

Emergence of nation states and problematic political concepts in four ‘waves’: From the French revolution to the end of the cold war

Ahmet Sözen

*Department of Political Science and International Relations,
University of Bahçeşehir, İstanbul, Turkey*

Abstract

In this paper, the concept of *sovereignty* and other related important problematic concepts such as *nation*, *people* and *self-determination*, that are closely, in fact organically, related to the concept of a *nation state*, and the problems associated with them will be analyzed in different ‘waves’ (historical processes) of the emergence of nation states. It is argued that the concept of sovereignty and other related concepts were in each ‘wave’ abused first by the monarchist leaders and later by the nation states, great powers and the international community. The author makes some modest recommendations for the international relations and international law literatures about how to establish and maintain peace in the new world order in the twenty-first century, given the current context consisting of a fragmented international society and that of several ethnic conflicts, such as the ethnic violence in Kosovo, Northern Ireland, and Chechnya.

1. Introduction

The end of the 1980s and the early 1990s witnessed dramatic transformations that shook the whole world radically. The emergence of almost two dozen new nation states from the remnants of the former Soviet Union and the Balkans (i.e., former Yugoslavia) together with the sudden eruptions of several ethnic conflicts within these new states and elsewhere in the world, pushed forward the discussion of troubled concepts, such as *sovereignty* and related concepts such as *people*, *nation*, *self-determination*, which are organically linked to the concept of *nation state*. In addition, scholars started to pay more attention to the management of ethnic conflicts in order to have a more peaceful world.

The above mentioned concepts will be analyzed in this paper with reference to both the contemporary and the early literature, from a historical, evolutionary point of view in distinct but important time periods – called ‘waves’. Since the scope of this paper is quite narrow, the period after the French Revolution, i.e., the so called modern era, will be surveyed with greater emphasis. This time period will be divided into four phases: 1) 1789-1914, 2) 1914-1945, 3) 1945-1989, and 4) 1990s. My basic aim in dividing this period into four phases is the assumption that each phase includes one important, what-I-call, ‘wave’ of the emergence of nation states:

First Wave - This wave occurred during the time between the French Revolution (1789) and World War I, when nation states emerged due to the influence of the ideas of the French Revolution;

Second Wave - The second wave took place between World War I and World War II, when history witnessed the disintegration of the defeated European empires into new nation states;

Third Wave - The third wave occurred during the Cold War era, more precisely between the end of World War II and the late 1980s. It was the anti-colonial movement that led to the emergence of new nation states;

Fourth Wave - This wave is still alive. It started soon after the end of the Cold War through the disintegration of the Socialist bloc and the emergence of new nation states in central Asia and the Balkans.

In the following pages, *sovereignty* and other related problematic concepts such as *nation*, *people* and *self-determinations* which are closely, in fact organically, related to the concept of *nation state*, and related problems will be analyzed in each ‘wave’ of the emergence of nation states.

This paper argues that the use (and the abuse of) the above mentioned problematic concepts throughout the important periods of history when compared with the contemporary, fragmented international society torn with several violent ethnic conflicts show us the need for reforms in both international law and in the conduct of international relations. In other words, these are some of the important problems of the contemporary international system. Hence, some modest recommendations for the international relations literature, as well as international law will be made about how to establish and maintain peace in the new world order in the twenty-first century, in the context of a fragmented international society and several violent ethnic conflicts - such as in Kosovo, Northern Ireland and Chechnya.

2. First wave: From the era of liberalism to *realpolitik* (1789-1914)

The concepts of sovereignty and self-determination can be traced back to the early Greeks: the beginning of government (Umozurike, 1972). However, the emergence of the monotheist religions had great impact on these concepts. For example, Jehovah, the god of Israelites, was omnipotent who “chose Israelites to serve him according to his Commands” (Freud, 1964: 170). So, the wars that the Israelites waged for centuries were in the name of Jehovah and in fulfilling his commands.

In the Judaeo-Christian faith, “a king was appointed by God to govern the Earth” (Freud, 1964: 170-1). For example, the Tsar of Russia claimed to govern with “absolute sovereignty bestowed upon him by God” (Freud, 1964: 170). The very act of the Pope’s placing his hand over the Holy Roman Emperor’s head during his crowning ceremony symbolized the transmission of the divine rights to the new emperor.

During the Middle Ages, we see the growing schism between the King and the Church. The King emerged more powerful from that schism and the more the King gained power from the Church the less the King is “restrained by moral scruples” (Freud, 1964: 173). In that respect, Jean Bodin defined sovereignty as “supreme power over all citizens and as unrestricted by law” (Freud, 1964: 171). Later, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) confirmed Bodin’s argument: “Laws are nothing but the Commands of a political sovereign who is subjected to no legal limits” (Freud, 1964: 172). Machiavelli is the other philosopher who, in *The Prince*, “glorified the ruler who, with no qualm whatsoever, must at all costs strive to become paramount and successful in achieving his aims” (Freud, 1964: 173; also see Machiavelli, 1942: 73-76).

During the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the common people were, as Alfred Freud states, “oppressed by the Kings’ levies, and robbed of their land by the barons” (Freud, 1964: 173-5). Since the common people did not have powerful leaders of the same rank due to the feudal structure of the society, most of their support came from the poets and philosophers.

Eventually, the eighteenth century period of Enlightenment which emphasized the ‘individual’, produced such optimistic philosophers as Leibniz, Voltaire, and, of course, Rousseau whose masterpiece, *Social Contract*, had great influence on the French Revolution. According to Rousseau, education was essential “in order to develop the innate good qualities in man ... [so that he would see] through the superstition which created the godlike, absolute king, ... [and] perceive himself as an integral factor in his community and as endowed with certain inalienable equal rights” (Freud, 1964: 175; also see Rousseau, 1762). However, Rousseau’s ideas on sovereignty were interpreted very narrowly and the ‘people’ were seen as a ‘unified body’ instead of as ‘individuals’, and the French constitution was written in that narrow perspective.

The French Constitution of September 3, 1791 states:

Sovereignty rests and resides, not in a fractional manner, in the individual members of the nation, but uniquely, in a global and indivisible manner, in that collectivity which is the nation envisaged as a unified body (Freud, 1964: 177).

This statement clearly transforms the people into one indivisible body - the nation, and it reads very much like Jean Bodin's ideas. That is to say, the sovereign King is replaced by the sovereign nation where this sovereignty is absolute and indivisible. From then on, there was no more " 'L'état, c'est moi!' (I am the state), but rather, 'L'état, c'est nous!' (We are the state)" (Freud, 1964: 178). Therefore, it was no longer a king or monarch who could seize the property of another nation; but the nation-state could, which obtained all the rights and privileges of the former sovereign (king). Here, Hobbes' *king* and Machiavelli's *prince* were replaced by the 'nation state,' which was subjected to no legal limits. Therefore, once sovereignty is given by the individual to the nation state the individual has nobody to appeal successfully against the state. For that, Hymen Ezra Cohen (1937) argues that there is an *appeal to Heaven, but it is not lawful*. Hence, the concept of sovereignty was abused by the ruler of the nation state. In other words, while sovereignty was supposed to be derived from the people, the people were ignored.

Following the French Revolution, the concept of 'self-determination' was also abused. Originally, the concept was used in holding plebiscites, which stressed the principles of the 'rights of man' and 'peoples' wishes. In that regard, plebiscites were held before Savoy (1792) and Nice (1793) were annexed to the French Republic. However, annexation of foreign territory that belonged to another sovereign was also decided by some plebiscites. In addition, the French assembly passed a decree "unanimously on December 16, 1792 ... [that] reaffirmed the inviolability of French territory and imposed the death penalty on anybody attempting to cede any part of it, including the annexed proportions" (Omuzurike, 1972: 11).

The universalism and individual rights that were the inspirations of the French Revolution were transformed into the absolute sovereignty of the (French) nation state. Moreover, the Napoleonic Wars paved the way to a centralized nation state by the introduction of a "unified system of law, bureaucracy and education" (Kohn, 1982: 28-9).

Other Europeans were heavily influenced by Napoleon. The idea of nation state was extensively yearned for especially by the nationalistic youth of those nations who lacked a political statehood (Kohn, 1982: 40-3). Mazzini "called upon the youth and the people to sacrifice everything to the attainment of a united, centralized, strong nation state" (Kohn, 1982: 41).¹ So, the years before 1848 saw the emergence of many

¹ Mazzini founded a movement which was called 'Giovine Italia' (Young Italy). He inspired similar movements among the German and Polish emigres and tried to constitute

nationalist movements, such as Ukrainian, Greek, Serbian, Irish, and Young Turkish nationalist movements. This phase is what-I-called the ‘First Wave’ of the emergence of nation states.

Most of the time, the idea behind those nationalist movements was liberal humanitarianism. The people in those nationalist movements were challenging the oppressive imperial regimes and they were trying to replace such regimes with a *nation state* where they would have individual liberty and constitutional guarantees. However, the ‘second signal’ that came from France is the declaration of the Second French Republic (1848): “The new nationalism stressed collective power and utility above individual liberty. It tended to mean independence from outside, rather than freedom within” (Kohn, 1982: 30).

From then on, the new nationalism “entered the age of what has become known ... *Machtpolitik* and *Realpolitik*, a policy based on power and self-interest, and not on humanitarian declaration” (Kohn, 1982: 53). The following decades until 1919 saw the struggle for national independence of many nations of Europe (both the Western and the Central Europe) and the Balkans, who were without a national ‘statehood.’

3. Second wave: Inter-war years (1914-1945)

The result of WWI brought about the emergence of 26² new states in Europe (Central and Central Eastern Europe). This ‘Second Wave’ of the emergence of nation states had resulted in the enlargement of the nation states formed in the nineteenth century, in terms of population and territory. This was the idea behind Mazzini’s assumption that the evolution of nation states is a healthy historical evolution: individuals, first form the family, followed by tribe, nation and eventually a global formation - leading to World peace. Wilson’s idealism was very much influenced by Mazzini’s assumption. The collective security of the member states of the League of Nations could be attained by granting the right to *self-determination* to the ‘peoples’ or ‘nations’ without statehood - the idea behind Wilson’s idealism. However, in practice, the concept of self-determination was never properly and wholly applied to the nations or peoples living in the territories of the dominant powers.

Although, plebiscites were held to decide which *nation* would govern itself, the Western European powers gave only limited support to the principle of self-determination. Instead, the victors of WWI tried to “match the territories with existing nationalities ... [i.e.,] groups that were already exerting control over definite areas. While recognizing certain rights for national minorities, it was only to a recognized national majority that a right to self-determination was extended. The use of the plebiscites,

them into an association of ‘Young Europe’ (See Kohn, 1982).

² The number is 27 with the Irish Free State included. See Hobsbawm (1990: 31-2).

determined which nationality was in majority” (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 87-8). Self-determination was, then, based on ‘nationality’ whose components were negotiable during the peace conferences after WWI. For example, the German territories were given to other states by the victors of WWI without consulting the population on the given territories (by means of plebiscites, i.e., using the principle of self-determination).

By and large, “minority treaties dominated state practices” (Gotlieb, 1993: 29) in the peace conferences after WWI. The treaties were imposed on the states, which emerged, for example, from the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Sevres (1920) and Lausanne (1923) treaties also included some provisions that govern minority rights on the former Ottoman Empire. However, due to the lack of an effective international community (or the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations) and the non-binding nature of the international law, most of the minorities were abandoned to the mercy of the ruthless oppressors, as in the case of the Balkans (Gotlieb, 1993: 29-30).

In addition, the Versailles peace settlement put together peoples who had been “animated by deep mutual antagonisms” (Gotlieb, 1993: 25) in a single state, such as the Croats and the Serbs in Yugoslavia, and the Czechs and Slovaks in Czechoslovakia.

In short, the idea that dominated the moves of the glorious alliance of the Western powers during the peace settlement after WWI was put forth by Gidon Gotlieb:

The cold logic of the balance of power prevailed, and geopolitical considerations received priority over the claims of small nation for independence. The synthetic states of Yugoslavia and of Czechoslovakia were created without much regard for the aspirations of the nations that were forced into them (Gotlieb, 1993: 29).

Once again, the principle of self-determination was violated³ as it had been after the French Revolution. In addition, the absolute sovereignty of the nation state prevailed over any known moral law - which led to the oppressive and harsh treatment of minorities by their own states under the shield of national sovereignty.⁴

4. Third wave: The cold war era (1945-1989)

We see that the principle of self-determination was misapplied after WWI and it was misunderstood since then. It gave power and legitimacy,

³ “The Allies themselves accepted self-determination only insofar as it applied to the disintegration and dissolution of the German, Austro-Hungarian, Turkish, and former Russian empires. There was no intention of applying the principle to their own colonies and subject people” (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 307).

⁴ Hitler treated Jews harshly and caused the extermination of millions of Jews, and he disguised all those crimes under the right of the ‘sovereignty’ of the German State.

for example, to Hitler who, during the 1930s, used the principle of self-determination to satisfy the expansionist aims and territorial ambitions of Germany.

Until the recognition of the UN Charter and post-1945 UN declarations (Cristescu, 1981), the right to self-determination was a political, and to a certain extent, a moral concept - but it had “no legal validity within the law of nations” (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 309)

The ‘balance of power’ system of the inter-war years was broken by WWII from which emerged, for a brief period, first a ‘unifocal system’ where the United States was the only dominant power with nuclear capability. However, soon afterwards, in the 1950s, the power started to polarize between the United States and the USSR (i.e., a bipolar system emerged). Then was the time when the new map of the world could be drawn according to this new power structure.

The Wilsonian idealism of the United States to extend the principle of self-determination to all the ‘people’ - although the word ‘people’ was never defined explicitly - was balanced by the power calculations of the USSR, and to a lesser extent by the United Kingdom. However, the war weary United Kingdom, by then, had lost her superpower status in the new bipolar power structure.

“The ‘peoples’ viewed as entitled to exercise self-determination no longer were defined in ethnic and cultural terms [as part of them were in the aftermath of WWI]. Instead, they were geographically determined by their presence within a colonial territory” (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 44).

Although the principle “respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples” (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 83), as it was stated, was introduced by the Soviet Union at the Big Four consultations in San Francisco, the principle was never applied to the ‘peoples’ within the multinational Soviet Union. The UN also failed to resolve the claims, for example, of the Quebecers, Sikhs, Palestinians, (Gotlieb, 1993: 35) and so forth, during the Cold War era. Once again the principle of self-determination was violated by the so-called international community (i.e., the UN, just like the League of Nations during the inter-war years).

Alexander and Friedlander observe:

Art.1, para.2, of the UN Charter referred to the relations among states. Therefore ... the term ‘peoples’, in connection with ‘equal rights’ meant states, since only states have ‘equal rights’ according to general, international law. Self-determination of peoples ... meant the sovereignty of the states. The combined principle of equal rights and the self-determination of people meant the sovereign equality of the states (Alexander and Friedlander, 1980: 83-4).

Once again, the idea of a sovereign nation state prevailed, which led to more fueling of nationalist movements and ethnic conflicts, instead of a new alternative for the peaceful co-existence of different ‘peoples.’ Of course, the colonial powers, such as the United Kingdom, were trying to postpone the transfer of power to the native people. In that respect, ‘divide and rule’ principle was once more triggered by the British in former colonies, such as India and Cyprus where, later, the nationalist movements went so far as to divide these countries into two or more ‘national’ territories - or so called ‘nation states.’

However, the substance of ‘sovereign nation state,’ or to be more precise, the criteria of forming a sovereign nation state changed radically with the emergence of the new nation states after WW II and during the Cold War era. In that regard, Jackson (1990) observes:

What has changed is not the empirical conditions of states but the international rules and institutions concerning those conditions. Briefly, the freedom or positive sovereignty of states expressed by the traditional balance of power system has been interfered with and subjected to new normative regulation: weak, marginal, or insubstantial states are now exempted from the power contest at least in part and treated as international protectorates (Jackson, 1990: 23).

Jackson argues that there existed after WWII, an international society – unlike in the pre-WWI era - that “has presided over the birth of numerous marginal entities ... guarantees their survival, and seeks at least to compensate them for underdevelopment if not to develop them into substantial independent countries” (Jackson, 1990: 23).

This ‘Third Wave’ of the emergence of what Jackson called weak, marginal, or insubstantial, nation states after WWII was distinguished from the earlier emergence of nation states and identified as the emergence of ‘quasi-states’ by Jackson. He identifies the quasi-states as having ‘negative sovereignty’ while the non-quasi-states or the existing states before the emergence of the quasi-states, as having ‘positive sovereignty’. Therefore, negative sovereignty is only a formal legalistic condition that involves the ‘non-intervention’ of the states into the internal affairs of a sovereign state, in this case the non-intervention into the internal affairs of the quasi-states. “This is the central principle of the classical law of nations: the sphere of exclusive legal jurisdiction of states or international *laissez faire*” (Jackson, 1990: 27).

Positive sovereignty, as Jackson argues, is distinguished from negative sovereignty in that it not only includes the formal legal conditions of sovereignty, but also the “capabilities which enable governments to be their own masters: it is a substantive rather than [merely] a formal condition” (Jackson, 1990: 29). Here, Jackson identifies the states having positive sovereignty with the industrialized developed Western states.

Before attempting to analyze the problems of the concepts of 'nation state,' 'right of self-determination of peoples' and 'sovereignty' in the contemporary international politics, we have to complete the historical survey with the analysis of the 'Forth Wave' of the emergence of the nation states which were brought about by the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia.

5. Forth wave: Post cold war era (1989 -)

Diuk and Karatnycky (1993) observe:

At the center of the collapse of the Soviet Union was the dramatic rise of nationalism. Nationalism and the desire for independence broke the 'eternal union of fraternal peoples' into fifteen discrete states. And while there can be no question that many factors contributed to the fall of communism, it was nationalism and its capacity to mobilize broad masses of citizens in behalf of independence that proved the decisive force in the unraveling of totalitarianism (Diuk and Karatnycky, 1993: 1).

The collapse of the Soviet Union began in 1989 with the secession of the Baltic States - Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia (Diuk and Karatnycky, 1993: 110), and this was followed in the next few years by the declaration of independence by the other Soviet states. By the end of 1991, there was no Soviet Union anymore, but more than a dozen sovereign nation states within the territory of the former Soviet Union.

The emergence of the nation states in post-Cold War era and in the aftermath of WWI and WWII are quite different. In the aftermath of WWI and WWII, the decisions of who would be a nation state and what territory they would occupy were made by the victors of the two World Wars. However, in the case of both the former Soviet Union and former Yugoslavia, the nationalist movements with their capacity to mobilize huge masses of people played the decisive role. Of course, the policies, such as *glasnost* and *perestroika* for Soviet nations and the decline of the Soviet sphere of control for Yugoslavia, were important factors that gave different peoples or nations an opportunity to press for the right of self-determination. The most important point to make here is that the new map of the world in the post Cold War era was not drawn by the superpowers, but predominantly by the indigenous peoples or nations themselves.

The claim for the right to self-determination and the definition of territories of the new nation states in the post Cold War era is similar to the experiences of the French Revolution period - unlike the intervention of the dominant powers in the aftermath of both WWI and WWII. The really unfortunate issue here, is that the peoples of the new sovereign nation states again fell into the trap just like the French did during the Napoleonic Wars period, and emphasized the absolutism of the sovereignty of the nation state that led to the eruption of many ethnic conflicts within the territories of the new nation states. The temptation of

homogenizing the people in the territory of the nation states prevailed and the new nation states came to face the same problems of the previous larger states, such as the empires did during the first half of the twentieth century. This time, smaller ethnic groups such as the Abkhazians in Georgia, Chechens in Russia, and Serbs in Bosnia came forth with the same principle of self-determination for statehood, or more precisely for a sovereign nation state, only this time within the newly formed so called nation states - leading to further fragmentation of the international state system.

Once again, the cold blooded reasoning of nationalism prevailed: i.e., ethnic cleansing by means of extermination (genocide), expulsion (forced migration) from a territory outvoted other alternatives, such as co-existence by means of accommodating the humanitarian and identity needs of the different peoples in a state.

6. Problems of the contemporary international system

Although it is debated extensively by many scholars whether there exists an orderly international system or not, the author, with all his optimism, will argue that there exists an international system, though not a perfectly ordered, but not totally an anarchic⁵ one. The evidence of my argument is the effort of many states, basically the dominant states, to establish such formations as the League of Nations and the United Nations to regulate or, to define the customary relations between and among the states. I also defy some scholars' argument that 'since the UN was formed by the initiative of the dominant Western powers and that it is dominantly ruled by the Western powers, it only serves the interests of those powers only.' The real issue here, is not who established a necessary organization, but how it can be transformed into an organization where it would work most efficiently for the good of all the people in the world and be a platform where both international and ethnic conflicts are resolved, or even the prospective conflicts were prevented before they erupt. Otherwise, we have to argue that 'without the UN the world would be a much better place, especially for the non-Western states' - which, in my opinion, would foster the state-centric approaches much more fiercely, eventually leading to a real anarchistic system.

⁵

One of the legacies of the state-centric theories has been the assumption that the international relations are conducted in an anarchic fashion and that there are no general rules that help us understand the moves of the states on a global level. "We live in two different worlds. Within our own community, peace is maintained by the courts. No citizen can out of self-interest or self-protection impose sanctions against a wrongdoer. Among national states, however, there still exists the atavistic, tribal custom of revenge. A dispute between nation-states is not brought up before any court of law; instead, brute force decides its outcome. Within the state, order is maintained by civilized jurisdiction whereas our relationships with other states remain *anarchistic*" (Freud, 1964: 2).

The violence of the ethnic conflicts in the post Cold War era and the vast availability of chemical and nuclear weapons to very small states - and even to very small ethnic groups - cry for the need of redefinition of certain political and legal concepts, such as sovereignty, self-determination, nation state, etc., the restructuring of the customary practices between the states, and the reformation of the international law - so that it will be relieved from its Eurocentric and Western biases. Of course, all these require global psychological processes of changing or distorting the dominant perceptions in the international relations. This is also a promising area of research for the prospective global theories on international system.

In the contemporary world, we see both 'integration' and 'breakaway' movements simultaneously. While some of the old states, such as the Western European nation states are forming a supranational structure - the European Union, we also see that there are many attempts and inspirations of ethnic groups to form their own nation state within an already existing nation state, such as the Abkhazians in Georgia, Chechens in Russia and the Kurds in Iraq.

In order to attain peace and stability globally, and prevent violent ethnic conflicts, both legal and political precautions should be taken. In that respect, I propose two ways to start, which will also help to construct new global perceptions of the international system: 1) Reforming the existing international law through the global participation of the member states of the UN; 2) Restructuring the dominant practices (i.e., dominant patterns of behavior) in international relations.

6.1. Reform in international law

There is a need for a reformed international law that will also incorporate non-Western legal systems. Larson and Jenks (1965) argue that the histories, diplomatic and legal precedents of the non-Western countries should be studied in order to search for principles that are common in most of the legal systems - both Western and non-Western, in order to incorporate them into a reformed international law.

The other issue, which is probably the most challenging one is to search for ways of diminishing state sovereignty, which impairs contemporary international law and also gives the right to the nation state to treat its people - especially the minorities - as it pleases. In that respect, the definition of 'collective intervention' by a comprehensive group of member states of the UN⁶ into the internal affairs of a state who violates

⁶ There is no doubt that the UN also needs radical structural reforms, especially reforms on the monopoly of the Security Council in decision making. One option is to expand the number of the members of the Security Council to include other permanent states (such as Germany and Japan), at the same time incorporating a new 'rotational membership' structure for the participation of the other member states in the decision making process.

the human rights as described in the reformed UN Charter should be incorporated into the new international law.

One radical reform in contemporary international law and also in the structure of the UN is to find ways of creating new 'spaces' (Gotlieb, 1993) for the nations who do not have a 'statehood' and also new 'spaces' for the ethnic groups so that they can represent themselves in the international community without resorting to either terrorist acts or secessionist movements in order to obtain their humanitarian and identity needs. Certainly, this would be a challenging area of further research.

6.2. *Restructuring the international community and its dominant practices in the new world order: A non-territorial approach*

Gidon Gotlieb (1993) offers a 'non-territorial approach' to the restructuring of the international community and its dominant practices:

A new space for nations [without statehood] would require a new status for such nations in international organizations and in international diplomacy. It would also require to move beyond - not to abandon, but move beyond - the two methods traditionally used for meeting their concerns; the protection of minorities and the protection of human rights. ... [A new space for nations] involves an extension of the formal system of states to include alongside it a system of nations and peoples that are not organized territorially into independent states (Gotlieb, 1993: 36-7).

This non-territorial approach might work in terms of building 'associations' and organizations among the nations (without statehood) that would give them a platform to voice their needs and claims to the international community and draw support for their physical and social needs. Again, this is also a challenging area of further research that might provide useful insights for global theories on the restructuring of the international society and its dominant practices.

7. Concluding remarks

The emergence of dozens of intergovernmental organizations, thousands of multinational corporations, and hundreds of influential international profit-free organizations, such as Amnesty International after WWII give some hope and motivation to the scholars and the idealist politicians to carry on with their mission: *to create a better and more ordered world of peace*. Without such global formations, the world would be an arena of only nation states that would be subjected to no legal and moral limits (just like the state-centric and isolationist theories depicted since the times of Hobbes and Machiavelli).

Although the most dominant actor of the international politics is still the nation state, it is not alone anymore, and all efforts should be made not to leave it by itself. The key to the problems of international and ethnic

conflicts is to find the ways of eroding the sovereignty of the nation state. The Westphalian inheritance of the principle of 'non-intervention into the internal affairs of the nation state' has already been broken, to a certain extent, legally since WWII and by the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The real issue, here, is to go beyond this stage where the sovereignty of the nation state is eroded.

History proved us that the principles, such as the 'right to self determination' and 'sovereignty' have been violated and mistreated in accordance with the interests of the nation state, in the first three 'waves' of the emergence of the nation states. However, the contemporary international society is more experienced (after two World Wars) and it has more opportunities than the international society before the UN was founded.

We are now in the Fourth Wave of the emergence of the nation states where we are also faced with the eruption of many violent ethnic conflicts and a fragmented international society. However, now we have the necessary platforms and the means, already founded - but needing immediate reforms, i.e., the UN and international law, to restructure international society and its dominant patterns of relationships between and among the states - in such a way that the sovereign nation states would not treat their own citizens as they wish by hiding behind the shield of 'sovereignty,' and the 'nations,' 'peoples' and other ethnic groups should be incorporated into the international society by inventing or creating new 'spaces' for them, so that they would feel secure and most important of all, they would be bounded by the treaties and the contracts of the international society which would prevent fragmentation and create a sense of community.

References

- ALEXANDER, Y. and FRIEDLANDER, R. A. (1980), *Self-Determination: National, Regional, and Global Dimensions*, Colorado: Westview Press.
- CVIIC, C. (1991), *Remaking the Balkans*, New York: Cassel Academic Press.
- COHEN, H. E. (1937), *Recent Theories of Sovereignty*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- COMMONS, J. R. (1965), *A Sociological View of Sovereignty*, New York: Augustus M. Kelly Publishers.
- CRISTESCU, A. (1981), *Right to Self-Determination*; New York: United Nations Press.
- DIUK, N. and KARATNYCKY, A. (1993), *New Nations Rising*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- EHERLICH, T. (1974), *Cyprus 1958-1967: International Crises and the Role of Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FREUD, A. (1964), *Of Human Sovereignty*, New York: Philosophical Library Press.

- GOTLIEB, G. (1993), *Nation Against State*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- HOBBS, T. (1951), *Leviathan*, Baltimore, MD: Penguin Classics.
- HOBBSBAWM, E. J. (1990), *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- JACKSON, R. H. (1990), *Quasi-States*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- KOHN, H. (1982), *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*, New York: Van Nostrand.
- LARSON, A. and JENKS, C. W. (1965), *Sovereignty Within the Law*, North Carolina: Oceana.
- MACHIAVELLI, N. (1942), *The Prince*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MAYALL, J. (1990), *Nationalism and International Society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- MOSTOV, J. (1992), *Power, Process and Popular Sovereignty*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- PEARCY, G. E. (1977), *World Sovereignty*, California: Plycon Press.
- ROUSSEAU (1762), *The Social Contract*, Baltimore, MD: Penguin Classics.
- SOROOS, M. S. (1986), *Beyond Sovereignty: The Challenge of Global Policy*, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.
- UMOZURIKE, O. O. (1972), *Self-Determination in International Law*, Connecticut: Archon Books.

Özet

Ulus devletlerin çıkışı ve dört 'dalga'da sorunlu siyasî kavramlar

Bu makalede, ulus devletle organik ilişkili egemenlik kavramı ve bununla ilgili ulus, halk, egemenlik gibi önemli ve problematik kavramlar ve bunlara bağlı problemler ulus devletlerin farklı çıkış 'dalga'ları – yani farklı tarihsel süreçler içinde irdeleniyor. Makalede iddia ediliyor ki egemenlik ve diğer ilgili kavramlar tüm 'dalga'lar içinde ilk önce monarşist liderler, daha sonra da ulus devletler, büyük güçler ve uluslar arası topluluk tarafından suistimal edilmiştir. 21. yüzyıla sırtımızda ufalanmış bir uluslar arası toplum ve Kosova, Kuzey İrlanda, Çeçenya gibi bir çok etnik uyuşmazlık kamburuyla girmişken, yeni dünya düzeninde barışı tesis ve devam ettirmek için neler gerektiği doğrultusunda uluslar arası ilişkiler ve uluslar arası hukuk literatürüne bazı alçak gönüllü öneriler sunulacak.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.