

---

## Europe and Nationalism: Lessons for the World

**Altaf Majeed**

PhD Scholar Department of International Relations  
GC University Faisalabad  
Email: altafgill2028@gmail.com

**Nimra Zulfqar**

Visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science  
GC University Faisalabad  
Email: nimradogar98@gmail.com

**Sadia Naz**

Lecturer, Department of Political Science  
Government College University Faisalabad  
Email: Sadiahussain160@yahoo.com

### Abstract

The basic purpose of this Paper is to introduce the reader with a different perspective on nationalism in relation to the Europe. It is assumed that nationalism develops a sagacity of arrogance, hostile attitude and abhorrence towards other nations and leads to conflicts. The study of Europe is most imperative in this regard as it is the only region in the world which has experienced almost all the political structures throughout its history; from Greek city states to Roman Empire, feudal system of England to the absolute monarchy of France. This particular region fought 30 years and 100 years wars, and two world wars in 20th century need not to be mentioned. No two rival nations in the world had the worst animosity than England and France in Europe. Later, this region became the cradle of democracy and a champion of nation state system. Currently, Europeans are witnessing highest level of peace, security, stability and economic progress in the whole world under the aegis of European Union. So, it is endeavored to determine that why such perpetual changes are befalling at European level in particular and at global level in general and what are the key propelling forces behind them. It is proposed that other volatile regions of the world such as South Asia, Central Asia, Middle East, and Africa should also follow the European suit to establish peace and security, which are the pre-requisites of social welfare and prosperity. At the end, "World Government" is found to be a crescendo of peace, security, and stability; which is not only possible but indispensable for the survival of mankind.

### Introduction

Nationalism can be defined as —a sentiment based on common demographic, geographical or cultural characteristics that bind the people together as a nation.

There are two major schools of thoughts within nationalism regarding its advent: primordialism and modernism (Christian 2010). A central point emphasized by primordialists is shared history and culture including national language and symbols. According to Herder, language is the soul of any nation: —in its speech resides, all its soul and heart (Heart 1997). Culture, in broader sense, includes games, heroes, festivals and more or less similar political and social behavior; which is imperative, for primordialists, in constituting a nation.

One most of the significant claim of the primordialists is that they ascertain —nation came before the state (Breuilly 2010). Primordialists believe that a nation possess history reaching to pre-modern time, to a pre-political society.

Modernists, on the other hand, hold totally opposite view except the congruence that national sentiments do exist. Modernists argue that nationalism emerges in Europe between the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, particularly, after the fall of church and feudal society. Different events in Europe led to the creation of a nation-state; for instance, enlightenment, treaty of Westphalia, Industrial revolution, and last but not least, French Revolution. Modernists argue that Industrial revolution led to the dilution of feudal system and a need of market emerged to sell the commodities. This need of market was satisfied by creating separate sphere of influence in the form of states. Then to stabilize and maintain this state setup, people were united by the common market and the nationalist tendencies were inculcated in them by centrally controlled institutions. So, Modernists nullify the primordialists claim that nation leads to the creation of state (Hobsbawm *et al.* 2012). Hence, according to modernists, a nation was created through the —social engineering of the people. Once the state was created to satisfy the political and economic needs of the political and capital elite; then state advanced loyalty and common culture among her citizens to unify them. To crown all, for modernists, nation proceeded by the state (Hobsbawm *et al.* 2012).

Now, attention is turned to the establishment of European Union and to scrutinize which nationalist theory elucidates the creation of European Union more effectively.

In April 1951, Six European central states, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands entered into a treaty called European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which was nothing more than an economic cooperation in one field. This Coal and Steel community transformed into —European Community in 1957, which further grew with the passage of time and became single market in 1987. This single market ultimately transformed into —European Union in 1993 —through treaty of Maastricht. A common currency and a central European reserve bank, then established through the —treaty of Amsterdam in 1999. A common European constitution was also promulgated in 2009 (EU, Treaty of

Lisbon). Since 1951, European membership has grown from 6 to 28 members; and from cooperation in one sector to the ultimate union with common currency, reserve bank, parliament, and constitution, although states still retain their sovereign status.

So, it is clear from the above mentioned facts that European Union emerged from the need of a common market, and then, it flourished into a union, which is still in an evolutionary phase and ultimately expected to become a European confederation in the future. The emergence of this dynamic economic, political and social union poses serious challenges to the phenomenon of nationalism.

Hence, through this study, flaw in nationalism and importance of regionalism is identified, which can be best achieved through the European Union model. This regionalism, then, is believed to be transformed into globalism i.e. —one world confederation in the far future. OWC (one world confederation) is expected to be an ultimate stage of international peace and security.

### **Hypothesis**

Nationalism proffers national unity but debilitates international integration leading to the statism, competition, wars, and other human miseries.

### **Research Methodology:**

This study tries to elaborate on the possible conditions for the establishment of the European union. Nationalism theory is the vital concept behind which economic conditions work. There are two schools of thought within nationalism: pre-modernist and modernist. This study scrutinizes which nationalist theory elucidates the creation of the European Union more effectively. For the accomplishment of the above objectives qualitative research techniques are used during study. This study is also an explanatory battery connected to different ideas, concepts and its causes. Secondary data has been collected from the literature available on the literature.

### **Review of Literature**

According to Tagore, nationalism is the cause of war and oppression rather peace and solidarity. It is only an organization of politics and commerce, emerged in the post religious laboratory of industrial-capitalism. He sees nationalism as an institution that aims for material well-being of the people rather than moral and spiritual health. Tagore believes that there is a need of an enlightened human cooperation rather than a commercial and political based unity (Qauyum 2011).

Christian von Compe (2010) determines the advent of nationalism. There are two major schools of thoughts within nationalism regarding its advent: primordialism and modernism. According to the primordialists, a nation consists of the people, who share common history, heritage, descendency,

and territory. On the other hand, according to modernists, a nation was created through the —social engineering‖ of the people. Once the state was created to satisfy the political and economic needs of the political and capital elite; then state advanced loyalty and common culture among her citizens to unify them. To crown all, for modernists, nation proceeded by the state. He concludes that there is no sense of primordial nationalism in European Union because they do not possess a same language though is spoken in most of the countries but still it cannot be considered as the language of whole Europe. They do not enjoy common culture and their history, except for one or two events, is entirely different. Though there are some common cultural activities that unite whole Europe but they are not enough to take EU's nationalism as primordial. On the other hand, modernist nationalism is more applicable on EU. The establishment of free market for whole European community and the reproduction of national markets as EU market but on the supranational scale support this idea. Where primordial believe that nations create state, modernists think the way round. State is built on economic and political grounds and after that the sense of nationalism and loyalty for state is injected in the hearts of people. Compe believes that the modernist approach perfectly supports the nationalism in EU and also believes that supranational body like EU can be taken as a role model as the successor of nation-states today (Christian 2010).

Whereas Dr. Moonis Ahmer (2015) in his article —The myth of Pakistani Nationalism‖ discusses the two sides of Nationalism, it can work as a uniting force can be a destructive agent. According to him when Pakistan came into being, it was a specific state with a characteristic of possessing a heterogonous society in her.

Michael (2008) examined whether nationalism generates war or war generates nationalism. If we see the European history then we note that there were more frequent wars in pre-nationalism period. In the modern times wars have become less frequent but more lethal. Mann argues that though nationalist motivations initiated World War I but it has a very little role in the proceedings of the War. The soldiers had to do a very little with nationalism. They were recruited to fight and they had to fight under their respective officers' command no matter what. The scenario in the World War II was different. There were two main nationalism driven forces i.e. Germany and Japan. Their opponents were injected with nationalism once they were attacked and they had to respond. So in the World War II, war generated nationalism.

Harry Anastasiou (2007) gives his views about nationalism by taking the example of European Union. EU's role in international peace is not usually underestimated. Europe has evolved through the historical legacy of ethno-centric nationalism and then nation state nationalism. They have deconstructed their nationalism for the purpose of democracy, peace and

finance etc. Now a day we can see that they have one of the strongest political systems. People have firm believe on their governments and so if anything goes wrong against their system people oppose it wholeheartedly through their actions. Likewise we see that they have developed the regionalism by limiting the role of nationalism and as result the have strong economies of world. Especially after the world wars they realized that they can't proceed further by holding the grudges against each other and fighting. They managed to resolve their disputes by peaceful terms and achieved the better life standards for the people of their region.

Jaguraibe (2008) gives a new insight in nationalism. According to him, the biggest threat to nationalism is the growing hegemony of the North-American states on the global market. MNCs have taken over the global market and in the process of globalization the nation-states are just formal structures with their own flags and armies but in reality they are the provinces of American Empire, a new form of colonialism i.e. economic colonization. Some of the countries are challenging the American hegemony like China and India as well as European Union which have their own tendencies. But national capital is still very important and acts as a hurdle in the way of internationalizing the world capital. Hence the intelligent understanding of domestic and international realities is necessary instead of xenophobia in the international arena. Similarly, promoting regionalism can also be an important step towards regaining lost national pride and EU can be taken as a role model in this regard.

Dr. Oral Sander (2010) expressed the positive side of nationalism by taking the example of Turkish nationalism. He gives credit to Kamal Ataturk for his efforts for developing a sense of unity in the Turkish society. Turkey was suffering enough under the European forces but Kamal Ataturk organized his people and fought a successful Turkish war national independence. Turkey alone fought its war and within years she was able to negotiate on equal terms with European powers. Kamal Ataturk developed peaceful and stable policies for external as well for internal matters by developing a peaceful foreign policy it gave the impression of turkey as a peaceful nations on international stage. Turkey under the Ataturk also stabilized its internal matters and developed a sense of strong nationalism in their people. Putting turkey on the path of modernization was also the vital step taken by at that time which liberated them from religious conflicts and they were able to install peace in their society (Sander 2010).

### **Europe: From Extreme Nationalism to a Perfect Union**

According to socio-anthropology, a nation is a community having its own culture, following a single leader and inhabiting a same territory (Daniel 1994). In medieval ages, nation was regarded as a group of people with

same linguistic background like French and German etc. The modern concept of nation state emerged during Renaissance in Italy with the nation states of Florentines, Milanese and Neapolitans etc. but the concept of nation state fully emerged in its true sense in the aftermath of Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, though before that, in 16th century Nation States of England, France, and Portugal had formed. By 18th century Nation State had evolved to its modern form and by the unification of nations of Germany and Italy in the late 19th century, the evolution of Nation-States in Europe was almost completed and it was ready to expand its wings in other continents as well (Harry 2007).

One thing is imported to note here, throughout the history, the transition in European society was fed by economic necessities. Modern state system emerged after the industrial revolution in Europe, when rulers of Europe carved their separate economic sphere of influences. This state system was later consolidated by inculcating nationalism among the people of states. The same happened for the European Union-when an economic community transformed into a union encompassing all the spheres of human life. So, behind every socio-political transformation, whether state or nationalism, there was only one main agenda and that is economic interest.

Hence, it is crystal clear that nation-state system and nationalism is not the ultimate fate of humanity. Human from so called different nations can be united to form single unit just like European Union. Europe has experienced destabilization and two great wars when it was scattered on ethnic and nationalistic lines. Nationalism is considered very attractive by many; as what is more good than to live and die for your own country, your own society, and your own people (Oral 1981). But this nationalism debilitates the global integration at the same time; for instance, if everyone starts caring about one's interest, then who will care about the global interests? It is natural when one has excessive love for one's nation or country; hatred for other nations or countries becomes a common matter.

Two world wars were the ultimate results of nationalism. If we look thoroughly the events that started World War I, we see that it was nationalism that begun the war. A nationalist Serbian killed Austrian Archduke that provoked Austrian nationalism and Austria put forwarded certain demands for redemption that was felt offended by Serbia. As a protector of Serbian national existence, Russia stepped in on which Austria objected as she felt this as a violation of Austrian national identity and Germany, in its pan- Germanism, joined hands with Austria. Similar to this nationalism of other powers of Europe was offended one way or the other and in response to this offence France, Belgium, England and Italy all joined the war to protect their nationalism and redeem their national identity (Helio 2008).

It is often claimed, especially by the socialists, that economic causes are the main causes behind wars and this claim is backed if we peek into history



and study great wars from the time of Alexander the Great or even before that era. The present-day Europe can be seen divided due to economic rivalries that emerged in the past few centuries or so. We often heard the phrases like —spheres of influence and —places in the sun are the reasons behind the wars but actually those were the economic causes as well like possession of trade privileges and foreign markets. One thing is for sure that wars are always fought for the kings and the capitalists and never for the people who actually take part in the wars. Though the wars are fought for the kings and the capitalists but they need to make sure that people are properly motivated for it. In dark and middle ages, the promise for loot and plunder, women and lands and many such promises encouraged the people for the wars for the war creators but in the last century or so these promises are not so urging for the people to go for the war for the capitalists so they used another mean, a stronger one, that compelled the civilized people to go for the war and that is Nationalism.

By the middle of 20th century most of the Europe was ethno-centric and the war taught them the unforgiving lesson over the dead and wounded bodies of millions that national sovereignty cannot be deemed as absolute. So the Europeans, after realizing the illusion of absolute national sovereignty, decided to alter their approach towards other nations in a peaceful manner and looked towards peaceful relationships with each other. They decided to disassociate themselves from the absolute sovereignty and progressed towards the idea of shared sovereignty thus laying down the bases of European integration.

Before World War II, masses used to presume nationalism a natural cause to go for a war. They find it their duty towards their nation to go for a war on their leaders' call and it was deemed as a symbol of national unity and even democracy but in reality it was nothing more than public opinion leading towards militant nationalism. But the post-war Europe was different. Europeans became indifferent towards nationalism and they stopped singing songs of the glorious past – the past that brought death for millions. Instead they adopted a new approach in relations with each other in which they were successful to achieve an integrated Europe which was knitted to help each other in the fields of economy, culture, language and society. In the post-war Europe, archrivals acknowledged the sufferings of each other. They were not blaming each other and reconciliation took over the hostilities. The removal of all nationalist stereotypes from the textbooks was another step forward towards a more integrated Europe (Harry 2007). The Europe, who experienced two world wars and lost millions of lives, now values human life more than anything. They now firmly believe that everyone has the right to live and that is why they launched a campaign to abolish capital punishment universally through a campaign of European Commission that asserted that —this stance is rooted in the belief in the inherent dignity of all human beings and the inviolability of the human

person, regardless of the crime committed (EU's Human Rights and Democratization Policy, 2007).

The post-war Europe can be taken as a perfect example of how we can end conflicts in other volatile parts of the world such as South Asia, Central Asia, Middle East, and Africa etc. and how we can endure peace throughout the globe. The European integration provides us with certain steps that can be used by any regional organization if willing to contribute towards global peace. First of all economic integration must be done which must be institutionalized based on democratic values keeping in mind the common national interests. Then every country should submit some part of her sovereignty for the greater good and verve for a shared sovereignty on the basis of trans-national democracy. They must apply rule of law across the borders for the common interests of people and put aside their national interests. Then they must go for enhancing socio-economic conditions, appeasement, peace and integration. But before doing all this they must acknowledge the value of human life. They must discourage war and realize that war is a failure of all of us as a human being.

Peace and Security along with climate change are the major issues of 21<sup>st</sup> century. No single country can tackle these menaces alone. Besides it, emerging economic and cultural ties among the countries of the world due to globalization rendered nationalism useless. Hence, the whole world should be united for the sake of humanity; because the future will witness global issues on a large scale such as security, global warming, energy and non-renewable natural resources etc. These global issues need global efforts. Ever increasing population and limited resources of the world cannot cope up with lavish lifestyle and long standing wars. The only option left is the union of the world —the world confederation or —The United States of the World. According to many realists, world government is an ideal concept and cannot be manifested into reality; the same could be said about Europe a century ago, but we see Europe united today under the single market, currency, laws, and parliament. So, one should be optimistic about the emergence of —World Government in future.

### **The Case of World Government**

World government is the concept of a single political authority with jurisdiction over all the humanity. The terms one world government, world government, and global governance are used interchangeably for this concept. The idea of global government is not new as it is under discussion since classical times. Italian Poet Dante viewed 'World Government' as a kind of Utopia. While, the Dutch scholar Hugo Grotius, regarded as the father of International Law, believed in the formation of World Government to enforce it. However, due to ever increasing nationalism in



early and cold war in late 20th century, the idea of world Government was put into hush as neither party was willing to discuss any structure which could erode their dominance over the international system. But, with the advancement of war technology including nuclear weapons and growing global issue such as climate change and terrorism, this subject has come into life again and is being argued by many leading International Relation theorists. Such as, Alexander Wendt, perhaps America's most influential IR theorist, recently suggested that a *'World Government' is simply inevitable* (Craig 2008).

Last three centuries, since the advent of industrial revolution, international system witnessed rapid changes in the socio-political ideologies and the state structures; from Feudal State System to colonialism, colonialism to nationalism, and recently, from nationalism to regionalism.

To envisage the future global political structure, it is mandatory to explore the current one; nation-state system. Nationalists believe that nation state system is based on nationalism, which entails the feelings of oneness among the people of a particular area.

On the other hand, socialists and liberalists conceive a nation-state as a common market and economic enterprise, and nationalism is only used to accomplish the economic objectives. David P. Berenberg, a renowned socialist, said: —Nationalism is the cloak behind which economic cause works. As explained earlier, there are two schools of thoughts within nationalism: Primordialist and Modernist. Primordialists believe a nation consists of the people having shared territory, shared heritage, descent, and shared history. Due to these factors, they possess the spirits of oneness and formed a nation. According to primordial concepts, nations precede states. On the other hand, modernists conceive that states precede nations through —*social engineering*. According to modernists, states were created due to political and economic needs, particularly for common accessible market after the industrial revolution. People of these common markets were then unified through the common institutions; such as common parliament, political structure, currency, education, social values, and so on. For instance: in the beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> century, Germany was scattered into 39 small states, Prussia was the biggest among all of them. They all had economic barriers; a merchant travelling from south to north or west to east had to pay duties on goods about 11 to 15 times (about 5% on each), it used to make the price of the goods almost double. As it was the beginning of rapid industrialization in this area, all these states formed a custom union (*Zollverein* in German) in 1834 under Prussian leadership to remove these barriers and become a single economic unit, in other words, a single market. There were 32 different currencies before 1834 in 39 German states, which were reduced to 2 within few years. After becoming an economic unit, all these German states were united through the railway lines for the quick movement of goods. After that, a sense of oneness among the people was

inculcated through common political institutions, values, Army, and education system. Eventually, a German confederation was formed leading to the German unification in 1871. Within few decades, this sense of nationalism in German people became so extreme that it leads to the two world wars. Similarly, America was not a nation historically but amalgamation of people from different nationalities, particular Europe and largely England. But with the passage of time, Americans were molded into one nation through —social engineering<sup>ll</sup>. Pakistan is also no exception in this case, Pakistan historically, was not a nation, and probably is not a nation in strict sense; Punjabis, Sindhi, Balochi, and Pukhtoons were different people historically with different values and language. But, an engineered nation has been created through common economic and political interests. Hence, the question arises, if these sharply different people can be united into a single unified nation for shared interests, then why different nations cannot be united under a single unified world government for global socio-economic and security interests?

It seems that realists undermine the power of world political and economic institutions, when they say, that world government is an ideal concept, not more than an illusion of insane. In the last three centuries, since the industrial revolution, all the socio-political institutions were created to serve the economic objectives of global bourgeoisie class. Current wave of globalisation is no exception; as it emphasizes on free movement of goods and capital but not humans. Man is the principal figure of not only society but the whole planet. All the modernizations, inventions, technologies etc. are meant to serve the humans; but when it comes to globalization, we have the free movement of everything but people. It is, therefore, an —incomplete globalization<sup>ll</sup>. But even it is incomplete; this wave of globalization possesses the affinities to unite the whole world into one unit. What we need are the same shared economic and political institutions, which played a cardinal role in yoking people and crafting nation states. Increasing penchant of regionalism in this century; such as European Union, African Union, ASEAN, and NAFTA etc. is another hope for such development of world government. Zbigniew Brzezinski rightly said: —This regionalism is keeping with tri-lateral plan; which calls for a gradual convergence of east and west, ultimately leading toward the goal of one world government. National sovereignty is no longer a viable concept<sup>ll</sup>. Global institutions such as United Nations, World Bank, International court of Justice etc. do exist but they are not yet strong enough to enforce their will on the so-called sovereign states in a strict way. But with the increasing pace of globalization, increasing inter- dependence of people in all the spheres of contemporary social live, and increasing global issues like peace and environment; optimism is there that this surge of globalization would ultimately unite the whole world into one unit politically and one market economically.

In the beginning of mankind, men used to live a selfish and brutish life, according to Hobbs, in the state of nature. Later on, people congregated together into a society, then society transformed into the nation and now different nations are coming together to form a global state like a world federation. So, it appears that union of all the humans into one is a natural phenomenon and ultimate destiny of mankind. Eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were the centuries of colonialism, twentieth century marked by nationalism, 21<sup>st</sup> by globalization, and 22<sup>nd</sup> century would be marked by one world government.

The tragedy of Realists is that they put too much emphasis on nationalism and claim that World government is unnatural and impossible. The fact is, every international political system including nation-state is unnatural and was artificially accomplished. There was only one natural system and that was state of nature, which proved to be enviable for peace and security. To crown all, from the above analysis, it can be concluded that World government is not only possible but inevitable. Albert Einstein once said: *"Our separation from each other is an optical illusion of consciousness."*

## CONCLUSION

Current international system is based on nation-state, and nation-state is based on nationalism which has been an attractive theory since many centuries. Since the absolute sovereignty is losing its worth with an ever increasing globalization, so does the nationalism. Besides globalization, historical consequences of nationalism also compel the world to look beyond it and carve regional ties for the benefit and welfare of their people. European Union is an excellent manifestation in this regard. The need of time is to unite the whole world to curb the enemies of peace. Besides it, regions of continuous volatility such as South Asia, Middle East, Central Asia and Africa etc. should be united following the example of European Union. These are developing (mostly underdeveloped) regions, which cannot take the burden of ethnicities and nationalism for a very long time. However, the ultimate peace and security in the world is possible only under the world government which is not only possible but a necessity of mankind.

*"To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, loyalty to family traditions, national patriotism, and religious dogmas."*

(Brock Adam, Director UN Health Organization)

## References

- Alger, Chadwick (1996). The Emerging Tool Chest for Peace-builders. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 1 (2), p. 21-45. DOI. 10.1111/j.1747-7093.2008.00139.x
- Brown, Harold (1983). Thinking about national security: defense and foreign policy in a dangerous world. *U.S. national security: a reference handbook, ABC-CLIO*, p. 281, ISBN: 978-1-59884-041-4.
- Campbell Craig (2008). The Resurgent Idea of World Government. *Ethics and International Affairs*, 22 (2), P. 133–142
- Chaim Gans (2003). The Limits of Nationalism. *Nationalist Ideologies*, University of Cambridge Press, ISBN: 0-521-80864-2
- Christian von Campe (2010). Nationalism and the European Union, p. 1-7
- Daniel Druckman (1994). Nationalism, Patriotism, and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol. 38, No. 1, Publishers: Blackwell Publishing, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/222610>
- David P. Berenberg (1917). Nationalism — A Cause of War. *The New York Call (21 October)*, volume 10, p. 6
- Dr. Oral Sander (1981). Nationalism and Peace: The Significance of Atatürk's Movement. *The Turkish Year Book*, vol. 20
- Geertz C. (2006). primordial and civic ties, p. 32
- Gifford C. (2012). The UK and the European Union: Dimensions of Sovereignty and the Problem of Eurosceptic Britishness. p.331
- Harry Anastasiou (2007). The Europe as Peace Building System: Deconstructing nationalism in an area of globalization, *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Volume 12, No. 2
- Heart J. (2010). Rethinking nationalism. P. 20
- Helio Jaguaribe (2008). Nation and nationalism in the 21st century. *Estudos avançados* 22 (62), p. 275
- Hobsbawm E. J. (1993). The Nation as Invented Tradition. p.76
- Hobsbawm E. J. and David J. Kertzer (1992). Ethnicity and Nationalism in Europe Today. *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Publishers: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3032805>.
- Marco Maertens (1997). European Integration and SubState Nationalism: Flanders, Scotland, and the EU, Department of Political Science, McGill University, Montréal, ISBN: 0-612- 37219-7
- Mohammad A. Quayum (2011). Imagining —One World: Rabindranath Tagore's Critique of Nationalism. International Islamic University Malaysia

- Peter Olesen (2008). Non-State Nationalism within the European Union. Aalborg University
- Pohl,ad Z.A. Hranice (2009). Nationalism and International Order: Acontemporary perspective.
- *Filozofla*, vol. 64, no. 9, p 861
- Ruth Elisa Roller (1999). Catalonia and European Integration: A regionalist strategy for nationalist objective. University of London, Published by ProQuest LLC, UMI: U142935
- Thomas Hylland (1991). Ethnicity vs Nationalism. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 28, no. 3, p.
- 263
- V. P. Garnon, Jr (1995). Ethnic Nationalism and International Conflicts: the case of Serbia.
- *International Security*, vol. 9, Issue 3, p. 130