regional area.

Furthermore, depending on the outcome of the workshop, the discussions and the gathering could represent a first step for publication and the establishment of a future research group on minorities and new nationalizing states around the world.

### 1.3. Type of Papers

Papers using different methodologies and research strategies are welcome. Nevertheless, participants are asked to fit into the existing theoretical framework and to focus on National Minorities and/or Nationalizing States, which emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries (as shown in the outline of the topic). Case studies and comparative papers giving incentives for further theoretical discussions are particularly welcome.

This workshop aims at gathering all scholars willing to take part in it. The directors will review all proposed papers and select between 15 and 20 scholars working on this topic. Several colleagues have already expressed their interest or would be willing to answer our request favorably thanks to the nature of their work.

Amoah Michael, Open University

Danero Julien, Cevipol, Université libre de Bruxelles

Foucher Vincent, IEP Bordeaux

Goujon Alexandra, IEP Dijon

Hajda Lubomyr, Harvard University

Lynch Gabrielle, Keele University

Pavlovic Dusan, University of Belgrade

Petithomme Mathieu, European University Institute

Ramet Sabrina, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Weinblum Sharon, Cevipol, Université libre de Bruxelles

Ragsag, Anabelle, Center for Development Research, University of Bonn.

## 2. Funding

The workshop could be given funding on behalf of the FNRS (Fonds national de la recherche scientifique - Belgium) and the CNRS (Centre national de la recherche scientifique – France).

## 3. Biographical Notes

Jean Michel De Waele is a full professor of political science at the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB). He is the director of the Cevipol (Centre d'Etude de la Vie politique). He is the author and editor of several books (amongst them *L'émergence des partis politiques en Europe centrale – 1997 – & Partis politiques et démocratie en Europe centrale et orientale – 2002* at the Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles) and articles.

Antoine Roger is a full professor of political science at the Bordeaux Institute for political studies (Institut d'études politiques de Bordeaux) and director of SPIRIT (CNRS Research center) in Bordeaux. His research interests include theories of nationalism, peasant mobilizations and protests against European policies. He is the author of several articles in edited books and papers in peer reviews. He has published three books (one about theories of nationalism and two about Romanian nationalism); he edited or co-edited three others.

## 4. Indicative Bibliography

BEISSINGER, Mark R., 1995, "The Persisting Ambiguity of Empire", in *Post-Soviet Affairs* 11:2, 149-184.

BEISSINGER, Mark R., 2002, *Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

BEISSINGER, Mark R.; YOUNG, Crawford (eds.), 2002. *Beyond State Crisis? Postcolonial Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington DC.

BRUBAKER, Rogers, 1996, 1996, *Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BUNCE, Valerie, 2005, "The National Idea: Imperial Legacies and Post-Communist Pathways in Eastern Europe", in *East European Politics and Societies*, 19, 406-442.

GELLNER, Ernest, 1983, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, New York.

JOHNS, Michael, 2003, "'Do As I Say, Not As I DO": The European Union, Eastern Europe and Minority Rights", in *East European Politics and Societies*, 17, 683-699.

JUSKA, Arunas, 1999, "Ethno-political Transformation in the states of the former USSR", in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22:3, 524-553.

- KYMLICKA, 2001, *Politics in the Vernacular*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- LUSTICK, Ian, 1980, *Arabs in the Jewish State, Israel's Control of a national Minority*, University of Texas Press, Austin and London.
- MCADAM, Doug; TARROW, Sidney; TILLY, Charles, 2001, *Dynamics of Contention*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- MOTYL, Alexander, 2001, *Imperial Ends: The Decay, Collapse, and Revival of Empire*, New York Columbia University Press, New York.
- PHILLIPSON, Robert, 1999, "Political Science", in FISHMAN, Joshua A. (ed.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnicity*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- ROGER, Antoine, 2001, *Les grandes theories du Nationalisme*, Armand Colin, Paris.
- SCHRAD, Mark L., 2004, "Rag Doll Nations and the Politics of Differentiation on Arbitrary Borders: Karelia and Moldova", in *Nationalities Papers*, 32:2, 457-496.
- SMITH, Anthony D., 2001, *Nationalism, Theory, Ideology, History*, Blackwell, Malden.
- SMITH, Graham; LAW, Vivien; WILSON, Andrew; BOHR, Annette; ALLWORTH, Edward, *Nation-Building in the Post-Soviet Borderlands. The Politics of National Identities*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1998.
- SMITH, John E., 1994, *Quasi-Religions, Humanism, Marxism, and Nationalism*, Macmillan, London.
- SMOOHA, Sammy, 1978, *Israel, Pluralism and Conflict*. Berkeley, University of California Press, Los Angeles.
- TOLZ, Vera, 1998, "Conflicting 'Homeland Myths' and Nation-State Building in Postcommunist Russia", in *Slavic Review*, 57:2, 267-294.
- ZEVELEV, Igor, *Russia and Its New Diasporas*, United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington DC, 2001.