2. Nationalism

Both the Lower Rhine and South Sleswick have been subject to Nationalism in its various forms which lead to their eventual inclusion into the German national state. Nationalism also had partially severe consequences for their current status, the cultural and economic development and involvement in historical events such as WWI and WWII. Therefore an analysis of “Nationalism” appears required to understand the historical events and the current status of the two regions.

According to the “Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI)” (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973 (http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default), nationalism initially was broadly defined by the philosophical works of Rousseau (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1712 – 1778 Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer) and Herder (Johann Gottfried von Herder, 1744 – 1803, East Prussian philosopher, theologian, poet, and literary critic) and to some extent influenced by thoughts of Kant; it was originally divided into two directions:

1. Territorial-political nationalism

2. Romantic-ethnic nationalism.

The Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI) describes the origins of nationalism as follows: “Territorial-political nationalism was based on Rousseau and primarily on a political-territorial concept, based upon common law and citizenship. It aimed to reform an existing state on the basis of liberty, to vitalize and strengthen it by the new dynamic forces of the new age. It was neither narrow nor backward looking.

Romantic-Ethnic nationalism appeared in central and eastern Europe since these regions did not fit into the existing Western European state patterns. At the onset of the age of nationalism such political moulds were lacking among Germans and Italians, among western and southern Slavs. Herder and the so-called romanticists directed attention to pre-political, pre-rational foundations—the mother tongue, ancient folk traditions, common descent, or the “national spirit.” These non-political criteria created an ethnic-linguistic nationalism, which differed from the territorial state-nationalism in the West. This more intimate and more unconscious nationalism corresponded to the “spontaneous” or instinctive ancestral community. Subordinating political criteria to the ties of inheritance and tradition, Germans, Italians, and Slavs in their efforts to build their nation-states insisted that people speaking the same tongue or claiming a common ancestry should form one political state. Herder himself did not promote sealing off nations from each other's influence or to keep them static and instead recognized and welcomed the facts of normal interlinguistic and intercultural exchange, and of linguistic-cultural development and advocated a pluralistic concept (Forster, Michael, "Johann Gottfried von Herder", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2008 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), 9. Political Philosophy, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/herder/).
The American scholar of political philosophy Andrew Levine described ethnic groups or, inasmuch as the difference is not clear-cut, nations as “imagined communities” – not found in nature but more or less deliberately socially constructed (The Delegitimization of Israel – Article by Andrew Livine in Counterpunch from 9th January 2015, http://www.counterpunch.org/2015/01/09/the-delegitimization-of-israel/). Eventually ethnic-linguistic nationalism lead to bitter disputes in areas where different peoples where intermingled such as Bohemia where Czech and German linguistic nationalism replaced the formerly strong Bohemian territorial patriotism in 1848 (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973 (http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default).

In an essay on “Nationality” (1862) Lord Acton (English historian, politician, and writer) insisted that in the interests of human liberty, multi-ethnic states which guaranteed the equality and the autonomous free development of several ethnic groups within one political nation were most desirable” (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973 (http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default). Several poly-ethnic states did exist (e.g., Switzerland and Austria-Hungary in the 19th century; Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia after 1918) who also considered themselves as such. But other states which were de-facto multi-ethnic as e.g. the German Empire, Russia and also France, regarded themselves as essentially mono-ethnic nation-states, and identified the state with the domination or superior position of one of the several ethnic (linguistic or religious) groups. After 1918 many constitutions, under the influence of the League of Nations, provided a theoretically “good” treatment for the “minorities,” but usually the minority considered itself an underprivileged group, because it was not accepted as an equal partner in the common state. A truly poly-ethnic state would only be achieved if psychologically the feeling of a “majority” and “minority” relationship does not exist. Such an attitude implies that none of the ethnic, linguistic, or religious groups suffers from the impression that the state identifies itself with one of them at the expense of others.

Contemporary examples which appear to have achieved a synthesis between ethnic-linguistic nationalism and territorial-political nationalism which allowed two or several ethnic or linguistic groups to live as equals within one political nation are Switzerland and Finland and to a lesser degree Belgium. Switzerland has four official languages, each of them is the first language in the respective area and national consciousness is derived through common historical background, shared values such as highly decentralized federalism and democracy and finally, symbolism referring to the mainly Alpine topography. The Italians in Switzerland are numerically a small minority, only 10 percent against 70 percent German-speaking Swiss; but psychologically they do consider themselves not a minority but an equal partner in a poly-ethnic nation. In the case of Finland both Finnish and Swedish share equal officially status although 90% of the population declares Finnish as their native language. Belgium is de facto a state where
several ethnic or linguistic groups live as equals within one political nation (Flemish-Dutch, Wallonian-French and East-Belgian German) but since the ethnic and linguistic division has lead to a lot of quarrels and disagreements it is disputable whether Belgium can be seen as a successful case of a poly-ethnic state.

Another element added to nationalism was derived from successful trades and business. “National Liberals” such as Friedrich List viewed the creation of national states only as a stepping stone on the way towards a global economy. They also concluded that small states as e.g. Belgium or Denmark will not be able to survive because of the economic need to create ever larger units. (L.H.M. Wessels and A. Bosch, Veranderende Grenzen – Nationalisme in Europa 1815 – 1919, Heerlen / Nijmegen 1992, ISBN: 90-6168-376-9).

The DHI continues: “By the end of the 1840s Nationalism no longer formed part of the popular democratic European movement, which started in the late eighteenth century; instead, it relied on the means and methods of the new Macht- and Realpolitik, and gratefully acknowledged and accepted their success. After the middle of the century nationalism abandoned its hope and aspiration to create a new popular political and social order; it willingly made its peace with the traditional power structure. The peace-loving idealism was replaced by slightly Machiavellian politics; the temper of the Communist Manifesto (1848) and of Darwin’s On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life (1859) stimulated a view of history as incessant war, with conflict as a vehicle of progress. Struggle for power seemed to be inherent in society and history, among individuals, classes, races, and above all, nations.” (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973 (http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default).


How much this view of nationalism had gained popularity in the German Empire and infiltrated its military circles on the onset of the First World War was becoming obvious when the former chief of the war historical section of the General Staff, Friedrich v. Bernhardi published in 1911 his famous work “Germany and the Next War” in which he “preached the necessity of war with an urgency bordering on panic” (Allen H. Powles:

The consequences of these ideas were worst where nationalities were intermingled, or where, with the new emphasis upon their national past, they recalled the fact that formerly they had settled or dominated lands. These lands, though long “lost,” were now reclaimed on the strength of what was called “historical rights.” This had a particular impact on the Duchy of Sleswick since it incorporated also Low Saxon and Frisian speaking population which, in turn, were regarded as “German” and thus were used as an excuse to claim Sleswick of becoming a part of the German national state.

The Holy Roman Empire, established by the East Franconian King Otto I after he conquered Italy in 962, was claimed later by German nationalists to be the forerunner of Germany and the German Empire. But this Holy Roman Empire was a multi-ethnic state stretching over large parts of central Europe with shifting borders and through the title “Holy Roman Empire” it was emphasizing the inheritance of the Roman Empire and Christianity. In the 15th and 16th century the title “Nationis Germanicæ” was temporarily and sporadically added and many German historians claim this as prove of the existence of a German nation at this early stage and even before (Karl Zeumer: Heiliges Römisches Reich deutcher Nation. Eine Studie über den Reichstitel, Weimar, Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1910, http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Heiliges_%C3%B6misches_Reich_deutscher_Nation_%C3%89in e_Studie_%C3%8Cber_den_Reichstitel). But in the 15th and 16th century the term “Nationis Germanicæ” meant something different of what is understood today.

The historian Karl Zeumer sees in the addition “Nationis Germanicæ” simply a specification to describe the parts of the Holy Roman Empire which were ethnically “German” or speaking a Germanic language (Karl Zeumer: Heiliges Römisches Reich deutcher Nation. Eine Studie über den Reichstitel, Weimar, Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1910, II. Der Zusatz „deutscher Nation“. http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Heiliges_%C3%B6misches_Reich_deutscher_Nation_%C3%89in e_Studie_%C3%8Cber_den_Reichstitel). Some historians nevertheless claim this term suggests the dominance of the “German Imperial States” in the Empire (as e.g. http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heiliges_%C3%B6misches_Reich, Der Name des Reiches) but considering the multi-ethnic composition and origins, including that of the local rulers
(dukes, princes etc.), there is no evidence that the rulers of “German” origin enjoyed dominance or extra privileges which is also confirmed by Zeumer (Karl Zeumer: Heiliges Römisches Reich deutscher Nation. Eine Studie über den Reichstitel, Weimar, Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1910, Einleitung.

http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Heiliges_r%C3%B6misches_Reich_deutscher_Nation._Eine_Studie_%C3%BCber_den_Reichstitel).

This addition was dropped again after the 16th century and until the very end in 1806 the title was officially only Holy Roman Empire (Karl Zeumer: Heiliges römisches Reich deutscher Nation. Eine Studie über den Reichstitel, Weimar, 1910, Einleitung, “...Demgemäß ist der Reichstitel mit jenem Zusatze [Deutscher Nation] offiziell nie als Bezeichnung für das gesamte Reich in dem Sinne, den gelehrte Umdeutung erst im 17. Jahrhundert hineingeleget hat, gebraucht worden”

http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Heiliges_r%C3%B6misches_Reich_deutscher_Nation._Eine_Studie_%C3%BCber_den_Reichstitel).

The dramatist and novelist Heinrich Laube (1806-1884) wrote that “it is an error to push the genuine German patriotism and the desire for a united Germany far back into history” (Hans-Ulrich Wehler: Der deutsche Nationalismus, page 67,


Thus, there was previously no “Germany” in the way it existed after the German national state was established in form of the German Empire in 1871.

Finally, “Germanic” people include a variety of peoples and their languages such as e.g. Dutch, Danish, English, Icelandic or Old Saxon (dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München, 1985, ISBN 3-423-03025-9, Die Germanen, page 43), so in the 16th century the term “Germanicæ” has to be seen as describing a person of Germanic origin while this person may have Dutch, Danish, English, Icelandic, Old Saxon or, Old Franconian as his/her mother tongue. According to Online Etymology Dictionary, the term “nationis” referring to Latin “nation” derives from Latin “nationem” (nom. natio) ”birth, origin; breed, stock, kind, species; race of people, tribe,” lit. ”that which has been born,” from natus, pp. of nasci ”be born” (Old Latin gnasci; see genus)” (Online Etymology Dictionary, © 2001-2012 Douglas Harper, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=nation), thus emphasizing the origins and the surroundings of the place of birth. The modern political interpretation that “nation” describes a people is rather recent and therefore not applicable when interpreting a term from the 15th and 16th. Consequently, the term “Nationis Germanicæ” could also simply highlight that the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire derived from a Germanic dynasty during that period and was not describing all the inhabitants of that Empire since this Empire was anyway a multi ethnic state. Moreover, if the term really had been aimed at the German people (Die Deutschen) it should have been rather “Nationis Theodesce”.

Then, at least a predecessor and some tentative inheritance of the word “Deutsch” could have been claimed but that was neither the case (see also further below: 2.1.The term “German / Deutsch / Dutch”).


The acquisition of the Emperor title by the Prussian king in 1871 to proclaim the “German Empire” was neither based on inheritance or popular demand. When Napoleon Bonaparte was threatening Rome in 1801 he eventually refrained to challenge the authority of the pope but in return claimed the title of Emperor for being recognized as the legal protector of the papacy. He then conquered most of what was left of the Holy Roman Empire and the Habsburgs were forced to abdicate their title of Holy Roman Empire but continued to act as Emperor of Austria. The Napoleonic crown remained in the French Bourbon dynasty until 1871 when it was claimed by the Prussian King after his victory over Napoleon III.

As already mentioned above, the Holy Roman Empire was never a national state and if at all, it was a forerunner of a kind of Central European Union in attempting to settle internal conflicts and disputes but it was nowhere near a national state or a German state. Still to this day not only German historians tend to describe this Empire as a “German” empire when it was not as e.g. Manfred Groten in his “The Rhinelands in High-Medieval times (925–1288)” from 2012 (Landschaftsverband Rheinland – Portal Rheinische Geschichte, Die Rheinlande im Hochmittelalter (925–1288), http://www.rheinische-geschichte.lrv.de/epochen/epochen/Seiten/785bis1288.aspx). The term “German” empire can even be found frequently in Danish historical essays or descriptions (e.g. in the Wikipedia section about the Holy Roman Empire as “Det Tysk-romerske Rige”, http://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Det_tysk-romerske_Rige) but to a lesser degree in Dutch historical essays, there appears to be more awareness since the Netherlands themselves once were part of the Holy Roman Empire but would not consider themselves German in modern sense.

Observing the developments towards Machiavellian politics, in April 1849, the British philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill wrote in The Westminster Review an article vindicating the French Revolution of February 1848: “It is far from our intention to defend or apologize for the feelings which make men reckless of, or at least indifferent to, the rights and interests of any portion of the human species, save that which is called by the same name and speaks the same language as themselves. These feelings are characteristic of barbarians; in proportion as a nation is nearer to barbarism it has them in a greater degree: and no one has seen with deeper regret, not to say disgust, than ourselves, the evidence which recent events have afforded, that in the backward parts of Europe and even where better things might have been expected; in Germany, the sentiment of nationality so far outweighs the love of liberty, that the people are willing to abet their rulers in crushing the liberty and independence of any people not of their own race and language.” (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973 http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk.id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default).

In contrast to the French national state, the eventual German national state of 1871 was not a result of a popular uprising and the constitution was not a result of a popular and democratic process, it was the creation of the old aristocracy and since they opposed
liberalism and democracy they needed to create different symbols and myths for the unified German national state. National-chauvinist ideas, promoted already by Fichte, Arndt and Jahn and others at the turn of the 18th century who declared the “German” people as superior, served as a well received substitute (Hans-Ulrich Wehler: Der deutsche Nationalismus, pages 65/66, http://gepeskonyv.btk.elte.hu/adatok/Germanisztika/111Balk%E1nyi/Horv%E1thPabis/17-Der%20deutsche....pdf)

Sentiments hostile to mass-urbanization, to “uprooted” cosmopolitanism, to humanitarian considerations, became more and more characteristic of certain trends of nationalism, as Europe approached the onset of the 1st World War.

As a result of these developments the character of European nationalism between 1860 and 1914 differed considerably from what it had been before 1848. The new nationalism was opposed to internationalism and put no emphasis on the common people as the foundation of the nation. It became the political doctrine of the upper classes, of the “rightists” in the political spectrum of the day. It stood in sharp opposition to socialism, an “international” movement that included industrial workers and peasants, who, in most respects, felt excluded from the national society.

The first World War began on the 28th July 1914 when the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria was assassinated by a Yugoslav nationalist and became the first climax of nationalistic conflicts.

DHI concludes: “The Great European War of 1914 originated in nationalist struggles, and primarily in a conflict of Germanism and Slavism. As far as Europe was concerned the war ended the dynastic state: the great monarchies which in 1815 controlled the whole of central and eastern Europe—the Romanovs, Habsburgs, Hohenzollern, and the Ottoman Sultans—were suddenly replaced by republics that, at least originally, followed the pattern of parliamentary constitutionalism which the dynasties had long combated. From a global point of view, the year 1917—the entrance of the United States into the war and the November revolution which, at least temporarily, took Russia out of Europe—transformed the war for European hegemony into a war for a world balance of power. The era of European preponderance had lasted from the early eighteenth century, the time of the rollback of the Ottoman Empire by Austria and Russia and the rise of a more efficient and dynamic political and social order, based upon the new public morality of the Enlightenment, until 1917. From then on, to a growing degree, European policy (in both West and East) has become intelligible only in a global framework. Yet this beginning of interdependence coincided in 1918 with the triumph of the nationalities in Europe, a triumph which seemed a belated justification of the revolution of 1848. Again, as in 1848, this triumph was short-lived: quarrels, jealousies, mutual suspicions, resentments, and contradictory historical claims of the various nationalities endangered not only peace and constitutional liberties, but their very existence.” (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973)
The emergence of a renewed internationalism as a consequence of the first World War was then opposed by an especially violent form of nationalism, also known as “fascism”, which rejected all international obligations and stressed and glorified the need for a hierarchical and authoritarian structure of the nation. Though this fascist nationalism took various forms in different countries, according to their national traditions and social structure, it represented in all its forms a total repudiation of the liberal ideas of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century revolutions, of the rights of the individual, and of the desirability of a rational international order based upon the equality of men and nations.

The DHI comments: “Fascism was not, as it was sometimes believed, the last stage of capitalism, but a defence of largely pre-capitalist, pre-modern social hierarchies. Capitalism has survived fascism and seems, though of course different from what it was in 1840 or 1900, more strongly established in the 1960's than in the 1930's, when fascism, proud of its alleged moral superiority and higher efficiency, believed that non-fascist capitalism, called “plutocracy,” would crumble under the blows of fascist aggressiveness. Fascism in its various forms had its roots in certain pre-1914 nationalist trends in the various countries—especially, but not only, in Germany—and though it was in no way the inevitable outcome of late nineteenth-century national ideas, it was their extreme consequence. Nationalism in its fascist period—motivated partly by the fear of social change, and partly by the impact of modern civilization in countries insufficiently modernized in their social structure and overly traditional in their attitude—assumed far beyond anything known in the period before 1914 an absolutist and extremist self-assertiveness, glorifying war between nations or races. Fascism, therefore, helped to dismantle the League of Nations, which represented the first attempt to institutionalize an international order based upon the victory of the Western democracies. The League conformed in some respects to the concept of nationalism which predominated before 1848; its proponents believed in a modus Vivendi of nationalism and internationalism and in the resumption of the modern trend toward peace, equality, and moderation. Only the complete defeat of fascism in 1945 allowed the United Nations to resume the institutionalization of internationalism (Dictionary of the History of Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973).

The former German chancellor K. Adenauer commented in his memoirs 1945-1953 that he believed that the neglect of the individual and the idealization of the state and society above the rights and freedom of individual has lead to extreme forms of nationalism such as the fascist nationalist Nazi-dictatorship. But he also saw in socialism a root of the nationalistic extremes since socialism as such has a tendency to set the rights of the society above the right of the individual (Konrad Adenauer: Erinnerungen 1945-1953, Stuttgart 1965, ISBN 3 421 01140 0., http://www.konrad-adenauer.de/files/7613/8746/5768/Adenauer_Erinnerungen.pdf, page 45). Looking at the
Bolshevist structure of the Soviet Union this claim holds true and it appears that despite
the communists aim to create a perfect equal and peaceful society the reality became
often a lot more similar to the Nazi dictatorship than anything else. But there are also
substantial ethnic differences because even the Soviet Bolshevist regime refrained from
promoting any racial or ethnical selective programs such a Jewish discrimination, master
race theory or other eugenically concepts such as euthanasia of the handicapped.
Socialism might indirectly have influenced fascism and Nazi policies but did this
unintentionally.

With the end of the 2nd World war fascism as an extreme form of nationalism was
effectively defeated (although the Franco-regime remained in government until 1975 and
various South American countries had fascist-reelessness governments until the 1980s)
but that was not the end to nationalism.

DHI: “Africa and Asia emerged from partly colonial heritage to form national states
based on various ideas, often recalling historical events from Europe during the 19th
century. The present emphasis on folkloristic art in Africa and on a revival and re-
interpretation of the history of ancient kingdoms went on in Europe a few decades ago.
Again, as happened in many European countries in the early stages of nationalism,
religious or messianic movements seem to create a bridge between traditionalism and
incipient nationalism. In some cases nationalist, racialist, messianic, and socialist
elements enter into a strange and new amalgam. Through these declarations of African
nationalism the historian will find parallels in the nationalist utterances from other
continents. Yet everywhere nationalists frequently regard their situation, attitudes, and
aspirations as unique. They easily overlook the difficulties which a complex reality
presents to the realization of their goals. Nor are these goals static. Nationalism as a
historical phenomenon is everywhere in flux. Some nationalism loses itself in the course
of time in a more encompassing one as did the Egyptian-Pharaonic nationalism of the
1920's and 1930's in the Arab nationalism of the 1960's. On the other hand, sub
nationalisms can develop into full-fledged nationalisms. Religion and nationalism can
influence each other in various ways. Religion created in Pakistan a “new” nation, the
emergence of which seemed improbable in 1900 or 1920” (Dictionary of the History of
Ideas (DHI), University of Virginia Library, 1968 / 1973
(http://xtf.lib.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=DicHist/uvaBook/tei/DicHist3.xml;chunk_id=dv3-42;toc.depth=1;toc.id=dv3-42;brand=default).

Both, South Sleswick and the Lower Rhine were exposed to various forms of chauvinist
nationalism where ethnic and linguistic groups and minorities were denied any status
from the superior ethnic or linguistic group until recently and the population was (more
or less voluntarily) drawn into the racist-nationalistic excesses during the Nazi-
dictatorship, which, in turn, is often seen as the logical result of applying Romantic-
Ethnic nationalism to such an ethnic and linguistic diverse state as the German Federation
(and German Empire after 1871) was. The Nazi government even attempted to artificially
create an ethnic homogenous area where history, linguistic tradition and place names
betray that the ethnic origins of the population was different than the one of the now
dominant group and resulted into, for example, place-name changes. An East Prussian place such as “Stallupönen” clearly reflected the non-German Prusso-Baltic origin in its name but, was renamed to “Ebenrode” in 1938 to make it sound more “German”, furthering the process of Germanization of the former ethnically Baltic East Prussia (Kreisgemeinschaft Ebenrode (Stallupönen) e.V., Geschichte des Kreises Stallupönen – Teil der preußischen Geschichte, 2009, [http://mitglieder.ostpreussen.de/ebenrode/index.php?id=589](http://mitglieder.ostpreussen.de/ebenrode/index.php?id=589)). Ironically, both the Baltic heritage as well as the German rule of East Prussia were then abruptly ended by the mass-escape and eviction of the population once the Red Army conquered it in WW II and East Prussia became an ethnically Russian enclave called the “Kaliningrad Oblast” as part of the Russian Federation.

However much exposed to romantic-ethnic nationalism, attempts to promote Territorial-political nationalism existed in both Sleswick and the Lower Rhine (Uwe Jens Lornsen or the Cisrhenanian- and later Rhenish-Republican movement in the Rhineland which included the Lower Rhine (see chapters 5 and 8)). But when the bourgeoisie elite and aristocracy in charge in what was to become the German Empire viewed the increasingly chauvinist becoming nationalists as the lesser evil, their case was unsuccessful until the complete collapse of the German Empire in 1945.

In recent years we saw the re-emergence of nationalism in Eastern Europe, brought about by the collapse of the communist regimes and the Warsaw pact. The Baltic States re-emerged, Czechoslovakia split and above all, the Yugoslav wars which lead to the complete destruction of the Yugoslav Federation and the transformation of each previous federal republic into a national state. In Asia, East Timor succeeded from Indonesia, in Africa, Eritrea and South Sudan emerged and since there are still a great number of secessionist movements and calls around the globe this process appears to be on-going. However, there is also a growing counter development through pan-national bodies, which in principle draws on the internationalist ideas of the revolutionary movements before 1848: Starting with the League of Nations in 1918, succeeded by the United Nations in 1945, the OECD, ASEAN, the European Union, the Schengen Agreement, and various other global or continental pan-national bodies. The same Yugoslav Federal Republics which so eagerly broke apart in the 1990s are now all applying to join the European Union which, in its final consequence, would mean that all those republics would eventually abolish the same border controls on the newly created national borders again and be re-united in the European Union using a single currency. Another factor currently countering nationalism is globalization made possible by improved transport links and communication through the emergence of mediums such as World-Wide-Web. This made communication possible on a previously unknown scale and also helped to break down barriers and to counter separatism, nationalism, prejudice and discrimination.

The emergence of pan-national bodies and the increasing globalization, in turn, reflect also a recall of the ideas of the early 19th century nationalist liberals who saw the development of the national state only as a stepping stone on the way towards a globalized economy.
However, a side effect of territorial-political dominance in contemporary developments is the appearance of ever more uniform and homogenous territories. Sometimes this was enforced by allowing only one state language officially while denying any status to regional or minority languages (France) but often it is voluntary (as e.g. in the U.S.) and is based on economic and cultural pressure. As long as this is a voluntary process it can be argued whether this is really a problem or disadvantage but the diversity is certainly decreasing and in an increasingly prosperous global economy, tourism may become a major factor of economic growth and here, old traditions and customers and/or diversity can certainly be a major factor to touristic promote a locality. How much also multi-national bodies such as the EU contribute to the process of uniformity is difficult to judge at the moment. An example is the strong position of English as a cosmopolitan medium and this is documented by the adoption of English as an official language and “Lingua Franca” in multi-ethnic states such as the Indian Federation. But all too often, once English has gained an official status it often becomes dominating in expense to the local languages and subsequently the trend appears irreversible. An example are the attempts of the Irish Republic to re-establish Gaelic as the first state language where English is still the daily language of all business and the first language of most citizens despite Gaelic being promoted thoroughly by the state. Currently Gaelic has achieved nothing more than a symbolic character in regard to nationhood and the promotion may have, at best, prevented the complete extinction of Gaelic in Ireland. Whether this is an example of things to come in Latin America and Africa where respectively the “Lingua-Francas” English, French, Spanish and Portuguese have usually official status in the multi-ethnic national states and will lead to the smaller regional and local languages’ decline is yet to be seen but a tendency appears to exist.

Such a tendency could re-enforce romantic-ethnic nationalism with all its violent side effects experienced in Europe before. But romantic-ethnic nationalism must not necessarily lead to conflicts, Herder’s pluralistic, non chauvinist and pacifist ideas suggesting a loose federation of states could be regarded as a compromise. Switzerland or Finland may form an alternative of a pluralist federation which must not necessarily lead to a revival of ethnic conflicts. However, Herder obviously did not anticipate several ethnic groups living effectively dispersed over one state or even city making it impossible to separate them by borders. Singapore is such a case where a diverse range of ethnic groups reside within one city state, all having been individually recognized as integral parts of society and culture and all enjoying equal official status, the economy is prosperous nevertheless and ethnic conflicts are not being heard of. However, in the case of Singapore, English has the status of “Lingua Franca” as well and is the main language of education since it was officiated as “predominantly” by the government in 1987 (Stephany Qiouyi Lu, English in Singapore: History and current debates, December 7, 2009. 2.1 English-medium schooling, page 6, http://www.scribd.com/doc/23801004/English-in-Singapore-History-and-current-debates), it is yet to be seen whether English will not eventually become the first language of all citizens in the long run since all international business, which is the base of Singapore’s economy, is conducted almost entirely in English. But, nevertheless, these examples
show that Herder’s ideas can work as well, even in small territories with multi-ethnic groups living side-by-side.

2.1. The term “German / Deutsch / Dutch”

According to dtv-Atlas zur Deutschen Sprache the origins of the word „Dutch“ go back to “theodesce” which is the Latinized version of an old Germanic word which was recorded in West-Franconian as “theodisk” and is related to Gothic “þiuda” and old High German “diot” meaning “people” (dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München, 1985, ISBN 3-423-03025-9, Das Wort deutsch, page 59). It is also present in the Icelandic name for Sweden “Svíþjóð” meaning the “Svea-people” (Nationalencyklopedin 2014, Svithiod, http://www.ne.se/svithiod). It appeared for the first time in 786 when a papal nuncio reported over two synods held in England where the resolution was read out in both “latine” and “theodisce” to make them comprehensible to all participants. In this context the word “Dutch” was obviously describing the English language (Online Etymology Dictionary, Dutch (adj.), http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=dutch&searchmode=none). The term “‘theodisc” only became popular once the Western Francs adopted the Romanic language by the end of the first decennium and applied the term “Franconian” to describe their own version of the Romanic language (>French), thus the Germanic speech to the East could no longer be described as Franconian and slowly the term theodisk established itself and became in various local Germanic forms “Diets, Diutisch, Dutch, Dietsch, Duits, Deutsch etc.”. However, the term “theodisc” describing the non-Romanic language in the Romanic-Germanic language border area was initially mainly used by Romanic speakers to describe the non-Romanic speakers while the non-Romanic speakers would describe their own language as Franconian, Alamance, Saxon, English, Frisian, etc. Although the meaning of the word “theodisk” as “the language of the people” would originally simply describe the non-Romanic languages of the people, it became the term to describe the continental central European Germanic languages, including Eastern Franconian, Lower Franconian, Saxon, Bavarian, Alamance etc. (dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München, 1985, ISBN 3-423-03025-9, Zweite oder hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung, page 63). English, although originally also described as “theodesce”, became regarded as being separate and the term “Dutch” was associated exclusively to the continental Germanic languages.

However, the continental Germanic languages itself differed considerably and different written standards also appeared. In the South, the High-German sound shift (t>s, p>f, k>ch) was reflected in their written standard and the grammar and vocabulary differed greatly from Lower Franconian and Saxon further north (dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München, 1985, ISBN 3-423-03025-9, Zweite oder hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung, page 63). Although even as late as 1586 the Lower Franconian language was still described as “Duysts” (by Simon Stevin in Uytspraak van de weerdigheut der duytscbe tael) (Guy Janssens en Ann...
Marynissen: Het Nederlands vroeger en nu, Leuven, 2005, ISBN 90-334-5782-2, page 117) the difference was increasingly recognized during the 16th and 17th century, evident by adopting the term “Nederduitsch” as in Hendrick Laurensz “Twe-spraak van de Nederduitsche letterkunst” from 1584 (Guy Janssens en Ann Marynissen: Het Nederlands vroeger en nu, Leuven, 2005, ISBN 90-334-5782-2, page 115). The English themselves responded to this by calling the languages of the South as “High Dutch” and in the North as “Low Dutch” emphasising also the fact that the Low Dutch speakers where mainly living in the Northern lowlands while the High Dutch speakers in the uplands further to the South (About.com, German Language: The Pennsylvania Dutch, 2007, http://german.about.com/library/blgermyth07.htm). The division in the continental Germanic speaking area also becomes obvious when looking at official papers and official letters being sent in medieval times. The nowadays Netherlandic city of Nijmegen would write to the city of Lübeck in nowadays Sleswick-Holsten in its local Lower Franconian (Dutch) version and the city of Lübeck would reply in their local Lower Saxon version, both were intelligible to each other (Luebecker Stadtbuch 1450 – 1469, Burgermeister, scopen ende rait der stat van Nymegen, 1467). That was not so when communicating with cities in Bavaria or Upper Franconia, they had to use either Latin or High Dutch (High German) and have this translated. It is also interesting here that the language of the Netherlands was initially described as “Nederduitsch”, a term which is nowadays used to describe the dialects developed out of Low Saxon in present day Northern Germany. It confirms that initially the Netherlands and Northern Germany were viewed as one language area while the High-German one to the south as another one.

While the English later abandoned the prefix “Lower” and called the languages in the Lowlands simply “Dutch” and associated it to the language of the independent Netherlands in the 17th century (Online Etymology Dictionary, Dutch (adj.), http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=dutch&searchmode=none), in the South the Allemannians, East Franconians and Bavarians started to create a more unified written standard for their “High Dutch” which they called “Dutch” and this became the modern German term “Deutsch” (dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, München, 1985, ISBN 3-423-03025-9, Althochdeutsch, page 61). The German national state (“Deutsches Reich”) became established in the course of the 19th century long after the Netherlands formed their own independent national state and the term “Dutch” was already in use for the language of the Netherlands and thus occupying the literally translation of the word “Deutsch”. Hence, the terms “German” and “Germany” were applied to describe the people and their language in the area which in Latin was called “Germania” and now constituted in many parts the German Federation (Deutscher Bund after 1815) and the subsequent German Empire (Deutsches Reich) after 1871. The word “Deutsch” was never used by the continental Germanic speakers to describe their own Kingdom(s) and Empire; it was always either the “Holy Roman Empire” or the old tribal names such as Bavaria, Saxony, and Thuringia etc. Thus the term “Deutsch” applying to any constitutional state or federation was not in use before 1815 and various parts of Europe responded to this in adopting their own term for describing this new organization which was first a loose
federation (German Federation) and then became the German Empire as a national state (Karl Zeumer: Heiliges römisches Reich deutscher Nation. Eine Studie über den Reichstitel, Weimar, 1910, Einleitung, “…Demgemäß ist der Reichstitel mit jenem Zusatz [Deutscher Nation] offiziell nie als Bezeichnung für das gesamte Reich in dem Sinne, den gelehrte Umdeutung erst im 17. Jahrhundert hineingelegt hat, gebraucht worden”
http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Heiliges_r%C3%B6misches_Reich_deutscher_Nation._Eine_Studie_%C3%BCber_den_Reichstitel , see also chapter 2.).

Linguistically the term “German” or “Deutsch” became simultaneously associated with the High German language, but only after it became also the only official language in the German Empire after 1890. In the Netherlands, it remained common to describe the language of the Netherlands (in Dutch itself) as “Diets” until WWII when it got out of fashion because it became associated to fascism and the Nazi-occupation of the Netherlands. Since then the Netherlands would describe their language solely as “Nederlands” in all situations although the term “Dutch” still features in the Dutch national anthem in the form “duits” (Genootschap Onze Taal, Taaladvies, Ben ik van Duitsen / Dietsen bloed, https://onzetaal.nl/taaladvies/advies/ben-ik-van-dietsen-bloed ).

Most Romanic languages described the new German national state as “Alemania” or “Alemanha”, thus applying the tribal name of those Germanic speakers bordering to the East of the French speaking area. In Finnish and Estonian the term “Saxon” was inherited from old-Norse and it identifies the state with those who initially came to them as traders from (Lower-) Saxony, which formed later a part of the German Empire. The Slavonic speakers adopted “nemet” or “nemesce”, meaning “foreigner without language”, while the Balts adopted “Vacija”. The Scandinavian languages Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Faroese and Icelandic all use “Dutch” in their respective form as e.g. “tysk” in Danish but they also initially called the continental Germanic language from the Lowlands “Saksisk” (Saxon) from where it was borrowed into Finnish and Estonian and retained in those languages. Although the term “theodisk” would also include the Scandinavian languages initially, they never internally referred to their language as “Dutch” and once the term became popular for continental Germanic speech they obviously also applied it to distinguish their Scandinavian Germanic Speech from the Continental Germanic Speech. The term “tysk” became fashionable to describe all the Continental Germanic languages and the many loans originating from Low Saxon during the Hanseatic league era where thus simply described as “tysk”. When the use of Low Saxon declined in favour of High German in the 16th and 17th century, no proper distinction was made and this leads often to confusion because many “tysk” loans are not found in the present “tysk” language, which is High German. Once the Netherlands became independent and the linguistic difference between “Dutch” and “High German” had to be recognized the Scandinavians declared the language of the Netherlands as “Hollansk” or “Nederlansk”. (!! Question remains: When and why became “Saksisk” out of use and replaced by “tysk”?) Since many of the Low Saxon loans, which are not present in High German, exist nevertheless in the Dutch (Netherlandic) language it would thus be consequent to describe those loans as of originating from Dutch instead of German.
It can therefore be concluded that the term “Deutsch” (German) applying to the constitutional state established in central Europe after 1815 in parts of the territory which used to be the Holy Roman Empire and associated with the High German language only is rather recent in the historical context and contradicts the claims of German nationalists who see in it an old inherited tradition.
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