

## ■ article

JOURNAL OF CATALAN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY,  
Issue 5, 2013 | Print ISSN 2014-1572 / Online ISSN 2014-1564  
DOI: 10.2436/20.3001.02.71 | P. 13-34  
Reception date: 5/07/2011 / Admission date: 12/12/2011  
<http://revistes.iec.cat/index.php/JOCIH>

# Nationalism versus Cosmopolitanism: a comparative approach

Montserrat Guibernau

Professor of Politics, Queen Mary University of London  
Mile End Road  
London E1 4NS, United Kingdom  
[m.guibernau@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:m.guibernau@qmul.ac.uk)

## summary

Nationalism and cosmopolitanism are often portrayed as radically opposed to each other and scholars defining themselves as ‘cosmopolitans’ tend to display a very critical attitude towards anything that includes the word ‘nationalism’ and/ or ‘national’. Being a nationalist is frequently regarded as an obstacle to adopting a cosmopolitan outlook, as being in direct opposition with it. Why is this so? Are there any particular circumstances in which both cosmopolitanism and nationalism can coexist and be compatible? Or, on the contrary, are we faced with two irreconcilable ideologies? Following current debates on these issues, this paper offers a careful analysis of the specific conditions in which nationalism and cosmopolitanism might become compatible.

The paper is divided into four sections. First, it considers the treatment of nationalism in classical social theory and offers a detailed analysis of the concepts of state, nation and nationalism as well as the interrelations between the three. Second it introduces cosmopolitanism by studying its origins, development and key principles. Third, the paper adopts a comparative theoretical approach to establish a distinction between democratic and non- democratic forms of nationalism. To illustrate this it examines democratic Catalan nationalism, as exemplified by the Assembly of Catalonia (1971), as an opposition movement to Franco’s dictatorship which embodied both national as well as cosmopolitan concerns.

## key words

Nationalism, cosmopolitanism, democracy, nation, Catalonia.

## Nationalism

### *Nationalism in classical social theory*

Nationalism has traditionally been an uncomfortable topic for social scientists. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, we encounter numerous examples of major scholars who paid scant attention to what clearly was one of the major

political forces of their time. As I have shown elsewhere, Max Weber, a German nationalist himself never provided a systematic theory of nationalism. Weber revealed his German nationalism through his opposition to Polish immigration in eastern Germany, his support of German nationalists during the First World War, and his reaction against the Treaty of Versailles. He encouraged and correctly foresaw a movement of German irredentism after the First World War.<sup>1</sup>

Émile Durkheim and Karl Marx predicted that nationalism would soon disappear and they understood it as an ideology, which needed to be transcended. Durkheim's and Marx's approaches are slightly different. Durkheim's position could be described as 'pan-nationalist'. By this I mean that his stance places 'human' aims above 'national' ones. According to Durkheim, the 'patrie' has a key role in the process of moralization since it is the 'highest organized society that exists'.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast, Marx's attitude can be described as 'internationalist'. His main objective was 'universal emancipation' and he envisaged some kind of world solidarity. But he recognized that this could only be possible if nations were free from their conquerors, because only then could the workers think in international terms about a working-class solidarity.<sup>3</sup>

History has proved Marx and Durkheim to be wrong. Instead, nationalism has played a key role in the modern age and it currently manifests itself as a potent force. Nationalism has often been associated with xenophobia, racism, discrimination and backwardness and regarded as a political doctrine opposed to the cosmopolitan ideal once formulated by Kant.<sup>4</sup> Great uneasiness and even open hostility towards nationalism stems from its potent emotional dimension, which clearly differs from the ideal of rationality defended by the *philosophes* and, above all, hostility derives from the association of nationalism with illiberal and totalitarian ideologies such as fascism and Nazism and the violence and oppression perpetrated in its name. The Holocaust, the Soviet domination of the Baltic peoples, genocide in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia and the repression endured by the Catalan people during Franco's dictatorship represent only a small sample of cases which illustrate the so-called dark side of nationalism.

---

1 M. Guibernau, *Nationalisms*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, p. 36-38.

2 A. Giddens, *Durkheim on Politics and the State*, London: Fontana Paperbacks, 1987 [1972] p. 202.

3 See M. Guibernau, *Nationalisms*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, p. 41.

4 See E. Kant, "Toward perpetual peace" (1795) in *Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 311-352.

### *Nationalism, the nation and the state*

Nationalism is Janus-faced and it is important to establish a distinction between its two sides. Yet, in some cases nationalism is associated with xenophobia, racism and ethnic cleansing, while in other cases, it is applied to describe social movements led by peoples prepared to defend their right to exist and peacefully cultivate their own particular culture and language.

Nationalism, however, cannot be viewed in isolation I argue that a clear-cut distinction needs to be drawn between three main concepts: nation, state and nationalism. By 'state', taking Weber's definition, I refer to 'a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory';<sup>5</sup> although not all states have successfully accomplished this, and some of them have not even aspired to accomplish it.

By 'nation', I refer to a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself. This definition attributes five dimensions to the nation: psychological (consciousness of forming a group), cultural, territorial, political and historical.<sup>6</sup>

By 'nationalism' I mean the sentiment of belonging to a community whose members identify with a set of symbols, beliefs and ways of life, and have the will to decide upon their common political destiny.<sup>7</sup> As a political principle, nationalism 'holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent'<sup>8</sup> this is, nation and state should be co-extensive and the legitimacy of a state requires its own nation identifying with it. However, there are numerous examples of more than one nation -and parts of nations- coexisting within a single state, nations whose boundaries stretch well beyond the borders of the state, and nations that leave some of its nationals outside while including some foreigners. It is the exception rather than the rule to find an example of full coextensivity between nation and state.

A state regarded as alien by the nation lacks legitimacy in nationalist terms. In turn and while accepting the principles of democracy and popular sovereignty, a nation has the right to decide upon its political destiny. This includes

---

5 M. Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, H. H. Gerth and Wright Mills (eds.), London: Routledge, 1991 [1948], p. 78.

6 M. Guibernau, *Nationalisms*, Cambridge: Polity Press: 1996, p. 47.

7 M. Guibernau, *Nationalisms*, Cambridge: Polity Press: 1996, p. 47-48.

8 E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983, p. 1.

the right to construct a state with which those who belong to the nation are able to identify and feel represented. However, not all nations are prepared or willing to create their own state, some are content with various degrees of political autonomy and federation within large political institutions.

It is usual to locate the rise of the nation-state and nationalism in late eighteenth-century Europe and to link their emergence to the ideas which gave rise to the American Revolution in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789.

The political dimension of nationalism is closely related to the emergence of the concept of popular sovereignty –designed for the ‘whole people’– in the eighteenth century. When the revolutionaries stated that the principle of sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, they may be taken to have asserted that the nation was more than the king and the aristocracy. National self-determination turned out to be one of the most frequent interpretations of popular sovereignty.

The spread of the new ideas of the *philosophes* emphasizing the cult of liberty, equality and, in particular, the idea of state power rooted in popular consent, where initially applied to the construction and consolidation of the nation-state as a modern political institution, characterized by the formation of a kind of state which has the monopoly of what it claims to be the legitimate use of force within a demarcated territory and seeks to unite the people subject to its rule by means of cultural homogenization.

This raises issues about processes of ‘nation-building’ carried out by the state with the aim to homogenize an otherwise diverse population in linguistic and cultural terms. It also highlights the fact that most states are formed by more than one nation; thus including various nations or parts of nations within their boundaries. Moreover, it also emphasizes the relevance of a wide range of strategies employed in the construction of new nations destined to confer legitimacy to the state; a process in which the non-eternal and dynamic nature of all nations is brought to the fore. Yet while some nations are able to locate their ethnic roots in pre-modern times, others have emerged out of nation-building processes carried out from the late eighteenth century onwards.

Nation, state and nationalism form a triad characterized by a constant tension between its three components. Hence, changes in the definition of one of the constituents have the capacity to influence and, to some extent, even alter the definitions of the other two. For instance, if belonging to a nation is defined in terms of common blood, the definition of the state and with it that of citizenship, as an attribute conferred upon its members will have to include blood as a *sine qua non* condition for membership. Consequently, any nationalist movement emerging in these specific circumstances will focus upon common blood as a requisite for exclusion and inclusion in the nation that they want to defend and

promote. In other cases, where common ancestry is replaced by territory or by the will to become a member act as the main condition for membership of a particular state, the definition of the nation and the character of nationalism are altered accordingly.

The example that I have just mentioned refers to conditions for membership, this is to elements which are considered indispensable in order to establish a distinction between those who belong and those who do not belong to the nation. However, alterations in the definitions of nation, state and nationalism are not restricted to conditions for belonging or criteria for membership.

The state's self-definition as a unitary, a federal or even a multinational political institution holds significant consequences for the peoples living within its boundaries. Once one of these self-definitions is adopted by a specific state, it has the capacity to influence the definition of the nation. This is particularly evident in the case of being confronted with a state that declares itself to be multinational, thus assuming the coexistence of more than one nation within its territory. Such a position entails an automatic distinction between nation and state that challenges the commonly accepted coincidence between the two.

A multinational state explicitly acknowledges its internal diversity and in so doing, it influences the range of definitions of nationalism that may emerge within its territory. First, in these cases, the nationalism instilled by the state will necessarily involve the acceptance of the nations included within its borders. This type of nationalism tends to focus on shared constitutional rights and principles as elements able to hold together an otherwise diverse citizenry. Second, the nationalism emerging from some of the national minorities included within the state is bound to be strongly influenced by the state's recognition of their status as nations. The minorities' nationalism generally demands greater power and resources with the aim of furthering self-government, –this is assuming that they are already entitled to some political autonomy.

In spite of this, often states seek the cultural and linguistic homogenization of their citizens. Whether at the same time states will be prepared or not to respect and recognize the particular cultures and languages of their national and ethnic minorities will depend on the political culture of each particular state.

Alterations in the definition of nationalism have the power to impact upon the definitions of both the state and the nation. Therefore, a nationalist discourse based upon the rejection, dehumanization, and portrayal of those who do not belong to the nation as 'enemies' and as a 'threat' will feed xenophobia and ethnic hatred. This type of nationalism will invariably foster a narrow definition of the nation based upon the exclusion of the different and the belief in the superiority of one's own nation above all others. A state endorsing this

sort of nationalism is likely to base its policy on the marginalization or sometimes even the elimination of 'others' within its territory, and/or the pursue of a consistent assimilation policy. This type of state often engages in conflicts with other states as a result of an aggressive economic and/or territorial expansionist policy.

So far I have offered some examples showing how differences in the nature and definition of one of the constituents of the triad trigger substantial variations in the definitions of the other two. A further consideration suggests that different definitions of nation, state and nationalism coexist simultaneously in different parts of the globe. Hence, the relation between the three components of the triad can be analyzed by focusing upon two different levels. The first, as I have shown above, involves the study of how changes in the definition of one of the constituents affects the other two. The second moves on to consider the eventual emergence of external factors capable of altering the very nature of the triad by shifting the balance of power between its members and even threatening to undermine one of them at the expense of another. Here we are confronted with radical transformations able to alter the more or less stable equilibrium existing between the triad by affecting their relationship at a structural level well above the particular situations considered when analyzing individual cases.

At present, the main challenge to the relationship between the triad concerns the radical and rapid transformations altering the traditional nature of the state. The proliferation of supranational institutions, the increasing number of multinational corporations, and the emergence of substate nationalist movements contrive a novel political scenario within which the traditional role of the state is being undermined in a fundamental way. The signs of this have already become apparent; the radicalization of state nationalism, the proliferation of ethnic and national conflicts and the state's resistance to give up substantial aspects of its sovereignty represent but a few examples which hint at the state's urgent need to recast its nature; undoubtedly a process which is already under way.

Currently, democratic nationalist movements in nations without states such as Catalonia, Scotland and Quebec invoke the principle of consent and the idea of popular sovereignty to legitimate their claims for self-determination, a concept embracing a wide range of options encompassing political decentralization, devolution, federation and independence. The recognition of the right to self-determination has the capacity to challenge the nation-state as a political institution, which, in most cases, has been created upon the attempt to seek the cultural and political homogenization of its citizens, paying scant attention to its own internal national diversity.

## Cosmopolitanism

The Stoics initially formulated cosmopolitanism –they were a pre-Socratic philosophical school that criticized the historically arbitrary nature of boundaries of polities and their role in fostering a sense of difference between insiders and outsiders. In their view, the emphasis placed on boundaries contributed to shifting the focus away from the human condition shared by all persons by stressing differences rather than commonality among them. The Stoics sought ‘to replace the central role of the *polis* in ancient political thought with that of the *cosmos* in which humankind might live together in harmony’.<sup>9</sup>

During the Enlightenment, the cosmopolitan idea was given a new impetus by Immanuel Kant who stood in favor of allowing people to ‘enjoy a right to the free and unrestricted public use of their reason’<sup>10</sup> by placing themselves beyond the limits –rules, prejudices and beliefs– set up by their polities and by acting as members of a ‘cosmopolitan society’ defined by its openness. The entitlement to enter the world of open, uncoerced dialogue was adapted and developed in his concept of ‘cosmopolitan right’.<sup>11</sup>

In the late 1970s and partly influenced by the intensification of globalization processes, cosmopolitanism re-emerged once again. Currently, cosmopolitanism has three central separate meanings which are often in tension.

First, cultural cosmopolitanism is associated with those individuals who enjoy cultural diversity, are able to travel the world and tend to enjoy a privileged position, which places them well beyond ethnocentric views of culture and identity. This type of cosmopolitans forms a selected transnational elite and the study of their views on culture and identity belong to the realm of sociological analysis.

Second, philosophical cosmopolitanism relates to the adherence to a set of principles and values destined to attain global social justice and, with it, the elimination of dramatic disparities of wealth. This type of cosmopolitanism has a strong ethical nature. It is engaged in the quest for some minimal ethical values to be applicable to the whole of humanity; for instance, the commitment to Human Rights, as defined by the UN.

---

9 D. Held, “Principles of Cosmopolitan Order” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 10-27 (p. 10).

10 J. Schmidt, “Civility, Enlightenment and Society: conceptual confusions and Kantian remedies”, *American Political Science Review*, no. 92, 1998: 419-427, p. 424.

11 O. O’Neill, “Enlightenment as autonomy: Kant’s vindication of reason” in L. Jordanova and P. Hulme (eds.), *The Enlightenment and its Shadows*, London: Routledge, 1990, p. 194.

Third, institutional or political cosmopolitanism refers to the study of how novel forms of governance and political institutions might match up to a more cosmopolitan order.

Yet, in some instances a tension arises between cultural and philosophical (ethical) cosmopolitanism. For example:

1/ The enthusiasm that cultural cosmopolitans show towards cultural creations and diversity often ignores the circumstances of their origins:<sup>12</sup> an issue of paramount significance for ethical cosmopolitans concerned about social justice.

2/ A different attitude towards difference itself. Hence, while the cultural cosmopolitan praises and enjoys diversity, the ethical cosmopolitan seeks to find some universal standard concerning what ought to be regarded as inalienable rights and principles to be applied to all members of humanity.

3/ A somehow different position with regard to inequality. The cultural cosmopolitan enjoys an advantaged position and his/her open mind is generally associated with the opportunities enjoyed in terms of access to education, travel and the means allowing for a specific life-style. A certain inequality stands at the core of the privileges of which cultural cosmopolitans benefit. Therefore, resentment, lack of trust and criticism of cultural cosmopolitans usually originate among the ranks of less privileged people. According to ethical cosmopolitans, the quest for global social justice requires the mitigation of inequality, which, among other things, has allowed an elite to become cultural cosmopolitans. However, a more nuanced approach to this issue leads Synowich to argue that ‘the idea of global justice involves some idea of cultural evaluation’.<sup>13</sup>

In addition, some further tensions exist between the three notions of cosmopolitanism mentioned above. For instance, a cosmopolitan ethicist could be very skeptical of the possibilities of a cosmopolitan culture, in turn; an institutional cosmopolitan may adhere to a variety of different ethical commitments. Not to mention differing views upheld by cosmopolitans with regard to the existing gap between cosmopolitan philosophy and social reality.

The three key principles defended by scholars of philosophical cosmopolitanism, who are essentially ethical philosophers who focus on the nature

---

12 C. Synowich, “Cosmopolitans, cosmopolitanism, and human flourishing” in “Principles of Cosmopolitan Order” in G. Brock and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 55-74 (p. 57).

13 *Ibid.*, p. 58.



and form of ethical justification, such as C. Beitz, Thomas W. Pogge and Brian Barry<sup>14</sup>, are:

1/ Principle of individualist moral egalitarianism or egalitarian individualism, that is, all humans are free and equal beings.

2/ Principle of reciprocal recognition, ‘each person has an equal stake in this universal ethical realm and is, accordingly required to respect all other people’s status as a basic unit of moral interest’.<sup>15</sup>

3/ Principle of impartial moral reasoning ‘requires that each person should enjoy the impartial treatment of their claims –that is, treatment based on principles upon which all could act’.<sup>16</sup>

David Held has formulated the most recent and original work on institutional cosmopolitanism. He argues that cosmopolitan principles – equal worth and dignity; active agency; personal responsibility and accountability; consent; reflexive deliberation and collective decision-making through voting procedures; inclusiveness and subsidiarity; avoidance of serious harm; and the amelioration of urgent need – are the principles of democratic public life, but without one crucial assumption –never fully justified in any case in liberal democratic thought, classic or contemporary – that these principles can only be enacted effectively within a single, circumscribed, territorially based political community’.<sup>17</sup> This implies that ‘states would no longer be regarded as the sole centers of legitimate political power within their borders, as it is already the case in many places... States need to be articulated with, and relocated within, an overarching cosmopolitan framework’.<sup>18</sup>

---

14 See C. Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations*, Princeton University Press, 1979; C. Beitz, “Philosophy of International Relations” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 1998; T. Pogge, “Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty” in C. Brown, (ed.) *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 89-102; T. Pogge, “An Egalitarian Law of Peoples”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 23, (1994): 195-224; B. Barry, “Statism and Nationalism: a Cosmopolitan Critique” in I. Shapiro, and L. Brilmayer, (eds.) *Global Justice*, New York University Press, 1999, p. 12-66.

15 T. Pogge, “Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty” in Brown, C. (ed.) *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 89-102 (p. 90).

16 D. Held, “Cosmopolitanism: Ideas, Realities and Deficits” in D. Held, and A. McGrew (eds.) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002, p. 305-324, and p. 311.

17 D. Held, “Principles of Cosmopolitan Order” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 10-27 (p. 21).

18 D. Held, “Principles of Cosmopolitan Order” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 10-27 (p. 27).

I understand current accounts of cosmopolitanism to be closely related to the image of the world as a single interconnected place where an unparalleled degree of visibility brought about by the technological revolutions of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century and after have provided unprecedented awareness of political, cultural, linguistic, religious, gender, economic and other forms of difference. Within this novel scenario, increased multilevel interaction strengthens the case for cosmopolitanism as the ethics of the global age.

Cosmopolitan values defend the equality and freedom of all human beings, a principle already accepted and included in some constitutions, international norms and regulations. There is a big gap, however, between the theoretical vow to cosmopolitan principles and social reality since, at present, not a single institution or organization is recognized by all humans as capable of enforcing compliance with cosmopolitan principles and having sufficient power, legitimacy and means to punish those transgressing them. The global world is not guided by cosmopolitan principles, although there are some signs that a growing transnational movement, if still incipient, is beginning to emerge. Yet, some cosmopolitan values are embedded in some international and regional institutions such as the UN, the International Criminal Court and the European Court of Justice, among others, as well as in some transnational social movements and organizations such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace, hence stepping-stones exist.

## Democratic nationalism and cosmopolitanism

A type of nationalism based on the believe in the superiority of a particular ethnic group –ethnocentrism– aiming to dominate and exploit other peoples economically, culturally, military or politically, is not compatible with cosmopolitanism. This type of nationalism, which I refer to as ‘non-democratic nationalism’, tends to seek the expansion of its nation’s borders and is primarily concerned with acquiring sufficient power to achieve its aims. Non-democratic nationalism tends to embrace political ideologies infused with authoritarian, dictatorial or fascist ideas. It fosters unequal relations and tends to promote illiberal and undemocratic forms of government. But not all nationalisms define their objectives and the means to achieve them in non-democratic terms.

When studying the possible compatibility between nationalism and cosmopolitanism, the sometimes almost visceral rejection of anything related to nationalism on behalf of some defenders of cosmopolitanism, for whom nationalism is invariably associated with backwardness, ethnocentrism and even racism, has to be acknowledged. Often, an instead of engaging in a dispassionate and rigorous analysis of the Janus-faced nature of nationalism, they tend to focus solely upon the pernicious side of nationalism. In so doing, they fail to

recognize that, in some instances, nationalism is strongly associated with democracy, the search for recognition and the peaceful desire for the development and survival of peoples.

### *Catalan nationalism as a democratic force during Franco's dictatorship*

Two opposing ideas of nation and state came into play in the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939).<sup>19</sup> The Francoists presented an extremely centralized and uniform image of Spain. In contrast, the Republicans defended a moderately diffuse image of a state that would allow the historical nations, Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country, to enjoy a certain degree of political and cultural autonomy. However, it should be noted that the centralist view of the Spanish state was never exclusive to the Spanish extreme right, but rather a characteristic shared with most of the political spectrum. The main difference between Spanish political forces lies in their attitude toward internal diversity: while democratic parties accept it, fascists reject it.<sup>20</sup>

Franco's victory led to the suppression of Catalan political institutions, the banning of the Catalan language and the proscription of all the symbolic elements of Catalan identity, from the flag (the *senyera*) to the national anthem (*Els Segadors*).<sup>21</sup>

The Francoists, who called themselves 'nationals', professed a conservative form of state nationalism unwilling to accept Spain's national diversity; this informed their nation-building strategy aimed at the cultural and linguistic homogenization of the country.<sup>22</sup> For them, the unity of the Spanish nation was a nonnegotiable principle. Their nationalism was the result of a reaction against modern ideologies, such as socialism and anarchism, and also a rejection of the Catalan, Basque and Galician nationalist movements, regarded as a threat to the traditional socio-political structure of Spain. The II Spanish Republic had introduced progressive policies (among them abortion, divorce, devolution) and tried to build a state in which the historical nations were recognized and received

---

19 See M. Guibernau, *Catalan Nationalism: francoism, transition and democracy*, London: Routledge, 2004.

20 J. Llobera, "Catalan identity. The dialectics of past and present", *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. X, nos. 2 and 3 (winter 1990), p. 16. See also P. Preston, *Franco*, London: Fontana Press, 1994, and H. Raguier, *La pólvora y el incienso: La Iglesia y la Guerra Civil Española (1936-1939)*, Barcelona: Península, 2001.

21 See J. Benet, *Catalunya sota el règim franquista*, Paris: Edicions Catalanes de París, 1973.

22 J. Triadú, *Una cultura de la llibertat*, Barcelona: Aymà, 1978, p. 15.

a substantial degree of cultural and political autonomy. The right-wing nationalism of the Francoists reacted by calling a halt to the modernization of the country and choosing to maintain the traditional structures defended by broad sectors of conservative Catholics.<sup>23</sup>

The closed image of Spain imposed by the regime contrasted with the image of a plural Spain (mainly defended by the Catalans, Basques and Galicians) capable of recognizing and celebrating the wealth of its linguistic and cultural heritage. The opposition between the authoritarian nationalism of Francoism and the nationalism of the Catalans, Basques and Galicians, willing to lay claim to their difference was evident when studying the relationship between these two types of nationalism it is essential to understand that, while the regime had the power and the resources necessary to impose its vision of Spain, the peripheral nationalisms were dismembered or condemned to secrecy. Indeed, after the Civil War, the majority of the most important representatives of the democratic political parties banned by the regime went into exile, were imprisoned or executed. The relationship between the 'victors' and the 'defeated' left no place for dialogue.

The authoritarian state designed by Franco did not accept dissidence, and had conferred on itself, by force, the power to decide on the status of the historical nations included within its territory. The regime's aim was to annihilate them as nations.

Faced with a repression, which pervaded all daily activities of the population, most, although not all, Catalans responded with passive resistance. They had been defeated, their country had been destroyed and they now lived in precarious conditions. They had to confront the presence of an army, which defended the dictatorship and an imported and imposed bureaucracy, which only spoke and wanted to hear Castilian. The official public sphere was completely dominated by the new regime.

In that context, the regime's efforts to suppress internal diversity accentuated even more the distinction between 'us', the Catalans, and 'them', the Francoists (identified with Castilian culture and language, conservatism, centralism and conservative Catholicism), although not all Catalans were democrats and anti-Franco, and not all Castilians supported the Franco regime. The submission of Catalan society in the public sphere encouraged a 'tacit agreement' and a specific feeling of solidarity among Catalan people, a feeling resulting from sharing a situation of danger and collective oppression. For most Catalans, irrespective of their social class, the Franco regime and its officials were seen as a common enemy, at least because the mere fact of being a 'Catalan' was enough to generate

the suspicion and hostility of the regime's agents. Only certain sectors of the Catalan bourgeoisie received the Francoist victory with relief and showed their support for the new fascist ideology committed to protecting their economic interests.

Catalan identity was preserved thanks to the dynamic and engaged action of a very small intellectual elite, but also thanks to family and friendship circles within which Catalan was spoken and traditional Catalan culture was maintained.<sup>24</sup>

Catalan nationalism acted as a progressive social movement against the Spanish dictatorship (1936-1975) and Catalan nationalists endured persecution and death during the regime. In spite of that they stood up in favor of the democratization of Spain and the right to self-determination of the Catalan people thus defending their right to preserve and develop their distinct culture, language and political institutions. Under Franco's dictatorship, the former were forbidden and the latter were completely dismantled. Political parties were illegal and clandestine resistance to the dictatorship was actively persecuted and repressed.

On 7 November 1971 about three hundred people representing different Catalan political, social and professional sectors founded the Assembly of Catalonia, a clandestine organization that soon became the broadest and most important unitary Catalan movement since the Civil War. No similar unitary movement, in view of its scope and its relevance, was created in any other part of Spain. According to Josep Benet, a member of the Assembly, 'without the mobilizing power of the Assembly and its prestige, the Suárez government and even some Spanish democrats would hardly have taken the Catalan national demands into account'.<sup>25</sup> The Assembly initially founded by the socialists and, in particular, the communists received the economic support of the group led by Jordi Pujol<sup>26</sup>, which subsequently joined it.<sup>27</sup> The left wing MSC (Socialist Movement of Catalonia) and the communist PSUC (Socialist Unified Party of Catalonia) won over the support of significant sectors of the working class and of a high number of Castilian-speaking immigrants. They all voiced the need to bring together democracy, left-wing policies and autonomy for Catalonia.

---

24 M. Guibernau, "Intellectuals and nationalism in nations without states: the Catalan case", *Political Studies*, 48, 5, \*\*\*\*: p. 989-1005.

25 J. Benet, "Introducció", in A. Batista and J. Playà Maset, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

26 Once democracy was restored, Jordi Pujol became president of the Generalitat (Catalan Government) 1980-2003.

27 A. Balcells, *El nacionalismo catalán*, Madrid: Historia 16, 1991, p. 181.

The main aims shared by the Assembly's members were: 'achieving a general amnesty for political prisoners and exiles', 'the upholding of the fundamental democratic rights: freedom of assembly, of speech and of association –including trade unions–, of demonstration and the right to strike, which guarantee the effective access of the people to economic and political power', 'the provisional re-establishment of the institutions and of the principles embodied in the 1932 Catalan Statute of Autonomy, as a clear expression of the right to self-determination', and 'the coordination of all peninsular peoples in fighting for democracy'.<sup>28</sup> Its motto was: 'Freedom, Amnesty and Statute of Autonomy'. Assembly members risked their own lives to defend democracy at a time when repression was commonplace.

I argue that in defending freedom, democracy, dialogue and social justice the Catalan nationalism embodied in the Assembly of Catalonia stood up as an example of the compatibility between democratic nationalism and the main tenets of cosmopolitanism. In particular because the objectives of Catalan nationalism went well beyond the specific democratization of Catalonia, rather they focused upon the democratization of Spain and the desire to join Western liberal democracies while committing their support for Human Rights.

The Assembly worked tirelessly to circulate these demands and its mobilizing action continued until the first democratic parliamentary election held on 15 June 1977. From then on, the political parties became the new political actors. The unity of the opposition did not last long and was replaced by competition between the 'images' that the Catalans had of their country and of the status that Catalonia should have within Spain, depending on their loyalties and on the political interests of the different parties.

### ***Democratic nationalism and cosmopolitanism: conditions for their coexistence***

While compatibility between non-democratic forms of nationalism and cosmopolitanism is impossible, I argue that, coexistence between democratic forms of nationalism and cosmopolitanism stands as a viable alternative. For instance both ideologies share xenophobia, intolerance and injustice as powerful common enemies.

This is not to argue that democratic nationalism is either the only actual and possible condition for the emergence of cosmopolitanism or, that democratic nationalism will necessarily lead to a cosmopolitan outlook. Rather, it is my

---

28 Communiqué of the "I Reunió de l'Assemblea de Catalunya", 7 November 1972. Included as an appendix in A. Batista and J. Playà Maset, *op. cit.*, p. 301-302.

contention that, in some cases, the values intrinsic to democratic nationalism – social justice, individual freedom and deliberative democracy- and those of cosmopolitanism –the belief that all individuals are equal and free and deserve equal treatment regardless of their origin- allow and favor the compatibility between the two.

In my view, whether nationalism is compatible with cosmopolitanism or not depends on the political ideology nationalism is associated with. This is, a democratic form of nationalism –associated with social-democracy, socialism or liberalism, to mention but a few political ideologies that usually inform democratic nationalist political action- subscribing to the principles of social justice, deliberative democracy and individual freedom shares some of its values with cosmopolitanism. In contrast, non-democratic forms of nationalism associated with fascist and authoritarian ideologies stand in outright opposition with cosmopolitanism and democratic nationalism alike.

Being a cosmopolitan involves a commitment to global equality, but is it possible to sustain such a commitment and defend a preferential treatment for fellow-nationals? This is the crux of the matter when analyzing whether cosmopolitanism and nationalism can be compatible. The response is a nuanced one. Basically we need a definition of global equality and also an account of the meaning and limitations of the so called ‘priority thesis’ for fellow-nationals.

To define global equality is a difficult task because the meaning of words such as ‘sufficient’ and ‘basic needs’ is subject to variations according to different cultures and locations; still, this should not prevent us from offering a more general definition. I understand that the basic tenets of global equality are the avoidance of death by poverty and the fulfillment of Human Rights as defined by the UN.

A clash between cosmopolitanism and nationalism comes to light whenever the nation, through its policies, contributes to global poverty and the transgression of human rights. Pogge writes: ‘Our failure to make a serious effort toward poverty reduction may constitute not merely a lack of beneficence, but our active impoverishing, starving, and killing millions of innocent people by economic means’.<sup>29</sup>

Among the arguments commonly neglected by cosmopolitans when assessing the moral value of democratic nationalism and its nuanced compatibility with cosmopolitanism are:

---

29 T. W. Pogge, “Priorities of Global Justice” in in Held, D. and McGrew, A. *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003 [2000] (2nd edition), p. 548-558, (p. 550).



- ‘Their failure to acknowledge the role of the community and social relationships in constituting both selfhood and agency’.<sup>30</sup>

- The idea that many nationalists perceive national membership as a good in itself and not as a mere instrument.

- The assumption that the sense of community shared by members of the nation make national belonging valuable and meaningful to individuals. Although one should be aware of the non-homogeneous nature of the majority of nations and also bear in mind that, national belonging is not attributed the same value and status by all citizens. Nations are not eternal but subject to change and they are hardly ever culturally homogeneous. In spite of that, it is possible to speak about a sense of community emerging out of a shared sentiment of belonging to the same nation while simultaneously acknowledging that there will be always a number of people who will remain outside and feel alienated due to social, cultural, economic, religious or other factors.

- The belief that sentiments of national belonging generate a ‘community of obligation in the sense that their members recognize duties to meet the basic needs and protect the basic interests of other members’<sup>31</sup> thus providing a foundation for the development of social justice.

- The idea that within a democratic polity national attachments may attain moral value by instilling social justice, trust and respect among fellow citizens, thus contributing to enhance and promote democracy.

Yet, the compatibility between nationalism and cosmopolitanism still hinges on whether the cosmopolitan commitment to global equality can be reconciled with the nationalist principle of granting priority to fellow nationals. At this point, we could push this a bit further and ask whether the commitment to global equality is compatible with giving priority to family members and friends. Although we should be aware that, as Erskine, argues ‘morally relevant identities are created not only by “communities of place” but also by membership of non-territorial and overlapping communities of various types’.<sup>32</sup>

Cosmopolitans adopt two broad positions concerning this issue, basically they all accept the principle of egalitarian individualism, and nevertheless, they attribute different weight to the various modes of interpretation of other principles.

---

30 T. Erskine, “Citizen of Nowhere” or “The Point Where Circles Intersect”? Impartialist and Embedded Cosmopolitanisms”, *Review of International Studies*, 28 (3), 2002: 457-78, p. 461

31 D. Miller, *On Nationality*, Oxford University Press: 1995, p. 83.

32 Erskine, “Embedded Cosmopolitanism and the Case of War: Restraint, Discrimination and Overlapping Communities”, *Global Society*, 14 (4), 2000: 575-90, p. 575.



David Miller establishes a distinction between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ versions of cosmopolitanism.<sup>33</sup> According to the former, ‘all moral principles must be justified by showing that they give equal weight to the claims of everyone, which means that they must either be directly universal in their scope, or if they apply only to a select group of people they must be secondary principles whose ultimate foundation is universal’.<sup>34</sup>

In contrast, ‘weak’ cosmopolitanism ‘holds only that morality is cosmopolitan in part; there are some valid principles with a more restricted scope’, so that ‘we may owe certain kinds of treatment to all other human beings regardless of any relationship in which we stand to them, while there are other kinds of treatment that we owe only to those to whom we are related in certain ways, with neither sort of obligation being derivative of the other’.<sup>35</sup> Among the main advocates of ‘strong’ cosmopolitanism are Martha C. Nussbaum and Bryan Barry, defenders of ‘weak’ cosmopolitanism include Michael Walzer, Kor Cho Tan and Andrew Linklater.

In this respect, some liberal nationalists argue that the subordination of national commitments to cosmopolitan justice fails to properly accommodate people’s national allegiances and undervalues the moral significance of national identity. Moreover, ‘nationalists who reject the subordination of nationality to cosmopolitan justice do not necessarily reject the idea of global justice *per se*. What they reject is the cosmopolitan egalitarian ideal that the terms of distributive justice ought to be defined independently of people’s national commitments... National allegiances must be allowed to shape the terms of global justice, and not the other way round as cosmopolitans hold’.<sup>36</sup>

By being able to develop a sense of national solidarity and duty towards their fellow nationals, individuals move beyond the immediate family circle of solidarity and trust. In a similar manner, a democratic nationalism prompting people to be aware and sensitive to cosmopolitan values may contribute to strengthen the influence of cosmopolitanism. I argue that, in the global age all

---

33 David Held refers to ‘thick’ and ‘thin’ cosmopolitanism. See, D. Held, “Principles of Cosmopolitan Order” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 10-27, p. 17.

34 D. Miller, “The Limits of Cosmopolitan Justice” in D. Mapel, and T. Nardin (eds.) *International Society: Diverse Ethical Perspectives*, Princeton University Press, 1998, p. 166-167.

35 *Ibidem*.

36 K. C. Tan, “The demands of justice and national allegiances” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 164-179 (p. 167).

democratic nationalisms ought to incorporate a further dimension to their traditional values. Their concern for the nation and fellow nationals should be accompanied by a clear commitment to the cosmopolitanism values of social justice, freedom and dialogic democracy. For instance, I regard support for the International Criminal Court as a step towards global justice. By supporting this initiative, democratic nationalisms will be contributing to the strengthening of cosmopolitan values at a global level.

Attachment to fellow nationals does not imply denigration and disrespect for others. On the contrary, the main argument for defending the so called 'compatriot priority claim' assumes that we have a duty towards compatriots because they are members in a democratic political body that we, as active citizens, have a duty to sustain and improve.<sup>37</sup>

The 'priority thesis' is founded on the specific type of relationship established among individuals forming a community, in this case, the nation. It is my concern that the sentiments of solidarity that individuals tend to develop towards members of their own community have the capacity to generate a sense of special duty and care towards them. Being prepared to support your fellow nationals as well as the expectation that one would be assisted by them when in need constitutes a major tenet of social cohesion, this is, a situation in which a minimum set of values and principles able to maintain a sense of unity and common purpose are shared among the members of a particular society who are also prepared to make sacrifices for the well-being of the community.

But, why national solidarity is so important? Basically, because we do not live in a cosmopolitan world within which individuals feel free, equal, secure and are treated with dignity wherever they go regardless of their origin, gender, age, class and culture. Although some stepping-stones are pointing in the direction of cosmopolitanism, most nations remain engaged in a constant competition with each other, their relations being determined by their own power and status within the international community.

## On liberal nationalism and cosmopolitanism

It is the concern of some liberals that a particular type of nationalism, this is, liberal nationalism, is compatible with cosmopolitanism since 'it is within the context of a national culture that the core liberal values of individual autonomy and self-identity, social justice and democracy are best realized'.<sup>38</sup>

---

37 P. Kleingeld, "Kantian patriotism" in *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 29, 4, 2000: 313-341 (p. 327).

38 See Kymlicka, 2001; Gutman 1996; Tamir 1992; D. Miller 1995 and Nielsen 1999.

Liberal nationalism focuses on the connection between liberal democracy and the nation-state. Three basic principles define liberal democracy -social justice, deliberative democracy and individual freedom – and it is the liberal nationalists’ view that they are all better achieved within the nation-state. These principles are:

– *Social Justice*. It is the concern of many liberals that moral cosmopolitanism –that is the commitment to global social justice– is better accomplished by fostering it within the nation-state rather than by the creation of some kind of –still so far inexistent– global state. The construction of a welfare state can be regarded as a step toward social justice within a particular society and, as its name indicates, the state is its creator and designer. A ‘nebulous cosmopolitan order’ does not provide welfare state programs, public education, religious liberty, tolerance or the prohibition of racial and sexual discrimination’.<sup>39</sup>

Furthermore, a theory of social justice ignoring the particular ties and obligations shared by fellow-nationals cannot be considered suitable for humanity since it blatantly ignores the role of those nation-states committed to democracy and their quest to turn themselves into a political space within which social justice is promoted and regulated.<sup>40</sup> It is through the commitment to liberal democratic values that the nation-state may become an organ of global social justice.

However the intrinsic association of the nation-state with power and the use of violence generates a tremendous tension between its commitment to liberal democratic values and its determination to place national aims before cosmopolitan commitments.

Although some relevant attempts have been made recently aiming at the adoption of principles destined to promote global social justice, the scope of their impact is limited when compared with those principles according supremacy to the nation-state. It would be naïve to ignore that all nation-states’ actions are not necessarily conducive to social justice. For instance, it is true that, in some cases, nation-states seeking their own benefit or trying to protect themselves have sabotaged global initiatives destined to tackle specific transnational issues related to social justice such as global warming, genocide, the status and treatment of immigrants and refugees as well as national minorities, to mention but a few.

---

39 G. Himmelfarb, “The illusions of cosmopolitanism” in Cohen, Joshua (ed) *Nussbaum, M. C. with respondents, For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996, p. 72-77 (p. 77).

40 K. C. Tan, “The demands of justice and national allegiances” in G. Brock, and H. Brighouse, *The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 164-179 (p. 164).

– *Deliberative democracy* entails ‘a system of collective deliberation and legitimation that allows all citizens to use their reason in political deliberation’.<sup>41</sup> It requires a high level of trust and a mutual understanding among citizens, which, so far, only the nation has been able to generate. In a corresponding manner, a possible path towards global democracy may be achieved through the promotion of democratic citizenship at national level. Citizens should be encouraged to transcend their own national interests by balancing them with a genuine commitment to cosmopolitan values.

Democracy, tolerance and respect within a given society can never be fully attained through the strict compliance with the law - although the law and in particular the threat of punishment tend to persuade those inclined to act otherwise to comply with it. These are attitudes and values that need to be learned, internalized and regarded as so precious that individuals should be prepared to make sacrifices to preserve them.

In my view, a genuinely democratic political culture is difficult to achieve, it cannot be improvised and heavily relies on democratic values being introduced through education, political practice, the media and public debate. A commitment to democracy presupposes readiness to engage in a dynamic process, which recognizes dialogue as a means to reach solutions and overcome differences. Democracy, if only applied to the political arena, does not guarantee the construction of a democratic society. I regard democracy as a vital attitude defining private and public relations and occurring in the political, social and economic milieu.

– *Individual freedom*. The relationship between individual autonomy and national culture is a complex one. Liberals argue that national identity ‘makes individual freedom meaningful’.<sup>42</sup> By offering individuals a specific value system, a way of life and traditions, national culture bestows meaning upon specific social practices and situates the individual on a vantage point from which to relate, understand and value those of others. This is why national culture makes individual freedom meaningful.

National identity offers a moral anchor to individuals by means of the specific corpus of knowledge and values it embodies. This represents the context within which individuals make choices and foster solidarity bonds with fellow-nationals. Trust and mutual respect are likely to emerge among people socialized within a shared democratic culture including a value system.

---

41 W. Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 226.

42 W. Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 227.

In Nielsen's view, 'a truly liberal nationalist should also be a cosmopolitan nationalist and cohere with the quintessential cosmopolitan principle of normative individualism and ethical universalism'.<sup>43</sup> Thus the cosmopolitan commitment to global egalitarianism can be reconciled with the national principle in so far as this is informed by liberal nationalism, as an ideology prepared to protect the integrity of the nation while adopting an internationalist and egalitarian outlook.

One of the major weaknesses of liberal nationalism is its emphasis on individual rights and its disregard for collective rights, a concept of uppermost significance for democratic nationalists. I argue that individual rights cannot be fully enjoyed if they are not conceived within a framework including respect for collective rights. Thus, for an individual to be able to develop all its potentialities, he or she cannot be considered in isolation but as a member of one or more groups. Two sets of different rights which complement each other need to be taken into account, those concerning the individual as a free agent, and those related to the social dimension of individuals who live within specific communities. In late modernity, these communities tend to be nations.

After years of developing and promoting individual rights, we are now confronted with the socio-political need to counteract an exceedingly individualistic society threatened by a fragmentation resulting from a growing lack of civic coherence.

## Conclusion

We live in a world of nations within which national identity compels individuals to social and political action and where national loyalty takes precedence over cosmopolitan allegiances. We do not live within a cosmopolitan order, although some progress has been made in this direction. At present, the cosmopolitan ideal remains far removed from the constant competition, conflict and war defining international relations. It is within this context that most individuals turn towards their own nations as a source of identity but also as an environment within which they enjoy some rights.

As I have showed in this paper, there are certain instances in which nationalism and cosmopolitanism may be compatible. To illustrate this I have argued that the Catalan nationalism embodied by the Assembly of Catalonia (1971), which stood up to Franco's dictatorship, offers an example of a type of nationalism firmly committed to democracy, freedom and social justice, a democratic nationalism whose values and principles were compatible with those

---

43 K. Nielsen, "Cosmopolitan Nationalism", *Monist*, 82, 1 (1999): 446-490 (448-450).

embodied in cosmopolitan tenets. The objectives of Catalan nationalism went well beyond the specific democratization of Catalonia, rather they focused upon the democratization of Spain and the desire to join Western liberal democracies while committing their support for Human Rights. At that time, their supporters acted outside the dictatorship's law and were risking their own lives in the name of democracy and freedom.

Democratic nationalism is legitimate. It defends the right of nations to exist and develop while recognizing and respecting internal diversity. It rejects the territorial expansion of nations and shows a commitment to increasing the morality of the nations' citizens by promoting democracy, social justice, freedom, equality, and mutual respect concerning cultural and other differences. Only by being committed to these principles can democratic nationalism become compatible with cosmopolitanism.

From a normative perspective, I argue that all nations –with and without states– should be encouraged to set up the conditions favoring the emergence of cosmopolitanism as an attitude compelling individuals to add a further dimension to their care and concern for fellow nationals by raising awareness about the respect, dignity, freedom and equality that should be granted to all human beings. Indeed, while this process applies to those reaching out to cosmopolitanism via democratic nationalism, I am aware that others are adopting a cosmopolitan perspective from the outset while remaining skeptical of all forms of nationalism, democratic or not. Yet by comparing the main tenets of both democratic nationalism and cosmopolitanism and establishing the conditions for their compatibility, I have sought to bridge the theoretical opposition between the two.

I am convinced that the political agenda for the future of nations should include the commitment to cosmopolitan ideals and values capable of informing political action and adding a new moral dimension to national identity and nationalism. The advent of cosmopolitanism requires the pledge to eradicate social, political and economic exploitation of individuals and nations. Its strength as a political and moral ideology will depend on its own ability to act as a transformative force leading a multidimensional process destined to change the relations of power in society. I envisage it to encounter fierce opposition.

Original in English by the author