

*Insufficient Nationalism: The Case of the Macro-regional Divide Between  
Northern and Southern Italy*

A Thesis

By

AnnaMaria Depoian

The Department of Historical and Political Studies

In fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of a Bachelor of Arts in

International Studies

Arcadia University

2022

## Table of Contents:

	Page
I. Introduction.....	3
II. Lasting Effects of the Macro-regional Divide.....	6
III. Literature Review- Nationalism.....	17
V. Data Section.....	27
Historical Case Study- Unification.....	28
Historical Case Study- Fascist Period.....	32
Conclusion.....	35
VII. Final Thoughts.....	35
VIII. Bibliography.....	38

## Introduction

In 1861 Camillo Benso, Count of Cavour notoriously said, “We have created Italy, now we must create Italians.” (Pryke 2020, 7). Cavour acted as one of the primary catalysts for Italian Unification leading to the formation of the country we know today. The concept Cavour alludes to in this statement is the idea that countries are formed first, then the people are united as a later priority. This ordering of priorities may seem productive in theory, however, the creation of “Italians” later, as Cavour mentions, resulted in a divided nation. Italy insufficiently nationalized when becoming a nation state as a result of their unification process.

Despite their front as a united, nationalistic, and patriotic nation Italy’s Northern and Southern regions remain divided from one another. Political tensions and economic inequality during Unification created and perpetuated a divide long into Italy’s future. The relationship between the North and South is one that has been explored in depth from the way they “other” each other, to the way past political groups would define the fundamental differences between the North and South in the 1900s (Agnew 2017). The divide that exists plays a role in affecting nationalism within Italy.

Nationalism, defined by various scholars throughout the decades, touches on the general idea of identifying and supporting one’s country and feeling a unity or connection to the people and place they are a part of. While different scholars add or take away from this definition, some include factors such as what is a nation or what makes a “people.” (Smith 1992; Schnee 2001; Brubaker 2020). The constant in the definitions is the connection to what we call a “nation.”

There are different schools of thought regarding theories of nationalism including modernism, ethnosymbolism, primordialism and new approaches to nationalism. The central argument made by theories of modernism demonstrate that nationalism comes from the industrialization and modern forward movement of a nation (Gellner 1983; Breuilly 2011; Anderson 1983; Greenfeld 1996). The case of Italian Unification shows us that Italy insufficiently nationalized which created the rift between their macro-regions and other failures throughout history to nationalize. Authors of modernist theories argue that nationalism occurs post nation state formation and occurs alongside industrialization. While Italy did not achieve nationalization, they did follow this line of theory, by working towards nationalism during their industrialization period (Gellner 1983; Greenfeld 1996). Furthermore, some of the literature discussed ethnonationalist scholars and their work highlights how myth, memories and shared past are essential to nationalism and is also a direct critique of modernism (Smith 1983; Connor 1973). Both Connor and Smith demonstrate the importance of ethnicity and heritage in the creation of nationalism (Calhoun 1993). The central debate in ethnonationalist theory opposed the Italian case since ethnonationalists place importance in nationalism formation prior to the nation (Smith 1983). Theories of ethnonationalism argue that nationalism is created before nations; however, this does not explain the Italian case. Modernist scholars capture the Italian case in their theory more holistically because their ideology matches with the way leaders of Italian Unification attempted to nationalize (Smith 1983; Gellner 1983). This idea relates directly to the instrumentalist literature and thinkers such as Gellner, Greenfeld and Anderson (Gellner 1983; Greenfeld 1996).

Italian Unification represents a case of the nation forming first, then attempts by nation elites to create nationalism after. The divide originated and has been perpetuated throughout time, negatively impacting Italian nationalism. When Italy unified, people who were once politically free and separate from one another, were forced to work as a collective (Battente 2012). Unfortunately, no bond or connection was formed before being forced together. The more the nation's elites, primarily from the North, pushed them to be a cohesive people, the further the divide split them. The division weakens their nationalism since it was never created in the first place. Italian political leaders over time have tried different tactics to make the people feel more connected to one another, however, these attempts failed since no one prioritized nationalism at the nation's birth. Increasingly, through its lifetime as a nation, Italy's regions pull further apart creating a divide in the inhabitants.

The following sections will discuss the background of the divide between the Northern and Southern regions in order to show the negative side effects of insufficient nationalization. The divide will also present the ways the Northern elites used their status and power to run Italy and push the South down. Following this section, this thesis will analyze literature on nationalism to better comprehend different scholars' theories. This literature will also inform this thesis on ways to nationalize and unify a nation. Then, a historical case study of Italian Unification and Fascism will demonstrate the insufficient nationalization of the Italian nation state both at its inception and later in its history. This jump forward in Italian history showcases another Italian leader working towards nationalism and is a pivotal moment in their timeline.

## **Lasting Effects of the Macro-regional Divide**

This section discusses the history of the macro-regional divide from Unification, onward. It depicts the tensions between the North and South prior to the unification of the country, during Unification and later in their history during key historical periods. The divide highlights the inequality felt between the Northern elites and Southern farmers and dwellers. Background of Italian Unification, the Resistance, WWII, and the formation of the Italian Republic bring to light the nature of the North-South divide and the way it transformed throughout Italian history.

Italian Unification and other key events through Italian history created the North-South divide that exists to the modern day. In 1861, Italy's once politically independent regions found themselves suddenly united under one monarchy. Due to a sudden shift in power and political structure, Italy faced periods of identity shift, political and economic divisions. These divisions placed tension on the newly unified North and South and quickly created a rift between them (Foschi 2016; Bardagallo 2010; Agnew 2017; Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). The scholarly literature discusses landmark events and their impact on Italy's macro-regions (Foschi 2016; Bardagallo 2010; Agnew 2017; Forlenza and Thomassen 2011; Mouritsen 1998). These impacts therefore led to the development of stereotypes and a lack of unity during a time of supposed Unification. Scholars discuss the nature of Unification, the Resistance, WWII, and the creation of the Republic from both a historical perspective and a cultural perspective. They look at the impact on the North and South, how they perpetuated the divide that exists through history. Italian Unification led to a macro-regional divide and caused a weak and shifting national identity.

In 476, Rome ruled Italy and under Rome's rule "Italian[s] quest[ed] for citizenship" and separation from other kingdoms (Mouritsen 1998, 13). After Italians revolted on Rome "Italy lost political unity and remained divided until 1860." (Bardagallo 2010, 2). For centuries, Rome led many countries including the regions of Italy. The revolution not only led to freedom from Rome, but also a lack of a political power guiding them. They believed separation would solve all their problems, however, it created new ones instead. For decades Italian regions were conquered and ruled by different groups including the Phoenicians and Carthaginians until their unification in the mid-19th century (Bardagallo 2010).

The tensions between the macro-regions originated during Unification and highlight the differences in cultural, political, and economic views of the North and South. In 1860 the shift towards Unification led by Camilo Benso Count of Cavour, Giuseppe Garibaldi, Giorgio Asproni and Giuseppe Mazzini, sparked the quick process towards uniting the separate kingdoms of Italy. The region of Piedmont, located in the North, was one of the first regions brought into the new nation. After Piedmont, more regions united and the question of including Sardegna, an island off the coast of western Italy, came up. Piedmont saw adding Southern regions to Italy as "orientalizing" and saw them as "unworthy of a genuinely European country." (Salice 2015, 11). This bitter view points to a stereotype held by Piedmont against Sardgna. Piedmont seems to accuse Sardgna of "tainting" Italy before it is even a part of it (Salice 2015). This way of thinking is also inherently racist. It demonstrates a minoritization of those from Africa and even those perceived as being related to Africa. The Northerners saw themselves as better simply because they were closer in proximity to more European

nations. Included in this statement, people of Piedmont saw Sardegna as backwards, even so it was unavoidable to the North to include Sardegna in Unification (Salice 2015). Even with their difference in ideology, culture and roots, the leaders of Unification wanted Sardegna included in Italy. The social tensions grew from 1860 onward as Northern regions looked down on the South and viewed them as unworthy of being a part of the same nation.

After annexing Sardegna, the idea of annexing Sicily came into the conversation, the Kingdom of Two Sicilies pushed back when Cavour landed on their territory. Sicilians saw the annexing of Sardegna and themselves as a removal of patriotism. Giorgio Asproni, after hearing of Cavour's intention to annex Sicily during meetings with Garibaldi and Mazzini, "wrote in his *Political Diary* in October 1860" that he believed annexation "will bring [them] to civil war... since it's not possible for Napoli to suffer the yoke of Torino and for Southern Italy to bear the insolence of the Piedmontese." (Salice 2015, 14). Noting Torino as another region recently added to the North. The South saw joining with the North as another situation where the North could exert control over them and their sense of patriotism. Seeing the clear creation of the North as the politically and economically elite, made the South even more apprehensive to unify. Having Asproni, who aided in Unification, state that bringing Southern Italy under the influence of Northern regions such as Torino and Piedmont would create war, speaks highly of the deep seeded differences between them and the tensions that would arise once forced together. Sicily feared the North growing too strong and continuing their trajectory of leading the way politically. Even so, Cavour did as planned and in the late spring of the same year the annexation was legitimized (Salice 2015).



Asproni claimed a civil war would break out. His claim came to fruition in 1863. A war of “progress against tradition, North against South [ignited].” (Meriggi 2014, 4). The North led by Piedmont saw the future for Italy as industrialization and modernization and with this goal in mind they “overturn[ed] the ruling order in the South...[and] inflicted it with taxes, the state of siege...[and] mass arrests.” (Meriggi 2014, 5). The idea of this was to prevent the original political powers in the South from maintaining any control. Post-Unification “North-Ital[y]... took a disproportionately large share of the patronage of the Italian kingdom.” (Beales and Biagini 1971, 131). The elite north with majority political control were able to impose higher taxes on the South to fund their ideas of grandeur with industrialization. They also seized and arrested any Southerners that attempted to rebel against both the taxes and political rule of the North (Meriggi 2014). This evidence of tension prior to Unification and the outbreak of a macro-regional civil war shows the macro-regional divisions at an early stage and the nature of divide being a political and economic one. The disadvantages felt by the South from the North taking power and the disgust the North felt towards the South for their differences in traditions and culture prevented them from finding common ground.

Not only did the South experience higher taxes, but they were expected to follow radical legislation passed by the North and implement any new policy. One specific law, called The Casati Act, passed by the North included “the principle of compulsory primary education” for all children over 4 (Beales and Biagini 1971). While this concept may seem beneficial in a nation where the literacy rates were below 30%, the logistics of implementing a law like this requires money, money that the South did not have (Beales and Biagini 1971). This program would not bridge the education gap between

the North and South because the South knew their quality of education would be lacking compared to the North (Beales and Biagini 1971) The North working to implement expensive programs was another way for them to exert their power over the South and check in on their financial status. This law cemented both the political division since the South had no say in the law, and economic divisions. With the North in charge, the South fell further behind. Following Unification, the now North of Italy and the now South of Italy began to take issue with each other. Political powers focused on who would run the country rather than creating unity within the population (Donovan 2001). This power struggle left regions to fend for themselves and figure out the new country, language, economy, and political system thrust onto them.

The divide exists in terms of economic, cultural, and political differences. In terms of the economic divide the South was behind in both finances and development (Foschi 2016; Oliveria 2016). A financial gap did not exist before Unification. 44% of all Italians lived below the poverty line prior to Unification (Foschi 2016). After Unification in 1861, Southern poverty levels rose to 52% while the North declined to 37% (Foschi 2016). Unification also altered the tax system resulting in “tax rates...selected by the Northern elites, who [are] less concerned with the Southern citizenry’s welfare...” (Oliveria 2016, 3). Northerners do not consider the South as a part of their country nor do Southerners impact their day-to-day life. This means that Northerners changed the tax system to benefit themselves, not Southerners. Oliveria argues that “the present day [macro-regional] divide originated in the policies set by...past unitary governments.” These policies created during Unification perpetuated divided sentiments and pitted the North and South against each other.

Infrastructure also divided the North and South. The South had less roads and buildings and remained less industrialized than the North (Foschi 2016). The North leaped into modernization quickly leaving the South behind (Foschi 2016). The North's access to natural resources for building and trade made them a center for commerce and international relations (Foschi 2016). The South suffered from lack of modernization and a rise in organized crime. The Mafia and the Camorra created a greater divide between Northerners and Southerners. The North viewed the South as dangerous and untrustworthy (Foschi 2016). Due to the factors mentioned previously such as underdevelopment, and organized crime, Southern Italians had "worsened living conditions." (Foschi 2016). Compared to the North, the South seemed dirty, underdeveloped, and outdated. In the South, they were "forced into a more strict social immobility" due to lack of education and illiteracy. Northerners sought education and the North provided it more readily. Northerners also supported education more than Southerners. Southerners sought family more often than education, whereas Northerners were more individually minded seeking betterment of oneself (Foschi 2016). Social differences and economic disparity illustrate the nature of the macro-regional divide.

The Italian state, run primarily by the North, put "fiscal pressure" on the South and used their elite status to make alliances with some Southerners to further benefit themselves (Riall 2009). The South was forced into a politically weak position which prevented them from "improv[ing] their terms of trade with Northern Europe." (Riall 2009, 112). The South, rich in land, agriculture, and natural resources, had to give it up to please the North and fund their modernization endeavors. This caused the South to

resent the North—rather than it being a nationwide effort to modernize together, the North focused solely on their industrialization and left the South behind.

To hinder the South further and their actions towards rebellion, the Northern bourgeoisie class in Italy created an alliance with Southern landowners to prevent the “process of change” in the South, which further excluded their own modernization and improvement (Riall 2009, 74). The Northern elites added to the rift and created impediments the South could not overcome. This case further fractionalized the regions and embedded deep distrust and scorn into Italian relationships. The feelings created at Unification reproduced through time, fragmenting the North and South.

The North and South divide revolves around the political differences “intrinsic to the Southern society” and effects of the alliances made between the bourgeoisie and Southern landowners back during Unification (Capello 2016, 667). The discourse focused primarily on the phenomenon of how the South was “exploit[ed] of the local resources for growth” and the “reasons for the backwardness of the South of Italy.” (Capello 2016, 669). Once again, the elites in the North created a way to exploit poor Southerners by using their labors against them. Partnering with the landowning South to force farmers, and the impoverished into a cycle of working then using their resources to pay the landowners, placed them into a deeper cycle of poverty.

The South lagged behind the rest of Italy in terms of development due to the North’s need for modernization and the perceived backwards nature of the South. With the creation of the bourgeoisie and landowning South alliance, the poor, rural, farmers of the South were placed in a loop of working endlessly, paying taxes, and giving up resources to the North (Capello 2016). If a Southerner in a rising generation sought to

better their lives, become more educated or more wealthy, they had to move North with the rest of their resources (Capello 2016). Preventing young Southerners from moving up in their social class added more fuel to the fire driving the North and South apart. The perpetual cycle of holding the South down, adding to their identity as “backwards,” and the North keeping them out of the “status quo” contributed greatly to not only their divide but lack of national unity and identity since they could not relate to their counterparts.

Moving forward in time to post WWII and the creation of the Republic of Italy, competing political parties left the country disjointed politically during an unstable time in history. Groups like the Labour Democratic Party, Socialist Party, Italian Communist Party and Christian Democratic Party sprung up, all seeking to take the lead in the new government format (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). The government shifted political parties, leaving Italy without a clear political agenda and sense of homogeneity. Italy suffered a constant revolving door of different political parties for the years post-war. With each election, power shifted hands from Northern supported political groups to Southern supported political groups. These power shifts left whoever was not in charge feeling heightened animosity towards their political leaders and macro-regional counterparts (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). Government also furthered the North-South divide. The ever-changing political parties led the North and South to eventually choose sides. The major political parties on the right spectrum are the Lega Nord, The Brothers of Italy, and the Center Right. On the left there are the Democratic Party and the Five Star Movement (Donovan 2001). Some see the right as neo-fascists and xenophobic. The right rejects the concept of unification since they view the South as

lesser than (Donovan 2001). The left follows some ideals of communism. The South typically follows leftist ideals, and the North usually follows rightist ideals (Donovan 2001). These ideological differences divided Italians on more than one occasion making the constant reorganization of government strain the relationships between Italians. Italians lack trust “in other Italians and [have] negative attitude[s] to[wards] central government.” (Agnew 2017, 4). They may all call themselves Italians, but they view each other as “other.”

As mentioned previously, one major political group in the North is the Lega Nord. They are viewed as an anti-South political party. They preach anti-immigration sentiments as well as strong feelings of xenophobia. They believe that Italy should only host people born there or that can prove Italian descent (Agnew 2017). When the Lega Nord defines their country, they say that the North was always part of Europe whereas Africa and the South are synonymous. The Lega Nord met their Italian counterparts and stereotyped them as lesser (Agnew 2017). The Lega Nord also believes that the South drags down the North in terms of progression, development, and international ability (Agnew 2017). Unification started with great intentions, however, it ended with a macro-regional divide. Between governmental differences, stereotypes perpetuated in both macro-regions, differences in infrastructure and living conditions; the regions cannot seem to find much common ground to unite themselves. Agnew says, the “macro-regional division of Italy... appears to arrest the development of Italian national identity.” This claim truly highlights the nature of the Italian divide and the situation Unification put them in. In the late 1900s Italy “exported people not imported them.” This means that they could not hold onto their own citizens because they wanted to leave the

metaphorical sinking ship (Agnew 2017, 11). The “anti-immigration narrative” of the North created a greater divide between the South and the North, and discouraged people from entering Italy (Agnew 2017, 12). The North follows separatist policies meaning that they feel the North and South should remain separate macro-regions (Agnew 2017, 12). To Italians, especially those with separatist ideals, they feel that Unification is a word and not the actual description of how Italians feel towards one another (Agnew 2017). “Italian Unification brought together a set of city states and regional states... [with] distinctive economic, political, and cultural profiles...” then told them to be a country (Angew 2017, 14). There was no adjustment period or plan to truly unite the macro-regions other than in title.

Finally, the election of Carlo Azeglio Ciampi in 1999 until 2006 gave Italians on both sides of the political spectrum a leader the majority wanted. Ciampi sought to implement a common language and rework the Italian narrative to create a more unifying past (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). Some considered this a “rare and significant community [event]” since he was the first bipartisan elected president in Italy's history (Donovan 2001, 13).

For years prior, elections led to strife between political parties. No parties agreed on a candidate or elected in a bipartisan fashion. Italians of different political parties backed Ciampi and supported his plan for Italy. For a long time, the Left felt upset at the lack of political trade off. Ciampi brought their opinions back, allowing them to feel heard (DeGrand 2010). Ciampi started “rewriting and re-narrating the Italian past” to make them love their country and lessen the divide (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011, 5). Ciampi started Italy down the long road to true unification. Ciampi took on this difficult

task regardless of the history prior that created the North-South divide and weakened a sense of nationalism. He wanted to reimagine their history; however, 150 years of scars do not fully erase during a 7-year presidency.

President Ciampi truly prioritized national identity and strengthening the spirit of nationalism. The nationalism discussed here is the sense of pride for one's nation and desire to be a part of the culture, people, and system of the nation (Bardagallo 2010). Italy is "notoriously known for having a 'weak' national identity." (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011, 3). They have "'official nationalism' opposed from above" but not a real sense of national pride (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011, 3). Different government officials overtime tried to create a sense of nationalism, but none of their efforts truly sank in. At their formation they did not create goals for their nation and people which led to this weakened nationalistic state now.

President Ciampi from 1999-2006 reflected on Italy's past and made Italians look at it for all the good it possesses rather than the bad. Italy's part in WWII and fascism left them feeling as though their nation died and could not come back (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). Ciampi wanted to rewrite the narrative and make Italians see the end of fascism and the formation of the Republic as a new start—a rebirth of Italy (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). To Ciampi, The Resistance and June 2, 1946, were like a second unification of Italy.

Ciampi wanted to take the weakened sense of national identity and nationalism and make Italians see their potential. The divide between North and South only adds to the weakened national identity since the macro-regions cannot find common ground nor do they see their unifying history (Forlenza and Thomassen 2011). Nationalism and



national identity form through shared experience, relationships, shared culture, language, and a sense of connection to the others in one's country. Ciampi wanted to redefine their history, so Italians focus and unite under a new past. They needed a history where something was not taken from them, where one macro-region did not bring another down, where political differences made them stronger not weaker. Ciampi accepted the wrongs of Italy and said that these wrongs taught Italians to "fight for one's nation." (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 15). Ciampi wanted their history to be one of rebirth and lessons learned from the trials rather than mistakes and failure (Thomassen 2017).

From Unification to the modern-day, Italy underwent periods of change. They started as separate monarchy ruled regions and united into modern-day Italy. Looking at Unification and other historical events gives background as to why Italians view their regional counterparts the way they do. It also highlights the weakened sense of nationalism and why Italians cannot unite under one national identity. The pressures placed on the South both politically and economically by the elitist North resulted in long term resentment. Divisions during WWII, the leadership of Benito Mussolini and the formation of the republic further cemented the divide felt between these two regions. This left Italians feeling disconnected from each other and their nation.

### **Literature Review- Nationalism**

The literature significant to this topic revolves around theories and differing definitions of nationalism. Various scholars focused on different theories of nationalism and their implementation into nations. The theories include modernism, primordialism,

ethnosymbolism/nationalism and newer unnamed theories (Gellner 1983; Smith 1995; Brubaker 2009; Calhoun 1993). The literature exhibits a range of theories of nationalism and proposes the question: What comes first-- nationalism or the nation? This question comes up in the discussion and debate between scholars on whether nations create nationalism or the reverse. Scholars like Smith and Gellner nuance it by giving depth to the reasoning behind nation and nationalism creation (Smith 1983; Gellner 1983). Each theory of nationalism explains how nations form nationalism or how nationalism was formed by a collective people prior to national formation. In contrast, modernists believe that modern society perpetuates nationalism (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004; Ozkirimli 2000). Specifically, industrialization, changing political structures and capitalism contribute to a rising sense of nationalism (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004; Ozkirimli 2000; Breuilly 2011; Gellner 1983; Greenfeld 1996).

Ernest Gellner defines nationalism as a primarily political principle and one bound to industrialization (Gellner 1983). Gellner looks at nationalism as what he refers to as a "one roof" term since he considers primarily one nation at a time in regards to nationalism (Gellner 1983, 51). His theory included the idea of elites in society imposing their high culture ideas on lower class citizens and "low cultures" (Gellner 1983, 55). Gellner also goes on in his definition to say that nations and nationalism can emerge unexpectedly since modernization can happen rather suddenly (Gellner 1983). According to Gellner, nationalism occurs post-nation formation as a result of various factors including modernization, political control and societal elites. This definition remains one of the leading theories of nationalism and makes Gellner one of the most well-known theoreticians in the field of nationalism. Similar to Gellner, Liah Greenfeld,

another modernist, argues that industrialization drives capitalism and growth which in turn drives nationalism (Greenfeld 1996). Greenfeld says, "Nationalism is viewed as a cultural and psychological function of modernization." By this Greenfeld means that as nations industrialize, people can come into contact more often through improved infrastructure and become more united thus creating a sense of nationalism (Greenfeld 1996, 7). Greenfeld also argues the importance of democracy in nationalism since equality and social movement are essential to make a community feel equal to one another (Greenfeld 1996). She believes nations with democracy are synonymous with nations with nationalism because they give their people more of a voice and more options (Greenfeld 1996). This differs from Gellner's definition because it focuses on one type of government specifically in relation to nationalism. Gellner calls for a central government, but not one specific kind. Greenfeld falls under the modernist umbrella but adds her own nuance to the theory.

Benedict Anderson, while still a modernist, takes a more creative approach than Gellner and Greenfeld creating what he calls "imagined communities" in his definition (Bergholtz 2001; Ichijo and Uzelac 2004; Ozkirimli 2000). Anderson focuses more on the how and why people in societies think the way they do rather than a clear-cut definition. His definition is less restricted and considers factors such as emotion, identity and culture in the role of nationalism (Bergholtz 2001). Max Bergholz, a scholar who comments on the work of Anderson, clearly hails him, saying that Anderson fixed a gap in the literature around the 1980s and brought a new perspective to the table that other scholars had not considered (Bergholtz 2001). Anderson argues that the emergence of print capitalism, a form of industrialization, was the catalyst for nationalism (Anderson

1983). Anderson emerged as a new voice within the modernist field and explored the importance of culture in relation to nationalism more in depth than other theoreticians in his field.

Author and scholar Walker Connor is a mix of modernism and ethnonationalism which nuances both the modernist theories and brings ethnonationalism into the picture (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004). Connor defines nationalism as involving ethnic composition and modern movements contributing to nationalism. The theory of ethnonationalism-symbolism, made prominent by Connor in his writings within *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, directly critiques modernism since modernists believe nationalism came about after the nation and ethnonationalists believe people create nationalism at the start of the nation or even before (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004; Ozkirimli 2000). If Connor is a mix of modernism and ethnonationalism, that places him at an interesting point since they seem to conflict. Connor in his definition goes on to say that people of shared ethnicity form a bond and eventually a nation that they show “identity with and loyalty to...” (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004, 51). His definition pays particularly close attention to the relationship between ethnicity and nationalism and politics in relation to ethnic groups (Connor 1973). Unlike Gellner and Greenfeld, Connor pulls ethnicity into the conversation and talks about culture as a factor much like Anderson does.

Anthony D. Smith follows Connors ethnosymbolist theory and expands upon it, furthering the importance of people being part of a group that shares a history together. He emphasizes kinship and shared beliefs and ethnicity, but not to the point of saying that everyone in a nation should all be the same (Smith 1995). Smith also believes that nationalism comes before the modern era as “nations have origins in ethnic groups” and

nationalism comes from the “ethnie” or “shared ancestry, myths, histories and cultures.” (Ichijo and Uzelac 2004, 100-101; Smith 1992). Rogers Brubaker comments on Smith’s work, saying that it is heralded decades later (Brubaker 2020). Brubaker says that Smith’s focus on culture, ethnicity and nationalism creates a full picture of nationalism in a way other theories fail to (Brubaker 2020). Smith’s theory claims that nationalism can pre-date a nation if a group of people feel solidarity and intense pride toward their shared past, beliefs and language (Smith 1992). This approach to nationalism highlights the importance of unity among the people rather than placing importance on the nation or territory itself. According to this theory, nationalism is made within the people and nations are the afterthought that can expand nationalism, but not create it in the first place.

Scholar John A. Hall, critiques Gellner claiming that industrialization does not impact nationalism to the extent Gellner, and other modernists make it seem (Hall 2000). Hall looks at nationalism as being established by already formed nations, primarily focusing nations in the EU. Hall argues that nationalism happens long before industrialization. Though industrialization can perpetuate nationalism further, it is a principle created before (Hall 2000). This critique of Gellner also goes for other modernist theoreticians like Greenfeld and Anderson because it questions the catalytic role of industrialization on nationalism.

While some scholars critique Gellner, others use his definition as the gold standard. Sam Pryke, an author writing about nationalism in the EU, wrote highly about Gellner. Pryke, like Gellner, also understands nationalism as a primarily political theory involving the elite. Pryke uses Gellner’s definition defining nationalism in the EU by

saying that the EU created a unified major nation in a sense and those that feel loyal to it come primarily from middle to upper class society (Pryke 2020). While the EU is not a nation, it is a conglomerate of nations which operate under economic and political policies much the way an independent nation does. The EU came about due to a treaty to unify Europe. Pryke believes that the EU's sense of nationalism came from the will of middle- and upper-class elites, much like Gellner's claim that elites in society impose their culture to shape the nationalistic imagine suiting them (Herzfeld 2015). This support of Gellner showcases the array of opinions in the field.

In contrast to modernism, scholars critique the work of Greenfeld and Anderson's work. Craig Calhoun critiques modernism and Greenfeld saying that their definition forgets to address national identity and culture as a factor pertaining to nationalism (Calhoun 1993). Modernists see nationalism only as a result of modernity rather than it being a causal factor (Calhoun 1993). Walter Schnee claims that Greenfeld focuses too much on the internal structure of nationalism the way Gellner does and forgets to take other nations into account. Schnee's major argument is that nationalism cannot be solely looked at in one context, nationalism is a "transnational phenomenon." (Schnee 2001, 1). Scholars that only look at nationalism under one umbrella fail to see that nationalism relates to how other nations form nationalism and build off one another. Nationalism also encompasses the growing relationships nations have to one another and the way those relationships impact politics, economy and culture. Scholar, Anna Triandafylliou, critiques Anderson saying that Anderson needs to involve ethnicity even more in his definition (Triandafyllidou 2020). She thinks Anderson's definition recognizes culture and ethnicities' role to an extent but needs to take it further in order

to truly include minorities and migrants in the picture (Triandafyllidou 2020). These critiques on Greenfeld and Anderson show that nationalism can be pushed further and include aspects from other theories to make a more well-rounded definition.

Walker Connor is mentioned by other scholars under the ethnonationalism branch and is critiqued by new voices in the field of nationalism. Schnee critiques Connor's definition because he claims that Connor fails to explain why people will choose their nation sometimes even over their own self-chosen group. Connor states that within a nation people form self-identified groups, people with whom they share a background, culture, and ideas. Connor's version of nationalism also claims that at times people will choose their nation over self-formed groups even if the whole of the nation does not identify with them (Schnee 2001). Though Anthony D. Smith does not comment directly about Connor, he is also an ethnosymbolist and would agree with the role ethnicity plays in nationalism. Smith comments on the concept of self-formed groups. People can have multiple identities allowing them to form multiple groups. "These identifications may reinforce national identities..." meaning people who feel part of a larger collective feel more connected to their nation (Smith 1992, 6). Those who feel pulled between multiple communities can always feel whole knowing they are a part of a nation. Connor's definition is strengthened by Smith because those that choose their nation over their self-chosen groups may do so because they will always be a part of their nation even if their own self-identification changes. Smith builds onto ethnonationalism with his own definition. Smith defines nationalism as a "more homogenous category than...modernists." (Ozкимli 2000, 156).

Anthony D. Smith's definition of nationalism remains relevant through the decades and is still commented on by other scholars. Smith was once a student of Gellner but disagreed with his teacher's perspective on nationalism. From Gellner he learned the complexity of nationalism and sought to form his own ideology. Smith holds Gellner and his theory in high regard, but also learned to form his own opinion and make a name for himself in the field (Smith 1983). Anna Triandafylliou, who once worked with Smith and holds him in high regard as well, stating that she feels the area of nationalism needs to be expanded upon in the changing century. She appreciated Smith's work but feels as though it is no longer accurate in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. While Smith does focus on ethnicity, Triandafylliou feels as though past scholars lack focus on the role of "Others" in nationalism and nations. By "Others" Triandafylliou refers to transnational relationships, minorities and immigrants. In the modern context these groups are essential to include in a working definition of nationalism (Triandafyllidou 2020, 2). Smith expanded upon his teacher's definition and Triandafylliou did the same with Smith showing the changing nature of nationalism as time moves on.

The conversation between these different scholars communicates the array of opinions on the topic nationalism. There are clearly various theories and scholars who do and do not agree with each other. Some theories hold up overtime and some need to be adjusted to match modern day phenomena. These scholars focus on how nationalism appears within a country or appears prior to the nation forming.

Some scholars argue that nationalism comes prior to nation formation, while others argue that nations and their progress forward create a sense of nationalism (Gellner 1983; Smith 1995). The latter argument encompasses the Italian case far more



than the former since Italians lacked nationalism before they formed, then worked, however unsuccessfully, to create nationalism post-Unification. For ethnonationalism, nationalism can come before or after the nation based on nation creation. Finally, for modernists nationalism occurs after nation formation. Few scholars can come to an agreement on when nationalism truly comes about. This places a significant role in the debate about nationalism and the disagreement in the field.

With the case of Italian national unification and Italian nationalism it is important to note the efforts to first set up a ruling system and industrialize. The House of Savoy was the first monarchy in Italy and came from a Northern family (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). With the North in a position of power, they began focusing on industrializing themselves rather than the entire nation. The goal of industrializing Italy's north was to make them equal to other developed nations in Europe such as Britain and France. Italians believed industrializing themselves would create more jobs in the north, increase exporting and trade agreements with the other EU nations and unify Italians under one common goal (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017).

Industrialization in the north being used to unify the Italian people aligns directly with modernist ideology laid out by Gellner and Greenfeld. Modernist theory claims that nationalism resulted from industrialization and the rise of capitalism (Gellner 1983). Cavour believed that Italians would unify once the nation formed and the ruling class in the north thought modernization would be the unifying factor (Pryke 2020; Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). Gellner's definition also applies to Italy because as mentioned previously the north took on the role of leading Italy and they decided to industrialize themselves, leaving the South behind. Gellner believes that society's elite impose their

culture on the poor and low cultured to establish nationalism that benefits them and represents a move towards modernity (Gellner 1983). Northern Italians did exactly this, they pushed their agenda on the entire nation and sought to use modernization to create nationalism, when in fact it left the south feeling resentful towards their macro-regional counterpart (Caponio et al., 2018). Greenfeld agrees with the concept of elites running the nation because she believes elite is synonymous with nation during this time period (Greenfeld 1996). Greenfeld diverges from Gellner's definition because she believes, ideally, that the elite will work with the lower classes to create social mobility and create a new system that will allow equality and pride (Greenfeld 1996). Gellner focuses on the reality that elites exist and dominate the nation most times, causing their will to be the direct of the nation and the push for industrialization (Gellner 1983). Italy works more in line with Gellner's reality compared to Greenfeld's fantasy.

Ideologies from different theoreticians give diverse perspectives on nationalism, however, they do not work in this context. Smith asserts that nationalism comes prior to a nation-state forming since ethnic groups form unity and identity prior to ever becoming a formal nation (Smith 1992). Smith argues against modernist ideas even though he was once a student of modernist theoretician Ernest Gellner. Smith believes that countries that do modernize still derive their nationalism from ethnic roots since their ethnic roots unify people under a culture, past, language and belief system (Smith 1992). This theory, while valid in its own ways, does not adequately represent the situation Italy faced since Italians did not have a shared ethnicity, past, or culture to unify them before they formed a nation-state. Italians were incredibly resentful of being forced together and even after various political leaders tried to unify them, their lack of

common ground and shared past kept them divided (Leydesdorff 2021). Modernist theory best represents the way the Italian state worked to form a sense of nationalism, even if it was unsuccessful in the end. Ethnonationalist theories may encompass other nations and the way they maintain nationalism, however, Italians never had shared culture to begin with.

Italy faced a lasting macro-regional divide between their Northern and Southern regions regardless of the efforts made to unify them. The major scholars in this field lack a concise definition of nationalism, and debate which theory most accurately describes the way nationalism is formed. The different theories include modernists and ethnonationalists which take on entirely different perspectives of nationalism. The case of Italy is illuminated further by modernist theory rather than ethnonationalist theory. While there is little consensus in the field of nationalism between scholars, modernist theory most accurately represents the way Italians attempted to form nationalism and unify their people.

## **Data Section**

This thesis focuses on the failures of the Italian state in creating a sense of Italian unity. Looking at other scholar's work in the field of nationalism and nation-states illuminated that there is a debate about the relationship between the nation and nationalism. Based on the literature, theoreticians used similar wording to define nationalism. Nationalism, generally, means a collective of people sharing a past, beliefs, culture, language, or territory and unifying behind that identification. Scholars such as Ernest Gellner and Liah Greenfeld assert that nationalism is directly connected to the

industrialization of nations and the importance of elites in forming a sense of nationalism (Gellner 1983; Greenfeld 1996). This aligns with the efforts made by Italy to create unity and patriotism within their population and the role northern elites took to insert their ideas into the Italians narrative.

The Italian case of nationalization started during their Unification efforts and continued through their timeline, most notably during the Fascist Era. During Unification the monarchy sought to celebrate the new nation-state and manifest future success. The Italian state wanted to “mould a national character.” (Dagnino 2013, 3). Then the shift in history highlighted the rise in a new political power that worked to unify the Italian people under one common cause. Benito Mussolini, the Fascist leader, worked to bring the North and South not only together, but under his cause. Both cases of attempts at nationalization demonstrate Italian elites and political figure’s inability to unify the people. Their efforts fail and add to the divide between the macro-regions further cementing their lack of Italian unity and pride as one collective.

### **Historical Case Study- Unification**

Even though the Italian state and leaders of Unification intended to implement a sense of nationalism, the fault already divided Italians causing their efforts to fail. Overarchingly, the lack of nationalism at the time of Unification points to a complex situation in Italy’s future. Unification was a forced uniting of the Italian people rather than a gradual process that the citizenry desired (Foschi 2016; Bardagallo 2010; Agnew 2017; Thomassen 2011; Donovan 2001). The leaders of Unification sought to make a

country out of independent kingdoms, without considering the repercussions of their actions.

The House of Savoy, or Italia Savoia, was the first monarchy in Italy and came from a Northern family. They ruled the new country from 1861 until 1946. This Northern family came from wealth, and owned a sizable amount of land in the Northern regions of Italy. This family worked with leaders of Unification such as Giuseppe Garibaldi to join the Northern regions together (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). The House of Savoy remained in power as the monarchy of Italy until a new governmental system overthrew them (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). For many Northern Italians, “the monarchy has indeed become a symbol of unity.” (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 8). After the Savoy came to power in 1861 “statues were carved, monuments erected...” and holidays made in their honor (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 8). Actions such as these represent a move towards nationalization because monuments and statues are meant to evoke a patriotic or sentimental feeling. Their goal was to inspire unity and pride in the hearts of Italians by looking at these new symbols of the Italian nation.

While this was the ruling class of the North, the South felt much differently towards them. Southern Italians viewed the House of Savoy as the monarchy that took their royal family, the Bourbons, out of the picture (Salerno 2006). They did not look at the new royal family as their monarchs. The Unification of Italy, in the eyes of the Savoy, was their crowning achievement as a monarchy, however, to the South this was the reason they disliked them. They blamed the family for forcing them out of independence and under the rule of elites that ignored their wishes.

In the early 1900s The House of Savoy celebrated Unification and worked to inspire national unity (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). This celebration was to commemorate “the nations progress toward greatness, modernity and civilization.” (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 8). King Victor Emmanuel believed the success of the nation would come from “the beneficial intervention of God’s will.” (Diego 2018, 1). This was Italy’s first World’s Fair and celebration of a unified nation. King Emmanuel desired glory for himself and his family, thus spoke of grandeur and the upcoming successes of the nation (Diego 2018). He saw Unification as an inevitability and the partnership of their great family and “popular participation” of the people (Diego 2018, 1).

Not everyone at the celebration believed Italy achieved greatness with Unification, nor would in their future. Southerners saw this event as a frivolous bourgeoisie festival. Instead, they held “protest rallies against high living costs...” and pointed out the existence of “Two Italies” in their world—one thriving on economic and political power and the other frustrated and clawing to get by (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). In essence, the monarchy, post-Unification, tried to celebrate what they saw as the successful starting years of their country. The celebration’s main goal was to lay out a national identity, one of power and greatness of the accomplishment made by the Italian people and especially their new rulers. The monarchy sought to convey a message of “national destiny” and promote an awakened sense of nationalism that was not evoked when first unifying (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). Unsurprisingly, this backfired since the South “had opposed Unification as an act of unjust centralization” and felt slighted by the actions made by the Italian state since Unification (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). Without shared memories, culture, beliefs and opportunities to grow,

the macro-regions had nothing to unite behind. The words being spoken at the celebration were just that—words. They held no meaning to the Southerners and bolstered the North's superiority. With one celebration aimed at unity, the North and South grew more divided.

After this celebration, the rise of a peasant revolution came about to fight the elite rule of the North. The Southern peasants and farmers felt the strain of modernization efforts in the North funded by their agricultural struggle (MacLean 1985). When the celebration occurred in the North, peasants marched on the elites and the monarchy, protesting their rule. They claimed that the efforts made by the Savoy to “unify” put the South into poverty and prevented them from being independent (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). They protested the “high cost of living” and their exploitation (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 8). During the event the Northerners defended themselves and the Savoy claimed that none of their progress to unite Italy was detrimental to the South. The peasants were arrested, and the high taxes continued, however, word of the protest made its way South, and a rebellion grew (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017).

Based on the celebration of the 1900s, The House of Savoy worked to nationalize Italy, however, their actions left the South embittered and in rebellion. Celebrating the Unification of Italy in the North, by the Northern, elite monarchy, for the purpose of highlighting all the good the country has done since Unification, primarily in the North showcases the exact reason this celebration failed. Nowhere in this gathering were the Southerners considered as more than guests to attend and appreciate the glory of the Savoy. The elitist nature of the North and the monarchy built the national

image that the South rejected. This celebration more than highlighted the divided nature between them and their failure at inception to sufficiently unify.

### **Historical Case Study- Fascist Period**

In 1919 the political movement, Fascism, led by Benito Mussolini was on the rise taking ideas from the Risorgimento to create a “revolutionary appeal” around his political agenda. This 58-year shift in time period moves one through Italian history to another key era in Italian revolution and leadership change. Mussolini sought to use symbols from Italy’s past to fuel his “speeches, films... political rituals...[and] newspapers...” (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017 9). His hope was that people would hold onto the symbolism of the past and that would make them sentimental, thus relating to his cause. Though many Italians rallied behind Fascism, their loss in World War II immediately made Italians regretful of their choices. They took their embarrassment, anger and regret out on one another, each macro-region blaming the other for the poor outcome of their decisions.

Mussolini was convinced that “forging...an authentic national character” was the first step to offering “all social classes a sense of strength, virility and will.” (Dagnino 2013,2). Mussolini’s ideology spread quickly since it applied to all compared to past political parties aiming to please only the elites. The Italian people united behind this new movement because it “finally [gave] to the Italian people what they much longed for—political and moral unity...” (Dagnino 2013). Fascism “was a beacon in a dark world” for Italians and it gave them a feeling of redemption from the crises of their past as a nation. Fascism would rewrite their past and give them a shared memory to unify



behind, becoming a conscious “Italian people.” (Dagnino 2013). Fascism seemed to be the answer to everything Italians sought and had not found until this point, this political system would resolve the divide and bring each region prosperity, prosperity they could experience together as a collective people.

Mussolini wanted to continue the efforts of the Risorgimento, he saw that Italy was created and wanted Fascism to be the mode of unification to make true Italians. In 1932 Mussolini created the ritualistic historical celebration called Mostra Jubilee to commemorate the death of Garibaldi, “Italy’s most popular Risorgimento hero” and the anniversary of the March on Rome (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 11). The overly ornate and theatrical event was the “highest expression” of politics and Mussolini’s power (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 11). Mussolini introduced a new exhibition, a stamp commemorating Garibaldi, and a new holiday to be celebrated in schools. This all was a show of Mussolini’s success at finishing Unification. He was honoring the past hero of Unification and making himself a more modern hero because he finally did as Cavour said, he made Italians. While he was honoring the past, he made it abundantly clear in the three-day propaganda celebration that this was also to note the difference between past Italy and the “living present still in the making.” (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 12). Much like the event held by the House of Savoy in the early years of Italy, this event was meant to bring glory to Mussolini. He wanted to use Unification time tactics such as memorials and statues to create sentiments of national unity with his Northern and Southern supporters. Mussolini wanted all his supporters to know that moving forward, Fascism would be the reason Italy is better.

In the end, it was too good to be true. Eventually the rose-colored glasses were pulled off the faces of Italians and they saw the reality Fascism created for them. With this political shift came “individualist egotism” and “evil that had corrupted the nation.” (Dagnino 2013). Unfortunately, this venture towards unity led Italians to violence and war, a war they lost in and in turn lost their faith in fascism. Italy was invaded from Sicily and eventually Mussolini admitted defeat to the Allied powers causing them to lose WWII (Dagnino 2013). Mussolini was taken out of power by the Grand Council after they saw that Italy would lose the war. Though there are contradicting stories of how Mussolini was executed, in 1945 he was in some way killed, ending his reign in Italy (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017). In the years following, the Fascist party tried to keep their ideals running to maintain the support and unity of Italians. In a 1962 celebration, the second major celebration like the one originally created by Mussolini for Garibaldi, highlighted the fading nationalism. Their unity and pride “had been so thoroughly discredited by the fascist rhetoric and dreams of imperial greatness and emptied by the humiliating consequences” of Fascism’s failures. This event sought to revive the enthusiasm felt at the first celebration 30 years prior (Forlenza and Thomassen 2017, 17). All it did was remind Italians of their tensions before Mussolini and the greater tensions rising after his death.

This case proves that through Italian history, different political powers running the Italian state have done their best to unify the Italian people, but inevitably fail whether it’s to divided sentiments felt from the inception of the nation, or their own flaws in their ideology as Italians saw with fascism. It would be unfair to say Italian never felt unified or had nationalistic ideologies laid out before them, but it is fair to say from the

examples shown that each effort has failed leaving the Italian people in a state of uncertainty. The North and South have been failed by their state to provide a road map to bringing their people together, due to this Italian remain resentful of the attempts and of each other.

## **Conclusion**

Given these points, one can see the North South divide through political dissention during Unification. The original leaders during Unification attempted and failed to form unifying and nationalistic principles for Italy. This material illustrated the fundamental issue of nations who do not have a sense of nationalism and exist with a divided population. Overall, the political leaders in 1861 had an obligation to uniting the people they would call Italians and inevitably failed resulting in the rift that occurred between the North and South of Italy. This division further prevented the political leaders' endeavors to create a sense of nationalism. This fractionalization of the macro-regions also lingers to the modern day. Italy is a complex nation like many others, the divide is one facet of the country, it is a piece of Italy that is harming their nation and the people.

## **Final Thoughts**

This historical case study of the Italian macro-regional divide starting before and during the time of Unification encompasses the complexity of a nation divided. Cavour's statement, "We created Italy, now we must create Italians" captures the issue Italy faced and the founding members' goal when they first unified the individual regions (Pryke

2020). From the beginning of Unification, there was no intention to create nationalism during the initial process, it was an afterthought to be accomplished later. While monarchs and other political leaders did work to create unity later in Italy's timeline, they were too late. Without a sense of shared past and culture, the North and South remained wary of one another, and tensions grew.

The Italian nation lives with stereotypes about their macro-regional counterparts and animosity in their hearts and minds towards those they view as different from them. The lack of political leadership aiding the South during Unification and economic pushes to benefit the North breeds resentment and furthered stereotypes that were already taking off (Riall 2009). Italy overlooked this divide at its inception because it had more pressing needs to focus on, such as getting a country started. The founders and political leaders put the issue off until it was too late to address, or they used the divide to further their own political agendas throughout Italian history (Barbagallo 2010).

Creating unity within one's people should be one of the main objectives when forming a new nation with once independent regions. Much like scholar Anthony D. Smith asserts in his definition of ethnonationalism, groups of people form bonds through shared memory, beliefs, and history, thus forming nationalistic sentiments long before a territory (Smith 1992). While ethnonationalism does not fit the case of Italy since Italy failed to unify the people or find a connecting element between them, it does represent an idealistic way of creating nationalism for a new nation-state. If Italy truly wants to achieve national unity and work cohesively as a nation, the stereotypes must be fought against and amends for the inequality shown to the north compared to the south must be made. Creating infrastructure policies, modernizing the south and connecting

southern cities to central and northern ones will resolve the imbalances (Bergholtz 2001). Working to change the perceptions of the North of the South and vice versa would alleviate the tensions and misinformation spread by the regions (Bergholtz 2001). At its core, Italy requires efforts to be made by both macro-regions and political leaders to mend the divide that has remained in their country since 1861. While this is idealistic thinking, this thesis does illuminate one to the real case which is the insufficient nationalization of Italy at its inception.

## References

- Agnew, John. 2017. "Working the Margins: The Geopolitical Marking of Italian National Identity." *Carte Italiane* 2. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5070/C9211030340>.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. "Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism." In *Imagined Communities*, by Benedict Anderson, 256. London: Verso.
- Barbagallo, Francesco. 2010. "Italy: the idea and the reality of the nation." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 15. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545710110084299>.
- Battente, Saverio. 2012. "Nation and state building in Italy: recent historiographical interpretations (1989–1997), I: Unification to Fascism." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 5 (3): 13. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354571X.2000.9728256>.
- Beales, Derek, and Eugenio F. Biagini. 1971. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*. New York: Routledge.
- Bergholtz, Max. 2001. "Thinking the Nation." *AHR Reappraisal* 11.
- Breuilly, John. 2011. "Chapter 5: Nationalism as Global History." In *Nationalism and Globalisation: Conflicting or Complementary?*, by John Breuilly, edited by Steve Smith & Patricia Owens John Baylis, 33.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2009. "Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism." *The Annual Review of Sociology* 25.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2020. "Populism and nationalism." *JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION AS FOR THE STUDY OF ETHNICITY AND NATIONALISM* 23.
- Calhoun, Craig. 1993. "Nationalism and Ethnicity." *Annual Reviews of Sociology* 29.
- Capello, Roberta. 2016. "What makes Southern Italy still lagging behind? A diachronic perspective of theories and approaches." *European Planning Studies* 20.

- Connor, Walker. 1973. "The Politics of Ethnonationalism." *Journal of International Affairs* 22.
- Dagnino, Jorge. 2013. "Italianness during Fascism: the case of Il Selvaggio." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 15.
- De Grand, Alexander. 2010. "Reflections on Italian Nationalism." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 15 (3): 458-461.
- Diego, Bernardo. 2018. *Italy World's Fair*. Accessed April 22, 2022.  
[https://italyworldsfairs.org/basic/ES/Nation\\_Birthplace](https://italyworldsfairs.org/basic/ES/Nation_Birthplace).
- Donovan, Mark. 2001. "Nationalism, Democracy and State-Rebuilding in Italy." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 2 (2): 241-259.  
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/1570585018458761>.
- Forlenza, Rosario, and Bjorn Thomassen. 2017. "Resurrections and rebirths: how the Risorgimento Shaped modern italian politics." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 24. doi:: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354571X.2017.1321931>.
- Foschi, Renato, and Marco Lauriola. 2016. "Do Amoral Familism and Political Distrust Really Affect North-South Differences in Italy?" *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 47 (5): 751-764. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116644986>.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Greenfeld, Liah. 1996. "Nationalism and Modernity." *The John Hopkins University Press* 39.
- Hall, John A. 2000. "Globalization and Nationalism." *Sage Publications* 17.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2015. "States and Nationalism." *Emerging Trends in Social and Behavioral Sciences* 14.

- Ichijo, Atsuko, and Gordana Uzelac. 2004. *When is the Nation? Towards an understanding of theories of nationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Koulos, Thanos. 2020. "Nationalism and the lost homeland: The case of Greece." *Wiley* 15. doi:DOI: 10.1111/nana.12710.
- MacLean. 1985. *A Peasant Revolt in Italy- Archives*. Accessed April 22, 2022.  
<https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1914/4/1/a-peasant-revolt-in-italy>.
- Meriggi, Marco. 2014. "Legitimism, liberalism and nationalism: the nature of the relationship between North and South in Italian unification." *Modern Italy* 11.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. 1998. *ITALIAN UNIFICATION: A STUDY IN ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY*. Vol. 70. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43768024>.
- Oliveira, Guilherme de, and Carmine Guerriero. 2016. "Extractive States: The Case of the Italian Unification." *Development Economics* 51.
- Ozkuirimli, Umut. 2000. *Theories of Nationalism*. New York: Macmillian.
- Pryke, Sam. 2020. "National and European Identity." *Routledge* 1: 16.
- Riall, Lucy. 2009. *Risorgimento The History of Italy from Napoleon to Nation State*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salerno, Vincent. 2006. *Best of Sicily*. May 22. Accessed April 22, 2022.  
<http://www.bestofsicily.com/mag/art197.htm>.
- Salice, Giampaolo. 2015. "The Greek mirror: philhellenism and southern Italian patriotisms (1750-1861)." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 18.
- Schnee, Walter. 2001. "NATIONALISM: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE." *Journal of Political & Military Sociology*, 29 (1): 19. URL:  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/45292824>.



Smith, Anthony D. 1992. "National Identity and the Idea of European Unity."

*International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944)* 68 (1): 23.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2620461>.

Smith, Anthony D. 1983. "Nationalism and Classical Social Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 34 (1): 21.

—. 1995. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London: Routledge.

Thomassen, Bjorn, and Rosario Forlenza. 2011. "Re-narrating Italy, reinventing the nation: assessing the Presidency of Ciampi." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* (Routledge) 16 (5): 22.

Triandafyllidou, Anna. 2020. "Nationalism in the 21st century: Neo-tribal or Plural?" *Annual Lecture* 16.