Kissing Cousins: Nationalism and Realism

John J. Mearsheimer
University of Chicago

May 5, 2011

Kissing Cousins: Nationalism and Realism

Nationalism is not a key component of any realist theory. Yet most realists

appear to believe that nationalism has been an especially powerful force in

international politics. E.H. Carr and Jack Snyder, for example, have each written

books on the subject, and Barry Posen and Stephen Van Evera have written

important articles about nationalism.[1] Robert Pape argues that nationalism is the

key concept for understanding the causes of suicide terrorism.[2] Both Hans

Morgenthau and Walter Lippmann emphasized the importance of Asian nationalism

over communism when they argued against American involvement in the Vietnam

War.[3] Similarly, many realists who opposed the March 2003 invasion of Iraq argued

that Iraqi nationalism would help prevent the United States from winning a quick

and decisive victory.

It seems clear that there must be some affinity between nationalism and

realism, even if nationalism is not a key variable in realist theory. The aim of this

paper is to explore the relationship between these two isms.

As every student of international politics knows, there are numerous

theories of nationalism as well as realism. No two realists, for example, have

identical theoretical perspectives on the workings of the international system.

Nevertheless, there are certain essential features of world politics that are

incorporated into almost all realist theories. The same is true regarding

nationalism. I am not concerned with examining the differences among the various

theories in each literature or making the case for any particular theory of

nationalism or realism. Instead, my goal is to focus on the important features of

1

nationalism and realism that are common to both bodies of theory. Putting the spotlight on the overlapping attributes of these two isms allows me to talk about nationalism and realism as if they were each a single theory. Of course, they are not, but that does not matter much for my purposes.

Turning from theory to practice, there is little question that nationalism is a real-world phenomenon. It is commonplace to talk about nationalism as a powerful force in everyday life that shapes politics within and among states. However, realism is not a real-world phenomenon like nationalism. Instead, realism is a term reserved for a school of thought that purports to explain how states interact with each other. The real-world phenomenon that realists see at play and seek to explain is power politics. Specifically, they maintain that states usually act according to the logic of realist theory, which is to say that states compete with each other for power. In other words, realists believe that international relations is in good part power politics at play.

Therefore, when I move beyond the theoretical discussion of how nationalism and realism relate to each other and focus on real-world events, I will use somewhat different terminology and talk instead about the links between nationalism and power politics. Insofar as realist theory purports to explain the latter, however, it should be clear that I am still exploring the relationship between realism and nationalism.

I offer three sets of arguments. First, I try to show that there are important similarities between nationalism and realism at the foundational level. Both theories are particularistic, not universalistic, and each privileges two key concepts:

the state and survival. To illustrate this resemblance between nationalism and realism, I contrast them with liberalism and Marxism.

Second, I attempt to show that nationalism and power politics are actually intertwined phenomena that affect each other in significant ways, and this interaction has played a central role in creating the modern state system.

Third, I try to explain how nationalism has had a profound effect on various aspects of international politics that are central to the realist enterprise. In particular, I will explain how nationalism affects the balance of power, the conduct of war, the likelihood of war, and the probability that threatened states will balance against their adversaries, not bandwagon with them.

SHARED ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT POLITICS

Nationalism and realism are particularistic theories at their most basic level. They both assume that the key actors in the world are autonomous units that interact with each other as a matter of course. Because those interactions can be either beneficial or harmful, the units pay careful attention to how the behavior of the other units affects their own interests. Each unit has the right as well as the responsibility to pursue its own interests, even if it is done at the expense of the other units' interests. This privileging of one's own welfare sometimes leads the units to attempt to harm or even destroy other units.

This selfish behavior notwithstanding, the units are not hostile toward each other in all instances and they certainly are not in a constant state of war. In fact, they sometimes cooperate with each other. Nevertheless, every unit knows that there is always the possibility that another unit will threaten it. Because the

possibility of conflict is always present, the units worry about their survival, even when there is no imminent threat. Survival is not the only goal for the units, of course, but it must be their highest goal for the obvious reason that if a unit does not survive, it cannot pursue those other goals. Both realists and most theorists of nationalism also believe that there is little that the units can do to change or transcend this world.

The central unit of analysis for realism is the state, which is the most powerful political institution in the world. In contrast, the nation is the main unit of analysis for nationalism. Nations are intensely political actors for sure, but they must operate through specific political institutions to acquire and exercise power. The key institution for nations is the state, because it is so powerful relative to other political institutions. Indeed, their survival is inextricably bound up with the state, which is why each nation would prefer to have its own nation-state. In short, the state is of fundamental importance for nationalism as well as realism. Both theories treat the state as the key political actor on the planet.

Particularistic theories like nationalism and realism stand in marked contrast to universalistic theories. The latter family—which includes both liberalism and Marxism--emphasizes that the independent units that populate the world should be seriously concerned about the welfare of the other units, and not privilege their own interests over the interests of others. The units, in other words, should act primarily as if they are an integral part of a larger community, not as self-interested actors maximizing their own utility.

Realism

Realists start with the assumption that states are the major actors on the world stage. They focus most of their attention on the great powers, however, because these states have the largest impact on what happens in international politics. Realists also emphasize that states operate in an anarchic system, which is not to say that the system is characterized by chaos or disorder. Anarchy is simply an ordering principle; it means that there is no centralized authority or ultimate arbiter that stands above states. The opposite of anarchy is hierarchy, which is the ordering principle of domestic politics.[4]

Realists believe that power is the currency of international politics and that states compete with each other for power. States, in other words, pay careful attention to the balance of power. They not only try to gain power over other states, but they also make sure that no other state sharply shifts the balance of power in its favor. Realists consider war to be a legitimate tool of statecraft; they identify with Clausewitz's famous dictum that war is an extension of politics by other means.[5] In such a world, states face an ever-present danger that an adversary might attack them and in extreme circumstances threaten their survival.

There are substantial differences among realists over why states want power. For structural realists, states pursue power because the structure or the architecture of the system leaves them little choice. Specifically, in a system where there is no higher authority that sits above the great powers, and where there is no guarantee that one will not attack another, it makes good sense for each state to be powerful enough to protect itself in the event it is attacked. In essence, great powers are trapped in an iron cage where they have little choice but to compete

with each other for power if they hope to survive. In the structural realist story,

power is the key means to survival, which is the overriding goal of all states in the

system.

For classical realists, on the other hand, human nature is the main reason

why states want power.   Power is an end in itself for such realists. Hans

Morgenthau, for example, maintains that virtually everyone is born with a will to

power hardwired into them, which effectively means that great powers are led by

individuals who are bent on having their state dominate others.[6] Nevertheless,

survival figures prominently in this version of realism as well, because states

operating in a world filled with aggressive and potentially dangerous neighbors

have no choice but to constantly worry about their survival, even if their ultimate

goal is to achieve more power for its own sake.

For realists, the international community is not an important concept. It is

essentially a rhetorical device that powerful states use to sound civic minded when

they are pursuing their own narrow interests, and weak states appeal to when they

have no other recourse. The sad fact is that international politics has always been a

ruthless and dangerous business and it is likely to remain that way.

Although realism has been closely identified with the state system for

roughly the past four centuries, it is worth noting that basic realist logic can be used

to explain international politics in antiquity as well as the middle ages.   After all,

Thucydides, who is widely regarded as the father of realism, wrote his history of the

Peloponnesian War long before the first states began to emerge in Europe in the

early 1500s.[7] And Markus Fischer has shown how realism can explain many aspects

of politics among the various political entities that populated Europe in the Middle Ages, well before the state system emerged in that region.[8] In fact, Thomas Hobbes shows in *Leviathan* that basic realist logic applies to individuals in the state of nature.[9] For structural realists, the key reason for this continuity is that the structure of the international system has always been anarchic, and there has always been the possibility that at least one unit would attack another and threaten its survival. For classical realists, this permanence is due to the fact that human nature changes little over time. In sum, realism is a timeless theory.

Nationalism

Nationalism in its most basic form is based on the belief that the world is divided into a multitude of distinct nations and that each of those nations would like to have its own state. This is not to say that every national group can have its own state, just that it is the goal of almost every nation. The concept of the nation-state succinctly captures what nationalism is all about. But what exactly is a nation and what is the attraction of being linked with a modern state?

A nation is a large community of people who share the same culture. The members of the group not only have a sense that they have much in common in their daily lives, but they also believe that there are strong bonds among them. A nation is an "imagined community" in the sense that no person knows all the other members. In fact, no person knows many of his or her fellow nationals, but he or she clearly identifies with them and has certain loyalties to them because they are all members of the same nation. This is not to deny that individuals can have other

identities and loyalties. Indeed, all individuals have multiple identities. But national identity is especially powerful and trumps the others in most instances.

It is impossible to generalize about what objective features define a nation, as it varies from case to case. It is certainly not ethnicity or race, and neither language nor religion work either. To the extent we can generalize, a nation is a group of people with a powerful sense that they are part of a common culture that is based on two key factors: a shared history filled with remarkable individuals and events as well as communal symbols and practices that are pervasive in their daily lives. Naturally, they want to live together to carry on those national traditions and "validate the heritage that has been jointly received."[10] Theirs is a common destiny. As such, they care deeply that future generations will manifest the same collective identity and commitment to maintaining it.

People not only take great pride in their own nation, but they usually view it as superior to other nations. One's own nation is said to be unique and special in the most positive ways and therefore deserves to be privileged over other national groups. The views of the German nationalist, Johann Fichte, capture this perspective: "The German alone … can be patriotic; he alone can for the sake of his nation encompass the whole of mankind; contrasted with him from now on, the patriotism of every other nation must be egoistic, narrow and hostile to the rest of mankind."[11] It is hardly surprising that some nations – the United States included – view themselves as God's "chosen people."

To make the case that they are exceptional, nations invariably have to invent heroic stories about themselves. As Stephen Van Evera notes, "Chauvinist

mythmaking is a hallmark of nationalism, practiced by nearly all nationalist movements to some degree." Those myths, he argues, "come in three principal varieties: self-glorifying, self-whitewashing, and other-maligning."[12] Of course, those myths are directly linked to the nation's understanding of its history, which is why Renan said that "historical error is an essential feature in the creation of a nation."[13]

Nevertheless, nations do not always loathe each other, and sometimes they get along reasonably well. But this is not always the case, and there are many examples where rather benign nationalisms turned into ugly hypernationalism – the belief that other nations or nation-states are both inferior and threatening and must therefore be dealt with harshly. In these cases, contempt and loathing for "the other" becomes the order of the day. A transformation of this sort took place in the Balkans in the 1990s. The Croats, Muslims, and Serbs who had lived in relative harmony with each other in Yugoslavia between 1945 and 1990 were consumed by hypernationalism, as their country broke apart in the wake of the Cold War.

Given the value they place on their own unique cultural identity, nations are deeply interested in controlling their own political fate. They want self-determination, which means that almost every national believes that he or she has a right and a duty to participate in the political process. In practice, this means that nations want their own state, although that is not always possible to achieve. Before nations first came on the scene in the early eighteenth century, Europe was populated with dynastic states that were not closely connected with the people who lived inside its borders. Most people, for example, felt little attachment to the state

and they certainly had little influence on its policies. However, that world began to disappear in the wake of the French Revolution (1789), when the French nation, which had blossomed over the course of the eighteenth century, was married to the French state, producing a powerful French nation-state.[14]

Over the next one hundred years or so, other European states underwent a similar transformation. The result of this profound change was that sovereignty was no longer identified with the ruling elites or the crown; instead it was vested in the people or the nation. Thomas Paine put the point succinctly in *Rights of Man* (1791): "The Nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty."[15] The emergence of popular sovereignty meant that the broader public not only expected to influence policy but also had a powerful sense of loyalty to the state, which was inextricably bound up with their nation. In effect, this meant that most of the people would now be willing to fight and die for their state in ways that were unthinkable in the age of dynastic states, when rulers relied on mercenaries and "the criminal, the vagabond, and the destitute" from their own societies to wage war for them.[16]

Nations, of course, have good reason to worry about their survival in a world where nation-states sometimes threaten each other and where hypernationalism is commonplace. However, they also care about survival when they do not have their own nation-state, because there is always the possibility in that circumstance that a more powerful nation in their own country might attack them and possibly try to annihilate them. But even if that does not happen, there is the real danger that the dominant nation will eviscerate their culture by incorporating it into its own culture. This matter will be discussed in more detail below, but suffice it to say here

that survival is a crucial concern of nations, whether they have their own state or not.

Liberalism

Although there are important differences among modern liberal theorists, there is a core body of ideas that most of them accept, which has direct bearing on the previous discussion.[17] For starters, liberals regard the state as the principal actor on the world stage and acknowledge that there is no higher authority above states that can monitor and police their behavior. Liberals, like realists, accept the fact that states operate in an anarchic system. But unlike realists, liberals distinguish between different types of states. The key distinction is between liberal states, which are peace loving and good, and non-liberal states, which are troublemakers.

Liberals are naturally inclined to spread liberalism across the globe, ultimately producing a world where there are only liberal states. Those states, according to the liberal story, would not be different from each other in any meaningful way, other than their size, and that would not matter much. All liberal states, in other words, are effectively equals, which is reflected in the emphasis that liberals place on the notion that there is a "sovereign equality of states."[18]

And these liberal states are not just equals; they are also part of a rather close-knit community of states. It is striking how often the word "community" is employed in liberal discourse. In addition to the frequently used term, international community, one often hears reference to the Atlantic community, the European Community (EC), and security communities more generally. When Woodrow

Wilson spoke about power, a word rarely used by liberals, he spoke about the "community of power."[19] Liberals also use cognate phrases like international society and collective security.

It is apparent from this rhetoric that liberalism, at least in its modern form, is universalistic in its outlook. Or to put it in slightly different words, it is a transnational theory, not a particular theory like nationalism or realism. This point is captured in Bertrand Russell's reflection late in life on how his own thinking had evolved over time: "I grew up as an ardent believer in optimistic liberalism. I both hoped and expected to see throughout the world a gradual spread of parliamentary democracy, personal liberty, and freedom for the countries that were at that time subject to European Powers, including Britain. I hoped that everyone in time would see the wisdom of Cobden's arguments for Free Trade, and that nationalism might gradually fad into a universal humanism."[20]

The driving force behind this universalism is the respect for individual rights that sits at the core of liberalism. Unlike nationalism and realism, which subordinate the individual to the group or the state, the individual is the principal unit of analysis for liberalism. And all individuals – regardless of which country they live in – are entitled to the same package of rights, which, of course, are universal in their application. A nationalist, by contrast, would invariably treat a member of his or her own group differently than someone from another group. "The other" is simply not entitled to the same rights as fellow nationals. Liberals reject this particularist perspective and instead emphasize that human rights apply equally to people from all corners of the globe. After all, a world populated by liberal states is

a community, and everyone in it deservers to be treated the same way, especially when it comes to individual rights.

It should be clear from this discussion that although liberal theory has a place for the state, liberalism does not have a hard shell view of the state like nationalism and realism. Sovereignty, in other words, is not a cherished principle for liberals, as it is for nationalism and realism. Borders are soft and permeable in a liberal world because rights transcend borders, which not only means that people in different states have a great deal in common, but also means that liberal states have the right and the responsibility to intervene in the affairs of non-liberal states if they are violating the basic rights of their citizens. Human right norms, in other words, trump the norm of sovereignty in a liberal world.[21]

Survival is not a serious concern for states operating in a liberal world, mainly because the threat of war is taken off the table. "Constitutional democratic societies," John Rawls argues, "do not go to war with one another … because they have no cause to go to war with one another."[22] This welcome situation is due largely to the fact that there are rarely sharp and fundamental disagreements among liberal states, because they have a shared understanding about individual rights and see themselves as part of a larger community. In effect, states have essentially benign intentions towards each other and that crucial fact of life is widely recognized.

Of course, disagreements do arise, but liberal states invariably work out their differences by peaceful means, not by war. In a liberal world, the focus is on international law, international institutions, and conflict resolution, not the balance

of power. There is certainly no place in it for Clausewitz's claim that war is an extension of politics by other means. As John Ikenberry notes, "there is an optimist assumption lurking in liberal internationalism that states can overcome constraints and cooperate to solve security dilemmas, pursue collective action, and create an open, stable system."[23] In such a world, states will have little need to worry about their survival.

Marxism

Marxism, like liberalism, offers a universalistic perspective on politics. John Gray puts the point well: "Both were enlightened ideologies that looked forward to a universal civilization."[24] Class analysis is the driving force behind Marx's universalism. Specifically, he and his followers maintain that social classes, which are they key unit of analysis for understanding politics, ultimately transcend national groups and state borders. Most importantly, they argue that there is a powerful bond among the working classes in different countries, all of who are exploited by the capitalist classes in their respective countries. This line of thinking explains why some Marxists thought that the working classes or proletariat in different European countries would not take up arms against each other when World War I broke out in 1914. Instead, the workers of the world would unite in opposition to the war and refuse to fight.

Marxists pay careful attention to the state, but given the transnational nature of social classes in their story, the state hardly has a firm shell around it. More importantly, however, the state is expected to "wither away" over time as the proletariat triumphs over its rivals and eventually produces a classless society.

Nevertheless, states remain critically important actors as long as the capitalist

classes are influential, and those states will continue to engage in violent conflict,

which means they will worry about their survival. But once the proletariat gains its

final victory and eliminates class conflict altogether, the state will disappear, mainly

because political conflict will be erased from the system, and thus there will be no

need for a state. After all, the principle purpose of the state in Marxist theory is for

one class to suppress another; but that issue is irrelevant in a classless society. As

Lenin put it, "Only Communism makes the state absolutely unnecessary, for there is

nobody to be suppressed."[25] Survival will obviously not be a serious concern in this

world, which will have little place for politics. In essence, Marxism, like liberalism,

but unlike nationalism and realism, tells an optimistic story about human progress.

In sum, nationalism and realism are particularistic theories that bear marked

resemblance to each other and little resemblance to liberalism and Marxism, which

are universalistic theories at their core.[26]

THE DRIVING FORCES BEHIND THE MODERN STATE SYSTEM

There were no states in Europe in the fifteenth century. Instead, that region

was populated with a variety of organizational forms, to include empires, city-states,

duchies, principalities, urban federations, and various kinds of religious

organizations. Europe, as Charles Tilly puts it, was characterized by "intensely

fragmented sovereignty."[27] There were also no states outside of Europe.

The first states – England, France, and Spain – began to take form around

1500 and over the course of the next 300 years, the dynastic state became the

principle political actor in Europe. After 1800, the dynastic state gave way to the

nation-state, and that political structure eventually spread across the globe.[28] The

contemporary international system is comprised almost exclusively of nation-states.

As David Armitage notes, "The great political fact of global history in the last 500

years is the emergence of a world of states from a world of empires. That fact –

more than the expansion of democracy, more than nationalism, more than the

language of rights, more even than globalization – fundamentally defines the

political universe we all inhabit."[29]

What accounts for this remarkable transformation over five centuries from

such a heterogeneous world system to such a homogeneous one? Although many

factors helped cause this profound shift, the two main driving forces were

nationalism and power politics, which have interacted with each other in profound

ways to help create the modern state system. Specifically, it is their emphasis on the

state and survival that that connects them together in ways that have promoted the

proliferation of nation-states.

The best way to understand this linkage is to start with an explanation of

how the preoccupation with survival that is at the heart of power politics helped

create states and spread that political form around the world. I will then show how

the analogous concern that nations have for their own survival pushes them to want

their own nation-state for protection. And consistent with basic realist logic,

nations want a powerful state so as to maximize their prospects for survival over

the long-term.

How Power Politics Helped Create the State System

Before there were states, the various political entities that populated Europe

engaged in almost constant security competition, which sometimes led to war.

When states began to emerge in Europe at the end of the fifteenth century, they had

little choice but to join the fray. Of course, all of the political units in Europe cared

greatly about their survival in what was a cutthroat milieu where there the danger

of being erased from the map was always present.

Staying alive in that dangerous world was largely a function of performance

on the battlefield, where unsurprisingly the most powerful actors tended to prevail.

Charles Tilly famously tells the story of how the state proved superior to all other

organizational forms at building military power and winning wars.[30] Military

success depends in good part on having money to finance an army and a navy and

sufficient numbers of people to build relatively large fighting forces. Of course,

those resources have to be extracted from the population, which means that ceteris

paribus it is better to have a large rather than small population. The state was

superior to all of its competitors at extracting resources from the resident

population and translating them into military might. Thus the state ultimately ran

all of its competitors out of the European system, mainly because they could not

build sufficient military power to compete on the battlefield. Survival, in other

words, came to depend on having a state.

This basic logic runs like a red skein through Machiavelli's *The Prince*. There

was no unified Italian state in the early 16th century when Machiavelli was writing

that famous tract. The Italian peninsula was instead populated with small city-

states that fought among themselves and often fell prey to French or Austrian

aggression. "This barbarian domination," he wrote, "stinks to everyone." Italy, he

believed was in a state of "slavery and disgrace." The taproot of the problem, he

reasoned, was that Italy was divided: "For I do not believe that divisions ever do any

good; on the contrary, when the enemy approaches, of necessity divided cities are

immediately lost, because the weaker party always joins the external forces and the

other will not be able to rule."[31]

Machiavelli understood that the best way to fix this problem would be to

transcend Italy's city-state system and create a single Italian state that could stand

up to the surrounding states – Austria and France – and keep them at bay. The

brutal and frank advice that he was offering to some future Italian prince was

principally aimed at helping him to unify Italy and "redeem her from these

barbarous cruelties and insults."[32] Of course, that would not happen until the

middle of the nineteenth century. In essence, Machiavelli understood that the

Italians would have to imitate their larger and more powerful neighbors if they

hoped to survive.

Machiavelli was writing at a time when the dynastic state was emerging in

Europe. While that early version of the state was skilled at extracting resources

from the population, the people actually had little loyalty to the state. Sovereignty

was lodged in the crown. Louis XIV said it best when he pronounced: "L'état c'est

moi." That situation changed drastically in the wake of the French Revolution

(1789), when France turned itself into Europe's first nation-state. The emergence of

nationalism in France meant that many French people suddenly felt a powerful

allegiance to the French state and were willing to fight and die for it. Nationalism

was, in effect a huge force multiplier that allowed Revolutionary and Napoleonic France to create a remarkably powerful mass army that overran most of Europe. Indeed, it took twenty-three years (1792-1815) and six different great power coalitions to decisively defeat France, which had no great power as an ally in all those years.[33]

The other European states eventually came to realize that if they hoped to survive in the European cockpit, they had little choice but to imitate France and turn themselves into nation-states. Prussia's actions during the Napoleonic Wars provide a clear example of this phenomenon at work. Napoleon's army decisively defeated the Prussian army in battles at Jena and Auerstedt in October 1806. Prussia's leaders feared nationalism, but they realized that their only hope for getting out from under Napoleon's yoke was to imitate France and use nationalism to turn their army into a much more formidable fighting force. They took the necessary steps and subsequently played a key role between 1813 and 1815 in helping finish off Napoleon's armies and end his reign.[34]

By the early twentieth century, every state in Europe was effectively a nation-state. Sovereignty no longer resided in the crown, but was now lodged in the people.[35] In sum, the logic of power politics – with its emphasis on survival – played a critical role in helping the dynastic state to best its various competitors in early modern Europe, and then it helped the nation-state put the dynastic state out of business.

Why Nations Want States

Let us now consider the role that the nation has played in creating the modern state system. Nations want their own state because it is the best way to maximize their prospects for survival in a world of competing nations. Of course, not every nation can have its own state, and nations are not necessarily doomed to disappear if they do not have their own state. As Yael Tamir notes, "The right to self-determination can be realized in a variety of different ways: cultural autonomies, regional autonomies, federations, and confederations."[36] But even she acknowledges that, "Unquestionably a nation-state can ensure the widest possible degree of national autonomy and the maximum range of possibilities for the enjoyment of national life."[37] Thus, nations push from the bottom up to establish states that they can dominate and run.

Nations have worried about their survival for three reasons. The first has to do with the intrusive nature of the modern state. The dynastic state did not interfere much in the daily lives of the people who lived inside its borders. It mainly collected taxes and looked for relatively small numbers of young men who might serve in the army. Otherwise people were pretty much left alone to operate within their own culture, of which there was a wide variety. But that situation changed drastically over the course of the nineteenth century as the state became more deeply involved in the daily lives of its citizens. Very importantly, states developed powerful incentives to homogenize the people inside their borders into a single culture with a common language and a shared history.[38]

This push to assimilate everyone into a common culture makes good economic sense in the industrial age, as Ernest Gellner argues in his classic work,

Nations and Nationalism. After all, it markedly improves economic efficiency to have workers and bosses who all speak the same language and observe the same customs. It is also important to have an educated work force, which meant that the state has to create a large-scale public school system. "The monopoly of legitimate education," Gellner writes, "is now more important, more central than is the monopoly of legitimate violence."[39] Naturally, this emphasis on public schooling raises the contentious question: which nation's version of history will be taught in the schools?

Furthermore, as Barry Posen points out, "any argument that one can make for the economic function of literacy and a shared culture is at least as plausible for a military function, particularly in mass warfare."[40] There is an abundance of evidence that shows that educated soldiers are far superior to illiterate ones, and that soldiers who speak the same language and share the same customs can obviously be better integrated into an effective fighting force than soldiers who come from diverse cultures where different languages are spoken. In short, it makes good economic as well as military sense to have a well-educated population that shares a common culture.[41]

This impulse to homogenize the culture, which is synonymous with nation building, is a potentially grave danger for any minority group in a multi-national state, simply because the majority is likely to control the assimilation process and ensure that its language and traditions define the new common culture. Minority cultures, on the other hand, are likely to be pushed aside and maybe even disappear in the process. As Walker Connor points out, states that are engaged in nation

building are invariably in the business of nation-breaking as well, and nobody wants their nation to be destroyed.[42] The best way for any culture of nation to avoid that outcome is to have its own state. This basic logic, of course, explains why so many multi-national states have broken apart over the past two centuries.

The second reason that minority nations worry about their survival is the danger that they might be killed in a civil war. A good example is the Hutu genocide against the Tutsis in Rwanda in the spring of 1994. A murderous campaign against a minority group might happen for any one of a number of reasons. For example, it might be driven by resentment against the minority for its disproportionate influence in the economy. Or the minority might be seen as a fifth column, as happened with the Armenians inside Turkey during World War I.[43] It is therefore safer to have your own state rather than be on the short end of the power balance in a fractious multi-national state.

Finally, national survival was a matter of central importance for subject peoples during the age of imperialism.[44] Indeed, this fear played the key role in spreading the modern state system beyond Europe. Between the early sixteenth century and the mid-twentieth century, empires run by the European great powers covered large portions of the globe. The indigenous people who were the subjects in those far-flung empires faced the grave danger that their cultures might be overwhelmed by the imperial power's culture. The best way to deal with this threat and gain self-determination was to rise up and break away from the empire, establishing your own state in the process. This is what happened over the course of the twentieth century and explains not only why the sun has set on all of the

European empires, but also why the every region of the world now contains nation-states.

Why Nations Want Powerful States

Once a nation has its own state, it invariably wants that nation-state to be as powerful as possible so as to maximize its prospects of surviving in the rough and tumble of international politics. This is "Realism 101" with a twist. Whereas realism focuses on the survival of the state, which it treats as a black box, the emphasis here is on the survival of the nation-state. To be more precise, the aim is not just to protect the state, but also the nation that underpins it. In essence, basic realist logic not only motivates power politics, it also influences nationalism in important ways.

My bottom line is that the nation-state system is largely the product of the inter-play between nationalism and power politics, both of which privilege the state and are motivated by concerns about survival.

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

There is another dimension to the close linkage between nationalism and realism. The emergence of nationalism as a potent force over the past two centuries has had a marked effect on aspects of international politics that are of central importance to realism's intellectual agenda.

The Balance of Power

Nationalism, as emphasized, allows states to build large and powerful armies, which means it has the potential to shift the balance of power in marked ways. These changes in how power is distributed among states can, in turn, affect who

wins or loses a war. They also can affect the likelihood that one state will be able to deter or coerce a rival state.

Because nationalism creates tight bonds between a people and their state, it is relatively easy for leaders to call on their citizens to serve in the military and provide the government with a steady flow of resources. Of course, many people will be willing to make great sacrifices – including the ultimate sacrifice – in times of extreme emergency. This means that nation-states can raise large militaries and sustain them over long periods of time, even when they are involved in deadly quarrels. None of the great powers, for example, ran out of soldiers in World War I. During each year of that lethal conflict, the governments routinely replaced their lost soldiers with a new crop of eligible teen-age males.

Nationalism, however, does not just mean an increase in the size of a country's military forces. It also means that its soldiers, sailors, and airmen are likely to be more reliable and more willing to fight and die for their state. In the age of the dynastic state, desertion was a major problem for military commanders both before and during battles. The underlying cause of this problem was that most of the troops – many of whom were mercenaries – had hardly any loyalty to the country in whose name they were fighting and they understandably did not want to die in combat. But when nationalism came on the scene, desertion became much less of a problem, because the fighting forces were now willing to put themselves in harm's way to defend their country. Napoleon captured this shift when he proclaimed, "All men who value life more than the glory of the nation and the esteem of their comrades should not be members of the French army."[45]

Nationalism's effect on the outcome of a war is greatest when one side uses it to build a powerful military and the opposing side does not. As noted, France capitalized on nationalism in the wake of its revolution (1789) and created the most powerful army in Europe by far. Clausewitz, an officer in the Prussian military who fought against that French army, writes that after Napoleon fine-tuned it, "This juggernaut of war, based on the strength of the entire people, began its pulverizing course through Europe. It moved with such confidence and certainty that whenever it was opposed by armies of the traditional type there could never be a moment's doubt as to the result."[46]

Another case in which nationalism played to the advantage of one side over another is the 1948 war between Israel and its Arab rivals. That conflict was actually comprised of two separate wars: 1) a civil war between the Zionists and the Palestinians that began on November 29, 1947 (the date of the UN decision to partition Mandatory Palestine) and ran until May 14, 1948, when Israel declared independence; 2) an international war between Israel and five Arab armies that began on May 15, 1948 and lasted until January 7, 1949. There were about 650,000 Jews in Mandatory Palestine during this time and roughly 1.3 million Palestinians, which means that the Zionists were outnumbered by the Palestinians by about 2:1.[47] The surrounding Arab countries that went to war against Israel had roughly 30 million people, which meant they outnumbered the Jews by about 46:1.[48]

Yet the Zionist fighting forces not only outnumbered their Palestinian opponents by a wide margin, they were also qualitatively far superior and much better organized as well.[49] It is no accident that the Zionists easily trounced the

Palestinians in the first half of 1948. The same story applies to the balance of power between the Israeli army and the five Arab armies it fought in the second half of 1948. Indeed, Israel's army was much larger than the combined size of all five Arab armies and it was far better trained and organized than all of them. To be more specific, Israel eventually mobilized 13.5 percent of its population in the 1948 war, while none of its Arab adversaries mobilized more than 0.5 percent of its population.[50] It is no surprise that Israel handily won the international war too.

The root cause of Israel's good fortune was nationalism. The Zionists who came to Israel in the first half of the twentieth century were deeply committed nationalists who were not only determined to create a Jewish state, but were also willing to make enormous sacrifices for that state. Zionist leaders naturally worked hard to build the institutions that would eventually form the foundation of that state while constantly fostering even greater nationalism among the public. As Benny Morris notes, "By the late 1940s, the Yishuv was probably one of the most politically conscious, committed, and well-organized communities in the world." And "this highly sophisticated national center," as Keren Fraiman notes, "facilitated the creation and maintenance of a 'people in arms'."[51]

In the Arab world, on the other hand, nationalism was a weak force that was just beginning to get traction. Consequently, there was a weak bond between the state and the broader public in Israel's adversaries, which hindered their ability to raise large and efficient fighting forces. Fraiman, Rashid Khalidi, and Morris all emphasize that one of the main reasons why the Palestinians were clobbered in 1948 was that there was little sense of nationhood and virtually no corresponding

institutions. Khalidi, for example, writes, "The Palestinians still had no functioning national-level institutions, no central para-state mechanism, no serious financial apparatus, and no centralized military force."[52] As Morris notes, "The contrast with Zionist society was stark."[53] The sense of nationhood in the five Arab that fought Israel was only slightly more developed, which greatly limited their ability to extract resources and generate formidable military forces. Given those circumstances, Israel was bound to win, showing clearly that nationalism can be a huge force multiplier that has the potential to shift the balance of power in ways that affect who prevails in war.

The Conduct of War

Nationalism has a profound effect on how wars are fought and the form they take. In particular, wars between modern nation-states tend to escalate into what are often called total or absolute wars, which is where each side will accept nothing less than decisive victory over its adversary. Given this impulse to escalate, it is difficult to fight wars with limited force and limited aims. Before nationalism arrived on the scene in Europe in the late 18th century, almost all of the great power wars were limited in scope and means.

But as Clausewitz recognized first hand, that world was turned upside down during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. "One might wonder," he wrote, "whether there is any truth at all in our concept of the absolute character of war were it not for the fact that with our own eyes we have seen warfare achieve this state of absolute perfection." His classic work, *On War*, is actually an attempt "to grasp the concept of modern, absolute war in all its devastating power."[54] Indeed,

Clausewitz's famous dictum that war is an extension of politics by other means is designed in part to make the case that civilian leaders should go to great lengths to limit wars when it makes good political sense, while recognizing that war's natural tendency in the age of nationalism is to escalate to its absolute form.[55]

Modern wars often escalate because national armies tend to be large and have substantial staying power, which means that they are well suited for waging total war. Furthermore, when mass armies clash with each other, the result, to quote Clausewitz, is "primordial violence, hatred and enmity."[56] This kind of hostility almost guarantees that each side will be so enraged with the other that it will demand decisive victory and refuse to settle for a limited victory.

This phenomenon is compounded by the fact that governments usually have to motivate their publics to make great sacrifices to win these wars. Most importantly, some substantial number of citizens has to be convinced to serve in the military and possibly die for their country. One way that leaders motivate their people to fight modern wars is to portray the adversary as the epitome of evil and a mortal threat to boot. Doing so, however, makes it almost impossible to negotiate an end to a war short of total victory. After all, how can one negotiate with an adversary that is thought to be the devil incarnate? It makes much more sense to pull out every punch to destroy that opponent. Of course, both sides are invariably drawn to this conclusion, which rules out any hope of a compromise settlement.

The Causes of War

Nationalism also has a significant effect on the likelihood of war, although one cannot simply say that it makes war more or less likely. In fact, it cuts in both

directions. It seems clear that at a general level nationalism has a pacifying effect on international politics. There is no question, however, that there are circumstances where the political arrangements among different nations is a cause of intense hostility that sometimes leads to war.

There are two important ways in which nationalism lessens the probability of war. First, because nationalism makes war more deadly by pushing it toward its absolute form, it makes war less likely. The reason is simple: states are unlikely to start wars that they think will be costly. This is why nuclear weapons are the ultimate deterrent; it is difficult to imagine winning a nuclear war at some reasonable cost. A similar logic applies to nationalism, although a state still might conclude that it can avoid a costly war by devising a clever strategy.[57]

Still, leaders know that in the age of nationalism the war will probably turn into a protracted bloodbath if the strategy fails to achieve its aims. The prospect of that awful outcome will make policymakers reluctant to initiate a war, which is not to deny that they will sometimes be willing to bet that the clever strategy will work as designed. That strategy, however, will have to be designed to decisively defeat the adversary, not to win a limited victory. The problem with a limited aims strategy is that the victim is unlikely to accept defeat, however limited, and the war is therefore likely to turn into a protracted and costly conflict.

Not surprisingly, there is an abundance of evidence which shows that since 1800, when nationalism first began to have an impact on international politics, great-power wars have become much less frequent, but much more deadly.[58] Of course, limited wars were the norm before 1800, which is why they were less lethal,

and I would argue, more frequent. Since then, however, great powers have often

sought decisive victories over each other, which has driven the costs of war up, but

the likelihood down.

Second, even if one state conquers another state, nationalism makes it

difficult for the victor to occupy the vanquished state.[59] As the United States learned

in Vietnam and more recently in Afghanistan and Iraq, nation-states worship at the

alter of self-determination, which means that a substantial portion of the population

in an occupied country is likely to rise up against the occupying forces and try to

push them out of their country. In such cases, the occupier invariably ends up

bogged down fighting against insurgents, who are usually hard to defeat.

None of this is to deny that occupation can succeed under special

circumstances – witness Germany and Japan in the early Cold War – or there can be

wars where the victor does not occupy the defeated country for any appreciable

period of time. Nevertheless, occupation often follows military victory and it is hard

to do successfully in the age of nationalism, which makes war less likely.

Unfortunately, nationalism can sometimes make war more likely.[60] Indeed, it

has played a key role in causing numerous wars during the past two centuries. The

problem manifests itself in two ways. First, nations that do not have their own state

and feel threatened by another national group are sometimes willing to fight to gain

one. This consideration was the main driving force behind the various wars of

decolonization that brought down the overseas European empires after World War

II. Kenyans, for example, did not want to live under British rule; nor did the

Vietnamese want to be ruled by France.   Both peoples wanted their own state and

were willing to wage war to achieve that goal. The same logic can apply to minority groups in multi-national states that want a state of their own.   Croats and Kosovars, for example, did not want to be part of Yugoslavia and went to war in the 1990s to gain their independence. Chechnya went to war against Russia in 1994 to gain its own state. There are many other such examples from the past two centuries.

Nationalism can help cause war in a second way. States sometimes go to war to acquire territory that contains fellow nationals so as to create a larger national unit. Piedmont, for example, precipitated a war involving Austria and France in 1859 to facilitate the unification of Italy. And Bismarck took Prussia to war against Austria in 1866 and then France in 1870 so that he could create a unified Germany. More recently, both Croatia and Serbia went to war against Bosnia in the early 1990s so that they cold incorporate the Bosnian territory that contained Croats and Serbs into their respective countries.

This discussion does point up that reducing the number of multinational states and increasing the number of pure nation-states increases the prospects for peace. Indeed, Europe is more peaceful today in part because many of the states in Eastern Europe are more homogeneous today than they were in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Istvan Deak touches on this very point when he writes: "It may be cruel, but twentieth changes in Eastern Europe's ethnic mosaic could hold the key to better relations among the East European states. Though achieved at the price of incredible cruelty and suffering, these changes have drastically diminished the number of ethnic minorities, and thus also the number of potential conflicts."[61]

Nevertheless, many of the countries that once constituted the Soviet Union contain intermingled nations and are thus a source of potential trouble.[62]

Of course, there are still many nations that do not have their own state and some countries that have diasporas in neighboring states. Africa is a potentially dangerous region in this regard, as the ongoing conflict in Sudan makes clear. A recent article in the *New York Times* succinctly summarized the problem: "Africa is wracked by separatists … they direct their fire against weak states struggling to hold together disparate populations within boundaries drawn by 19th-century white colonialists."[63] Thus, nationalism is likely to remain an important cause of war for the foreseeable future. At the same time, however, **its** impact on the nature of war cuts in the other direction and makes it a force for peace.

Balancing, Bandwagoning and Contagion

There has been much discussion in the international relations literature about whether states balance or bandwagon against powerful adversaries. With balancing, threatened states seriously commit themselves to containing their dangerous opponent. With bandwagoning, the threatened state abandons hope of preventing the aggressor from gaining power at its expense and instead joins forces with its dangerous foe, possibly to get at least some small portion of the spoils of war. These strategies represent stark alternatives for dealing with threatening rivals.

This same dispute has also been at the heart of some important policy debates. For example, the controversial domino theory, which was influential in the United States during the first half of the Cold War, was predicated on the

assumption that states are prone to bandwagoning behavior.[64] Specifically,

proponents of that theory argued that if a state in a particular region fell to

communism because the United States failed to defend it, other states in that region

would quickly and easily fall to communism and soon the entire region would be

under the sway of Moscow. Communism would then spread to other regions and

eventually the entire world would be dominated by the Soviet Union.

The bandwagoning that underpinned the domino theory was expected to

result from sharp shifts in three different "balances." First, the balance of resolve

between the superpowers would shift against the United States, because the Soviet

Union would be emboldened by its victory, while America's leaders would be

infused with defeatism. Second, the balance of credibility would shift against the

United States, because it would be seen across the world as an undependable loser;

allies would move away from Uncle Sam and instead side with the Soviet Union,

which would be widely regarded as a reliable ally that could win when it counted.

Third, the balance of power would shift against the United States, because it would

lose an ally to the Soviet Union.

The domino theory was not built around bandwagoning logic alone; it was

also based on the belief that communist ideology would spread across the globe

with relative ease. Marxism, after all, offers a universalistic theory of politics, which

should make it appealing to people all around the world. Whereas bandwagoning

depends on using force to spread communism, contagion relies on emulation to

accomplish that same goal. Not surprisingly some of the early Bolsheviks also

believed that it would be relatively easy to foment a world revolution that ended up

with communism in almost every country. Lenin, for example, said one month before the Russian Revolution, "We are on the eve of a worldwide revolution." This faith in contagion also appears to be reflected in a famous comment made that Leon Trotsky, the Soviet Union's commissar for foreign affairs, made in 1917: "I shall issue some revolutionary proclamations to the peoples and then close up shop."[65]

The Bush doctrine was also predicated on domino logic. At the end of the Cold War, many American's believed that liberal democracy had triumphed over fascism in the first half of the twentieth century and communism in the second half, and that liberal democracy to quote Francis Fukuyama, would be "the final form of government."[66] Moreover, the universal appeal of liberal democracy would make it relatively easy to spread it across the globe. People of all types want to live in that kind of society, so the argument went, but brutal dictators sometimes stood in their way. The Bush administration and its neoconservative allies believed that the United States could accelerate the spread of liberal democracy in the Middle East by using the American military to topple dictators like Saddam Hussein. It would not take more than two or three victories in places like Iraq before bandwagoning took effect and the remaining dictators in the region effectively surrendered to the United States rather than fight a losing war in which they might be killed.

Of course, the dominos did not fall in Asia after the United States was defeated by communist North Vietnam, which was aided by China and the Soviet Union, both stalwarts of the communist world at the time. In fact, shortly after Vietnam was unified, it fought wars with communist Cambodia and communist China. Moreover, China and the Soviet Union were bitter rivals throughout the

period when they were helping North Vietnam fight against the United States.   The Bush Doctrine also did not work according to plan, mainly because the United States found itself stuck in a quagmire in Iraq, but also because other countries in the region – including key allies like Saudi Arabia – saw the American policy of spreading liberal democracy at the end of a rifle barrel not as a welcome development, but as a threat.

Realists were not surprised that the domino theory proved illusory or that the Bush Doctrine crashed and burned in Iraq. These outcomes, after all, conform to the logic of nationalism and realism.[67] Specifically, realists believe that threatened states rarely bandwagon with their adversaries; they balance against them or rely on other states to do the balancing for them.[68] Contrary to the domino theory, one should not have expected the United States to allow the balances of resolve, credibility and power to shift against it after losing in Vietnam. Instead, one should have expected the United States to continue its efforts to contain the Soviet Union and its allies around the world, which is what happened. Nor should one have expected other states in Asia – or anywhere else – to jump on the Soviet bandwagon and start taking orders from Moscow. With or without nationalism, states balance against threats because they care about their own survival. The presence of nationalism, however, reinforces that balancing imperative, because then it is not simply the state's survival that is at risk, but the nation's survival as well.

Turning to contagion, the other driving force behind the domino theory, realists would not expect policies based on universalistic theories like Marxism and liberalism to work as advertised. Realists emphasize that the particular interests of

states almost always trump transnational ideologies and limit their effectiveness. Not surprisingly, that other particularistic theory, nationalism, buttresses realism on this score. The people in one nation-state may be sympathetic to an ideology promoted by another state, but they ultimately care more about self-determination. Thus, they tend to worry about other states trying to impose their way of thinking on them and they strive to protect themselves against foreign intervention.

In sum, nationalism reinforces the inclination that states have to balance against their adversaries, not bandwagon with them, while nationalism and realism act together as powerful antidotes to contagion.

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to explore the relationship between nationalism and realism, two of the most well known bodies of theory in political science, which are usually treated in isolation from each other. I have made the case that they share fundamental assumptions about political life that stand in marked contrast to the assumptions that underpin more universalistic theories like liberalism and Marxism. Moreover, I have argued that in the real world, nationalism and power politics have interacted with each other in ways that have played a major role in shaping the modern state system. Finally, I have attempted to show that nationalism has a significant effect on facets of world politics that concern realist scholars.

ENDNOTES

[1] E.H. Carr, *Nationalism and After* (New York: Macmillan, 1945); Barry R. Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 2, (Fall 1993), pp. 80-124; Barry R. Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict" *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring 1993), pp. 27-47; Jack L. Snyder, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* (New York: Norton, 2000); Jack Snyder, Nationalism and the Crisis of the Post-Soviet State," *Survival*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring 1993), pp. 5-26; Stephen Van Evera, "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1994), pp. 5-39.

[2] Robert A. Pape, *Dying to Win: The Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (New York: Random House, 2006).

[3] Fredrik Logevall, "First Among Critics: Walter Lippmann and the Vietnam War," *The Journal of American-East Asian Relations*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter 1995), pp. 351-76; Jennifer W. See, "A Prophet Without Honor: Hans Morgenthau and the War in Vietnam, 1955-1965," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 70, No. 3 (August 2001), pp. 419-47.

[4] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979), chapter 5.

[5] Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. and ed. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp. 88, 605-610.

[6] Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th ed. (New York, Knopf, 1973), chapter 3.

[7] Robert B. Strassler, ed., *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998).

[8] Markus Fischer, "Feudal Europe, 800-1300: Communal Discourse and Conflictual Practices," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Spring 1992), pp. 427-66.

[9] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1986).

[10] Ernest Renan, "What Is a Nation?" in Shlomo Sand, ed., *On the Nation and the "Jewish People*," trans. David Fernbach (London: Verso, 2010), p 63.

[11] Quoted in Anatol Lieven, *America Right or Wrong: An Anatomy of American Nationalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 34.

[12] Van Evera, "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War," p. 27.

[13] Renan, "What Is a Nation?" p. 45.

[14] David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); William H. Sewell, Jr., "The French Revolution and the Emergence of the Nation Form," in Michael A. Morrison and Melinda Zook, eds., *Revolutionary Currents: Nation Building in the Transatlantic World* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), pp. 91-125.

[15] Quoted in Robert Jackson, *Sovereignty: Evolution of an Idea* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2007), p. 78.

[16] Geoffrey Best, *War and Society in Revolutionary Europe, 1770-1870* (London: Fontana Paperbacks, 1982), p. 30.

[17] Liberalism has gone through something of a transformation over time. Early liberal theorists were inclined to emphasize disagreement over fundamental values, and thus the need for figuring out ways to manage conflict that might arise from those disputes. That perspective eventually gave way to a new form kind of liberalism that assumed that there are only minor differences among most people about what constitutes the good life, and thus it is possible to conceive of universal values. "Liberalism," as John Gray notes, "has always had two faces. From one side, toleration is the pursuit of an ideal form of life. From the other, it is the search for peace among different ways of life." John Gray, *Two Faces of Liberalism* (New York: New Press, 2000), p. 2. The focus here is on the more contemporary form of liberalism, with its universalistic outlook. The earlier form of liberalism, however, is particularistic at its core and thus is more closely identified with nationalism and realism. See Deborah Boucoyannis, "The International Wanderings of a Liberal Idea, or Why Liberals can Learn to Stop Worrying and Love the Balance of Power," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (December 2007), pp. 703-27.

[18] G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (March 2009), p. 75.

[19] Quoted in Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0," p. 75.

[20] Quoted in Duncan Bell and Casper Sylvest, "International Society in Victorian Political Thought: T.H. Green, Herbert Spencer, and Henry Sidgwick," *Modern International History*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (August 2006), pp. 207-208.

[21] See, for example, Seyla Benhabib, "Claiming Rights across Borders: International Human Rights and Democratic Sovereignty," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 103, No. 4 (November 2009), pp. 691-704.

[22] John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 8.

[23] Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0," p. 72.

[24] John Gray, *Black Mass: Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), p. 30.

[25] V.I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1970), p. 108. Also see Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Duhring: Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969).

[26] Some scholars argue that civic nationalism is an important force in world politics, especially in Western Europe. They contrast it with cultural and ethnic nationalism, which is said to be prevalent in Eastern Europe. Civic nationalism is essentially liberal nationalism. It is predicated on the belief that a people's identity can be based solely on the liberal creed; nationalism, so the argument goes, does not require a cultural or ethnic dimension. In essence, liberalism and nationalism can be neatly married together in the right circumstances, eliminating any serious tensions between them. This argument, however, cannot stand up to close scrutiny. No nation-state is a pure civic state; all are based on a cultural core. See Gregory Jusdanis, *The Necessary Nation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), chapter 5; Taras Kuzio, "The Myth of the Civic State: A Critical Survey of Hans Kohn's Framework for Understanding Nationalism," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (January 2002), pp. 20-39; Anthony W. Marx, *Faith in Nation:* Exclusionary Origins of Nationalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 113-17; Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997); Ken Wolf, "Hans Kohn's Liberal Nationalism: The Historian as Prophet," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1976), pp. 651-672.

[27] Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992), p. 32.

[28] Most nation-states, it should be emphasized, are comprised of more than one nation.

[29] David Armitage, "The Contagion of Sovereignty: Declarations of Independence since 1776," *South African Historical Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (2005), p. 1.

[30] Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States*. Also see Otto Hintze, "The Formation of States and Constitutional Development: A Study in History and Politics," and "Military Organization and the Organization of the State," in Felix Gilbert, ed., *The*

Historical Essays of Otto Hintze (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 157-215.

[31] Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 2nd ed., trans. Harvey C. Mansfield (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 53, 84, 105.

[32] See especially Machiavelli, *The Prince*, p. 102. See more generally, pp. 101-105.

[33] For an overview of France's military might and its military campaigns between 1792 and 1815, see John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001), pp. 272-288.

[34] Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," pp. 89-99. Also see Peter Paret, *Yorck & the Era of Prussian Reform, 1807-1815* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966); Peter Paret, *Clausewitz and the State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

[35] Robert Jackson, *Sovereignty: Evolution of an Idea* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2010), chapters 3-4.

[36] Yael Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. xiv.

[37] Tamir, *Liberal Nationalism*, p. 74.

[38] Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen* (Stanfotd, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976).

[39] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), p. 34.

[40] Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," p. 85.

[41] It should be noted that because wealth is the foundation of military power, any efforts to facilitate the growth of a state's economy has significant national security implications. All of this is to say that economic and military might are inextricably bound up with each other.

[42] Walker Connor, "Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying?" *World Politics*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (April 1972), pp. 319-55.

[43] Benjamin A. Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), pp. 157-166.

44 Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).

45 Quoted in J.F.C. Fuller, *Conduct of War: 1789-1961* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961), p. 46. Also see Peter Paret, "Nationalism and the Sense of Military Obligation," in Peter Paret, *Understanding War: Essays on Clausewitz and the History of Military Power* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 39-52.

46 Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 592.

47 Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999* (New York: Knopf, 1999), p. 192.

48 Benny Morris, *1948 and After: Israel and the Palestinians*, rev. and expanded ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 14.

49 Morris, *1948 and After*, pp. 13-16.

50 Keren Fraiman, "The Effects of Nationalism on the Military Balance in the Middle East in 1948," BA Paper, University of Chicago, April 24, 2002, pp. 11-13.

51 Fraiman, "Effects of Nationalism on the Military Balance," p. 41; Morris, *Righteous Victims*, p. 193.

52 Rashid Khalidi, "The Palestinians and 1948: The Underlying Causes of Failure," in Eugene L. Rogan and Avi Shlaim, eds., *The War for Palestine: Rewriting the History of 1948* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 29. Also see pp. 18-20, 30-31.

53 Morris, *Righteous Victims*, p. 192. Also see p. 193.

54 Clausewitz, *On War*, pp. 580, 584.

55 Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 88.

56 Clausewitz, *On War*, p. 89.

57 John J. Mearsheimer, *Conventional Deterrence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983).

58 Lars-Erik Cederman, T. Camber Warren, and Didier Sornette, "Testing Clausewitz: Nationalism, Mass Mobilization, and the Severity of War," forthcoming in *International Organization*; Michael Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Reference to Casualty and Other Figures, 1618-1991*, 2 vols. (Jefferson, N.C.:

McFarland, 1992); Kalevi J. Holsti, *Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order, 1648-1989* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Jack S. Levy, *War in the Modern Great Power System, 1495-1975* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1983); Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, abridged ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964): Mark W. Zacher, "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force," *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Spring 2001), pp. 215–50.

[59] On the difficulties of occupation, see David M. Edelstein, *Occupational Hazards: Success and Failure in Military Occupation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008).

[60] For an excellent discussion of the different ways that nationalism might lead to war, see Van Evera, "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War."

[61] Istvan Deak, "The Rise and Triumph of the East European Nation-State," *In Depth*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1992), p. 92. Also see Benjamin Miller, *States, Nations, and the Great Powers: The Sources of Regional War and Peace* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[62] Stephen Van Evera, "Primed for Peace: Europe After the Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1990/91), pp. 47-50.

[63] Jeffrey Gettleman, "In Sudan, a Colonial Curse Comes Up for a Vote," *New York Times*, January 8, 2001.

[64] Robert Jervis and Jack Snyder, eds., *Dominoes and Bandwagons: Strategic Beliefs and Great Power Competition in the Eurasian Rimland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Jerome Slater, "Dominoes in Central America: Will They Fall? Does It Matter?" *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 1987), pp. 105-134.

[65] Quoted in Stephen M. Walt, *Revolution and War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 129, 131.

[66] Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, No. 16 (Summer 1989), p. 4.

[67] Benedict Anderson opens his classic book on nationalism with a discussion of the various clashes between communist countries during the Cold War. After quoting Thomas Nairn's remark that "The theory of nationalism represents Marxism's great historical failure," Anderson writes, "It would be more exact to say that nationalism has proved an uncomfortable *anomaly* for Marxist theory." *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), pp. 11-13.

[68] Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987).