

The Concept of Nation: the Main Trends of Genesis in the 18th – early 20th Centuries in the Discourse of non-Marxist Paradigms

Vyacheslav Vilkov

Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: tvvvilkof59@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3542-0756>

Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2021) The Concept of Nation: the Main Trends of Genesis in the 18th – early 20th Centuries in the Discourse of non-Marxist Paradigms. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 8, 144-159. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/8/15>

In contrast to the approaches presented in the scientific literature, the article, based on a complex of methods (systematic, comparative, discursive and content analysis, prescriptions of scientism and the principle of historicism) of the humanities and social sciences, suggests the results of a system-oriented analysis of the evolution and transformations of the most influential meanings and senses of the concept “nation” used throughout the history of Europe and the world, which were theoretically developed in the philosophical and political thought, human sciences and political doctrines of the 18th – early 20th centuries for cognition, as well as ideological, legal and mental/psychological support of the two main ways of nation genesis and national-state building, in particular “from nation to state” and “from state to nation.” Historically, a large-scale scientific approach allowed to define the main stages and dominant trends in the development of interpretations of such national communities as cultural (ethnic) social groups and political (civil) communities, thus revealing their relationship with concepts, mythologems, and ideologems, such as “the people,” “national revival,” “the sovereignty of the people,” “national state,” “nationalism” and “patriotism.” Another scientific novelty of the article is the generalized presentation and theoretical evaluation in the context of the centuries-old genesis of the theoretical ideas about the nations, specifics of the Austro-Marxist approach of the early twentieth century.

The material of the article may be particularly relevant for a scientifically balanced, ideologically unbiased, adequate understanding of the processes of development of philosophical, social, and political thought both in the Western world and in modern Ukraine since independence.

Keywords: people, nation, ethnic (cultural) nation, political (civil) nation, national state, national-state building

Received: 3 April 2021 / Accepted: 5 May 2021 / Published: 29 May 2021

© Vilkov, Vyacheslav, 2021

Introduction

In many teachings on society and its development, as well as in ideological doctrines and political projects of the 18th – 20th centuries, the concept of “nation” (and its synonym – “people”) was the basic category. It was often used to designate the creator of cultural and political history, the sovereign of the state power and the subject, whose interest was the democratic transformation of political systems (territorial polities) and international law and order. It was recognized as legitimate and fair.

Meanwhile, little attention was paid to the study of the genesis and its semantic transformations and the systematization of its most influential values in the era of Modernism and Postmodernism. Among the currently existing classifications of theoretical models of national communities, the most universal and reasoned one is the theory created by the authoritative English scientist Anthony D. Smith (Smith, 2003). He, on the basis of an interdisciplinary approach and the principles of the paradigm organization of scientific knowledge, led to a logical system of a chaotic set of conceptual ideas about the mechanisms of education, as well as attributes and features of the political institutionalization of nations, including their definitions.

However, despite its advantages, such structuring of theoretical knowledge about the origin and essence of national formations in the form of paradigms (modernism, primordialism, perennialism and ethno-symbolism) has several fundamental flaws. Firstly, it is dominated by scientism research attitudes. Although those concepts were created on the ideological and methodological foundations of the fundamental sciences of society, they are analyzed exclusively in the subject field of such a modern and specialized branch of knowledge as “theories of nation and nationalism. All other interpretations of the phenomenon of the national community that were a part of more general teachings (philosophical, political, sociological, cultural, psychological, etc.), and in addition, included valuable and ideological prescriptions, were almost left out of any research. Secondly, such a classification of theoretical models of the nation covers mainly the last century.

In general, it should be noted that the standards of scientism and the paradigm approach that are now popular in modern social and political sciences, and often a small chronological framework for analyzing the dialectics of the centuries-old development of theoretical ideas about the nature of national communities, their role in the political and cultural history of mankind, and especially the exception of scientific consideration of the fundamental teachings about society and its subsystems, which became ideological and valuable foundation of the ideologies (liberalism, Marxism, nazism, etc.), projects and strategies of regional and global democratic modernization of the last three centuries, initially become a cause of incomplete or inadequate research problems and development of the phenomenon of the nation and its concept.

Research results

If we consider the genesis of the concept of *nation* in the dialectic of lexical display and ideological support of social and political processes, then it becomes possible to identify both special and general features in its tendencies. First of all, it lies in the fact that the interrelated, albeit multidirectional ways of nation-building and national genesis (“from state to nation” and “from nation to state”) gave rise not only to “autonomy,” self-sufficiency, and sometimes even alternativeness of the ethnic (“cultural”) and political meanings of the concept of “nation,” but

also stimulated their active integration, interpenetration and mutual complementarity, which in the final, modern historical result led to the acquisition by this concept of a distinct cultural and political binary (Vilkov, 2017: 18-99).

When summarizing numerous assessments and conclusions of well-respected representatives of the scientific community from different countries on the evolution of the concept of “nation,” it should be noted that originally it, as a word, acquired primarily ethnocultural, non-political meaning. At the same time, in the history of the process of ethnization as acculturation, and the gradual saturation of the word and the socio-political concept of “nation” with ethnocultural sense and meaning, it is possible, in our opinion, to distinguish two main stages.

The first one, is its primary ethnocultural (ethnology, ethnicity, “culture”), *lexical or terminological* meaning. It was shaped as early as in Ancient Rome times and continued its additional sense formation throughout the Middle Ages. Lexically, this tendency was expressed in the nominative similarity of the use of the words “gens,” “natio” (originating from “nasci” – born), and “lingua.” They denoted individual groups of people (tribes, nationalities) and later representatives of various medieval communities (“nations”). For instance, university students, clergy, professional corporation members, etc., ranked among separate groups based on a rather conditional criterion – “the community organizing principle.” The most common characteristics of such systematization were as follows: “blood relation,” “collective genealogy or place of birth,” “land” or “country of origin,” “language,” “morals, traditions and customs,” “laws,” “collective beliefs” etc. Besides, the word “natio,” as a certain social marker, throughout centuries has had both positive and negative ethnocultural and identifying application when dividing people into “us” and “them” (Habermas, 2002: 364–380; Habermas, 2001: 197-206, 229-237; Vilkov, 2014: 6-74).

The second stage in the development of the ethnocultural meanings of the noun “nation” (a term, and then an independent concept) is characterized by the fact that it became almost synonymous with the concept “people,” which was introduced into scientific discourse in the 18th century, and until the beginning of the 20th century, in the complex of philosophical and political knowledge, played the role of a basic category for designating an ethnocultural, especially linguistic group of people with common traditions, customs, morals, laws, beliefs and mentality. In particular, this is attributed to those concepts/*teachings* that were created on the basis of the ideas of the concept and ideology of the “spirit of the nation” and in the framework of an objectively idealistic model of the historical process.

Such a tendency, the way the concept of “nation” is used, clearly manifested itself in the philosophical interpretations of the logic of history, the *subject* of the social (spiritual, cultural, and political) life by J. Vico and S. Montesquieu. Later, in the theoretical generalizations of German enlighteners, romantics, philosophers, and founders of historical linguistics. First of all, I.G. Herder, G.V.F. Hegel, V. von Humboldt, Novalis (F. von Hardenberg), L.J. Tick, F.V. J. Schelling, F. Schlegel, F. Leermakers, Fichte, etc. The political and legal aspect manifested itself in the axiomatics of the “historical school of law” of G. Puhta and F. Sauvigny. Since the middle of the 19th century – in the teachings of such adherents of the school of the “psychology of peoples” as G. Steinthal, M. Lacarus, V. Wundt, A. Fulle, G. Lebon, etc. (for more information, see, for example Vilkov, 2014: 91-152).

At the same time, it should be emphasized that under the direct political and ideological influence of the ideas and categorical apparatus of the above-mentioned thinkers and schools, in several regions of Europe, a conceptual and lexical tendency was, on the one hand, formed not only towards rapprochement and steady synonymization of the ethnocultural meaning of

the terms “people” (in some interpretations even “race”) and “nation”, but, on the other hand, also towards their ideological and semantic opposition to the concept and phenomenon of “state” (see, for example Vilkov, 2014: 91-152; Vilkov, 2017: 18-100).

Under the influence of the German linguistic and scientific tradition, the concept of “nation,” synonymous with the concept of “people” and ethnocultural in its meaning, was established in the Eastern European intellectual space/discourse.

In its nature and purpose, the concept of the “spirit of the nation” and, accordingly, the ethnic and culturological meanings of the concept of the *nation* took shape and played a leading ideological role in those political and ideological processes in many European countries that were called the “national revival,” and represented a national liberation or unification struggle. According to the reconstruction done by J. Habermas, these were “the second and fourth zones of nationalization” in world history. According to his estimates, “the second wave” brought “late” or “delayed nations,” such as Italy and Germany. They chose a course “that later became typical of Central and Eastern Europe.” The fourth world-historical stage is represented by the “trend towards the formation of independent nation-states” in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe during the collapse of the federal Soviet systems there. Eventually, both “zones of nationalization” were one of the two leading world trends of national genesis (“from nation to state”) as a component of the processes of political modernization of the last centuries. Here, “the formation of a nation-state took place after the propaganda spread of national identity that preceded it,” and “nation-building” preceded “the construction of a nation-state” (J. Habermas), or, as E. Gellner suggests, it was not directly related to it. However, in any of these scenarios, the spiritual construction and constitution of a nation were paramount in this method of national genesis (*nation-building*). For this purpose, numerous actions were taken to form the image of a “cultural nation,”¹ allegedly having “ancient historical roots and a unique fate.” Without which, in fact, the emergence of necessary incentives and spiritual relationships for the appearance of social integration, solidarity, political mobilization, as well as the emergence of the spirit and sense of community (the “national” one) in the arrangement of a modern democratic political system (of a nation-state) would be impossible (Habermas, 2001; Habermas, 2002).

When evaluating the theoretical component of the genesis of the meanings of the concept of “nation,” it is possible to notice that the mentioned theoretical distinction between the phenomena, as well as the concepts of “nation” and “state,” characteristic of the concept of “the spirit of the people,” which later clearly manifested itself in the historical-economic (Russian Marxism and Soviet Marxism-Leninism of the 20th century), cultural-psychological (Austro-Marxism), culturological, psychological and ethnological conceptual models of the nation and national genesis, which, starting from the end of the 19th century, were actively created on various philosophical (materialism and idealism) and sociological (objectivist and subjectivist approaches) grounds, and dominated in scientific, political and ideological discourses throughout the 20th century.

Evaluating the theoretical component of the genesis of the meanings of the concept of “nation,” it is possible to notice the mentioned theoretical distinction between the phenomena, as well as the concepts of “nation” and “state,” characteristic of the concept of the “spirit of the people,” which later clearly manifested itself in the historical-economic (Russian Marxism

¹ A detailed analysis is presented in the article “Axiomatics of the political and philosophical model of state and nation building by Jurgen Habermas” (see, for example, Vilkov, 2017: 5-17). Briefly speaking, the German philosopher proposes to call such a concept of nation, and respectively its historical prototype, “*Volksnation*”.

and Soviet Marxism-Leninism), cultural-psychological (Austro-Marxism), psychological and ethnic conceptual models of the nation and national genesis, which, *first of all*, criticized and denied the objectively idealistic concept of the “spirit of the people,” and *secondly*, were created, starting from the end of the 19th century, already on various philosophical (materialism and idealism) and sociological (objectivist and subjectivist approaches) grounds, and throughout the 20th century dominated in scientific, political and ideological discourses.

Only a few of the most characteristic and clear culturological definitions of the concept of nation proposed at the turn of the last century will be given below. Thus, the theorist and ideological leader of the Austrian Social Democrats, the philosopher O. Bauer, who openly positioned himself as a follower of the teachings, theory, and methodology of K. Marx, in his fundamental work “The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy” (1907), proposed the following definition: “A nation is a totality of men united through the community of fate into a community of character” (Bauer, 1909: 139). “Common destiny,” he explained in a very tautological manner, “means a joint experience of the same fate on the basis of constant intercommunications and interactions.” Such a community of life acts in two directions: “the qualities assigned by a nation on the basis of a common fate are transmitted through natural heredity” and through cultural inheritance, when “cultural values created by a nation on the basis of the same community of fate are transmitted further on” (Bauer, 1909: 115-116, 25). In addition, the theorist of Austrian Marxism, contrary to the axiomatics of its creators, argued that nations are communities of people that do not arise in the era of capitalist development but exist throughout the history of mankind. They are a phenomenon of both classless and class society. But in a society divided into classes, the “cultural affinity” “embraces only the ruling class,” and “the broad masses, at the expense of whose labor this class feeds itself, are outside this affinity” (Bauer, 1909: 51). As a result, contrary to the theory of K. Marx and F. Engels, their Austrian “follower” postulates as follows: “Three different stages in the development of a nation correspond to the three stages in the development of a human society – the era of tribal communism, modern class society and future socialist society” (Bauer, 1909: 139-140).

Another ideological leader of the Austrian socialists, jurist K. Renner (pseudonyms – R. Springer, Synopticus), who is often referred to as the follower of Austro-Marxism in literature, proposed a purely culturological definition. According to his socio-political and philosophical views, a nation is “a union of like-minded and like-speaking people.” It is nothing more than “a cultural affinity of a group of modern people, who are not connected with the land” (Springer, 1909: 43-44). At the same time, in order to solve national problems in the society of his time, primarily in the conditions of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century, he recognized as necessary not political institutionalization (independent nation-state) but a political and legal project of “cultural and national autonomy.” Its main principle or sense of “the right to a nationality” was stated as follows: “Nationality should become one of the legal characteristics that determine the state of a person,” i.e., publicly declared by each individual (citizen/nationals) “belonging to the nation” in legal terms should “become part of the basic subjective and public rights.” Whereas each national community “should be constituted as a union of people on the basis of modern democracy, as an organization of legal protection” (Springer, 1909: 80-81, 111, 44).

A similar classic and laconic definition of a nation as a community of culture was proposed at the end of the 19th century by a Russian scientist, supporter of liberal ideas, and an adherent of the subjective trend in sociology (“principle of personality” as the core of “subjective method” by N.K. Mikhailovsky), N.I. Kareev: “A group of individuals, united whenever possible in

all cultural relations to the group of people who are constituted as a nation” (Kareev, 1897: 301). Another influential Russian scientist (economist, historian, philosopher) P.B. Struve, who politically began as a social democrat, “legal Marxist” and later moved to the positions of “liberal conservatism” and anti-Bolshevism, in the collected volume *Out of the Depths: A Collection of Articles on the Russian Revolution* (1918) the editor and one of the authors of the article (“The Historical Meaning of the Russian Revolution and National Tasks”) of which he became, he formulated the following detailed definition: “Belonging to a nation is primarily determined by some objective indicators, mostly by language. But for the formation and existence of a nation, that unifying attitude expressed in the national consciousness, which creates a kind of spiritual unity from a group of persons of the same origin, one faith, one language, etc., is of decisive importance. A nation is constituted and created by the national consciousness”. And it “is formally the same concept as the class.” The essential work of our time and future generations must be done under the banner and in the name of *the nation*. The nation, as I have already said, is formally the same concept as the class. National consciousness also forms a nation, as class consciousness forms a class. And then echoing E. Renan and criticizing the social theory of Marxism, he writes: “Nation is a spiritual unity created and supported by a community of spirit, culture, spiritual content, bequeathed by the past, living in the present and creating the future in it. But while the class distinction is associated with the meager socio-economic content, which has neither moral nor any other spiritual value, the national affiliation indicates all that enormous and imperishable wealth that every member and participant of a nation possesses and which, in essence, forms the very concept of nation. “A nation is always based on a cultural affinity in the past, present, and future, a common cultural heritage, common cultural work, common cultural aspirations. ... The Russian nation and its culture is a spontaneous product of our entire harsh and cruel history.

Now it must become a beloved, consciously created environment of our existence – the highest value, from which countless generations of Russian people must come and go. To clear the place for the beloved conscious creativity of the national culture, Russian educated people must first of all free themselves in their spiritual being from that false ideal, the destructive effect of which on the people’s spirit and people’s life is now finally known. This is class, internationalist socialism. Along with that, they must get rid of admiration for any political and social forms. Neither the class interests of the international proletariat nor one or another political and social forms (for example, republic, community, socialism) can claim any recognition as the highest ideals or values. National culture is not subordinated to any class interests and cannot be enclosed in any particular political or social form. Its participation in the national culture predetermines the place of every class in popular life. Every political and social form, in order to justify itself in history, must manifest itself in the given historical conditions as the best repository for the national culture, that is, for the spiritual content, the meaning and sense of which goes beyond all class boundaries and surpasses all political and social forms” (Collection, 1990).

In modern social science, within the framework of substantiating the theoretical models of national genesis, nation, nationalism, and state-building, the culturological (ethnological) interpretation of the nature of the national community is characteristic, first of all, of the paradigm of perennialism and cultural primordialism, as well as some adherents of the paradigm of modernism.² From a large number of the definitions of the nation (understood as

² See, for example, the essay “Paradigmatic prescriptions for studying the processes of the formation of national communities and the definition of the concept of nation (Smith’s theoretical model)” (see, for example, Vilkov, 2017: 205-243).

a cultural affinity/community), two definitions proposed by the representatives of sociological science can be cited as an example. Thus, P. Sorokin, in the article “Essential characteristics of the Russian nation in the twentieth century,” writes: “The nation is a multi-connected, multifunctional, solidary, organized, semi-closed socio-cultural group, that is at least partly aware of its existence and unity” (Sorokin, 1999). The English philosopher and social anthropologist E. Gellner, when formulating one of the working definitions of the nation (as he notes: “cultural,” having an “ethnological” character and built “on the principle of cultural affinity” of the concepts of the nation), emphasizes: “Two people belong to one nation if, and only if, they belong to one, common culture – the latter concept means a system of ideas, symbols, associations, ways of behavior and communication” (Gellner, 2003: 36).

It should be noted that within the framework of the centuries-old development of the concept of *nation*, apart from the trends and stages outlined above in the formation of its ethnocultural meanings, its special political content and purpose were formed long before the beginning of the modern era. In this case, in the processes of politicization of this concept, it also seems justified to single out two main stages. Here is their essence: the formation and transformation of political content is a fixation of the change of subjects of state sovereignty from the feudal-class world order (“ancien régime”) to a society institutionalized as a modern democratic state (including, of course, mental, ideological, political and legal mechanisms, methods and types of legitimation and self-legitimation. It was achieved by the appropriation of the noumenon “nation” by groups to themselves).

The first of the main stages of this process is the introduction and application of the concept of “nation” to designate the special, “gentry,” “upper-class society”). Such medieval formations had a kind of “national” identity and, on the basis of the powers of the legislative and advisory institutions of a feudal society (Landtag, Reichstag, Seim, Parliament, States-General, etc.), carried out political participation in the affairs of state administration and, in fact, were special collective subjects in the dual system of sovereignty in the era of feudalism.³

Meanwhile, it should be emphasized that the “estate political nations” (“Adelsnation” – J. Habermas), depending on the author’s theoretical, methodological, and ideological position, is interpreted either as reality or as an ideologeme, political myth, idea-concept that organized self-awareness of groups of “power holders” in a feudal society.

For example, the “aristocratic and political essence” of the nation was polemically vividly declared by the religious reformer Martin Luther, who, in his address to the “Christian nobility of the German nation” (1520), noted that the “German nation” (of that time) consisted of “bishops and princes.” Later the influential politician and reactionary ideologist Count Joseph de Maistre, who, when asked “What is a nation?”, replied that it was “sovereign and aristocracy.” At the beginning of the twentieth century, the well-known Ukrainian researcher V. Starosolsky emphasized: “The aristocracy creates a surrogate for a nation, in the modern sense – an “exclusively political” nation, which is essentially closer to the same other nations than its own” (Starosolsky, 1998: 105). Even the Austro-Marxists (O. Bauer) and supporters of Marxism (in particular, A. Kozing) recognized the existence of “estate political nations” or the corresponding ideologeme (Bauer, 1909: 43; Kozing, 1978: 38). Although, it is a common fact that the classical axiomatics of the Marxist socio-philosophical doctrine postulates that nations are exclusively a product (a type of historical community of people, which is formed

³ A good example is the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation of the late Middle Ages with a special status in its political system of “imperial estates,” which had the right to vote in the Reichstag and owned territorial sovereignty.

on the basis of nationalities of the feudal period) of the capitalist and socialist eras of social development.

The global bourgeois-democratic revolutionary transformations at the turn of the Modern era played a special role in the formation of the already basic modern political meaning and sense of the concept of “nation.” By their nature, they represented a general democratic modernization, political activation and ideologization of society. In this case, it is particularly indicative that during the gestation period of bourgeois revolutions in the West, the very concept of *nation* began to be theoretically developed and purposefully used with the aim of political and ideological consolidation, as well as mobilization of the population (the people) of territorial state’s formations in the struggle to establish its (often on its behalf) political and legal sovereignty. They were mostly created in the republican form of government. In its fundamental essence, such a process represented the transition (by destroying the principles of organization and functioning of the “ancien régime” in Western civilization) of the majority of the population – the people – from the state of nationals to the status of citizens. This meant a revolutionary transformation of the people (often with the use of means and measures of open violence) into an imperious majority, and into the only legitimate subject of the social and political system and power. As a consequence of this way of development (“from state to the nation”), there was an intensive convergence in the semantics and word usage of the terms and concepts of “people” and “nation.” Moreover, it was mostly done on the basis of the actualization of the socio-political, civil meanings and senses of the latter, since the name “nation” was no longer assigned to the estates of the nobility, but to the people as a supposedly “sovereign, fully fledged political and legal community” or “civic nation.”⁴ On a global scale, such semantic innovations in the purpose of the autosemantic word *nation* meant that the history of large social groups that make up the denotation of this concept appeared as a centuries-old and revolutionary path in the development of democracy and creation of a modern statehood type that corresponded to its basic principles.

If the political and ideological aspect of word formation is analyzed from a purely historical viewpoint, then the specifics of the aforementioned politicization and etatization of the meanings of the concept of “nation” lay in the fact that the principles of democracy, constitutionalism, elements of republican institutions of power, essential for the modern type of state, began to be established in the political system (most clearly in England and France), and only later, at the end of the 18th century, the philosophical, ideological, political and legal comprehension of these processes (including preparation and adoption of legislative acts) completed in some essential ways the ideological substantiation of the political concept of *nation*, and for a long time predetermined (in Western European and, to a certain extent, North American intellectual spaces, social science and political discourses) the semantic overlap (often conceptual identity) of the terms “people” and “nation.” In addition, since this period, the politicization of the term “nation,” especially in the English and French-speaking communities, contributed to its significant lexical and semantic etatization, i.e., active use and clear consolidation in the political lexis and terminology of legislative acts as an analog for the designation of state. In the twentieth century, international organizations of states became the most prominent examples of the dominance of such a lexical tradition. They received the names of *the League of Nations* and *the United Nations*.

⁴ J. Habermas conceptually identifies and names this phenomenon through the concept of “the nation of citizens.”

It should be noted that the ideological priority in the creation of the theoretical and ideological foundations of the democratic project of the political nation of the modern age belongs to the philosophy of the state of the Western European enlightenment of the 17th and 18th centuries. (G. Grotius, J. Locke, T. Hobbes, J. Milton, J.-J. Rousseau, I. Kant and others). Liberalism (in its enlightenment interpretation and limitations), legal egalitarianism, cosmopolitanism, “republican” (in the understanding of J. Habermas), but not ethnonationalistic political world perception and world outlook, became a characteristic feature of the standards of its worldview and ideological imperatives. The essence of the national community was seen in the presence of a political community of citizens equal before the law. A representative government, as an expression of the unified will of the entire people, became the source of state power legitimacy and national sovereignty. Provisions of the theory of natural law, social pact, the ideologeme of the “civil society,” and partly the concept of the rule of law were the backbone of the nation’s philosophical, political, and legal projects. The two ideas of state and popular sovereignty acquired great significance in the structure of the concept of a political (civil) nation and its theoretical and ideological understanding. The first idea (sovereignty of the republican state and its power), having assigned political sovereignty to people and legal sovereignty to the parliament, became guiding in the English (under its influence the American as well) educational thought and constitutional practice. The second idea (the actual sovereignty of people), which combined a declarative political (“people are the source of all power”), legal regulations (direct will expression, law-making of people, for example, its modern equivalent – the referendum), and terminologically identified popular and national sovereignty, differentiates the French enlightenment (especially the teachings of J.-J. Rousseau, J.P. Marat) and the constitutional acts of the bourgeois revolution in France (Vilkov & Kostenko, 2016: 62-83; Vilkov & Kostenko 2016a: 99-112).

It is also worth mentioning that at the end of the 19th and throughout the 20th centuries, the democratic ideology of civil solidarity and republican patriotism, as a basis for the formation of a political (“civil”) nation and a democratic state, was replaced by the ideology of ethnonationalism, political myths about a single ethnocultural origin (or even racial unity) of people and commonality of its historical fate. In such a political and ideological context, the nation began to be interpreted as a community of ethnically close, ethnoculturally unified citizens. Thus, the direct mentally and ideologically motivated identification of a cultural and linguistic community of citizens with a nation (and the highest form of its political development with a separate state) was the stimulation of the widespread understanding of the political nation as an ethnic (cultural, ethnic, racial) community that “owns the state,” seeks to create or maintain its own state,” “tries to find itself in the system of interstate relations.”

If we analyze the modern theoretical models of the “political nation,” then we can admit that this concept has a very ambiguous meaning and interpretation. The model approach of the supporters of etatism is characterized by the fact that they define a nation through its relationship with the state and proceed from a very standard axiomatic premise. Accordingly, the “own state,” as a political reality or a deliberately declared goal (by analogy with Marx’s concept of political transformation of the class – “a nation for itself”), transforms a plural, in ethnocultural and linguistic terms, the mass of citizens or a single ethnocultural group (called “people,” “nation”), into an independent territorial and political community, as well as into the subject of the system of international relations. And such a community/society as a real or potential sovereign of state power receives the name “nation.” Under this approach, the determining factor is that, according to the etatist understanding of nation (especially from the

point of view of the concept of the “nation-state”), a political community in the democratic form of government “becomes the state,” a full-fledged collective subject of power. In theoretical and ideological views of the political process, such a phenomenon is seen as “the source of statehood completeness.” It appears as a monopoly owner of the legitimate powers of a state’s political and legal institutions (which, by the way, in reality, may not embody the principles of democracy).⁵ Consequently, one way or another, but in the etatist conceptual designs, a number of basic features of the state are transferred to the community of citizens. In the theoretical model, the properties and functions of the institutions of state power and some components of the democratic political system are transformed into attributive properties and signs of the national community.

In most cases, this borrowing is directly related to such signs of state formation (from the standpoint of liberalism – “democratic political and legal community” or, according to E. Yan, a “free constitutional republic”) as: a territorially, politically independent and organized population of a country (the people), which is delimited by the internationally recognized borders (national identity is oriented towards them, as on the exclusive area of state education, national (as civil) identity is formed and maintained); citizenship status⁶; constitutionally secured and institutionalized self-government of citizens; state (collective), legal and (or exclusively) political sovereignty. The latter is terminologically fixed and interpreted within the norms/vocabulary of law as national sovereignty (sovereignty of the nation).

Among the huge number of adherents of the concept of the “political nation,” in terms of the interpretation of its meanings and realia, there exist three basic variants.⁷

The first of them is a purely institutionalist, etatist approach. It lies in the fact that if a nation with its substantial properties, is fully or partially identified with the attributive characteristics of the democratic type of state power (political system) and with the source of its legitimacy and institutionalized means of realization in a territorially delimited socio-political space, and also if the fundamental role of the national (as a state) identity of citizens is recognized, or when the role of nationalism, as a “common political/civil religion” (in some interpretations even as a “modern type of symbolic culture,” L. Grinfeld) for the formation of a sovereign political and legal community, is also recognized, then researchers (some of them even add

⁵ A laconic and classical formula of etatism in the theory of nation was offered in the following statement by J. Kollab (“People, Law and State,” published in Prague, 1919): “The nation demands to transfer to itself not only some, but all the competences of the state, it must take control over the whole state mechanism” (quoted from: Knyazhinsky, 1959: 277).

⁶ Prescription is of fundamental importance for the theoretical model and building of political (“civil”) nations, whereby a nation is formed by a group of equal citizens, whose “nationality” is nourished by their civic identity and does not depend on ethnicity (origin, assuming the presence of consanguineous ties, common language, culture, religion, etc.). A very clear alternative contributes to the comprehension of this view of the world of “nations and nationalities.” It is demonstrated by the goals and methods of national and state building in the post-Soviet Baltic states. In the newly formed “democratic” states of this region discriminatory division of the entire population into “citizens” and “non-citizens” took place. Apart from this, some new regulatory rules are being established. These rules do not allow for immigrants from “non-indigenous peoples” even the smallest possibility of becoming a representative/member of the “state-constituting nation”. For example, in accordance with the “final version of the amendments to the law on the change of name, surname and nationality” adopted by the Parliament of Latvia in September 2016, all persons with “non-Latvian roots” (regardless of the period of their residence in the country, the degree of the state language proficiency, national self-identification) were denied the right to “become Latvians” (In Latvia, 2021).

⁷ For a detailed analysis of the basic theoretical models of the political nation, see (Vilkov, 2014: 296-347).

cultural and linguistic unification to the basic features of the nation) are inclined to operate with the concept of the “nation-state” (the definitions of A. Giddens, M. Ilyin, A. Maiboroda, M. Mann are particularly illustrative).

In many other variations, the “nation” is defined in a pro-etatist way, mainly in the ideological standards of the concept and ideologeme of the “sovereignty of people” (of course, with its peculiar content and author’s or disciplinary interpretations). Under certain circumstances, taking into account the specifics of the political history of a number of peoples, it is interpreted on the basis of the concept that is close to it in meaning: the concept of the “subject of sovereign political power.” In this case, the “political nation” phenomenon is sometimes theoretically presented as a formation that is characteristic not only of modern society and democratic political systems, but also as the one that existed in the period of feudalism and even antiquity. Researchers give ancient Greek polises as examples (Krysachenko, 2003: 70-78). As can be seen from the above, within the framework of such a model, nation is defined as *demos* (some of its categorical designations: “political and legal community of citizens,” “co-citizen territorial polity,” “a community of individuals that is based on the foundations of democratic self-government”), which is substantially characterized by the political and legal egalitarianism, and often by a constitutionally fixed authority to exercise power in the state, as well as a single political culture, civic identity, solidarity and patriotism. For example, according to O. Dunn’s interpretation, “the fundamental concept of nation,” which “specifies the political structure of post-feudal societies” and “has established itself as a leading model of the modern political system,” *“is interpreted as a nation consisting of citizens of one state, or one civil nation.”* “The following normative elements” make the basis of the *“model of a modern nation,”* “The nation includes all the inhabitants of the national territory since they all shall have the same human and civil rights”; “All members of the nation are equal and shall be given the opportunity to participate in its political culture and enjoy the solidarity of the nation; it is the responsibility of every member of the nation to ensure that these requirements are met”; “The nation has the right to political self-governance within its territory; the principle of sovereignty of people shall become the norm of the state life”; “All peoples have the same right to exist, to form a nation and to self-determination within the territory inhabited by them”; “The modern *nation-state* is a state in which sovereignty belongs to the nation, i.e., to the totality of its citizens, the nation establishes and controls political power.” In general, *“Nations* are communities that share common historical roots and common political interests. They perceive themselves as a solidary community since it is based on the legal equality of its members. Nations are always tied to a specific territory (*patria*). Another important feature is that they themselves are responsible for the regulation of relationships on their territory, i.e., they establish their own political self-governance (sovereignty), in other terms, form their own state. The unity of a nation is based on a consensus on the political structure and culture.” It is worth mentioning that Dunn supplements and specificates the definition he proposed as follows, “The notions of *nation* and *people* in our political lexicon are the most equivalent and are used as synonyms. Indeed, *the people*, as the term “sovereignty of the people” shows, is also a political notion denoting people of a certain state, and in this respect is identified with the notion of nation” (Dunn, 2003: 12-13, 8).

And finally, the nation is identified, almost conventionally in a politological or political and psychological way, only by pointing to the present or potential ability (a kind of “legitimate intention”) “to have its own state” (for example, M. Weber, D. Dontsov, G. Cohn, F. Meinecke, H. Setton-Watson, V. Starosolsky, E. Haas and others). The most common variants of such a

postulation are the interpretation of the national community as a “constellation of people” who, with or without common group ethnocultural features, “collectively own the state,” “wish to achieve self-determination,” “seek to create or preserve their own state”; as a “solidary community” which is “based on the constitutional equality of its members”; as “a people that proclaims its right to sovereign political self-governance”; as a “politically mobilized people”; “people who have a common political will” or “political identity,” “seek the right to statehood” or “require political self-determination.”

As can be seen from the above, despite the variety of specific nuances of such interpretations, their main ideological and theoretical postulate is very characteristic. According to the Doctor of Philosophy and Professor A. Knyazhinsky (Ukrainian emigrant in Canada), this postulate comes down to the fact that many researchers “looked for the difference between the nation and the people, as assumed degrees of the development of an ethnic community, in the manifestation of an activity and found it in the statehood of peoples, or at least in their orientation towards it” (Knyazhinsky, 1959: 137, 139-140).

In contrast to the above-mentioned information, another model is common in modern social science and political theory. It interprets the formation of the meaning of the concept of “nation” as a multidimensional process of its interrelated cultural and political transformation, i.e., as a continuous ideological synthesis of cultural and political meanings. Its active foundation in social science was laid more than a hundred years ago by the German historian, researcher of the history of philosophical thought F. Meinecke, who introduced the concept of “cultural” and “political” nation into the scientific circulation. Nowadays, the idea of a cultural and political dichotomy or binary nature of the basic meanings of the concept of *nation* is recognized or supported by a large number of scientists. In fact, in lexical and conceptual terms, the categorical consolidation of cultural and political two-dimensionality in scientific, political and ideological discourses was a natural logical conclusion of the dialectic of the history of semantic transformations, interrelationships and complementarities of ideas about the nation and the people as ethnic and political phenomena, as subjects of cultural and political (including legal and institutional aspects) history of humanity.

Conclusions

In general, it can be concluded that in the 20th and early 21st centuries, the meanings of the concepts of “cultural” and “political” nation served as the ideological, theoretical and methodological foundations for the intensive development of the scientific knowledge on the determinants of education and essence of national communities and identities, the typology of nationalisms, multi-vector tendencies of national genesis and nation-building. Their competition and interrelations formed the scientific lexicon, research attitudes and categorical tools, outlined a promising direction of scientific research, the nature of interpretations and theoretical modeling. And the binary cultural and political “matrix concept” accomplished the synthesis of the basic meanings of the concept of “nation”, in which the ideas about the national community both as an ethnocultural and as a political and civil formation were closely intertwined and conceptually fixed. It also integrated and meaningfully reflected the fact that in the realities of world history, nations have been and still remain communities that are consolidated by ethnocultural, civil and political ties, the corresponding binary self-consciousness and identity, and are institutionalized in the form (often regardless of the state structure, either purely unitary or officially federal as, for example, the USA, Austria or the

Federal Republic of Germany) of nation-states – the dominant type and method of democratic self-determination in the conditions of the modern world system.

In conclusion, if one concisely assesses the transformation of conceptual knowledge about nations, dominant cognitive attitudes among representatives of the scientific communities of the post-Soviet period, then it can be noted that since the early 1990s, as an alternative to the uniformity of the theoretical and ideological prescriptions of Marxist-Lenin metanarrative, especially its historic-economic theory (Vilkov, 2020: 36-68; Vilkov & Rudenko, 2019: 69-84) of the nation, the authors “intellectual freedom” had appeared, more similar to scientific-theoretical anarchy. Although at that time Soviet Marxism often remained an ideological foundation of social science, it did not transform the Stalinist interpretation of the nation radically, but its ideas were already actively, unsystematically, uncritically combined in symbiosis with individual postulates of those theories, paradigms or approaches, which Western anti-Marxism researchers created. Moreover, within the framework of academic and university science of the post-Soviet period, unlimited freedom to choose ideological bases for personal theoretical generalizations and constructions, complete nihilism in relation to the previous theoretical legacy (primarily Marxist), created an atmosphere of the chaos of “points of view” in the subject field of the theory of the nation, stimulated scientific irresponsibility and strong tendencies to eclecticism, relativism, as well as to the substitution of independent and systematic analysis by compilations or by judgments deprived of any scientific specificity. In addition to this, in the situation of a radical change of political systems and ideological doctrines that occurred in the new independent states, many scholars in their interpretations of sociopolitical phenomena and processes that were related to national problems, were often driven not by strictly scientific, scientific theoretical and methodological criteria, attitudes, arguments and requirements, but by political sympathies and ideological preferences.

In the theoretical aspect, as one more characteristic feature of the post-Marxist stage of the development of theoretical models of the nation, which implicitly began to form in the USSR in the late 1980s and became one of the determining factors after its collapse, was the tendency to interpret the national community. Firstly, it was done on the basis of very abstract ethnological and ethno-psychological ideas (in the latter case, even the nineteenth century), and secondly, not to include in the definition of the nation a list of its specific features. For example, the definition of the nation that is proposed in such a Russian edition as “*Politology: An Encyclopedic Dictionary*.” The dictionary defines nation in the spirit of the ethicist interpretation with some elements of agnosticism, “A nation (from Latin. *Nation* – tribe, people) is a type of ethnos, a historically arising socio-economic and spiritual community of people with certain psychological make-up and self-consciousness. It is so complex in content and diverse in its specific rules that it is impossible to embrace it with a general, formal definition, without distorting its essence, without leaving aside many essential characteristics and features” (Politology, 1993: 212). Another, even more, pro-Marxist definition, although with the active use of postulates from the Western theories of ethnicity, as well as psychological interpretations of the phenomenon of the nation, was offered in the collective work of Ukrainian scientists “*Politology Encyclopedic Dictionary: higher educational establishment students manual*”, in which the authors noted, “A nation (from Latin. A *nation* – tribe, people) is a type of ethnos, a socio-economic and spiritual community of people with a certain psychological make-up and consciousness, the occurrence of which was predetermined historically and which has a persistent aggregate of essential characteristics” (Politology, 1997: 222).

Another innovative post-Marxist tendency of the last 20 years in Ukraine, which has not yet produced significant results, was the numerous attempts of Ukrainian specialists in the field of theoretical knowledge of the phenomenon of the nation, the national idea, the processes of national and national-state building (some ideologists of political parties and movements joined them) to develop the concept of “Ukrainian political nation”. Moreover, they tried to create such a term or conception, as a rule, not on the ideas, political and ideological principles or legal recommendations of modern Western liberal-democratic doctrines and teachings, i.e., not as a model of a “civic nation” (for example, similar to the concept of the German political scientist, Otto Dunn and the Canadian researcher, Will Kymlicka), but exclusively on the ethicist (sometimes even radically nationalistic or ethnocentric) ideas about the national community and nationhood, as a model of a homogeneous, mono-ethnic nation (Vilkov, 1918: 9-22).

As for the prospects of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation (i.e., the historical and economical version of the interpretation of the system of nation-forming traits), now, as a result of the official or unofficial (personal author) decommunization, it has practically lost its political relevance, influence and significance in the post-Soviet space, including Ukraine. Moreover, the general situation among the scientific communities of the post-Soviet states, including the Ukrainian one, which studies the theoretical aspects of national problems, was that most of their representatives were completely reoriented towards the intellectual product created by Western researchers in the field of theoretical modeling of the phenomena of nations and nationalism. In fact, many modern social scientists stopped independent scientific research and retrained to popularize basic non-Marxist paradigms (Vilkov, 2014; Vilkov, 2017). Moreover, some of the most influential theorists in both Soviet and post-Soviet times, in particular, Ukrainian (G. Kasyanov, M. Stepyko) and Russian (V. Tishkov, V. Malakhov, A. Kustarev), following the well-known Western authorities in the theory of nation and nationalism (for example, such as Benedict Anderson, P. Alter, R. Brubaker, E. Carr, F. Hertz, K. Minogue, J. Summers, K. Symmons-Symonolewicz, H. Seton-Watson, Ph. White, etc.), became vocal supporters of either constructivism (especially of the postmodern, cognitive and linguistic type), or adherents of the “paradigm of strategic relativism” and agnosticism. They openly proposed to abandon both, the notion of “nation” and any scientific theoretical modeling of the phenomenon of the national community, the definitions of its main features, the understanding of its institutionalization processes, etc. (Vilkov, 2014: 186-263). They argued that there had long been a fundamental and insoluble problem of the “definition uncertainty” in the complex national sciences complex (unlike many other social, especially natural, branches of knowledge). Its essence is simple and lies in the fact that even in the medium term, there are no scientific and theoretical prerequisites and opportunities to formulate a definition of the nation that could become universally accepted and common to all scientists, at least within the scientific community of one country.

References

- Bauer, Otto (1909) *The Question of Nationalities and Social Democracy*. St. Petersburg. *Collection of articles on the Russian Revolution* S. A. Askoldov, N. A. Berdyayev, S. A. Bulgakov et al (1990) Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow University. Available online: <http://vehi.net/deprofundis/struve.html>

- Dunn, Otto (2003) *Nations and Nationalism in Germany 1770-1990*. St. Petersburg: Science.
- Gellner, Ernest (2003) *Nations and Nationalism; Nationalism*. Kyiv, Taxon.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2002) *The European National State. Its Achievements and Its Limitations. On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship*. Nation and Nationalism. Moscow.: Praxis publishers.: 364–380.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2001) *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, St. Petersburg, Nauka publishers.
- In Latvia, people of other nationalities were prohibited to become Latvians* (2021) Available online: <http://www.belvpo.com/ru/74266.html>
- Knyazhinsky, Anton (1959) *The spirit of the nation*. Sociological-ethnopsychological studio. New York – Philadelphia – Munich: Science partnership im. Shevchenko.
- Kozing, Alfred (1978) *Nation in History and Modernity* (A research held in connection with the historical-materialistic theory of the nation). Moscow: Progress publishing house.
- Krysachenko, Valentin (2003) *The mechanism of formation of classical political nations*. Ukrainian political nation: genesis, state, prospects. Kyiv, НІДС: 70-78.
- Politology: An Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1993) Moscow: Moscow publishing house. The University of Commerce Publishing House.
- Politology Encyclopedic Dictionary: higher educational establishment students manual* (1997). Kyiv: Genesis.
- Smith, Antony (2003) *Nationalism and Modernism*. Accessible online: <http://milliyyet.info/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Anthony-D.-Smith-Nationalism-and-Modernism.pdf>
- Springer, Rudolph (1909) *National Problems: The Struggle of Nationalities in Austria*. St. Petersburg.
- Sorokin, Pitirim (1999) *National question*. Available online: http://www.srinest.com/book_843_chapter_24_PITIRIM_SOROKIN_INAIONALNYJJ_VOPROS.html
- Starosolsky, Vladimir (1998) *Theory of the nation*. New York; Kyiv: Nauk. T. Shevchenko: Higher school.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2017) Axioms of the Political and Philosophical Model of Nation and Nation-State Building by Jürgen Habermas. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 2017. Vol. 2.: 5-17.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2014) *Genesis of the notion of nation*. 3rd edition. Kyiv: Published by Karpenko V. M.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2018) The Ideologeme and Mythologeme of the National Idea: Ukrainian Political and Philosophical Tradition in the Discourse of Modern Theory of Democracy (part two). *Współpraca Europejska*, Warszawa, Polska, Wydawca – Consilium Sp. z o.o. Vol. 5 (36): 9-22.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav and Rudenko, Sergey (2019) The Modernization of the Russian Marxist Concept of the Nation in the Social Sciences and Humanities in the USSR in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 4: 69-84.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav and Kostenko, Alexander (2016) Politico-philosophical and regulatory framework for the creation of civil nations and nation-states at the beginning of the modern era (part one). *Współpraca Europejska*, Warszawa, Polska, Wydawca – Consilium Sp. z o.o., 2016. № 4 (11): 62-93.
- Vilkov, Vyacheslav and Kostenko, Alexander (2016a) Politico-philosophical and regulatory framework for the creation of civil nations and nation-states at the beginning of the modern era (part two). *Współpraca Europejska*, Warszawa, Polska, Wydawca – Consilium Sp. z o.o., No. 5 (12): 99-112.

Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2020) The Russian Marxist concept of the nation: Soviet de-Stalinization problems and the main trends of anti-Marxist revisionism in post-Soviet Ukraine. *Research, challenges and development prospects in the area of social sciences: Collective monograph*. Riga: Izdevniecība “Balija Publishing,” 36-68.

Vilkov, Vyacheslav (2017) *Western Nationology of 20th Century: Conceptual Portraits. History of Nation and Nationalism Theories*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

The Concept of Force in Political Science Research. On the Example of Conflict Between Ukraine and Russia

Oktawian Piotr Żmijowski

University of Szczecin (Szczecin, Poland)
E-mail: oktawian38@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7173-363X>

Żmijowski, Oktawian Piotr (2021) The Concept of Force in Political Science Research. On the Example of Conflict Between Ukraine and Russia. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 8, 160-166. <https://doi.org/10.29202/up/8/16>

The inspiration for writing the article was a fascination with physics and the understanding that transferring force to political science should not occur by establishing appropriate rules. The variable referred to in its original form is governed by specific laws, and so it should be in all sciences that adopt this concept. The determination of the rules of force must be done by defining the problem. The article will be an attempt to answer the interdisciplinary trend and is more an attempt to answer the question of what exactly is “force” and how to define it. By discussing the definition of force, the article attempts to understand how the crisis between Ukraine and Russia may evolve. It is an attempt to transfer the concept of force to the indicated case study.

Keywords: force, politics, strategy, physics, Crimean crisis

Received: 20 February 2021 / Accepted: 06 April 2021 / Published: 29 May 2021

Introduction

Force is a physical quantity subject to its laws. Political science and various Social Sciences have adapted this concept and made it a qualitative criterion. Many geopolitical researchers use this variable to determine the position of a given country on the world map. Still, the force criterion is different – depending on the thesis that someone proves or contradicts.

If you look at the scientific articles on “force,” you can see the qualitative approach mentioned above. The theoretical approach balances power with might. It is appealing to many authorities in the field of security and placing these two concepts on the level of strategy and policy. Presenting the achievements of specific scientists, he breaks down the concept of force into entirely different aspects and erroneously balances the two English words force and

© Żmijowski, Oktawian Piotr, 2021