Nationalism and racism

SINIŠA MALEŠEVIC

ABSTRACT: This paper explores the complex and contradictory relationships between nationalism and racism. It aims to show that these two ideological projects have developed distinct and independent trajectories which are based on their intrinsic conceptual differences. However, there is also a substantial degree of ideological and organisational compatibility between nationalism and racism which has allowed that in some historical contexts these two ideologies were able to coalesce into one ideological project, while in other situations nationalism and racisms have developed as ideological opponents. The paper explores the historical trajectories of nationalism and racism and analyses how these two ideologies operate in the contemporary world.

KEYWORDS: Nationalism. Racism. Nation-States. Political Power. Ideology.

Nacionalismo e racismo

RESUMO: Este artigo explora as relações complexas e contraditórias entre nacionalismo e racismo. Pretende-se mostrar que esses dois projetos ideológicos desenvolveram trajetórias distintas e independentes que se baseiam em suas diferenças conceituais intrínsecas. No entanto, há também um grau substancial de compatibilidade ideológica e organizacional entre nacionalismo e racismo. Isso permitiu que, em alguns contextos históricos, essas duas ideologias fossem capazes de se fundir em um projeto ideológico, enquanto em outras situações o nacionalismo e o racismo se desenvolveram como oponentes ideológicos. O artigo explora as trajetórias históricas do nacionalismo e do racismo e analisa como essas duas ideologias operam no mundo contemporâneo.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Nacionalismo. Racismo. Estado-Nação. Poder Político. Ideologia.

SINIŠA MALEŠEVIC

Membro da Academia Real da Irlanda e professor da Escola de Ciência Política e Sociologia da Universidade Nacional da Irlanda, Galway.
E-mail: sinisa.malesevic@ucd.ie

1 Concepts

In the contemporary political discourse nationalism and racism are often deemed to be very similar, if not identical, social phenomena. In public and academic debates, they are often treated as part of the same doctrinal family: 'The fight against racism and nationalism in Europe depends on schools helping with a policy of cultural pluralism, integration, and respect for minorities' (SAYER, 1993, p. 136) or 'nationalism is a politics of exclusion that renders the often racialised Other the outsized object of political anxiety' (VALLUVAN, 2020, p. 244). Others emphasise their ideological compatibility: 'the ideology of racism can be used to define and sustain nationalism' (MILES, 1986, p. 24). In some strands of recent scholarship, nationalism and racism have become completely amalgamated, with a number of scholars invoking concepts such as 'racist nationalism', 'racial nationalism', or 'nationalist racism' (WALIA, 2021; ELIAS; MANSURI; PARADIES, 2021; VALLUVAN; KALRA, 2021; TOPINKA, 2018). This conceptual fusion is premised on the idea that both racism and nationalism invoke social hierarchies and exclusionary ideas and behaviour. In particular they are both associated with the overt and covert discriminatory policies towards individuals and groups on the basis of their cultural or phenotypical differences.

However, nationalism and racism are two highly distinct forms of ideology and social practice. They also have very different historical trajectories and have also developed diverse contemporary manifestations. This is not to say that these two social phenomena are not compatible or that they never intersect in practice. Instead, the key point is that any sociological analysis of these two phenomena entails differentiating between racism and nationalism in order to pinpoint under which historical conditions they can and do coalesce. The conceptual difference between these two can be formulated in the following terms: nationalism is a meta-ideology and a form of social practice that 'posits a nation as the principal unit of human solidarity and political legitimacy' (MALEŠEVI□, 2013, p. 75) whereas racism is 'an expression of racially predicated or manifested social and political relations of domination, subordination or privilege (GOLDBERG; SOLOMOS, 2002).

Hence while racism presupposes relationships of domination and subordination on the basis of specific phenotypical or cultural categorisations, nationalism is centred on conceptualising the entire world through the prism of nationhood. In other words, unlike racism which is explicitly hierarchical and exclusionary, nationalist ideologies regularly invoke egalitarian and universalist principles such as that all nations should attain full sovereignty and that political independence for all nations would contribute to global peace (SMITH, 1971). Thus, as conceptual ideal types the two doctrines differ profoundly in their understanding of social relations. Nevertheless, the historical realities of nationalism and racism indicate that these inherent conceptual differences can be negotiated and overcome. Consequently, the historical relationship of nationalism and racism has oscillated and changed over time: from deep antagonism to strong affinity and back.

2 Historical trajectories of nationalism and racism

Despite popular perceptions, often reinforced by cognitive evolutionary theory and other reductionist approaches, neither racism nor nationalism are ancient phenomena. Although xenophobia and other instances of group-based animosities have been recorded through human history, racism as a coherent ideological doctrine and mode of political action develops only in the early modern period. Much of the literature on 'race' and racism emphasises that the racial categorisations develop late in human history and that racism only becomes politically meaningful in modernity (MALLON, 2017; OMI; WINANT, 2015; GOLDBERG, 2002). The early documented cases of proto racism include the *limpieza de sangre* (purity of blood) statutes in early modern Spain and Portugal. These statutes introduced discriminatory policies against recent converts from Islam (Moriscos) and Judaism (conversos). These policies differentiated sharply between the 'Old Christians' and recent converts while privileging the former over the latter. Ultimately the statutes legitimated the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492. With the expansion of the Spanish empire throughout the new world these systems of categorisation and discrimination were extended to include the colonised native populations (NIRENBERG,

2009 *apud* HANNAFORD, 1996). However, these early instances of proto racism were still focused more on one's religious origins rather than the phenotypical differences. As Hannaford (1996, p. 147) rightly argues the concept of race [*raza*] was still conceptualised in ecclesiastical sense: 'it is unhistorical to perceive the concept of race before the appearance of physical anthropology proper, because the human body, as portrayed up to the time of the Renaissance and the Reformation, could not be detached from the ideas of polis and ecclesia'. Nevertheless, with the expansion of the European imperial order throughout the Americas, Asia, Africa, and Australia, proto racism based on religion was gradually giving way to fully fledged racist ideologies built on the secular and biological concepts of human differences.

Throughout the 18th, 19th, and early 20th centuries, racism became a cornerstone of European imperial projects. Initially, the key legitimising principle of European colonial expansion was the idea of a civilising mission (*mission civilisatrice*, *misión civilizadora*). By invoking the idea that colonisation is undertaken in the name of modernisation and social development, the European imperial powers attempted to justify their conquest and exploitation of the colonised world. Over the years, the imperial civilising mission shifted from a religious, Christian, duty towards biological racism rooted in the notion of white supremacy over the 'primitive' societies in the non-Western world.

With the growing influence of science, including botany, zoology, and anatomy, religious prejudices were increasingly replaced by science-driven taxonomies of human difference, which gave new impetus to racism. In the mid-18th century scientists started to typologise human races[1] and by late 19th century social Darwinists such as Benjamin Kidd, Walter Bagehot, and William Graham Sumner reconceptualised races in strictly biological and hierarchical terms where 'white race' was understood to be superior to

---

[1] For example, the infamous taxonomy of races produced by botanist and zoologist Carl Linnaeus in early 18th century differentiated between white Europeans who were according to Linneaus 'governed by law', black Africans who were 'governed by caprice', 'sallow' Asians 'ruled by opinion' and 'reddish Americans' who were 'regulated by custom' (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2006, p. 31).

others. It is no historical accident that biological racism gained more influence when European imperialism was at its peak – the scramble for Africa between 1881 and 1914. In this period the concept of race was almost universally accepted as a principal category for understanding the world of humans. Whereas in the early modern history only some groups were deemed to be *raza*, now 'every population was thought to be a "racial" population. There may be racially mixed populations, but not raceless populations' (HOCHMAN, 2020, p. 6).

By early 20th century 'race' was established as the dominant category of social differentiation. Long before Nazis came to power in Germany, 'scientific racism' permeated academic and popular debates in Europe and North America. For the proponents of scientific racism such as Madison Grant, Alfred Ploetz, and Lothrop Stoddard, among many others, race was a defining category for all social relations. In this understanding, 'person's outward appearance was an indicator of his place in a natural order' (BANTON, 1983, p. 45). The key representative of this movement advocated 'racial hygiene', the compulsory sterilisation of 'inferior races' and selective breeding practices all of which became a part of the eugenics project. Once National Socialists gained power, scientific racism become the official state practice, ultimately resulting in the mass murder of all *Untermensch* (inferior people) – the Jews, Roma, Slavs, Blacks, and others.

In contrast to racism, which is intrinsically built on ideas of hierarchy and superiority of one group over others, nationalism is rooted in the universalist principles that advocate the idea of popular sovereignty, self-rule, and moral equality of all citizens inhabiting an autonomous nation-state. Although the intellectual roots of nationalist ideas can be traced back to the Enlightenment and Romanticism, their full articulation came about in the wake of French (1789 - 1799) and American revolutions (1775 - 1783) and the Latin American wars of independence (1808 – 1833). However, this is not to say that the insurgents involved in these violent events were motivated by nationalist aspirations or preservation of cultural authenticity as later claimed by many official accounts. Instead, nationalism gradually developed as an unintended consequence

of political reorganisation of the state. Thus, the patrimonial kingdoms and absolutism gave way to the republican model of polity organisation which eventually transformed into the nation-state. Although initially cultural difference played a marginal role in the revolutionary upheavals, once the new order was created the idea of cultural authenticity attained visible significance in the process of legitimation. At the onset of the revolutions and wars of independence, the rebels were largely part of the same cultural tradition as those they confronted – American colonists were indistinguishable from their English counterparts and initially demanded their rights as Englishmen (CHAVEZ, 2009), the metropolitan elites in Caracas, Santiago de Chile, and Bogota who rebelled against the Spanish rule were part of the same cultural milieu as their Spanish counterparts, both of which differed profoundly from the majority of native Latin American populations and the descendants of African slaves. Even in the French case the leading revolutionaries had culturally much more in common with their enemy aristocrats than with the rest of the Third Estate that they nominally represented – the illiterate serfs, free peasants, and the urban poor (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2013). Thus, rather than being a principal motivator of revolutionary change, nationalism was a consequence of state re-organisation.

The first wave of nationalist movements was largely inspired by progressive aims such as the demand for the extension of citizenship rights, fair taxation, religious tolerance, social reform, a degree of gender parity, social protection of vulnerable groups, and full political representation of all citizens. It is no historical accident that early 19th century nationalisms in Europe and the Americas were aligned with other ideological projects that challenged the *ancien régime*, including liberalism, socialism, republicanism, secularism and the nascent expressions of anarchism and feminism, among others. At the same time, the early forms of racism as expressed by the counterrevolutionaries such as François Dominique De Reynaud (1791) were hostile to nationalism as they perceived ordinary population representing the Third Estate as the inferior new people born of slaves and mixture of all races (GARRIGUS, 2006).

However, despite this general commitment to social inclusion of underprivileged social strata, the European and American nationalist movements retained hierarchical structure in relation to class, gender, and 'race'. The popular revolutionary mottos of the French (*liberté, égalité, fraternité*) and American revolutions (no taxation without representation) did not apply to the non-white populations, women, and propertyless men. The notion of a universal citizenship as officially proclaimed in The Declaration of Man and of the Citizen (1789) did not include the populations inhabiting the oversees colonies of France such as Haiti or Senegal. Similarly, the US Bill of Rights (1791) was reserved for the property-owning white men. In these two cases and many others across Europe and the Americas the rhetoric of popular sovereignty reinforced social hierarchies along the racial, gender, and class divisions. However, some liberal, socialist, and republican strands of nationalism advocated expansion of citizenship rights to the excluded groups and eventually by 20th century women, underprivileged social groups, and many minorities did attain full legal rights within these societies. Yet, the formal inclusion did not prevent continuous discrimination in practice.

By the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, European and American nationalisms have largely shifted to the right of political spectrum and have coalesced with imperialism, colonialism, monarchism, racism, and fascism. This ideological shift was rooted in the new geopolitical logic of European imperial expansion across the world. The imperial race for new colonies was now ideologically justified through ever more popular social Darwinist principles. In this period, nationalism, imperialism, and racism often blended and reinforced each other. In order to legitimise their territorial conquests, the British, French, Dutch, and other European colonial powers relied on the newly established racial hierarchies where the indigenous populations were deemed inferior and incapable of self-rule, while the white Europeans were depicted as the universal carriers of progress. The Opium wars in China (1839 - 1842 and 1856 - 1860) together with the Scramble for Africa (1881 - 1914) reinforced the racial hierarchisation of the world and also contributed to the rise of nationalism among the

European populations. While European powers were pursuing their imperial ambitions abroad, they were also involved in the nationalisation of their population at home (MALEŠEVI□, 2019; KUMAR, 2017; WEBER, 1978). Whereas in the early 19th century nationalism was mostly a prerogative of the upper and middle social strata, by the beginning of the 20th century nationalist ideologies have penetrated most other social classes. Hence, while previously nationalism was an enemy of imperialism and, to some extent, also of racism, now nationalism, imperialism, and racism have often banded together. The proliferation of nationalism as a mass phenomenon in Europe and the Americas relied extensively on the use of the racist tropes about inferior Others (MOSSE, 1975).

The defeat of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Imperial Japan in 1945 has delegitimised racist ideologies and has inaugurated a new wave of nationalism across the world. This postcolonial nationalism was characterised by hostility towards racism and imperialism. In this understanding, nationalism and racism are conceptualised as mutually exclusive ideologies. In the words of the leading representative of postcolonial nationalism, Julius Nyerere (1974, [s.p.]), 'we believe that only evil, Godless men would make the colour of a man's skin the criteria for granting him civil rights' while also emphasising that 'No nation has the right to make decisions for another nation; no people for another people'. The rise of anti-colonial movements gave impetus to the creation of new nation-states on the ruins of imperial structures across Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The popularity of postcolonial nationalism also had impact on the development of anti-racist movements in the former colonial powers including the civil rights movement in the US. More radical strands of this movement, such as the Black Panther Party and Revolutionary Action Movement, articulated a vision of Black nationalism. Drawing on the ideas of Frantz Fanon and Kwame Nkrumah, the black nationalist movement advocated socio-political empowerment of the African American population in the US.

The recent economic and political crises, including the 2008 financial crisis and the 2015 - 2018 migrant crisis, together with the protracted wars in Syria, Libya, Iraq, Yemen, and Afghanistan,

have changed the relationship between nationalism and racism yet again. Whereas the late 20th century nationalisms were mostly focused on liberal principles, the latest wave of nationalism is distinctly nativist, populist, and anti-immigrant. The Brexit crisis and the election of many far-right leaders across the world, including Donald Trump in the US, signified a shift towards much more exclusive form of nationalism. In this context racism became the cornerstone of many nationalist policies.

Thus, the historical trajectory of racism and nationalism shows clearly that nationalism and racism are two different yet compatible ideological projects. Their historical trajectories are characterised by change and fluctuation: sometimes they were mutually opposing ideological projects and on other occasions they converged and reinforced each other.

3 Grounding nationalism and racism in the contemporary world

Most literature on racism now recognises that this phenomenon is historically generated and structurally reproduced and as such cannot be reduced to individual psychologies. Rather than focusing on 'the pathology of racist individuals' it is paramount to explore 'the structural forces that produced racist social systems' (MEER, 2021, p. 2). However, this line of argument has rarely been applied to nationalism. In most conventional accounts, nationhood and nationalism are simply taken for granted and normalised. While racism is now seen as a problem in all its forms, nationalism becomes an object of critique only when it takes a more radical shape such as 'racist nationalism', 'sectarian nationalism' or 'ethnic nationalism'. In other words, whereas many analyses now agree that institutional racism is produced by the existing state structures, including its coercive-organisational apparatus such as the police, military, the judiciary, and the education system, there is very little if any discussion about institutional nationalism. Furthermore, many critics of institutional racism often see political remedies for racism within the existing nation-states and as such tend implicitly or explicitly to reinforce the nation-centric

understanding of social reality. For example, both Modood (2020) and Nimni (2016) argue that the institutional racism and intra-societal ethnic conflicts can be resolved through the development of multicultural nationalism. In their own words:

> [...] multicultural nationalism unites the concerns of some of those currently sympathetic to majoritarian nationalism and those who are pro-diversity and minority accommodationist in the way that liberal nationalism (with its emphasis on individualism and majoritarianism) does not. It therefore represents the political idea and tendency most likely to offer a feasible alternative rallying point to monocultural nationalism. (MODDOD, 2020, p. 308).

In these and similar accounts, 'race' and nationhood are treated very differently: whereas racism is understood to be a problem generated by inequitable institutional mechanisms of the state, the same yardstick is not applied to nationhood and nationalism.

In contrast to these accounts, one could argue that although nationalism and racism are different ideological doctrines and modes of practice they are institutionalised and reproduced through the same organisational, ideological, and micro-interactional mechanisms. Hence, to understand the relationship between the two in the contemporary world it is necessary to briefly explore these long-term processes that on the one hand make nationalism and racism so pervasive in everyday life and on the other hand create institutional conditions for their occasional cohabitation.

For one thing both racism and nationalism are organisationally grounded phenomena. The extent of their influence is determined by the capability of specific social organisations to enforce these ideas and practices throughout societies. Thus, the rise and expansion of nationalism and racism in the modern world was made possible by the relatively continuous and cumulative increase in the coercive organisational power – from secret conspiratory societies, cultural associations, economic unions, organised social movements, political parties, and civil society groupings. For example, whereas the nationalist ideas and practices were initially spearheaded and spread by the small yet highly disciplined revolutionary secret societies, such as Irish Republican Brotherhood,

Young Italy, Young Poland, Portuguese Carbonaria, the influence of the early racist organisations such as Ku Klux Klan (established in 1865) or Germanenorden (1912) was also determined by their organisational prowess. However, the most important organisational vehicle for both ideological doctrines was the state. Once nationalism became the principal legitimising sources of state power it quickly gained influence across the societies. The rulers of nationalising states could use their ever-increasing coercive organisational capacities to shape their culturally diverse populations into more homogenous nation. With the development of greater infrastructural capacities, including extensive transport and communication networks, regularised extraction of resources and taxation and the implementation of the wide-ranging policing and surveillance of their citizens and borders the state authorities were able to mould and standardise the everyday practices of their populations (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2019; MANN, 1993; TILLY, 1992). In some historical cases, such as late 18th and 19th century France or late 19th century and early 20th century Balkans, this process was overtly violent involving mass killings and expulsions of 'undesirable minorities'. The French revolutionary armies attempted to homogenise France through the physical destruction of clergy and peasantry in Vendée and Brittany, and others who opposed the revolution and remained committed to the preservation of their minority languages. Similarly, the rulers of the newly independent Balkan states, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece, embarked on mass scale ethnic cleansing and massacres of local Muslim populations. In many other cases, national homogenisation was achieved through assimilation. The same coercive organisational capacities were also deployed to enact racist policies ranging from the large--scale slave labour on the tobacco, sugar cane and cotton plantations in the US, the Caribbean and South America to the expropriation of the land owned by the native populations in the colonies of Africa, Asia, Australia, and Oceania. It is the continuous increase in the coercive organisational powers of states (i.e. better and larger administrative apparatuses, military and police forces, court systems, prison systems etc.) that made the colonial expansion and labour exploitation possible. In some cases, the instruments

of the coercive-organisational power played a decisive role in the genocide of native populations including the virtual annihilation of Native Americans and Herrero and Nama peoples of Southwest Africa. Without ever increasing coercive organisational capacities of states, neither nationalism nor racism could have reached deep into every nook and corner of the globe.

For another thing, the successful grounding of racism and nationalism was historically dependent on, and is still accomplished through, ideological penetration. While premodern ideological doctrines were more focused on maintaining a degree of social cohesion at the top of the political pyramid, the modern ideologies such as nationalism and racism have to attract the attention of the mass audience (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2017). In other words, in a mass society where social and political elites rely on support of millions of individuals to gain or maintain power both nationalism and racism have proved to be potent source of political legitimacy and a mechanism for mass mobilisation of population. Hence, while organisational power provides means for the spread of racist and nationalist ideas and practices it is the ideological penetration within and through the society-wide networks that plays a key role in the normalisation and naturalisation of nationalism and racism. Both nationalism and racism have reached wider social strata through the increased literacy rates, development of mass media and society-wide compulsory educational systems, standardised languages, and military conscription practices among others (GELLNER, 1983; ANDERSON, 1983; MALEŠEVIĆ, 2019; 2013).

In addition, both racist and nationalist doctrines appeal to wider audiences as they offer utopian grand vistas of collective freedom, shared goals, and group prestige. While nationalist discourses are regularly premised on implementation of specific ethical principles such as justice, equality, and liberty for the oppressed people (i.e. *liberté, égalité, fraternité*) racism is usually couched in the language of fraternity, righteousness, and a sense of moral superiority. For example, for the nationalist ideologues who persistently advocated for the unification of Italy (1870) and Germany (1871) such as Giuseppe Garibaldi and Friedrich Jahn, respectively, a nation is a moral project that entails self-sacrifice:

'To this wonderful page in our country's history another more glorious still will be added, and the slave shall show at last to his free brothers a sharpened sword forged from the links of his fetters' (KUMAR, 2013, p. 50) or 'Germany needs a war of her own in order to feel her power; she needs a feud with Frenchdom to develop her national way of life in all its fullness. This occasion will not fail to come' (VIERECK, 2017, p. 97). The racist discourses also invoke moral codes but the focus here is on group superiority: 'The Whites, by law of conquest, by justice of civilization, are masters of the American continent, and the best safety of the frontier settlements will be secured by the total annihilation of the few remaining Indians' (VENABLES, 2004, p. 254).

In addition to coercive-organisational capacity and society--wide ideological penetration, both nationalism and racism entail micro-interactional grounding. In other words, these doctrines and modes of practice have gained in influence because they are maintained and reproduced in everyday life. Everyday nationalism is discursively constructed and enacted through routine daily practices ranging from the patterns of consumption, ritualistic events, modes of speech to the ordinary ways of socialising (SKEY, 2011; FOX; MILLER-IDRISS, 2008; BILLIG, 1995). In this way nationalism is normalised and naturalised as the only legitimate way to understand one's identities. The sense of being French, Algerian, or Chilean is constantly reinforced through the everyday practices that posit nationhood as the dominant form of groupness.

Racism too is perpetuated through the variety of everyday practices – racial profiling by the police and immigration officers, casual references to one's physical features or accents, the use of racialised jokes, derogatory attitude towards distinct forms of dress or different cultural activities. Some of these practices are overtly expressed while other forms of everyday racism such as exclusionary body language, disproving looks, or culturally insensitive disparaging reactions are often displayed in a less visible way (COUSENS, 2019; LEDDY-OWEN, 2019; SMITH, 2016 *apud* HILL, 2011). Everyday racism is also reinforced in the mass media and social media representations of different parts of the world (i.e. sub-Saharan Africa) as well as the stereotypical and often

prejudiced depiction of immigrant areas within the big cities of respective nation-states.

The continuous reproduction of everyday nationalism and racism is dependent on ability of ideological discourses to successfully tap into the existing micro-level solidarities. Hence, nationalist ideologies often penetrate the micro world by framing nationhood in the language of kinships (i.e. our Hungarian brothers and sisters, our Greek forefathers, mother Russia). In a very similar way racist discourses are often couched in the discourses of male bonding, kin and comradeship (i.e. Aryan brotherhood, Blood & Honour, True Blue Crew).

As with other ideological projects, nationalism and racism rely on the same organisational, ideological, and micro-interactional processes to penetrate the social order. However, as they are compatible yet distinct ideologies and modes of practice, they also display different dynamics of influence. The racial classifications and racism are endemic in the modern world and are now mostly recognised as a problem that needs to be addressed. In direct contrast national classifications and nationalism are rarely perceived as a social problem in of themselves. Instead, nationalism becomes a problem only when it attains more radicalised forms. These different understandings and distinct structural positions of racism and nationalism have generated an interesting paradox: while racism is more pronounced and visible social problem that impacts negatively and more directly on the everyday lives of many people it is potentially more rectifiable than nationalism. Although racist ideologies have evolved over time and have proved resistant to many attempts to eradicate them from the social and political life they can still potentially be displaced by other ideological projects. In contrast, as nationalism underpins the political legitimacy of modern nation states it simply cannot be removed or replaced by other ideologies as long as the nation-state model of polity organisation remains dominant. In other words, whereas racism in not a necessary ingredient of modern social order, one cannot dispense with nationalism in a world where nation-states are the only legitimate form of territorial organisation (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2019; 2013). As nationalism in all its forms is the principal mode of political

legitimacy, for the very existence of nation-states it cannot be displaced by alternative ideological projects without also dispensing with the nation-state model of territorial organisation. The key normative principles of any nationalist ideology such as the idea of popular sovereignty, self-rule, economic independence, or the preservation of cultural authenticity have co-evolved with the distinct organisational form that is a nation-state where the focus is on clearly demarcated borders, administrative control of entire state territory, possession of monopoly on taxation, education, judiciary and the legitimate use of violence (MANN, 2012; 1993). The modern nation-states justify their existence through nationalist principles where one's co-nationals are always prioritised over non-nationals. The rulers of nation-states can and do advocate different policies and can pursue different ideological orientations, but their legitimacy is always derived from the idea that they represent the nation (MALEŠEVIĆ, 2006).

None of this is to say that racism is less relevant in the contemporary world. In contrast to scholars who see racism as a residual of premodern imperial structures and as such something that is extraneous to modernity (i.e. GELLNER, 1995) one could argue that racism has become much more grounded and widespread in the contemporary world. Just as nationalism racism has expanded in the world of nation-states as they are both grounded in the cumulative increase of coercive-organisational, ideological, and micro-interactional powers. In this sense racism can and has historically been co-opted to enhance legitimacy of the state rule in some polities such as apartheid era South Africa and Namibia, Jim Crow US, or *branqueamento* era Brazil (1889 - 1940) among others. Racism has also supplemented nationalism in a more subtle forms where racial privilege has been maintained through the discourse of colour blindness. However, unlike racism which is largely dependent on nationalism to retain a degree of legitimacy when in power the opposite does not apply. As Mosse (1995, p. 163) rightly argues, 'racism was never an indispensable element of nationalism'. While racism needs nationalism to gain or retain power, nationalism does not need racism to control the state. In a social environment where racism is increasingly delegitimised

most nationalist movements are eager to dissociate themselves from racist discourses and practices. Hence, the more liberal and progressive forms of nationalism tend to position themselves against all forms of racist thought and action. In some respects, the weakening of racism has translated into the strengthening of nationalism where the discourse of inclusion of minority groups often happens at the expense of strengthening boundaries between the nationals and non-nationals. Thus, precisely because nationalism and racism are not members of the same ideological family, they can conflict and coalesce in different historical conditions.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, B. **Imagined Communities**: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso, 1983.

BANTON, M. **Racial and Ethnic Competition**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

BILLIG, M. **Banal Nationalism**. London: Sage, 1995.

CHAVEZ, J. **Beyond Nations**: Evolving Homelands in the North Atlantic World 1400-2000. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

COUSENS, S. **Overcoming Everyday Racism**. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2019.

DE REYNAUD, F.D. **De la nécessité d'une contre-révolution en France**. [s.l.]: [s.n.], 1791. Available at: https://dmr.bsu.edu/digital/collection/FrnchRev/id/408. Access on: Jul. 17, 2022.

ELIAS, A. J. B., MANSURI, F.; PARADIES, Y. Racism and nationalism during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. **Ethnic and Racial Studies**, v. 44, i. 2, p. 01 – 11, 2021.

FOX, J.; MILLER-IDRISS, C. Everyday nationhood. **Ethnicities**, v. 8, i. 4, p. 536 – 563, 2008.

GARRIGUS, J. **Before Haiti**: Race and Citizenship in French Saint-Domingue. New York: Springer, 2006.

GELLNER, E. **Encounters with Nationalism**. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

_____. **Nations and Nationalism**. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

GOLDBERG, D.T. **The Racial State**. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

GOLDBERG, D.T.; SOLOMOS, J. General Introduction. In: _____. (eds). **A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies**. London: Blackwell, 2002. p. 03 – 28.

HANNAFORD, I. **Race**: The History of an Idea in the West. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1996.

HILL, J. H. **The Everyday Language of White Racism**. London: Wiley, 2011.

HOCHMAN, A. Is 'Race' Modern? Disambiguating the Question. **Du Bois Review**, v. 16, i. 2, p. 647 – 665, 2020.

KUMAR, K. **Visions of Empire**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.

_____. **World Greatest Speeches**. [s.l.]: Sterling Publishers, 2013.

LEDDY-OWEN, C. **Nationalism, Inequality and England's Political Predicament**. London: Routledge, 2019.

MALEŠEVIĆ, S. **Grounded Nationalisms**: A Sociological Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

_____. **The Rise of Organised Brutality**: A Historical Sociology of Violence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

_____. **Nation-States and Nationalisms**: Organisation, Ideology and Micro-Solidarity. Cambridge: Polity, 2013.

_____. **Identity as Ideology**: Understanding Ethnicity and Nationalism. New York: Palgrave, 2006.

MALLON, R. Social Construction and Achieving Reference. **Noûs**, v. 51, i. 1, p. 113–131, 2017.

MANN, M. **The Sources of Social Power**: Global Empires and Revolution, 1890-1945. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

_____. **The Sources of Social Power II**: The Rise of Classes and Nation-States, 1760-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

MEER, N. Introduction: The Wreckage of White Supremacy. In: _____. (ed). **Whiteness and Nationalism**. London: Routledge, 2021.

MILES, R. Recent Marxist Theories of Nationalism and the Issue of Racism. **The British Journal of Sociology**, v. 38, i. 1, p. 24-43, 1986.

MODOOD, T. Multiculturalism as a New Form of Nationalism? **Nations and Nationalism**, v. 26, i. 2, p. 308-313, 2020.

MOSSE, G. L. Racism and Nationalism. **Nations and Nationalism**, v. 1, i. 2, p. 163-173, 1995.

_____. **Nationalisation of the Masses**. New York: Howard Fertig, 1975.

NIMNI, E. **Multicultural Nationalism**. London: Routledge, 2016.

NIRENBERG, D. Was There Race before Modernity? The Example of "Jewish" Blood in Late Medieval Spain. In: ELIAV-FELDON, M.; ISAAC, B.; ZIEGLER, J. (eds.) **The Origins of Racism in the West**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. p. 232–264.

NYERERE, J. **Man and Development**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

OMI, M.; WINANT, H. **Racial Formation in the United States**. New York: Routledge, 2015.

SAYER, J. **The Future Governance of Education**. London: Cassel, 1993.

SKEY, M. **National Belonging and Everyday Life**. London: Palgrave, 2011.

SMITH, A. **Racism and Everyday Life**. London: Palgrave, 2016.

_____. **Theories of Nationalism**. London: Duckworth, 1971.

TILLY, C. **Coercion, Capital and European States**. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

TOPINKA, R. J. Politically incorrect participatory media: Racist nationalism on r/ImGoingToHellForThis. **New Media & Society**, v. 20, i. 5, p. 2050-2069, 2018.

VALLUVAN, S. Nationalism and Racism. In: SOLOMOS, J. (ed.). **Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms**. London: Routledge, 2020. p. 145 – 151.

VALLUVAN, S.; KALRA, V. S. Introduction. In: _____. (eds.). **Racial Nationalisms**: Borders, Refugees, and the Cultural Politics of Belonging. London: Routledge, 2021.

VENABLES, R. W. **American Indian History**. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 2004.

VIERECK, P. **Conservativism Revisited**: The Revolt against Ideology. London: Routledge, 2017.

WALIA, H. **Border and Rule**: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021.

WEBER, E. **Peasants into Frenchmen**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978.