

### Nationalization, modernization and symbolic media: towards a comparative historical sociology of the nation-state

Tanaka, Shigeru

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

**Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:**

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Tanaka, S. (2013). Nationalization, modernization and symbolic media: towards a comparative historical sociology of the nation-state. *Historical Social Research*, 38(2), 252-267. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.38.2013.2.252-267>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

---

# Nationalization, Modernization and Symbolic Media – Towards a Comparative Historical Sociology of the Nation-State

Shigeru Tanaka\*

---

**Abstract:** »Nationalisierung, Modernisierung und Symbolische Medien: Eine historische-vergleichende Soziologie des Nationalstaates«. In the formation process of the nation-state, there took place processes analogous to globalization. People and things moved on a nationwide scale and local regions and people became homogenized and also differentiated. Such process can be called 'nationalization'. By taking its meaning as a more comprehensive one than ever, we can understand the formation process of the nation-state more accurately. Also we have to differentiate 'nationalization' from 'modernization'. We regard that modernization is the process of disembedding people from various 'existences' in which they have been embedded. In the course of disembedding, people began to regard 'existences' as means and obstacles for 'actions'. That is to say, 'predominance of actions over existences' has occurred. The reason why such 'predominance of actions' has taken place can be made clear by introducing 'symbolic media' which reduce 'existences' to something on each standard. In history symbolic media have been conflicting and allying with each other. 'Predominance of actions', that is to say, modernization advanced through such conflicts and alliance.

**Keywords:** nationalization, globalization, modernization, symbolic media, violence, nation-state.

---

## 1. Globalization and Nationalization

---

### 1.1 From Globalization to Nationalization?

Globalization can be characterized by processes in which people, things, money, information and so on move freely on a worldwide scale and as a result people and countries become homogenized and at the same time differentiated with each other.

In the process of nation-state formation, there took place processes analogous to those of globalization. People, things and so on moved on a nationwide scale and people and local areas became homogenized and at the same time

---

\* Shigeru Tanaka, 1-6-30 Mino, Mino city, Osaka, Japan; stanaka@soc.ryukoku.ac.jp

differentiated with each other (i.e., regional division of industries, formation of social classes). The whole processes can be called ‘nationalization’.

However, ‘homogenization and differentiation’ are often mutually contradictory and its solution has been difficult. The nation-state formation accompanied by abolition of the old social status system gave politically equal status to the people and each domestic area as a member of the nation-state (equal political status-homogenization), and also economically made the people and each area an element of a free economic system called ‘national economy’ (equal opportunity-homogenization). Endowed with equal opportunity, people and each area had developed intense competitions in organizations and market, and as a result, the gap between classes, between industries (i.e., uneven development between agriculture and industrials) and between domestic areas (i.e., domestic colonialization) have been produced, and also monopolistic major companies have arisen. The equal political status and economic opportunity (homogenization) given by the ideal of the nation-state produced political and economic inequality of the people and domestic areas through competitions (differentiation). In other words, new contradictions and confrontations have been introduced after the nation-state formation.

The great difference between nationalization and globalization lies in the way of coping with these contradictions and confrontations. In the former, the government has not only engaged in promotion and restraint of each process of ‘homogenization and differentiation’ by utilizing policy measures, but also engaged in accommodation of contradictions and confrontations.

On the contrary, in the latter, because of the absence of the world government, such accommodation has not been taken and market fundamentalism has been carried through. The economic gaps have expanded not only in between advanced nations and poor nations, but also even in an advanced nation.

Are there any researchers who share the way of thinking which I have described above? Although overwhelmingly great numbers of researchers take the meaning of nationalization as that of ‘nationalization of industries’, the description of experiences of the 19th century United States by J. Stiglitz, a recipient of the Alfred Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics, is just that.

- 1) Nationalization: At that time, when transportation and communication costs fell and previously local markets expanded, new national economies formed, and with these new national economies came national companies, doing business throughout the country. But the markets were not left to develop willy-nilly on their own; government played a vital role in shaping the evolution of the economy (Stiglitz 2002, 21).
- 2) Globalization: Today, with the continuing decline of transportation and communication costs, and the reduction of man-made barriers to the flows of goods, services, and capital (though there remain serious barriers to the flow of labor), we have a process of ‘globalization’ analogous to the earlier processes in which national economies were formed. Unfortunately, we

have no world government, accountable to the people of every country, to oversee the globalization process in a fashion comparable to the way national government guided the nationalization process (ibid.).

Stiglitz thought that “the experience of United States during the nineteenth century makes a good parallel for today’s globalization – and the contrast helps illustrate the successes of the past and today’s failure” and called the whole process drawn in the part of 1) Nationalization as ‘nationalization’, and contrasts it with reckless ‘globalization’.

However, the central theme of Stiglitz is not the process of nationalization, but that of globalization. He did not have to build a theory of nationalization by making the concept of nationalization an analytic one.

On the contrary, E. E. Schattschneider (1975), a political scientist, substantially used nationalization as a concept implying ‘becoming nationwide scale’ and ‘homogenization and differentiation’, and paid attention to the political aspect of relations among them.

Studying relations between voting behaviors of the people and ‘nationalization of social class cleavages’ that is, the spread of social class cleavages on a nationwide scale, he discussed “nationalization of politics”, such as the abortion of local political parties into national political parties.

However, his successors are much more interested in making his political model into a quantitative one rather than pursuing a theoretical possibility of the concept of nationalization (Caramani 2004).

As for the process of homogenization, there are fairly many researchers using the concept of nationalization as a meaning of homogenization. They discuss national education, political control of religion and culture and so on using the concept of nationalization, such as “nationalization of masses” (Mosse 2001), “nationalization of religion”, “cultural nationalization” (Moore 1997) and so on. Here, nationalization is used as a concept that means ‘making religion, culture or masses peculiar to a nation-state’. However, researchers who discuss nationalization in such a meaning of homogenization often have the strong intention to criticize political control of social thought by the state government. They seem to have little intention to take the concept of nationalization as a comprehensive one, in which meanings of ‘becoming nationwide scale’ and ‘homogenization and differentiation’ are included.

As mentioned above, it will be clear that the conventional social sciences including sociology have not tried to understand that social phenomena, such as ‘becoming nationwide scale’ and ‘homogenization and differentiation’, are mutually connected and that such phenomena can be theoretically conceptualized by using a concept of nationalization. To take the concept of nationalization as a comprehensive one will open up great possibilities not only for to analyze the nation-state formation, but also to develop sociological theory. But, unfortunately such possibilities are even now hidden.

## 1.2 Governmental Intervention and the Varieties of Political Regimes

It is the present development of globalization that let us find such hidden possibilities. Globalization can be now served as a mirror to understand nationalization simply as processes in which people, things, money, information and so on moved on a nationwide scale and people and domestic areas became homogenized and at the same time differentiated with each other.

However, there are, of course, differences between nationalization and globalization. In both, there underlie contradictions between 'homogenization and differentiation'. But nationalization can be discerned from globalization in that there were governmental interventions in such contradictions. In the process of nationalization, "government played a vital role in shaping the evolution of the economy" as Stiglitz mentioned.

Governmental interventions in contradictions between 'homogenization and differentiation' can be diverse. Depending on, for example, whether to leave the gap between the poor and the rich as it is or not or how to cope with the gap, political regime will be varied. It can be said that the diversity of governmental interventions had produced the diversity of the political regime of nation-states (*laissez-faire*, socialism, fascism, a welfare state, neoliberalism, etc.) (Tanaka 2008).

---

## 2. Symbolic Medium or Sociology of 'Existences and Actions'

---

In many countries, people experienced nationalization and modernization simultaneously. This experience still limits our perspective and makes us difficult to discern between them. Now we have to bridge conceptual gaps between nationalization which has been almost ignored in sociology and modernization which have been one of the most important themes in sociology.

### 2.1 What is Modernization?

However, in a moment, there arise problems of how to conceptualize modernization or modernity. Although modernization has been used as a comprehensive concept which indicates industrialization, bureaucratization and urbanization and so on in sociology, the settled definition has not been established yet.

A. Giddens considered modernization as a "disembedding" process, that is, the "lifting out" of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of time-space" (Giddens 1990, 21). The focus of his analysis is placed on how social relations were restructured across indefinite spans of time-space. However, in order to understand modernization,

we should also place focus on how to theoretically conceptualize “local contexts of interaction”. What on earth were people embedded in before modernization? Simply speaking, they can be thought as ‘existences’.

The world of animism or totemism, it is the world in which human behaviors or actions were determined by various ‘existences’, such as trees, woods, rocks, rivers, animals and relatives. Here we mean by existences not as ‘relative’ existences in the sense that they are “contingent (possibly being otherwise)” (Luhmann 1976, 1984), but as ‘absolute’ existences, such as ‘the sacred’.

People of Europe of the 17th century called the way of life and thought of African people living in such a world “fetishism” in contempt (de Brosses 2008). Human beings had been embedded in such ‘existences’ for a long time. The times when many kinds of ‘existences’ automatically decided human behaviors cover almost all human history exhaustively.

By disembedding I mean “lifting out” of human beings from various ‘absolute existences’ in which they had been embedded for a long time. And also I consider that the way to modernization is a process in which ‘absolute existences’ gradually cease to decide ‘actions’, but the ‘actions’ recognize ‘existences’ as tools and means, or conditions for ‘actions’. Human beings recognize those ‘existences not as fetish but as mere objects and conditions for ‘actions’. In other words, ‘absolute existences’ lose their absoluteness and became ‘relative existences’. Here, ‘the inversion of existences and actions’ has taken place.

Modernization is a process in which ‘existences’ become not to determine ‘actions’, but ‘actions’ place ‘existences’, including not only things but also human beings, as means and/or obstacles for actions’. In other words, ‘predominance of actions over existences’ has led us to modernization.

## 2.2 ‘Predominance of Actions over Existences’ and Symbolic Media

‘Predominance of actions over existences’, by making existences as means and conditions of actions, removes absoluteness of ‘absolute existences’ and promote stratification and functional differentiation. And, In turn, these social changes promote ‘predominance of actions over existences’.

Why has ‘predominance of actions’ taken place? The answer can be prepared by introducing the concept of ‘symbolic media’ (religion, money and so on) which reduce ‘existences’ to something different on each standard.

T. Parsons and N. Luhmann, the latter who is influenced by the former, both argued for ‘symbolic media’ respectively. Fundamentally both of them assume its function as resolution of uncertainty in the process of interaction (Parsons 1969; Luhmann 1984, 1997). We would like to call media of meanings in general which resolve uncertainty of interactions as ‘symbolic media’.

Historically speaking, there have been many kinds of symbolic media (religion, money, power and so on). Each symbolic medium categorizes and re-

cates every existence according to its own code. For example, religion relocates people and things under its religious order or outside of it. Money will categorize people the rich or the poor.

According to the code of a symbolic medium, some 'existences', on the one hand, will be regarded as useful, even though they may be despised merely as tools or means, but some of them, on the other hand, will be excluded as useless or dangerous ones.<sup>1</sup> In other words, every existence will be deprived of its own meanings or values by reduction mechanism of a symbolic medium and become a mere object of action which a symbolic medium requires of human being.

Here arises the problem that Parsons and Luhmann, regarding symbolic media as one of the most important concepts in their social theory, thought that symbolic media is peculiar to modern society (Parsons 1969; Luhmann 1984). In case of Luhmann's theory, symbolic media are assumed to have the function that reduce complexity increased by functional differentiation in modern societies and each functional system has its own symbolic medium (Luhmann 1984).

Why symbolic medium is regarded as peculiar to modern society? It can be traced back to the fact that both of them adopt, in a fundamental level of their theory, the model of human being formed under the situation of 'predominance of actions over existences'.

In accordance with evolution of 'predominance of actions over existences', people began to deny 'absolute existences' and, at the same time, regard themselves as active 'subjects' that can manage end-means relations deliberately. Here have arisen two major social-science models. One of them is the theory of active 'subject'. And another one is functionalism. Functionalism is the most typical theory that the 'predominance of actions over existences' produced.

Not only Parsons and Luhmann, but also most sociologists presuppose diadic interaction between 'ego' and 'alter ego'. However, ego presupposed there is not 'a person' with concrete characteristics, but 'an abstract subject' deprived of such concreteness. And also interaction counterpart is not 'the other' with concrete characteristics, but 'another abstract subject (alter ego)', from whom ego can distinguish himself only in that alter ego is not ego.

Thus interactions between ego and alter ego become really uncertain for both of them, because they, with each other, cannot get any kind of concrete clues which would promote their interaction. The 'diadic interaction model' based on abstract ego inevitably bears the difficult problem of "double contingency". And this will bring excessive theoretical importance on "double contingency" (Tanaka 1989).

Parsons tried to resolve the problem of "double contingency" by introducing social values. In contrast, Luhmann regarded it as a problem of modern society

---

<sup>1</sup> Luhmann expressed these ambivalent functions of symbolic medium by *symbolisch-diabolisch* dichotomy (Luhmann 1997).

with increased complexity and introduced the model that a symbolic medium and its code promote communication by reducing complexity selectively. This is the reason why he thought that the symbolic media are peculiar to modern society.

However, is not it impossible to think that there have been various symbolic media even in the history of pre-modern society and that ‘predominance of actions over existences’ have been promoted as a result of the fact that various symbolic media have been confronting and allying repeatedly with each other?

In the following part of the article, we would like to describe that ‘violence’ which has been almost ignored in sociology has played an influential role in history as a pan-historical symbolic medium.

---

### 3. Violence as a Symbolic Medium and its Deterrence

---

#### 3.1 Violence as a Symbolic Medium

Although many articles on the theme of violence have written, almost of them argue why people and what kind of person resort to violence. Really, violence should be denied from the standpoint of view of humanism. However, we should remember the fact that the nation-state, monopolizing on violence, denies people’s violence. And we should rethink reflectively that violence has been treated in a negative way in theories of social sciences. Sociological theory of violence is now required to develop.

Violence destroys the “form” (Aristotle) of existence and reduces it to “matter” (Aristotle). In other words, violence destroys meaning by destroying existence endowed with meaning. And it can be a powerful measure to reduce double contingent situations in interaction. Although violence cannot be a symbolic medium according to Luhmann’s social theory that regards symbolic media peculiar to modern society, it is exactly a pan-historic symbolic medium with a binary code consisted of use/non-use options.

If so, it can be said that wars and violent conflicts are a kind of communication systems based on violence as a symbolic medium. ‘Violence for violence’ rule will perpetuate a war. K. Matuszek (2007) thought that a war is a communication system in accordance with a code consisted of enemy/friend options. Though the importance of distinction between friend/enemy was also pointed out by C. Schmitt (1996), the central code of violence is that of use/non-use options and enemy/friend options should be regarded as a secondary one.

It is obvious that a war cannot be a functional system, but it may be called a communication system in that it has its own binary code. Matuszek proposes to call such system as a ‘code system’. We would like to comply with his proposal.



## 3.2 Pan-Historicity of Violence and Difficulty of its Deterrence

### 3.2.1 'Orthopraxation of Violence' – Mechanism of Deterring Violence (1)

P. Clastres denied Lévi-Strauss' thesis that "wars are the outcome of unfortunate transactions" (Clastres 2010, 252) and insisted "universality of war in the Savage world" (ibid.). The primitive community needs an enemy and continues wars in order to maintain its autonomy and homogeneity among people. Clastres mentions as follows:

Each community, to consider itself as such (as a single totality), needs the opposite figure of the foreigner or enemy, such that the possibility of violence is inscribed ahead of time in the primitive social being; war is the structure of primitive society and not the accidental failure of an unsuccessful exchange. This structural status of violence is illustrated by the universality of war in the Savage world (ibid., 264).

Primitive society as a homogeneous being continues to "refuse social division, to exclude inequality, to forbid alienation" (ibid., 260). "Society does not accept power separated from its being, division established between those who command and those who obey" (ibid., 261), so the savage chief has to be powerless.

However, there rises the possibility that restless wars may permit the autonomy of the group of warriors and introduce the risk of social division (ibid., 330). The organized group of "professional" warriors tend to transform the "permanent state of war" into "actual permanent war" (ibid., 303).

Here the mechanism which we call 'orthopraxation of violence' will be set in motion in order to prevent the risk of social division. "Orthopraxy" is the concept which Geertz (1973) introduced as a contrary concept of "orthodoxy". The latter is the principle that regards 'doxa' as supreme. In contrast, the former is the principle that regards 'praxis' as such. The mechanism of 'orthopraxation' means that the actin becomes detached from end-means relations and will be autotelically performed (Tanaka and Yoshida 2011, 168).

In a primitive society in which wars are structurally built in, a person who became a member of group of warriors finds himself "irremediably trapped in his vocation, a prisoner of his desire for glory which leads him straight to death" (Clastres 2010, 313). He is "in essence condemned to forging ahead. The glory won is never enough in and of itself" (ibid., 302). He is obsessed with the mechanism of 'orthopraxation of violence', so is destined to die embraced by glory.

Thus, the possibility that "this prestige group has a good chance of becoming a pressure group, then a power group" (ibid., 313) is inhibited. That is to say, the mechanism of 'orthopraxation of violence' makes violence impossible to become a major symbolic medium in a primitive society.

### 3.2.2 'Orthodoxation of Existence' – Mechanism of Deterring Violence

When a stratified society which is structured on the principle of division comes into existence in spite of all the efforts that primitive society paid, how is violence going to be deterred?

It is carried out by establishing 'absolute existences' such like God and the king, in other words, by re-absolutizing existences. For example, we may recollect the doctrine of the divine right of kings according to which the king can deter military forces (violence) of the powerful lords.

We would like to call this mechanism 'orthodoxation of existence'. By absolutizing existences such as things, persons, history and institutions, those existences can overwhelm any kind of violence. Here, we may remember "traditional authority", which is one of the Weber's three types of legitimate rule.

We can find this mechanism also in primitive society. Clastres pointed out that the chief in primitive society is just "commissioned to speak in the name of society" and expresses "the text of Law that no one has established", legislators of which are "the founders of society – the mythical ancestors, the cultural heroes, the gods" (ibid., 261).

Therefore the chief will never express "the flights of his individual desire or the statement of his private law" (ibid.). He may be said to exist merely as "personification" of society and law.<sup>2</sup> What is absolutized is not the chief, but society and Law.

We have briefly looked at mechanisms of deterring violence in primitive and stratified society – 'orthopraxation of violence' and 'orthodoxation of existence'. However, violence is a symbolic medium which is difficult to deter in spite of existence of such mechanisms. So, human history has been forced to develop with focusing on taming violence.

---

## 4. History of Confrontation and Alliance among Symbolic Media

---

### 4.1 'Action' as a Symbolic Medium

To demonstrate that 'predominance of actions over existences' have been promoted as a result of confrontation and alliance among various symbolic media,

---

<sup>2</sup> "Personification" forms a counter part of "reification" in Marx's theory (Marx 1953). "Personification" means that social relations appear as a property or a meaning of a person (Tanaka 1981).

we would like to argue another important symbolic medium besides violence. 'Action' as a pan-historical symbolic medium is that.

'Action' is a pan-historic overall symbolic medium with a binary code consisted of action/inaction options. It becomes gradually dominant in accordance with evolution of 'predominance of actions over existences'. As a result, it constitutes 'a code system' just like violence and begins to restructure whole society. And there arise achievementism and meritocracy that are familiar to us.

Luhmann regards that not 'action' but communication is a fundamental factor of society and that 'action' is "reduction of communication" (Luhmann 1984). According to Marx's theory of reification (Marx 1953), 'action' can be rephrased as 'reified communication'. Not only sociologists but also ordinary people understand communication in the name of 'action' or regard it as 'action', so there comes into existence the code system consisted of action/inaction options.

We have no time to discuss the importance of achievementism in modern society, but, for example, we can explain much more simply the reason of religious shift from Catholic to Protestantism in Europe by introducing the idea that takes 'action' as a symbolic medium. In contrast with Catholic that can be characterized as a religion fundamentally based on 'orthodoxation of existence', Protestantism, characterized by individual direct actions toward God, can be said to be the embodiment of 'action' as a symbolic medium and also to be the representative of 'predominance of actions over existences'.

Also, denial of indulgence, inactivity and inability and discrimination against people with such traits can be said to symbolize dominance of 'action' as a symbolic medium in modern society. The same thing can be said about historical changes of meaning of 'insanity' and also 'punishment', both investigated by M. Foucault (1972, 1975).

As we have already mentioned before, Luhmann thought that symbolic medium is peculiar to modern society with increased complexity. Not only Luhmann but also Parsons understate the importance of ongoing 'predominance of actions over existences' in history.

Therefore, they are indifferent to the fact that symbolic media which have become dominant in modern society, namely money, science and law, are deeply influenced by 'action' as a symbolic medium because of their fundamental affinities with 'action'. Such affinities specifically appear in that Protestantism, symbolizing the beginning of modern times, is not 'a religion of existence' but 'a religion of action'.

On the contrary, within primitive society, violence which has affinities with 'action' was forced to develop autotelically to come to a tragic end ('orthopraxation of violence'), because 'code system of action' had not been established yet in it. For the same reason, in primitive society, we find "the impossibility of accumulating wealth" (Clastres 2010, 273).

## 4.2 Interaction among Symbolic Media and Modernization

As exemplified in the affinity between Protestantism and 'action' as a symbolic medium, various symbolic media have been confronting and allying with each other repeatedly. In what follows, we would like to describe how 'predominance of actions over existences' have been promoted by such confrontation and alliance.

'Predominance of actions over existences' has undergone evolution by successive appearance of powerful symbolic medium; violence, religion, money, action, science and nation-state. However, those symbolic media were often mutually contradictory and opposed with each other, and dramas of hegemonic replacement have been historically repeated. 'Predominance of actions over existences' has advanced as a result of confrontations and alignments among symbolic media.

In medieval times in Europe, Christianity dominated Europe as a sacred canopy. In this sense, Christianity is a powerful symbolic medium that will interpret the whole world according to God's intention. Although the people's 'actions' are absolutely determined by the special 'existence' of God, people's 'actions' were not determined by various 'existences' such as trees, woods, animals and so on. And so, Christianity despised fetishism of African people.

But, later, Christianity was convicted by Marxists as a religion which clouds people's recognition and it has been almost excluded in socialist countries.

And at last two powerful symbolic media, money and science, although in a different way, burdened religion with the decisive wound, and have destroyed the credibility of a religious view of the world (=secularization).

Christianity drove out animism and totemism, but in turn it was driven out by science and money. As a result, 'predominance of actions over existences' has advanced further.

Thus modernization took place as a result of long historical process of confrontations and alignments among symbolic media, taking the shape of those between religious power and political power (i.e. power of king) or between political power and economic power.

---

## 5. Nation-State and Symbolic Medium

---

### 5.1 Nation-State Formation and Symbolic Medium

Symbolic media played also important roles in the process of the nation-state formation. It differs in each nation-state which symbolic medium played an important role and with which symbolic medium it confronted and allied.

B. Anderson (1983) lays weight on information media as expanded language in cases of nation-state building in Central and South America. In Europe,

religious wars of the 16th century played important roles in the nation-state formation. Religious wars accompanied even by religious cleansing had heightened the religious homogeneity that became the basis for the nation-state formation. For example, France, protestant fleeing it to other countries, became a Catholic nation.

## 5.2 State's Monopoly of Violence and Nation-State Formation

Violence as a symbolic medium deeply connected with the formation of a nation-state. It is typically presented in that ancient regime was subverted by bourgeois revolution accompanied by violent bloodshed. And as a result, there arose state's monopoly on legitimate violence. The ancient regime which controlled military forces of powerful lords by the mechanism of 'orthodoxation of existence' was replaced by a modern state which deprives the people of weapons and monopolizes violence. It is a modern style of taming violence.

However, state's monopoly on violence is regarded as one of prerequisite features of a state by M. Weber (1958), it has been mainly told as a symbol of a repressiveness of a state, but its theoretical meaning has been hardly studied.

State's monopoly on violence depends on a nation-wide network of railway and roads, and, by promoting homogenization of legal and economic systems, it can stabilize commercial activities. And all of them promote the process of nationalization mentioned before.

However, it burdens government and people with difficult problems of civilian control of the military. The problem of civilian control is deeply connected with how not only military personnel but also ordinary people think of law in modern society.

Luhmann (1969), fundamentally based on Weber's (1980) theory, argues that rational-legal legitimation comes from formally-rational procedures themselves. According to our framework, it can be expressed that, under the conditions of 'predominance of actions over existences', decisions can be legitimated if they are based on a definite process of 'actions', that is to say, formally-rational procedures/due process. In other words, the dominance of the 'code system of action' makes such legitimation possible. Problems of civilian control can be resolved, only when rule of law is established under such dominance of the 'code system of action'.

In modern society, 'action as a symbolic medium' establishes its code system and as a result it obtained power of legitimation. Such may be called 'orthodoxation of action'. Achievementism and meritocracy can be said to symbolize 'orthodoxation of action'.

## 5.3 Nation-State as a Symbolic Medium and Nationalization

As I have mentioned above, symbolic media have been deeply concerned with the nation-state formation. However, much more important is that the nation-

state itself will function as a powerful symbolic medium, even though it may be local in a sense that it functions only in a nation-state. After the formation of a nation-state, 'existences' such as persons, things and their relations are categorized and relocated according to the code of 'nation-state as a symbolic medium'. Nation-state functions a symbolic medium which is consisted of pro/anti options.

Now, nationalization process can be restated as the process that the code of 'nation-state as a reductive medium' spreads throughout the nation-state. In other words, 'nation-state as a reductive medium' plays as a national standard when the process of 'becoming nation-wide scale' and 'homogenization and differentiation' take place. And also it can be said that nationalism is a kind of such national standard.

Even though nation-state can be regarded as a symbolic medium consisted of pro/anti options, specific contents of pro/anti options differ in each nation-state mainly based on its historical and geopolitical conditions. So, we cannot discern so easily what is pro/anti nation-state in case of a specific nation-state.

But as nationalization processes go on, an option of anti-nation-state becomes not available and nationalism grows up. Labeled as anti-nation-state, a person or an organization may be endangered its existence. That does not exclude a government or a parliament.

Although many of sociologists are usually critical about nationalism, they are not so conscious that the selection which nation-state forces us creeps into their theory. They are adopting "methodological nationalism" that "conflate a nation state with a concept of society" (Wimmer and Schiller 2003; Chernilo 2007). Is it an overstatement to say that sociology is a nationalized study and sociologists exist as personification of a nation-state?

---

## 6. Politics of a Nation-State and its Function

---

### 6.1 Function of Politics – Binding Decision or Allocation

Luhmann regards "binding decision" as a function of political system (Luhmann 1984). In contrast, D. Easton (1965) regards the authoritative allocation of values for a society as that. Luhmann's way of thinking can be traced back to Parsons' theory (1937) in which "a primary dichotomy between economics as a science of scarcity and sociology as a science of social solidarity" (Turner and Rojek 2001) is formulated. Parsons followed the theory of modern economics which took 'scarcity' as a starting point of its argument.

However, according to K. Polanyi, modern economics is constructed on "the delusion" that identifies "market phenomena" with "economic phenomena" and regards economic determinism as "a general law for all human society" (Polanyi 1977, 9-12). If we follow him, we have to say that Parsons and also

Luhmann committed the same logical fallacy and regarded economic activities in general as ‘allocation of scarce resources’. So they have to give a political system another function that is to say, “binding decision”.

Polanyi distinguishes between reciprocity, redistribution and exchange as forms of integration. When primitive society based on reciprocity shifted to a society based on redistribution, politics that controls redistribution arises. That is to say, “The emergence of retribution as a form of organization of the economy is, therefore, closely related to the emergence of the political order as a differentiated system in society” (ibid., xxxiv) .

“Binding decision” which Luhmann regarded as the function of a political system is just a condition which validates distribution. So, following Easton’s theory, we would like to regard redistribution as a function of a political system.

## 6.2 Politics of a Nation-State – Is Modern Society without a Center?

Supposed that the function of politics is the authoritative allocation of values for a society, we have to question what kind of values a nation-state allocates and what on earth values are. According to the framework of symbolic media and their code, values can be said to be the option which is preferred by a symbolic medium itself. For example, in case of nation-state, it is something to be thought to be ‘pro nation-state’.

Politicians embody ‘pro nation-state values’ in that they won in pole which is consisted of formally-rational procedures in a nation-state. Such politicians constitute the government and it will engage in allocation of ‘pro nation-state values’ to persons and institutions that are accredited with ‘pro nation-state values’. Thus the process of nationalization evolves reflexively.

Luhmann characterized modern society as “society without a center” (Luhmann 1981). One of the reasons can be attributed to the fact that he assigned function of distribution or allocation not to political system, but to economic system. As we have mentioned above, modern society has evolving as a “society with a center” in which mechanism of nationalization rules.

However, as globalization evolves further than when Luhmann lived, “society without a center” is going to be realized especially after the cold war is over.

---

## 7. Conclusion

---

In the article, focusing on nationalization analogous to on-going globalization, we asked how it has been related to modernization. In the process of nationalization, influences of ‘a nation-state as a symbolic medium’ spread throughout

the nation-state. Removing peculiarity of the local, national standard stimulated both markets and productions and also promoted the process of modernization. And, in turn, development of modernization promoted the process of nationalization.

In the course of rethinking modernization, we could get to some theoretical findings; the theoretical importance of violence, roles of various symbolic media including violence and 'action' in social changes, the importance of analysis of a nation-state for sociology and so on.

In cases of developed countries, it may be said that the relations between modernization and nationalization are mutually enhancing ones. However, in reality, these relations vary in each country. So, we have to study, for example, how was sequential relations between them, which symbolic media played important roles and so on in each country.

All these findings and tasks to be studied direct us the necessity of reconstructing comparative and historical sociology. And the framework constructed in the article may be helpful to accomplish such a reconstruction.

---

## References

---

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Caramani, Daniele. 2004. *The Nationalization of Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chernilo, Daniel. 2007. *A Social Theory of the Nation-State: The Political Forms of Modernity beyond Methodological Nationalism*. Abington and New York: Routledge.
- Clastres, Pierre. 2010. *Archeology of Violence*. Paris: Semiotext.
- Brosses, Charles de. 2008. *Du Culte Des Dieux Fetiches, Ou Parallele de L'Ancienne Religion de L'Egypte Avec La Religion Actuelle de Nigritie (1760)*. Paris: Fayard.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique. Folie et déraison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1969. *Legitimation durch Verfahren*. Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1976. Generalized Media and the Problem of Contingency. In *Explorations in General Theory in Social Science: Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons*, ed. Jan J. Loubser, Rainer C. Baum, Andrew Effrat and Victor M. Lidz, 507-32. New York: Free Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1981. *Politische Theorie im Wohlfahrtsstaat*. München: Olzog.



- Luhmann, Niklas. 1984. *Soziale Systeme: Grundriß einer allgemeinen Theorie*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1995. *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1997. *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Marx, Karl. 1953. *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie*. Berlin: Dietz.
- Matuszek, Krzysztof C. 2007. *Der Krieg als autopoietisches System – Die Kriege der Gegenwart und Niklas Luhmanns Systemtheorie*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Moore, Robin D. 1997. *Nationalizing blackness: afrocubanismo and artistic revolution in Havana, 1920-1940*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Mosse, George L. 2001. *The Nationalization of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich*. New York: Howard Fertig Pub.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1937. *The Structure of Social Action*. New York: The Free Press.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1969. *Politics and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. *The livelihood of man*, ed. Harry W. Pearson. New York: Academic Press.
- Schattschneider, Elmer E. 1975. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. Wadsworth Publication Company.
- Schmitt, Carl. 1996. *The Concept of the Political*, trans. George D. Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stiglitz, J. 2002. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: Academic Internet Pub Inc.
- Tanaka, Shigeru. 1981. Marukusu no Jinkakuka Gainen no Kousatu [An Inquiry of Marx's 'Personification' Concept]. *Soshioroji [Sociology]*, 23-42. Shakaigaku Kenkyukai.
- Tanaka, Shigeru. 1989. Shakaitekiyakuwariron; daburu-konthinjenshi wo meguru mondai [Theory of Social Role; concerning double contingency]. In *Gendaishakai no Shoriron [Theories of Contemporary Sociology]*, ed. Hisao Naka, 158-76. Kyoto: Sekaisisousha.
- Tanaka, Shigeru. 2008. Soukatu: kousakusuru shukyo heno manazashi [Summery Thesis: Complicated Gaze on Religion], In *Kokka to Shukyou [The State and The Religion]*, ed. Ken Arai and Shigeru Tanaka, 537-621. Kyoto: Houzoukan.
- Tanaka, Shigeru, and Ryuji Yoshida. 2011. Maturi no Ohsopurakushika to Shakai-hendou: Hikiyamamaturi wo Jireitoshite [Orthopraxy of Festival and Social Change: Cases of Traditional Float Festival in Japan]. *Kokusaishakaibunka Kenkyusho Kiyo [Society and Culture; Journal of the Socio-Cultural Research Institute]*, 167-204. Ryukoku University.
- Turner, Bryan S., and Chris Rojek. 2001. *Society and Culture: Principles of Scarcity and Solidarity*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Weber, Max. 1958. *Politik als Beruf*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Weber, Max. 1980. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 5. Aufl. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wimmer, A., and N. Glick Schiller. 2003. Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37 (3).