How to examine attitudes to a homeland? Towards the typology of irredentism[1]

Joanna Rak

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

joanna.rak@amu.edu.pl

ABSTRACT: The specific aims of the article are to scrutinise the most meaningful works on irredentism published in last years, establish the distinctive features of the types of irredentism, and determine the criteria of the typology formulation. The qualitative content analysis of secondary literature is employed to examine methodological and theoretical approaches towards a theoretical category of irredentism application to empirical studies. This article compares and evaluates them critically to solve two research problems: what types of pitfalls occur when formulating a theoretical category of irredentism and employing it to empirical studies, and how to improve analytical value of this category using the ideal typical approach. The main purpose of the article is to construct the typology of irredentism which would make methodological contribution to social science. It applies the method of ideal types in Max Weber's view to phrase the set of theoretical categories which constitute the gradual typology outlined according to the homogenous criterion of the extent of the valorisation of the homeland.

Key words: Irredentism – territorial claim – homeland – ideal type – political movement – typology – methodology

***Joanna Rak** es Doctora en Ciencias Políticas y profesora del departamento de Cultura Política de la Universidad Adam Mickiewicz de Poznan (Polonia). Es experta en temas de cultura de la violencia donde trabaja su proyecto „Basque Revitalization: The Continuance Trajectory of ETA". Es autora de "A typology of cultural attitudes as a device describing political thought of the populations influenced by globalization." Anthropological Notebooks 21(2): 55–70, 2015; "Contra-Acculturative Thought as the Source of Political Violence." Terrorism and Political Violence 28(2): 363–382, 2016; "In the search for theoretical approaches to studying attitudes toward antipoverty, policy in Passarinho." Anthropological Notebooks 22(2): 119–128, 2016; "Intrastate, Regional, and Colonial Contributions to Post-2008 Cultures of Political Violence." Polish Political Science Yearbook 46(1): 1–8, 2017; "Dealing with Trauma Experience and Political Violence Memory." Qualitative Sociology 40(2): 259–262, 2017; "Russia, 'Near Abroad', and the West: Struggling with the Research Field of Geopolitical Cultures." Geopolitics, 1–7, 2017.*

Joanna Rak

¿Cómo examinar análisis sobre una patria? Hacia una tipología del irredentismo

RESUMEN: Los objetivos específicos del artículo son analizar los trabajos más significativos sobre el irredentismo, publicados en los últimos años, establecer las características distintivas de los tipos de irredentismo y determinar los criterios de formulación de su tipología. El análisis del contenido cualitativo de la literatura secundaria se emplea para examinar los enfoques metodológicos y teóricos para una forma teórica de aplicación sobre el irredentismo en los estudios empíricos. Este artículo los compara y evalúa críticamente para resolver dos problemas de investigación: qué tipos de dificultades se producen al formular una categoría teórica de irredentismo y emplearla en estudios empíricos, y cómo mejorar el valor analítico de esta categoría utilizando el enfoque típico ideal. El objetivo principal del artículo es construir la tipología de irredentismo que haría una contribución metodológica a las ciencias sociales. Aplica el método de los tipos ideales en la visión de Max Weber para expresar el conjunto de categorías teóricas que constituyen la tipología gradual delineada de acuerdo con el criterio homogéneo del alcance de la valorización de la patria.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Irredentismo – reivindicación territorial – patria – prototipo ideal – movimiento político – tipología – metodología

Introduction

Irredentism is intimately linked to nationalism, because of its use of territorial claim, as an element of social mobilization. However, one of the problems in analyzing this phenomenon comes from the plurality of opinions of the researchers themselves. The so-called primordialists argue that nationalism would find its raison d'être in cultural, linguistic and racial traditions, as Hans Kohn put it in his classic, *The Idea of Nationalism*. In the intermediate stage, we would have perennialists, who would accept the modern character of nationalism, but understand nations as a premodern expression of existing ethnic identities. In this sense, ethnosimbolists also support the modernist thesis that the nation is a modern phenomenon, but it would be built on some premodern structures, which would form the "subsoil" of nationalism, as his principal representative, Anthony D. Smith, showed in *The ethnic origins of nations.*

On the contrary the modernists understand the nations as modern political constructions, directed by the elites and inserted in a process of modernization. Ernest Gellner argues that nationalism, although present as the awakening of an ancient, hidden and lethargic force, is not really. Nationalism would engender the nation, as it counts in *Nations and Nationalism*. In turn, Eric Hobsbawm argues that many traditions are invented by these national elites to

justify the existence of imagined nations, as it says in *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: program, myth, reality*. Similarly, Benedict Anderson considers that nationalism emerges in Europe as an imitative action of the new political entities that have emerged in the United States. As he says in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. At the present time, right-wing populisms defend defensive nationalisms in the face of increasing globalization, as Cas Mudde puts it in *The Ideology of the Extreme Right*.

Generally, the theoretical category of irredentism is applied to investigate territorial claims expressed by individual and collective political subjects[2]. The notion of irredentism comes from Italian *irredento* and means unredeemed. Primarily, it was used to describe independence political movements functioning in the 19th and 20th centuries in Italy. Their participants, Irredentists demanded Trieste, Trident, Dalmatia, and Istria to be incorporated to Italy. In reality, the territories inhabited by Italian language people, called unredeemed brothers, were expected by them to be seceded from Switzerland and Austria-Hungary. In other words, Irredentists aimed at the integration of all the territories inhabited by Italian language ethnic groups in the one state, Italy. The attempts made by this movement were named irredentism. However, recent works on irredentism go beyond its traditional meaning limited to the Italian irredentism, by exploring research fields which cover: ethnic, social and political conflicts[3]; policies[4]; political movements[5]; features of discourses[6]; expressions of interests[7]; behaviours[8], and political attitudes[9]. Hence, the semantic field of the category is blurred. Furthermore, irredentism is typologised on the basis on the following criteria: the type of claimant[10] and the extent of irreden-

---

2 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics: Argumentation, Compromise and Norms*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

3 Mark de SOCIO, Christian ALLEN, "Irredentism in MexAmerica", *Military Review*, 82 (5/2002), p. 68-80.

4 Thomas AMBROSIO, "The rhetoric of irredentism: The Russian Federation's perception management campaign and the annexation of Crimea", *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 27 (3/2016), p. 467-490.

5 Donald L. HOROWITZ, "Patterns of Ethnic Separatism", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23 (1981), p. 165-195; Donald L. HOROWITZ, *Ethnic groups in conflict*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985; Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, "Determining the Causes of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities at Risk Data from the 1980s and 1990s", *The Journal of Politics*, 62 (4/2000), p. 1126-1144.

6 Denis VOVCHENKO, "Gendering irredentism? Self and other in Russian Pan-Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism (1856-85)", *Ethnic & Racial Studies*, 34 (2/2011), p. 248-274.

7 Jacob M. LANDAU, *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

8 Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnonationalist Conflict in Postcommunist States: Varieties of Governance in Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Kosovo*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013, p. 216.

9 Alexander C. DIENER, "Assessing potential Russian irredentism and separatism in Kazakhstan's northern oblasts", *Eurasian Geography & Economics*, 56 (5/2015), p. 469-492.

10 Naomi CHAZAN, "Introduction: Approaches to the Study of Irredentism" in Naomi CHAZAN (ed.), *Irredentism and International Politics*, Boulder, Colo: Lynne Reinner, 1991, p. 1-3.

---

tist attempts intensity[11]. These typological frameworks are useful to prove to what extent what manifestations of irredentism are diversified but simultaneously they fail to cover all the distinctive features of the category. It means that they do not allow us to compare the manifestations in a complex way according to other criteria such as the extent of intensity of attitudes toward a homeland.

In addition, although irredentism is a highly applicable theoretical category and recent books on this issue present a variety of approaches to its use, it is often oversimplified and deprived of analytical values. Therefore, it is important to reveal drawbacks occurring in these works. This article employs a qualitative content analysis of secondary literature selected on the basis of the works' influence on studies of attitudes towards homeland. These are: George Gilbert's *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia: Dreams of a True Fatherland?*, Maria Koinova's *Ethnonationalist Conflict in Postcommunist States: Varieties of Governance in Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Kosovo*, Markus Kornprobst's *Irredentism in European Politics: Argumentation, Compromise and Norms*, Stephen M. Saideman and R. William Ayres's *For Kin or Country: Xenophobia, Nationalism, and War*, and Christopher Wetzel's *Gathering the Potawatomi Nation: Revitalization and Identity*. The article critically discusses definitions of irredentism adopted and created in the volumes under scrutiny, and it suggests how eliminate their shortages. Then, it argues and proves that irredentism is often an insufficient category to study diversified examples of irredentism expressed by various political subjects. Hence, it considers the types of irredentism which may be used in empirical studies to identify, distinguish, and explain manifestations of irredentism. The analysis of the definitions of irredentism allows us to establish analytical requirements for scholars who aim to explore the research field of irredentism, such as criteria of the types of irredentism differentiation. Thus, the article introduces how to use irredentism as the basis of a typological framework to improve current works.

Overall, being concentrated on comparing and evaluating different approaches to the theoretical category of irredentism application to empirical studies, it solves the following research problems: what types of pitfalls occur when formulating the theoretical category of irredentism and employing it to empirical studies, and how to improve the analytical value of the theoretical category of irredentism using the ideal typical approach. The article strives to create the typology of irredentism which would contribute methodologically and theoretically to social science. Therefore, it applies the method of ideal types in Max Weber's view[12] in order to phrase the typology on the basis of the

---

11 Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, *For Kin or Country: Xenophobia, Nationalism, and War* New York: Columbia University Press, 2015, p. xvi; 2.

12 Max WEBER, "The 'Objectivity' of Knowledge in Social Science and Social Policy", in Hans Henrik BRUUN, Sam WHIMSTER (eds.), Hans Henrik BRUUN (trans.), *Max Weber: Collected Methodological Writings*, London: Routledge, 2012, p. 100-138.

extent of the valorisation of the homeland. The typology is an analytical tool of a high extent of applicability to empirical research.

How the recent books on irredentism approach irredentism by formulating methodological assumptions?

The authors of the books under scrutiny incorporate the category of irredentism into methodological assumptions of their works on various stages of a research process to perform different tasks. Thereby, the category is used: as an explanatory framework to explain aggressive policies towards neighbours[13], the microdynamics of conflicts[14], and the social dynamics of Russian right[15]; as a subject criterion to determine a research field[16]; and as an analytical tool to study national revitalisation[17].

The first work, Saideman and Ayres's *For Kin or Country* addresses the following research problem: why do some states adopt aggressive foreign policies toward their neighbors, bent on "reclaiming lost kin," while others do not?[18]. The authors argue that irredentism is driven or inhibited by a few crucial dynamics and what is best for politicians matters more than what is best for a state[19]. Time-series analysis and Structural Equations Models would be highly applicable to study the data gathered and to verify this assumption. Though methods and techniques are not applied to the study, it addresses the research problem by presenting well-thought arguments and counterarguments[20]. The volume offers a comprehensive review of literature on irredentism. It presents two sets of states which are the research subject field. The first encompasses these that have been involved in irredentism: Armenia, Croatia, and Serbia. The second embraces these which have not, however, could have been or were expected to do so in the 1990s: Hungary, Romania, and Russia[21]. Then, the authors plausibly formulate an explanatory framework of irredentism asserting that, on the one hand, irredentism is probable when the lost territories are inhabited by ethnic brethren who are relevant politically in the homeland and the content of

---

13 Stephen M SAIDEMAN, R William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*

14 Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnonitionalist Conflict in Postcommunist States… op. cit.*

15 George GILBERT, *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia: Dreams of a True Fatherland?* London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

16 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*

17 Christopher WETZEL, *Gathering Potawatomi Nation: Revitalization and Identity* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015.

18 Stephen M SAIDEMAN, R William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. xiii.

19 *Ibidem*, p. xvi.

20 David Mario MATSINHE, "Quest for Methodological Alternatives" *Current Sociology*, 55 (6/2007), p. 836-856.

21 Stephen M SAIDEMAN, R William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. 15.

nationalism concentrates mainly on those kin. On the other hand, irredentism is regarded as less probable when the kin are politically irrelevant and national identity marginalises the lost kin or involves them in a category that is separate from the domestic "us". Other vital factors are the treatment of those kin and how contented they are with that treatment. Yet, no analytical tool is proposed to measure a correlation between the variables.

Saideman and Ayres claim that the book analyses "as many sources as possible"[22], while it would be useful to assume the criteria of the sources selection in order to give the study intersubjective and verifiable nature. The theoretical approaches are tested empirically in the next chapters. They find that the Croatian Serb, the Bosnian Croat, and the Serb were involved in the irredentist project providing manpower and political cover for the policies of their homelands. In turn, the Armenian represent the most violent and aggressive irredentist claims amidst the examples studied. The authors show that irredentism is not desirable in Hungary because of Hungarian xenophobia. The Hungarian do not want to involve the Romanian and the Slovak in Hungary and they are not attached to their kin abroad. The authors reveal that the domestic politics of identity meant in Romania that friendly foreign policies were not costly and they underline no urgency to involve in the defence of kin abroad. Unexpectedly, the absence of Russian irredentism in the 1990s is identified in spite of the occurrence of factors which have generated irredentism elsewhere. It is justified through unquestionable dominance of the Russian in the Russian empire and the Soviet Union. In sum, the volume contributes to the studies on ethnic conflicts through the argumentation on the explanatory frameworks of the appearance and intensity of irredentist claims.

The second work, Markus Kornprobst's *Irredentism in European Politics* argues that European states have tended to solve their irredentist feuds peacefully since the end of the Second World War because of the emergence of a territorial status quo norm in the region. However, in contrast to Saideman and Ayres, it passes over the levels of intensity of irredentist claims. Additionally, the author explores territorial claims made in Europe in order to create the background to examinations of German and Irish irredentism, which makes the research subject field different from Saideman and Ayres's one[23]. Kornprobst scrutinises the development of the territorial status quo norm based on argumentation and compromise. Importantly, argumentation and compromise are shown as providing a generative mechanism used by nations for selecting norms. The volume's aim is to deal with three major research problems. The first concerns the premise that almost all irredentist disputes have been solved by the peaceful

---

22 *Ibidem*, p. 49.
23 *Ibidem.*

de jure recognition of de facto existing borders rather than by peaceful territorial change[24] and asks what explains this shift. The second focuses on tracing how European states have come to settle their irredentist disputes peacefully in the post-Second World War era. The last strives to determine why they have settled their disputes by the recognition of the territorial status quo[25].

Just like Saideman and Ayres[26], Kornprobst solves the research problems using critical argumentation without specifying methods and techniques[27]. He avoids justifying the sources selection of compilation cases[28]. Providing explanation of filters for the selection of irredentist disputes, he concentrates on the substantiation of the exclusion of some of them from the sample but omits the aspect of inclusion of the others. Nonetheless, a detailed register of the sources delineates the boundaries of the research field and makes the research results verifiable. Kornprobst critically discusses the literature on irredentism highlighting the current lack of interest of norms and he subsequently traces irredentist disputes from 1848 to 2000 in Europe and from 1946 to 2000 in the world. Kornprobst puts forward the environmental conditions conductive to innovative argumentation and the conditions facilitating persuasive argumentation and compromise. These assumptions are empirically tested through the description of the cases of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Ireland. The first depicts the evolution of the West German commonplaces set, and it clarifies how and assesses with what success West German norm entrepreneurs related elements of the evolving commonplaces set to the idea of a territorial status quo norm. The second traces the evolution of the commonplaces set in the Republic of Ireland. It deals with how domestic advocates made use of this evolution for their advocacy for a territorial status quo norm. The author draws a conclusion that ideal-typically, the process of coming to select the territorial status quo norm by two states consists of three stages: innovative argumentation, persuasive argumentation and compromise. They enunciate an analytical framework which is highly applicable to the content analyses of irredentist disputes[29] thus making a contribution to studies on international politics.

The third volume, Maria Koinova's *Ethnonationalist Conflict in Postcommunist States* considerably contributes to the microdynamics of conflicts explaining why ethnonationalist conflicts reach different levels of violence and it

---

24 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 7.

25 *Ibidem.*

26 Stephen M SAIDEMAN, R William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*

27 Mike SCHMIERBACH, "Method Matters: The Influence of Methodology on Journalists' Assessments of Social Science Research", *Science Communication*, 26 (3/2005), p. 269-287.

28 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 238.

29 Adam R. C. HUMPHREYS, "Applying Jackson's Methodological Ideal-Types: Problems of Differentiation and Classification", *Millennium*, 41 (2/2012), p. 290-308.

determines why they often persist in spite of strong international conflict resolution and peace- and institution-building programmes. The author handles these research problems through a decade-long comparative analysis of events which occurred in places where minority-majority relations escalated to different extents of violence after the end of communism: Bulgaria, Macedonia, and the then province of Kosovo in Yugoslavia. In Bulgaria, conflicts were characterised by low violence, mid-range in Macedonia, and high in Kosovo[30]. Therefore, in spite of the concentration on irredentism, it covers entirely different research subject field from Kornprobst[31]. Despite similar choice of the cases, it differs considerably also from Saideman and Ayres's research field. Yet, due to the concentration on the dynamics of conflict it would benefit from the application of time-series analysis as well as Saideman and Ayres's volume[32].

Moreover, like the books discussed, Koinova fails to explain the sources selection, which reduces the level of verifiability and intersubjectively of the study. The book commences with an in-depth theoretical perspective on the creation and perpetuation of informally institutionalised conflict dynamics, and it convincingly presents domestic politics before and during the critical juncture of the end of communism (1987/89-1992). Significantly, like Saideman and Ayres, Koinova tackles a pattern of minority-majority relationship at this time and the formation of informally institutionalised conflict dynamics. Then, she throws light on the self-reinforcement mechanisms which facilitated the consolidation of conflict dynamics from 1992 to 1999-2001 by arguing that timely and well-organised government responses to non-territorial minority demands prevented such demands from transforming into territorial. However, in contrast to Kornprobst's work, the explanatory framework does not take norms into consideration. Koinova discusses how the international community of non-identity-based agents contributed to the patterns of interaction between minority and majority during the critical juncture. The author analyses specific policies of the United States, the Council of Europe, the European Union, the International Conference on Former Yugoslavia, and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe in the context of local minority-majority relationships. She traces the intervention of identity-based external agents during the 1990s focusing on kin-state participation in adaptation processes and the diasporas activities which affected the level of violence. Koinova delves into a conflict dynamics and claims that transition weakened a kin state's institutions and its elites could not develop a coherent foreign policy denying support for irredentism or secessionism abroad. She discusses the al-

---

30 Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnontionalist Conflict in Postcommunist States… op. cit.*, p. 2.
31 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*
32 Stephen M SAIDEMAN, R William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*

terations in conflict dynamics throughout the 2000s underlining the meaning of mechanisms of the rules changes and the perpetuation of informally institutionalised conflict dynamics throughout the 2000s and critically examines theories on durability of conflicts and the path-dependence approach. Finally, she assesses the applicability of a path-dependence approach to conflict analysis and depicts the role of impact of international agents during a critical juncture which is often overlooked in the peace-building literature.

The fourth book, George Gilbert's *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia* covers a strikingly different research subject field than the works mentioned above. It presents comprehensively the history of Russia's radical right movement from 1900 to 1914. In those last years of the Russian Empire, promises of civil and legal rights for minorities, pronounced demographic and social transformations and the formation of a Duma occurred. The author convincingly argues that a large right-wing movement was created in reaction to the changes in Russian society, culture, and politics. Additionally, it is shown that it evolved separately from the autocracy and frequently in conflict with it[33]. However, likewise Saideman, Ayres, Kornprobst, and Koinova, Gilbert omits the criteria of the sources selection. Moreover, in contrast to Saideman, Ayres, and Kornprobst, the author merely adopts a descriptive approach to characterise the research field rather than critical argumentation. Employing methods and techniques to the study would allow him to achieve more analytical view on the research subject[34]. Indeed, the book reveals the formation and development of an alternative image of Russia on the radical right tackling the following research problems: what was the changing social dynamics of Russian right, and what was the specificity of the development of radical, populist, demagogical nationalist ideas and practice in 1900-1914 in wide European context[35]. Gilbert discusses the rise of the Russian right concentrating on the nineteenth-century inspirations and the Russian Assembly, the early right-wing group. He traces the challenge posed by right-wing radicalism to the tsarist status quo and examines the right's changing ideas and activities from 1905 to 1908. Kornprobst's analytical framework would be highly applicable to the analysis of the disputes. Yet, likewise Koinova's work, it proves high utility of studying relations between majority and minority while assessing the sources of irredentist attitudes[36]. Then, Gilbert focuses on the activity of the right from 1907 to 1914 which consisted in facing new challenges in the struggle to renew Russia. Overall, the volume contributes relevantly to the historiography on the European radical movements by offering a comprehensive review of unpublished archival material from the Russian State Archive.

---

33 George GILBERT, *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia… op. cit.*, p. iv.

34 Cora LACATUS, Daniel SCHADE, Yuan (Joanne) YAO, "Quo vadis IR: Method, Methodology and Innovation", *Millennium*, 43 (3/2015), p. 767-778.

35 George GILBERT, *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia… op. cit.*, p. 2.

36 *Ibidem*, p. 59.

The research field of the last work, Christopher Wetzel's *Gathering the Potawatomi Nation* includes reinvigoration of the Potawatomi Nation from 1980 to 2014. Temporal and subject boundaries of the field are well-formulated and justified because they determine the process of cultural revitalisation of the Potawatomis, the nation which once focused in its homeland, around southern Lake Michigan, scattered into nine tribes across four states after the 1833 Treaty of Chicago. Wetzel contributes to the studies on national identity by solving three research problems which are as follows: what exactly does nationhood mean in the context of a specific contemporary indigenous community's experiences?[37], why has a national resurgence happened for the Potawatomi but not for other similarly fragmented native nations?[38], and how specifically has the national revitalization occurred for the Potawatomi?[39]. Like Saideman, Ayres, and Kornprobst, he grapples with them by using critical argumentation without specifying methods and techniques. Indeed, the experiences are worth approaching by using analytical tools[40]. The application of Anthony Wallace's classic continuance trajectory of revitalisation movement[41] would be desirable in order to intersubjectively analyse the processual structure of the revitalisation. According to Wallace, a revitalisation movement is "deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture"[42]. Hence, it is a specific type of self-directed culture change phenomenon[43]. Significantly, Wallace assumes that revitalisation movements have processual structures. He formulates a continuance trajectory of revitalisation movements which covers the following five stages: (i) "Steady State"; (ii) "Period of Individual Stress"; (iii) "Period of Cultural Distortion"; (iv) "Period of Revitalization (the functions of mazeway reformulation, communication, organization, adaptation, cultural transformation and routinisation appear in this stage)"; and (v) "New Steady State"[44]. Then, he provides the description of the subsequent stages. In the first period, generally satisfactory adaptation to a group's social and natural environment exists. It indicates that in the first stage, people accept their cultural or natural context and agree to live within it.

---

37 Christopher WETZEL, *Gathering Potawatomi Nation… op. cit.*, p. 138.

38 *Ibidem.*

39 *Ibidem*, p. 139.

40 Steven D. BROWN, John CROMBY, David J. HARPER, Katherine JOHNSON, Paula REAVEY, "Researching 'experience': Embodiment, methodology, process", *Theory & Psychology*, 21 (4/2011), p. 493-515.

41 Anthony F. C. WALLACE, "Revitalization Movements", *American Anthropologist*, 58 (2/1956), p. 264-281.

42 *Ibidem.*

43 Joanna RAK, "A typology of cultural attitudes as a device describing political thought of the populations influenced by globalisation", *Anthropological Notebooks*, 21 (2/2015), p. 55-70.

44 Anthony F. C. WALLACE, "25. Towards a Classification of Cult Movements: Some Further Contributions. I", *Man*, 59 (1959), p. 25-26.

According to Wallace, increased individual stress is characteristic of the second period. Even though the group as a whole can survive because of its accustomed cultural behaviour, changes in the social or natural environment frustrate attempts of many people to meet their normal physical and emotional needs. Thus, they are dissatisfied with this state of matters. Wallace shows that then the period of cultural distortion emerges. In this third period, accustomed cultural behaviour which used to meet most people's needs stops performing its role. Its capacity is substantially decreased by the changes in the group's social or natural environment. It means that individual dissatisfaction transformed into social discontentment and people in general do not agree to live within foregoing cultural or natural context. As Wallace states, the fourth stage is the period of revitalisation and it embraces six sub-stages. These are as follows: "reformulation of the cultural pattern"; "its communication"; "organisation of a reformulated cultural pattern"; "adaptation of the reformulated pattern to better meet the needs and preferences of the group"; "cultural transformation"; "routinisation, when the adapted reformulated cultural pattern becomes the standard cultural behaviour for the group". Wallace assumes in the final, fifth stage, the new period of generally acceptable adaptation to the group's altered social and natural environment occur[45]. This theoretical approach would be of paramount importance to trace the development of the Potawatomi Nation and to identify the role of irredentism on its continuance trajectory dynamics.

Jack Eller's approach would be useful to boost the analysis[46]. He distinguished seven essential features of revitalisation movements which allow us to verify whether a political movement fulfils them. He indicated that, first, they emerge at moments of cultural stress – when past ideas and actions no longer cause gratifying results, especially when external factors such as foreign influences or persons have disturbed the balance of the society. It means that the persons engaged in the process of revitalisation identify their cultural system as unsatisfactory. It may occur when some people begin to be perceived as unredeemed or the need to reunify the homeland appears. They initiate a holistic change to formulate a new cultural system. Worth underlying in that the duration of a change is not determined and universal for all the movements. Second, they are the inspiration of one person or at most a few people. Certain individuals identify the "culture crisis", a need of cultural change, before others, and their stimulus often occurs in the form of a dream, a vision, or a "near-death" experience which then is publicly disseminated. Third, they pass through a process of acceptance, rejection or transposition. Members of the society may become a part of the movement

---

45 *Ibidem.*
46 Jack David ELLER, *Cultural anthropology: global forces, local lives*, New York, London: Routledge, 2009, p. 370.

or brush it off, and elders and traditionalists may actively buck it. Outside forces may also outscorn it as a threat to their domination. Fourth, they start out as unfamiliar, sometimes being recognized as "heretical" or "cultish" phenomena. However, if they become popular, they resolve into "mainstream". Fifth, they can have sudden, undesired, and undesirable consequences. Worth reserving is that this feature is not specific only to the revitalisation movements and thought but to all social phenomena in general. Sixth, there may be more than one such movement appearing in the same society at the same time, sometimes with opposite goals. Furthermore, they may concentrate on various planes of existing reality. Differing and rival movements as well as movement leaders may joust for the interest and loyalty of the society offering diverse solutions to the society's troubles. Seventh, the movement, if it outlasts, will "routinise" and institutionalise – either as the new "mainstream" or as a more subjected alternative or specialty within the society[47]. These features shed more light on a social and cultural change[48] as well as a continuance trajectory of revitalisation movements which is highly applicable to study stages and dynamics of specific revitalisation irredentist movements' continuance[49]. In addition, they outline the phases of the evolution of revitalisation thought of the movements.

Moreover, Eller's modified typology of revitalisation movements[50] would be a useful tool for determining the configurations and reconfigurations of the types of revitalisation which occurred in the Potawatomis history such as nativism and irredentism. He proposed the typology of revitalisation movements which consists of: syncretism, millenarianism, irredentism, modernism/vitalism, and nativism/fundamentalism[51]. This approach offers a genus-differentia definition[52] composed of two parts: a genus, i.e., revitalisation movements and

---

47 *Ibidem*, p. 370.

48 Duane CHAMPAGNE, "Social Structure, Revitalization Movements and State Building: Social Change in Four Native American Societies", *American Sociological Review*, 48 (6/1983), p. 754-763; Margaret SANFORD, "Revitalization Movements as Indicators of Completed Acculturation", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16 (4/1974), p. 504-518; Russell THORNTON, "Boundary Dissolution and Revitalization Movements: The Case of the Nineteenth-Century Cherokees", *Ethnohistory*, 40 (3/1993), p. 359-383.

49 See the discussion: Matthew LIEBMANN, "The Innovative Materiality of Revitalization Movements: Lessons from the Pueblo Revolt of 1680", *American Anthropologist, New Series*, 110 (3/2008), p. 360-372; Michael P. CARROLL, "Revitalization Movements and Social Structure: Some Quantitative Tests", *American Sociological Review*, 40 (3/1975), p. 389-401; Kaye BROWN, "Quantitative Testing and Revitalization Behavior: On Carroll's Explanation of the Ghost Dance", *American Sociological Review*, 41 (4/1976), p. 740-744.

50 Jack David ELLER, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

51 *Ibidem*.

52 Terrence F. MEEHAN, Anna Maria MASCI, Amina ABDULLA, Lindsay G. COWELL, Judith A. BLAKE, Christopher J. MUNGALL, Alexander D. DIEHL, "Logical Development of the Cell Ontology", *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12 (1/2011) p. 1-12; Marko MALINK, *Aristotle's Modal Syllogistic*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013.

the differentiae, i.e., (i) syncretism; (ii) millenarianism; (iii) irredentism; (iv) modernism/vitalism; and (v) nativism/fundamentalism. It means that the definition of revitalisation movement functions as a portion of the new definitions of revitalisation movements. All definitions with the same genus fulfil the semantic field of the genus. Yet, the differentiae are diversified and they encompass the portion of the definition that is not provided by the genus. Nonetheless, this typology should be modified to be applicable as an analytical tool to empirical research[53] because of flaws which it comprises.

First and foremost, Eller did not take into consideration any division criterion which would embrace the whole semantic field of revitalization movements[54]. Worth stressing is that nativistic[55] and vitalistic[56] movements were distinguished on the basis of attitudes toward own and other cultures respectively while irredentist movements were determined on the basis of the attitude toward a homeland. Arguably, these criteria are not employable to millenarianism identification which one is in a belief in approaching transformation of society after which all things will be altered[57]. Secondly, the individual types are not separate but they partly contain in themselves such as syncretism and vitalism. Syncretism in Peter Worsley's perspective and vitalism in Marian W. Smith's view are based on the attitude of approval of foreign cultures inclusion in indigenous one[58]. In syncretistic movements their members strive to create satisfying cultural conglomerate by blending elements of two or more cultural sources into a new arrangement[59]. Vitalism, on the other side, is characterized by members' attempts to import accepted elements of other cultures to the own one. Furthermore, it is not entirely correct to treat jointly categories which have at least partly disparate semantic fields such as modernism and vitalism as well as nativism and fundamentalism. Modernist movements aspire to include the characteristics of a modern society and eliminate some or all of the traditional elements of the society undergoing the movement[60], while in the case of vitalistic movements, cultural goods which

---

53 Cecile OUVRIER-BUFFET, "Exploring Mathematical Definition Construction Processes", *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 63 (3/2006), p. 259-282.

54 Joanna RAK, "Toward a new typology of revitalistic attitudes", *Filosofija Sociologija*, 26 (2/2015), p. 122-128.

55 Ralph LINTON, "Nativistic Movements", *American Anthropologist*, 45 (2/1943), p. 230-240.

56 Marian W. SMITH, "Towards a Classification of Cult Movements", *Man* 59 (1/1959), p. 8-12.

57 Karen E. FIELDS, "Charismatic Religion as Popular Protest: The Ordinary and the Extraordinary in Social Movements", *Theory and Society*, 11 (3/1982), p. 321-361.

58 Peter WORSLEY, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*, London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957.

59 Charles STEWART, "Syncretism and Its Synonyms: Reflections on Cultural Mixture", *Diacritics* 29 (3/1999), p. 40-62.

60 Jacques WAARDENBURG, "Muslim Enlightenment and Revitalization. Movements of Modernization and Reform in Tsarist Russia (ca. 1850-1917) and the Dutch East Indies (ca. 1900-1942)", *Die Welt des Islams, New Series*, 28 (1/4/1988), p. 569-584.

are involved in own culture do not have to have modern provenance but they have to be different than indigenous[61]. It is a perceptible semantic difference between the second pair of categories as well. Members of nativistic movements, in Ralph Linton's meaning, concentrate on perpetuating, restoring or reviving aspects of their own culture. Fundamentalist movements, on the other hand, are characterized by attempts to address perceived social problems by restoring components of genuine indigenous culture[62]. However, the presentation of cultural fundamentalism passes over the significant facet of members' ways of thinking about own culture, which is similar to contra-acculturative movements[63]. It means that the essence of nativism is not an opposition to foreign culture which is perceived as precarious, which, by contrast, is an important feature of fundamentalism. Moreover, Eller's typology does not encompass all types of revitalisation movements feasible to mark out, particularly the antinomic ideal types of already determined types. For example, there is the lack of self-negativism which is an antinomic ideal type of nativism distinguished according to the attitude toward an indigenous culture criterion[64]. There is no contra-acculturation in Melville Jean Herskovits's meaning[65] which is the antinomy of vitalism on the account of the attitude toward foreign culture.

What is worth noting in Eller's theoretical proposal is the approach toward irredentism as a revitalization movement. Namely, he indicated that irredentism "(from the Italian *irredenta* for unredeemed) is any movement intended to reclaim and reoccupy a lost homeland. As such, irredentism is at the heart of many 'ethnic conflicts' in the modern world"[66]. He focused on determining the attitudes toward a homeland presented by the members of revitalisation movements. It is significant that he distinguished two fundamental goals of attempts, namely, reclaiming and reoccupying missing homeland because they reveal concentration on revivalist facet of this type of movement. Actually, these revivalist actions have self-conscious and organised nature which is a typical feature of revitalisation movements.

Indeed, this approach toward irredentist movements is too simplistic because it did not allow identifying diversified irredentist attitudes which occur in an

---

61 Lauren LANGMAN, "From Virtual Public Spheres to Global Justice: A Critical Theory of Internetworked Social Movements", *Sociological Theory*, 23 (1/2005), p 42-74.

62 Michael O. EMERSON, David HARTMAN, "The Rise of Religious Fundamentalism", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32 (2006), p. 127-144.

63 Joanna RAK, "Contra-Acculturative Thought as the Source of Political Violence", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 28 (2/2016), p. 363-382.

64 Ewa NOWICKA, *Bunt i ucieczka Zderzenie kultur i ruchy społeczne*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972, p. 21.

65 Melville Jean HERSKOVITS, *Man and His Works The Science of Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1960, p. 531.

66 J. D. ELLER, *op cit*, p. 373-374.

empirical plane. Moreover, Eller failed to construct the antinomic ideal type of irredentism or even detail revivalist irredentism. Thereby, there is the shortage of continuum which would consist of possible to logical isolating ideal types. These ideal types would seem to be a useful analytical tool for analysing particular cases of revitalisation movements. Therefore, it is significant to indicate that this attempt to present irredentist attitudes as the type of revitalisation attitudes is inventive and has an original explanatory power. However, this explanatory power is not strong because of the drawbacks mentioned. So, it would be desirable to eliminate them from Eller's approach and then strengthen the explanatory power of the approach by modifying its theoretical assumptions. Yet, the construction of the new analytical proposal has to be prefaced with the critical overview of antinomies toward irredentism which hitherto were put forward in specialist literature on irredentism. It may be particularly useful to formulate the new gradual typology of attitudes toward a homeland which would be free from the theoretical and methodical charges presented before. Nevertheless, firstly, more conclusions have to be drawn from the analysis.

Although Wetzel provides a general presentation of sources, like Saideman, Ayres, Kornprobst, Koinova, and Gilbert, he abandons presenting the criteria of the sources selection. As a result, the description of casual events with the participation of the Potawatomis[67] sometimes replaces systematic research[68]. Wallace's and Eller's approaches would be useful to boost this study. Wetzel argues that the Potawatomi Nation is driven by a historically rooted sense of social, cultural, and ceremonial solidarity. Hence, organising nation-building events and promoting the cultural thought, they managed to reconnect their people. The agency of brokers, creation of inventive programmes aimed at teaching how to think nationally, reinforce cultural identity and personal bonds contributed to the revitalisation of the Potawatomis. Significantly, the author critically reviews the subject literature and modifies theoretical categories so as to make them highly applicable to explore the research field. Thus, the volume contributes to an analytical framework of a nation proposing novel tools for studying nation building efforts.

What hinders both the formulation of the theoretical category of irredentism and its employment to empirical studies?

Besides different methodological assumptions already discussed, these books offer various definitions of irredentism. The definitions show how the authors

---

67 Christopher WETZEL, *Gathering Potawatomi Nation… op. cit.*, p. 41.
68 Mary Elizabeth LANGE, "In Search of Methodology: From One Other to An-Other", *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 3 (4/2003), p. 429-447.

understand irredentism and what exactly they analyse. Each definition consists of a definiens (plural: definientia) and a definiendum (plural: definienda). A definiens is the word or words serving to define another word or expression. So, in other words, it is a defining part of a definition. A definiendum is a word or expression that is being defined[69]. This article discusses the definientia of the irredentism presented in the books. It evaluates to what extent they are constructed properly, by assessing whether a given definiens (1) determines the set of distinctive features which are necessary and sufficient to count this what is characterised by all these features among the meaning scope of irredentism[70]; (2) is operationalisable, i.e., it is possible to translate irredentism into measurable variables[71]; (3) is not contextual, i.e., the definiens is independent of both time and space contexts; (4) is not replaced by examples; (5) the distinctive features are not in contradiction with the reverse of irredentism; (6) is not normative; and (7) is internally coherent. The higher the extent of the criteria fulfilment by a definiens is, the higher the extent of the applicability of a definition as a theoretical category is.

As the analysis proves, none of the books frames a theoretical category which may be used uncritically to perform the tasks assumed by the authors. This is the result of inaccurately outlined semantic fields of irredentism. They omit essential features, include unnecessary ones, and inadvertently left readers to speculate. It means they fail to embrace the constitutive semantic content of irredentism which is a necessary and sufficient condition to recognise an exemplification as irredentism. Nevertheless, the definitions introduce political phenomena which contribute to the comprehension of the category of irredentism. Hence, these definitions will be critically discussed in order to determine the distinctive features of irredentism.

Kornprobst examines definitions of irredentism and indicates that although irredentism is unquestionably a particular kind of territorial dispute, specialist literature contains fundamental disagreements on how exactly to define it. He identifies three contentious issues: who is the claimant?, what motivates the claim?, and how much of another state's territory is claimed?[72]. According to the question about the claimant, the author notices that, on the one

---

69 Emilio RODRÍGUEZ-PRIEGO, Francisco J. GARCÍA-IZQUIERDO, Ángel Luis RUBIO, "References-enriched Concept Map: a tool for collecting and comparing disparate definitions appearing in multiple references", *Journal of Information Science*, 39 (6/2013), p. 789-804.

70 Philip M. PODSAKOFF, Scott B. MACKENZIE, Nathan P. PODSAKOFF, "Recommendations for Creating Better Concept Definitions in the Organizational", *Behavioral, and Social Sciences Organizational Research Methods*, 19 (2/2016), p. 159-203.

71 Karl M. van METER, Marten W. de VRIES, Charles D. KAPLAN, Chantal I. M. DIJKMAN, "States, Syndromes, and Polythetic Classes: the Operationalization of Cross-Classification Analysis in Behavioral Science Research", *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 15 (1/1987), p. 22-38.

72 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 8.

hand, most scholars apply the term irredentism to name a territorial claim of one state against another. On the other, it is also defined as an attempt of an ethnic minority to be incorporated by the neighbouring homeland. Yet, this discussion is inessential on the level of discerning the distinctive features of irredentism. Firstly, the choice of one type of a claimant would erroneously exclude the others which may represent this way of thinking about political reality and achieve its goals. Secondly, the creation of such detailed typology may easily fail to encompass some political subjects, e.g., lone-wolf terrorists or terrorist organisations. Moreover, in a properly constructed typology its types should be separate, so, the assignment of exemplification may cause problems to researchers such as the distinction between political movements and ethnic minorities. Thirdly, determination of a specific claimant is a matter of operationalisation and research sample selection rather than definition. On the level of setting distinctive features of the category of irredentism it would be sufficient to state that the claimant is an individual or a collective political subject. Regrettably, the author's attempts to answer the two subsequent questions consider merely these definitions which present states as the claimants. Therefore, the review of approaches provided by the author fails to cover the motives of non-state actors', e.g., social movements', irredentist claims. Relating to the second question, Kornprobst assumes that most authors highlight the ethnic link between a homeland and a minority in a neighbouring state. Irredentist states aspire to retrieve ethnically kindred people and the territory they inhabit from a neighbouring state. Worth adding to these remarks is that this ethnic link may be either real or perceived. Irredentism, however, is also defined by Kornprobst literally according to the Italian *terra irredenta*: territory to be redeemed[73]. This territory is a land which is to be retrieved. Hence, the definiens of irredentism encompasses a government's claim to an ancestral homeland which may not be accompanied by the craving for incorporating the people who inhabit it. The last type of definitions combines the two approaches and it indicates claims to ethnic kin and an ancestral homeland. In fact, these three types of definitions differ in the objects of claims which are the people and the land but they do not deal with exact motives of taking irredentist attitudes towards their objects. The third question concentrates on the amount of another state's territory which is the object of the claim. It means that the second type of the objects, the people, is omitted in this literature review. Kornprobst maintains that some definitions of irredentism cover claims of national unification which are manifested in the desire of a state to merge with or annex an entire state. Other definitions capture claims of detaching a part of the claimed territory

---

73 Anthony D. SMITH, "The 'Sacred' Dimension of Nationalism", *Millennium*, 29 (3/2000), p. 791-814.

from another state or the attempts to retrieve a claimant's ethnic kin that constitute a minority in the challenged state.

Then, Kornprobst identifies irredentism as a "kind of international conflict"[74] and he comes up with the following definition: "Irredentism is a territorial claim by a sovereign state against another sovereign state, aimed at reaching congruence between the boundaries of the nation and the borders of the state"[75]. This definition qualifies the claims to a land and the attempts to retrieve a nation's diaspora as irredentism. Additionally, it limits the notion of claimants to states. Indeed, the definition of theoretical category should determine its semantic field listing the distinctive features of irredentism. As mentioned, the limitation of the object of analysis is not the goal of couching definitions of general social phenomena. In fact, this assumption prevents Kornprobst from accomplishing fully his aim of tracing all irredentist disputes from 1848 to 2000 in Europe and from 1946 to 2000 in the world. The book does not take into consideration some relevant disputes, e.g., concerning ETA, Silesian Autonomy Movement, and Silesian National Movement. Hence, not only are the criteria of the sources selection worth reviewing but also the distinctive features of the main category require reformulation. Yet, the author asserts that the dynamics of irredentist claims made by states is different from those made by non-state actors. This demarcation between the subjects is insufficient because it omits other distinctive features of the claimants such as the types of available sources which may be used to execute irredentist claims. Furthermore, were the definition to be extended to political subjects, it might be useful to replace the criterion of sovereignty by political subjectivity. This criterion is gradable and highly applicable for analysing the exemplifications of irredentism. For instance, it may be employed to assess the level of cohesion between the irredentist thought and its application to change political reality. Indeed, the category of sovereignty has a limited scope of applicability and requires to be clarified by adding an adequate term to determine its semantic field. In other words, the author should indicate whether he means legal, state, political, popular or some other type of sovereignty to define what he analyses. Finally, Kornprobst contends that his definition includes the cases in which a state claims either a part of another state's territory or the entire territory of another state. He aptly introduces reaching congruence between the borders of the nation, or a real or perceived political community as Wetzel suggests[76], and the state as the defining characteristics of irredentism.

---

74 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 7.
75 *Ibidem*, p. 9.
76 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

Different theoretical approach towards irredentism is presented by Saideman and Ayres who define irredentism as "aggressive efforts to change boundaries in order to reunite lost kin"[77]. Regrettably, this definition loses the semantic precision by not circumscribing the type of boundaries which are to be changed by the aggressive efforts. Additionally, by emphasising the act of aggressive attempts the authors excessively reduce the semantic field of the category. According to this definition, beyond its scope remains, e.g., the Potawatomis whose revitalistic irredentist attempts are not violent[78] and the representatives of the Conservative Revolutionary movement, German national conservative thinkers prominent in the years following the First World War who were formulating territorial claims against political subjects, aimed at reaching congruence between the boundaries of the perceived nation and the borders of the state[79]. In turn, the Kurds in general elude this definition because not all of their efforts are aggressive. Finally, the definition omits unification concentrating on reunification. Then, like Kornprobst, Saideman, and Ayres argued irredentism may be a foreign policy[80]. However, a foreign policy is merely one of the numerous planes exemplifying the irredentist type of thinking about a homeland. Then, the authors add: "irredentism refers to territorial claims made by one state that are based on ethnic ties to an ethnically related minority population that resides within another recognized state"[81]. Like Kornprobst, they limit the semantic field of irredentism determining a state as the only possible claimant. Yet, in an endnote, Saideman and Ayres define irredentism differently than in the main text as "a specific, relatively narrow form of behaviour, based on ethnic ties"[82]. This definition is too broad and does not allow them to distinguish irredentism from other behaviours such as a decision on immigration. Overall, Saideman and Ayres offer several, not complementing definitions.

Significantly, Kornprobst, Saideman, and Ayres narrow irredentism to its territorial facet and in this way the definition does not encompass the totality of the semantic field of irredentism[83]. In fact, as Stanisław Ossowski argues, a homeland is not a territorial notion and cannot be defined without relating it to community's stances. Territory gains values which render it a homeland only while subjected individuals shape its image and articulate their attitudes

---

77 Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. 1.

78 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*

79 Aristotle A. KALLIS, "To Expand or not to Expand? Territory, Generic Fascism and the Quest for an 'Ideal Fatherland'", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 38 (2/2003), p. 237-260.

80 Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. WILLIAM AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. 41.

81 *Ibidem*, p. 45.

82 *Ibidem*, p. 18.

83 Jon ANDERSON, Peter ADEY, Paul BEVAN, "Positioning place: polylogic approaches to research methodology", *Qualitative Research*, 10 (5/2010), p. 589-604.

towards this image[84]. Hence, as Wetzel aptly proves[85], the assumption that a homeland is the correlate of attitudes which are the part of cultural heritage of a social group has to be taken into consideration in the approach towards irredentism construction. The definitions ignoring this distinctive feature are not useful to analyse attitudes towards a homeland which go beyond references to a state territory.

Gilbert, Wetzel, and Koinova do not either formulate definitions of irredentism or discuss them, in contrast to Kornprobst, Saideman, and Ayres. In Koinova's work, although the notions of irredentism and irredentist play a major role in the descriptions of the conflicts distinctive features, their semantic fields are often taken for granted[86] rather than determined. In a note the author indicates that "Ambrosio defines irredentism as 'attempts by existing states to annex territories of another state that their co-nationals inhabit'"[87]. However, she does not apply this definition to the work. Instead of analysing these attempts according to the adopted meaning of irredentism, she treats irredentism as the type of attitude[88], movement[89], the predicate of a state[90], and behaviour[91]. This diversity of meanings is not explained and reduces the precision extent of argumentation. For instance, if the irredentism is the part of a theoretical category, such as in the cases of "the cost of irredentism"[92] and "an irredentist agenda"[93], then, this theoretical category does not function well as an element of an explanatory framework because it has a subject of applicability undetermined. We do not know what "the cost of irredentism" and "an irredentist agenda" are because irredentism was not defined properly. Then, in the same note Koinova adds that, in personal correspondence, Brendan O'Leary pointed out "true irredentism requires the irredentist state having a partner, a kin-group that wishes to achieve unification or reunification. When the state has no such kin-group, an irredentist posture could be more accurately described as 'annexationism'"[94]. In contrast to Saideman and Ayres's first definition, this definition encompasses unification and reunification. Furthermore, this approach sheds considerable light on the relational nature of irredentism but

---

84 Stanisław OSSOWSKI, *O ojczyźnie i narodzie*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984, p. 17-18.

85 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

86 Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnontionalist Conflict in Postcommunist States… op. cit.*, p. 15, 26, 37, 39, 130.

87 *Ibidem*, p. 249.

88 *Ibidem*, p. 29, 139.

89 *Ibidem*, p. 129.

90 *Ibidem*, p. 132, 135.

91 *Ibidem*, p. 216.

92 *Ibidem*, p. 133.

93 *Ibidem*, p. 140.

94 *Ibidem*, p. 249.

fails to capture its semantic field. Regrettably, Koinova provides discussion on neither this comment nor the definition of irredentism. Alike Koinova, Wetzel and Gilbert avoid applying this category to the research. They adopt a descriptive approach which is of a cognitive rather than analytical value.

How to refine the theoretical category of irredentism using the ideal typical approach?

Even though the books demonstrate that irredentism is a richly varied category which may be useful to explore diverse research fields, the extent of its usefulness is conditioned by its applicability to differentiation of the exemplifications based on specific criteria[95]. The authors suggest some criteria and on their basis they propose typologies or types which may contribute to future typologies. The classification frameworks are considered to be correct if (1) a division of irredentism into classes is carried out according to one homogenous rule or one invariable and homogenous configuration of rules; (2) it is exhaustive, i.e., each exemplification of the category belongs to one of the classes; (3) it is disjunctive, i.e., none of the exemplifications of the category belongs to more than one class; (4) it is complete, i.e., the sum of all the classes is the semantic equivalent for the entirety of the category divided; and (5) it fulfils the saturation condition, i.e., each class includes some component. Although no classification framework offered in the volumes meets all the criteria, each one is worth discussing because of its remarkable contribution to future typologies.

Saideman and Ayres make two attempts to shed some light on irredentism diversification. Firstly, they introduce a dual typology according to a type of a claimant defined as a state. It consists of two antinomic ideal types constructed on the basis of the references to metaphors[96]. The first is a "silent dog" which had the opportunity to pursue irredentist claims but decided not to. The second is a "barking dog" which had similar opportunities and decided to pursue them aggressively[97]. This approach, again, just like Kornprobst's one, limits the semantic scope of the irredentism definition to states. On the one side, it offers a useful tool to identify and diversify states according to the criterion of the extent of the intensity of irredentist attempts. On the other, it rules out the possibility of its use to examine different subjects, e.g., irredentist movements. The tool is highly useful to

---

95 Donald G. MCTAVISH, James D. CLEARY, Edward E. BRENT, Lauri PERMAN, Kjell R. KNUDSEN, "Assessing Research Methodology: The Structure of Professional Assessments of Methodology", *Sociological Methods & Research*, 6 (1/1977), p. 3-44.

96 Mary Jo HATCH, Dvora YANOW, "Methodology by Metaphor: Ways of Seeing in Painting and Research", *Organization Studies*, 29 (1/2008), p. 23-44.

97 Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R W. AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. xvi; 2.

discover the differences between irredentist and potentially irredentist sta-tes[98]. Indeed, its scope of applicability may be extended by replacing a state with a political subject. Secondly, Saideman and Ayres distinguish two types of irredentism according to the criterion of a claimant. The first consists in efforts to unify a state and is exemplified by activities which led Italy to uni-fication in 1867. The second one is illustrated by the Kurds and relies on the attempts by groups from multiple states to secede from existing states and then merge, creating a new state[99]. In line with this approach, a claimant may be a state or a group. Nonetheless, the authors evade presenting the semantic field of the second category, which makes it worth reconsidering. Ultimately, these dual typologies highlight the analytical requirement for diversifying the types of irredentism on the basis of the intensity of irreden-tist attempts and the claimants.

In contrast to Saideman and Ayres, Kornprobst does not propose the typology of irredentism. He emphasises that patterns of irredentism are va-rious across time and space[100] and this variety is reflected in the settlement of irredentist disputes. Significantly, as he assumes, on the one hand, some settlement patterns are marked by a strong tendency towards peaceful sett-lement depending on era and region. Thus, the extreme of the gradual typo-logy of settlements is peaceful recognition of existing boundaries or peaceful territorial change. On the other hand, some settlement patterns exhibit an uncompromising propensity of states to sustain irredentist claims and this type of settlement is the second extreme of the typology. Empirically identi-fiable cases may be located between these two extreme antinomic ideal types in Max Weber's meaning[101]. Although Kornprobst comprehensively analyses the cases of settlements tracing their ways of reasoning, he circumvents out-lining the types of irredentism. The analysis reveals the repertoire of possible results of irredentist claims but it is useless to diversify various irredentist attempts. Nevertheless, their distinctive features are clearly noticeable in the punctilious presentation of the changes in the ways of reasoning irredentism in time. It clearly demonstrates how a homeland may be revitalised through the verbal manifestations of the needs for its perpetuation[102] or revival[103], which is worth subsequent analyses with research tools such as the gradual typology embracing the various ideal types of irredentism. In sum, the ap-proach proposed in the volume is highly applicable to analyse how irreden-

---

98 *Ibidem*, p. 15.
99 *Ibidem*, p. 18.
100 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 13.
101 Max WEBER, *op. cit.*
102 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 116, 132.
103 *Ibidem*, p. 142.

tist disputes have been solved and is inspiring for staking out the types of irredentism.

Like Kornprobst, Koinova eschews offering the typology of irredentism but she notices that some populations, such as the Macedonian, are strongly diversified in terms of the criteria of attitudes towards a homeland[104]. Furthermore, in semblance to Kornprobst's submission, Koinova assumes that various types of irredentism are identifiable. Firstly, she states that "After the Cold War ended, conflicts did not resume in the same manner because the nature of irredentism had changed"[105]. The source of diversity is a claimant: "In the second half of the twentieth century, pressures to redraw territorial borders came from external secessionist movements rather than from within the irredentist kin-states"[106]. Even though this premise marks out a substantial analytical plane for distinguishing irredentist claims, it does not concretise with which type of a claimant it is correlated and how it influences the nature of irredentism. Secondly, Koinova maintains that kin-states and diasporas may act in irredentists ways[107] but they remain undetermined.

This diversity of attitudes towards a homeland is also evident in Gilbert's comprehensive examination of Russian right-wing groups, the Russian Assembly, the Russian Monarchist Party, the Union of Russian Men, the Union of Russian People, and the Union of the Archangel Mikhail. Importantly, the empirical data gathered is useful to determine the types of irredentism[108] and to test a future theoretical framework. Furthermore, Gilbert's study supports Kornprobst's assumption that attitudes towards a homeland have to be analysed separately due to their different subjects[109]. Yet, they are not compared systematically because research tools had not been used. The author aptly identifies the perpetuating tendencies[110] but does not formulate the categories of perpetuating irredentism and perpetuating nativism in order to examine attempts to preserve "true Russian people" and their culture[111]. Then, Gilbert goes into detail of irredentism's reviving tendencies[112] which Kornprobst mentions as well as the perpetuating ones[113]. He plausibly introduces the mechanisms of considering the Ukrainian to be the Russian and thus possible to assimilate by

---

104 Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnontionalist Conflict in Postcommunist States… op. cit.*, p. 135.

105 *Ibidem*, p. 129.

106 *Ibidem.*

107 *Ibidem*, p. 154.

108 George GILBERT, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

109 *Ibidem*, p. 128.

110 *Ibidem*, p. 32.

111 *Ibidem*, p. 58, 69.

112 *Ibidem*, p. 69, 118, 122.

113 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 116, 132, 142.

right-wingers[114]. Also, Wetzel does not formulate a typology of irredentism but he shows examples of perpetuation, amelioration, and sacralisation[115].

The review of the approaches towards irredentism shows that the sets of irredentism types do not meet the criteria of the properly constructed classification framework. The drawbacks proclaim that the dyads of types cannot be applied to both empirical and theoretical studies in their current forms due to the lack of a typological framework which would allow comparing the distinctive features of the irredentism manifestations. Thus, there is an urgent need for determining a gradual typology of irredentism and its ideal types distinctive features.

How the recent works on the attitudes toward a homeland contribute to the typological framework of irredentism?

The discussion on the definitions enables us to modify the well-structured definiens of Kornprobst's irredentism definition[116]. For the sake of the typological framework construction, irredentism is defined as a territorial claim by an individual or a collective political subject against another subject, aimed at reaching congruence between the boundaries of the real or perceived political community and the borders of the state perceived by it as a homeland. This definition is the base of the semantic fields of types included in the typological framework. Indeed, the particular types are formulated by adding to the basic meaning extra distinctive features which distinguish them. These features have to be determined according to the same criterion, a factor or a configuration of factors.

Saideman and Ayres base the typology on the criterion of a claimant[117] whereas Kornprobst's is on the settlement of irredentist disputes[118]. The first is useless to compare the types of irredentism expressed by the same of similar claimants. The second focuses on the results of irredentism manifestations thus failing to concentrate on the very nature of irredentism, its structure and dynamics. In turn, Kornprobst[119], Wetzel[120], and Gilbert[121] contribute to a subsequent set of the types of irredentism by presenting perpetuation, revival, amelioration, and sacralisation as the types of irredentism. However, firstly, these approaches are worth filling in by a distinction criterion to identify what

---

114 George GILBERT, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
115 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 10, 129.
116 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 9.
117 Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, *For Kin or Country… op. cit.*, p. 2.
118 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*, p. 116.
119 *Ibidem*, p. 116, 132, 142.
120 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*, p. 10, 129.
121 George GILBERT, *op. cit.*, p. 69, 118, 122.

exactly differentiates the types of irredentism. Secondly, the approaches should be completed with additional ideal types in order to improve the analytical value of the theoretical category of irredentism. The goal of improvement is to create a typological framework of high utility to identify and compare the manifestations of irredentism.

Current studies on irredentism confirm the volumes' premise that claimants always express positive attitudes towards own homelands and these attitudes vary considerably in terms of their intensity[122]. It implicates that the creation of a homeland image, which fuels irredentist attempts[123], is based on its valorisation. The sources of valorisation are worth analysing through contextual explanatory frameworks[124] but firstly the character of valorisation has to be identified. Although the studies indicate that the character of valorisation is the factor differentiating the types of irredentism, they do not introduce how to examine these types systematically.

Importantly, valorisation of a homeland takes on the form of revaluation or devaluation[125]. The revaluation consists in conferring on a homeland the anticipated value. In turn, the devaluation is based on depriving a homeland of the discerned value. These mechanisms are useful to describe the ways of thinking about a homeland which may be located on the continuum outlined by the ideal types in Weberian meaning. As Kornprobst, Wetzel, and Gilbert revealed, a homeland may be considered worth sanctifying, affirming, restoring or perpetuating by a political subject. Their conclusions find strong support in comparative analyses on irredentism claims[126], which show that each claim is motivated by a specific vision of a homeland. According to the set of incentives, homeland valorisation has a lesser or larger extent of intensity.

The sanctifying irredentism, exemplified in Wetzel's study, is the first of the distinguished types of the irredentism[127]. If both the relations between the parts of the divided nation and the nation and its homeland are sanctified in a public discourse, the sanctifying irredentism occurs. Indeed, as the analyses of Fascist Italy's (Libya) and Nazi Germany's (the Sudetenland and Austria) show[128], that is of no significance whether a homeland was lost in reality or

---

122 David CARMENT, Patrick JAMES, "Internal Constraints and Interstate Ethnic Conflict: Toward a Crisis-Based Assessment of Irredentism", *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39 (1/1995), p. 82-109.

123 Markus KORNPROBST, "Dejustification and Dispute Settlement: Irredentism in European Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, 13 (4/2007), p. 459-487.

124 John S. KOLIOPOULOS, "Brigandage and Irredentism in Nineteenth-Century Greece", *European History Quarterly*, 19 (2/1989), p. 193-228.

125 Gigi GOKCEK, "Irredentism versus Secessionism: The Potential for International Conflict", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 17 (3/2011), p. 276-296.

126 Thomas AMBROSIO, *op. cit.*

127 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*

128 Jacob M. LANDAU, *op. cit.*

the loss was merely expressed by the subjects' result of their imagination. The presentation of a united homeland as the sacred indicates that a subject does not see any alternatives for the homeland. These attempts are made by using all the available means and regardless of anticipated expenditures. In this way the extent of revaluation achieves the maximum ceiling.

The next ideal type, the ameliorating irredentism, is characterised by the attribution of an ameliorative value to a homeland. Amelioration depicted by Wetzel is based on giving positive meanings to the fully affirmed object of attention[129]. If both relations between the parts of the divided nation and its homeland are approved in a public discourse, the ameliorating irredentism occurs. This type differs from the sanctifying irredentism in its lesser extent of a homeland valorisation. For instance, Turkish (Western Turace) attempts were motivated by the moderately positive image of the homeland, whereas Nazi Germany's[130] and the Basques'[131] claims were based on the prospect for the sacred creation. So, to put it another way, approval is not extreme as far as a homeland is not considered to be the sacred. The ameliorating irredentism consists in organized and conscious attribution of an ameliorative value to the motherland.

The reviving irredentism illustrated by Kornprobst and Gilbert is the next ideal type of irredentism which is based on identifying a homeland as undergoing destruction. In contrast to the ameliorating irredentism, a homeland is not presented in the public discourse as the object which demands approval but as the phenomenon which is to be salvaged. For example, the Kurds and the Armenians manifest a need for their homeland revival rather than their approval[132]. If both relations between the parts of the divided nation and its homeland are revived in a public discourse, the reviving irredentism occurs. Yet, this is much more significant that a homeland is the object of imagination about being harmed than whether it is harmed in reality.

The perpetuating irredentism presented by Kornprobst, Wetzel, and Gilbert is the last of the distinguished types of irredentism and it encompasses the attempts to retain and immortalise a homeland which is perceived as worth protecting from threats. Pan-Arabism and Pan-Somalianism exemplify this type of claim[133]. The attempts to maintain the homeland are promoted in the public discourse and the homeland is not introduced as the worth rescuing object[134]. If both relations between the parts of the divided nation and its homeland are perpetuated in a public discourse, the perpetuating irredentism occurs.

---

129 Christopher WETZEL, *op. cit.*

130 Aristotle A. KALLIS, *op. cit.*

131 Gigi GOKCEK, *op. cit.*

132 Jacob M LANDAU, *op. cit.*

133 *Ibidem.*

134 Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics… op. cit.*

These ideal types of irredentism are located on the continuum and are as follows: sanctifying, ameliorating, reviving, and perpetuating. The closer to the sanctifying irredentism an exemplification is situated on the continuum, the higher the extent of a homeland revaluation is. The distance determination between an exemplification which exists in the empirical plane and its ideal type allow us to identify and compare various types of irredentism. Therefore, this analytical tool enables us to circumscribe the changes of the subjects' expressions in time and it offers the plane for comparing the various types of different subjects' ways of thinking about a homeland.

Conclusions

Summing up, the authors of the volumes under scrutiny incorporate the category of irredentism into methodological assumptions of their works on various stages of a research process to perform different tasks. Thereby, the category is used: as an explanatory framework to explain aggressive policies towards neighbours by Saideman and Ayres, the microdynamics of conflicts by Koinova, and the social dynamics of Russian right by Gilbert; as a subject criterion to determine a research field by Kornprobst; and as an analytical tool to study national revitalization by Wetzel.

Saideman and Ayres plausibly formulated an explanatory framework of irredentism asserting that irredentism is probable when the lost territories are inhabited by ethnic brethren who are relevant politically in the homeland and the content of nationalism concentrates on those kin. Irredentism is regarded as less probable when the kin are politically irrelevant and national identity marginalises the lost kin or involves them in a category that is separate from the domestic "us". Though methods and techniques are not applied to the study, it solves the research problem presenting well-thought arguments and counterarguments. In turn, Koinova contributes to the microdynamics of conflicts building irredentism into an explanatory framework. She delves into a conflict dynamics and claims that transition weakened a kin state's institutions and its elites could not develop a coherent foreign policy denying support for irredentism or secessionism abroad. A comparative analysis of events which occurred in places where minority-majority relations escalated to different extents of violence after the end of communism is applied. The third contribution to the usage of irredentism as an explanatory framework is made by Gilbert. He traces the challenge posed by right-wing radicalism to the tsarist status quo and examines the right's changing irredentist ideas and activities from 1905 to 1908. The volume contributes to the studies on irredentism showing how to benefit from building irredentism into the explanatory framework of the social dynamics in this specific context. Yet,

like Koinova's work, it proves high utility of studying the presentation of relations between majority and minority in a public discourse while identifying the features of irredentism expressions. However, unlike Saideman and Ayres, the author merely adopts a descriptive approach to characterise the research field rather than critical discourse. Employing methods and techniques to the study would allow the achievement of more analytical view on the research subject.

The second type of the category of irredentism usage introduces Kornprobst by showing how to determine the research field. The author assumes that the process of coming to select the territorial status quo norm by two states consists of three stages: innovative argumentation, persuasive argumentation, and compromise. Irredentism is a criterion of the research field distinction from the other elements of a public discourse. In turn, the stages enunciate an analytical framework which is highly applicable to the content analyses of irredentist disputes thus making a contribution to studies on international politics. However, in contrast to Saideman and Ayres, it passes over the levels of intensity of irredentist claims. Like the findings of Saideman and Ayres, Kornprobst addresses the research problems by using critical argumentation without specifying methods and techniques.

Finally, Wetzel approaches irredentism incorporating it into the research as an analytical tool to study national revitalisation. It enables him to distinguish the attitudes towards the nation from those towards the homeland expressed by the Potawatomis in the public discourse. Regrettably, just like Saideman, Ayres and Kornprobst, Wetzel solves research problems by providing critical argumentation without specifying methods and techniques. Hence, the results are unverifiable but they shed considerable light on the specific type of irredentism.

As the analysis revealed, determination of the distinctive features of irredentism causes difficulties to the authors and triggers off methodological pitfalls. Employment of the category with an undetermined semantic field to the empirical studies may bring about imprecise and unverifiable conclusions. Indeed, the main problems which occur in the volumes are: mixing up definition and operationalization and not applying methods and techniques. Nevertheless, the works offer insightful and inspiring remarks on the category of irredentism and its classification framework. This article has analysed all the examples of irredentism presented in the books and proposed the typology which embraces all the identified ideal types of irredentism: sanctifying, ameliorating, reviving, and perpetuating. According to the correctness criteria of classification frameworks, it has classified those ideal types on the basis of one criterion, the extent of the valorisation of the homeland. It is useful to distinguish diverse causes of irredentism, such as Basque irreden-

tism[135], which occur in empirical reality. Nevertheless, the framework may be extended with the application of new criteria and dividing the individual types into specific sub-types in order to obtain the analytical tool which would allow researchers to conduct as detailed analyses as possible to comprehend this socially meaningful phenomenon. Last but not least, the typology is worth testing through empirical analyses by examining the variety of research fields.

References

Benedict ANDERSON, *Imagined communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso, 1991.

Jon ANDERSON, Peter ADEY, Paul BEVAN, "Positioning place: polylogic approaches to research methodology", *Qualitative Research*, 10 (5/2010), p. 589-604.

Thomas AMBROSIO, "The rhetoric of irredentism: The Russian Federation's perception management campaign and the annexation of Crimea", *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 27 (3/2016), p. 467-490.

Kaye BROWN, "Quantitative Testing and Revitalization Behavior: On Carroll's Explanation of the Ghost Dance", *American Sociological Review*, 41 (4/1976), p. 740-744.

Steven D. BROWN, John CROMBY, David J. HARPER, Katherine JOHNSON, Paula REAVEY, "Researching 'experience': Embodiment, methodology, process", *Theory & Psychology*, 21 (4/2011), p. 493-515.

David CARMENT, Patrick JAMES, "Internal Constraints and Interstate Ethnic Conflict: Toward a Crisis-Based Assessment of Irredentism", *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39 (1/1995), p. 82-109.

Michael P. CARROLL, "Revitalization Movements and Social Structure: Some Quantitative Tests", *American Sociological Review*, 40 (3/1975), p. 389-401.

Duane CHAMPAGNE, "Social Structure, Revitalization Movements and State Building: Social Change in Four Native American Societies", *American Sociological Review*, 48 (6/1983), p. 754-763.

---

135 Juan DÍEZ MEDRANO, "The Social Roots of Basque Nationalism", *Contemporary Sociology*, 36 (2/2007), p. 163-164; Jason SORENS, "The Cross-Sectional Determinants of Secessionism in Advanced Democracies", *Comparative Political Studies*, 38 (3/2005), p. 304-326; Jean-Baptiste HARGUINDÉGUY, Xabier ITÇAINA, "Towards an institutionalized language policy for the French Basque country? Actors, processes and outcomes", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19 (4/2011), p. 434-447; Stanley G. PAYNE, "Nationalism, Regionalism and Micronationalism in Spain", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 26(3/1991), p. 479-491; David MCCRONE, "Politics, Culture, and Sociability in the Basque Nationalist Party", *Contemporary Sociology*, 41 (3/2012), p. 374-375; Julen ZABALO, Mikel SARATXO, "ETA ceasefire: Armed struggle vs. political practice in Basque nationalism", *Ethnicities*, 15 (3/2015), p. 362-384.

Naomi CHAZAN, "Introduction: Approaches to the Study of Irredentism" in Naomi CHAZAN (ed.), *Irredentism and International Politics*, Boulder, Colo: Lynne Reinner, 1991, p. 1-3.

Alexander C. DIENER, "Assessing potential Russian irredentism and separatism in Kazakhstan's northern oblasts", *Eurasian Geography & Economics*, 56 (5/2015), p. 469-492.

Juan DÍEZ MEDRANO, "The Social Roots of Basque Nationalism", *Contemporary Sociology*, 36 (2/2007), p. 163-164.

Jack David ELLER, *Cultural anthropology: global forces, local lives*, New York, London: Routledge, 2009.

Michael O. EMERSON, David HARTMAN, "The Rise of Religious Fundamentalism", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32 (2006), p. 127-144.

Karen E. FIELDS, "Charismatic Religion as Popular Protest: The Ordinary and the Extraordinary in Social Movements", *Theory and Society*, 11 (3/1982), p. 321-361.

Ernest GELLNER, *Nations and Nationalism,* Oxford, Blackwell, 1983.

George GILBERT, *The Radical Right in Late Imperial Russia: Dreams of a True Fatherland?* London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

Gigi GOKCEK, "Irredentism versus Secessionism: The Potential for International Conflict", *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 17 (3/2011), p. 276-296.

Jean-Baptiste HARGUINDÉGUY, Xabier ITÇAINA, "Towards an institutionalized language policy for the French Basque country? Actors, processes and outcomes", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19 (4/2011), p. 434-447.

Adrian HASTINGS, *La construcción de las nacionalidades,* Cambridge University Press, Madrid, 2000.

Mary Jo HATCH, Dvora YANOW, "Methodology by Metaphor: Ways of Seeing in Painting and Research", *Organization Studies*, 29(1/2008), p. 23-44.

Melville Jean HERSKOVITS, *Man and His Works The Science of Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1960.

Eric J. HOBSBAWM, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: programme, myth, reality,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Donald L. HOROWITZ, *Ethnic groups in conflict*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Donald L. HOROWITZ, "Patterns of Ethnic Separatism", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23 (1981), p. 165-195.

Adam R. C. HUMPHREYS, "Applying Jackson's Methodological Ideal-Types: Problems of Differentiation and Classification", *Millennium*, 41 (2/2012), p. 290-308.

Aristotle A. KALLIS, "To Expand or not to Expand? Territory, Generic Fascism and the Quest for an 'Ideal Fatherland'", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 38 (2/2003), p. 237-260.

Maria KOINOVA, *Ethnonationalist Conflict in Postcommunist States: Varieties of Governance in Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Kosovo*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

John S. KOLIOPOULOS, "Brigandage and Irredentism in Nineteenth-Century Greece", *European History Quarterly*, 19 (2/1989), p. 193-228.

Markus KORNPROBST, "Dejustification and Dispute Settlement: Irredentism in European Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, 13 (4/2007), p. 459-487.

Markus KORNPROBST, *Irredentism in European Politics: Argumentation, Compromise and Norms*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Cora LACATUS, Daniel SCHADE, Yuan (Joanne) YAO, "Quo vadis IR: Method, Methodology and Innovation", *Millennium*, 43 (3/2015), p. 767-778.

Jacob M. LANDAU, *Pan-Turkism: From Irredentism to Cooperation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Mary Elizabeth LANGE, "In Search of Methodology: From One Other to An-Other", *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, 3 (4/2003), p. 429-447.

Matthew LIEBMANN, "The Innovative Materiality of Revitalization Movements: Lessons from the Pueblo Revolt of 1680", *American Anthropologist, New Series*, 110 (3/2008), p. 360-372.

Ralph LINTON, "Nativistic Movements", *American Anthropologist*, 45 (2/1943), p. 230-240.

Marko MALINK, *Aristotle's Modal Syllogistic*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2013.

David Mario MATSINHE, "Quest for Methodological Alternatives" *Current Sociology*, 55 (6/2007), p. 836-856.

David MCCRONE, "Politics, Culture, and Sociability in the Basque Nationalist Party", *Contemporary Sociology*, 41 (3/2012), p. 374-375.

Donald G. MCTAVISH, James D. CLEARY, Edward E. BRENT, Lauri PERMAN, Kjell R. KNUDSEN, "Assessing Research Methodology: The Structure of Professional Assessments of Methodology", *Sociological Methods & Research*, 6 (1/1977), p. 3-44.

Terrence F. MEEHAN, Anna Maria MASCI, Amina ABDULLA, Lindsay G. COWELL, Judith A. BLAKE, Christopher J. MUNGALL, Alexander D. DIEHL, "Logical Development of the Cell Ontology", *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12 (1/2011) p. 1-12.

Karl M. van METER, Marten W. de VRIES, Charles D. KAPLAN, Chantal I. M. DIJKMAN, "States, Syndromes, and Polythetic Classes: the Operationalization of Cross-Classification Analysis in Behavioral Science Research", *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 15 (1/1987), p. 22-38.

Cas MUDDE, *The Ideology of the Extreme Right,* Manchester University Press, 2000.

Ewa NOWICKA, *Bunt i ucieczka Zderzenie kultur i ruchy społeczne*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1972.

Stanisław OSSOWSKI, *O ojczyźnie i narodzie*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984.

Cecile OUVRIER-BUFFET, "Exploring Mathematical Definition Construction Processes", *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 63 (3/2006), p. 259-282.

Stanley G. PAYNE, "Nationalism, Regionalism and Micronationalism in Spain", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 26(3/1991), p. 479-491.

Philip M. PODSAKOFF, Scott B. MACKENZIE, Nathan P. PODSAKOFF, "Recommendations for Creating Better Concept Definitions in the Organizational", *Behavioral, and Social Sciences Organizational Research Methods*, 19 (2/2016), p. 159-203.

Joanna RAK, "A typology of cultural attitudes as a device describing political thought of the populations influenced by globalisation", *Anthropological Notebooks*, 21 (2/2015), p. 55-70.

Joanna RAK, "Contra-Acculturative Thought as the Source of Political Violence", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 28 (2/2016), p. 363-382.

Joanna RAK, "Toward a new typology of revitalistic attitudes", *Filosofija Sociologija*, 26 (2/2015), p. 122-128.

Emilio RODRÍGUEZ-PRIEGO, Francisco J GARCÍA-IZQUIERDO, Ángel Luis RUBIO, "References-enriched Concept Map: a tool for collecting and comparing disparate definitions appearing in multiple references", *Journal of Information Science*, 39 (6/2013), p. 789-804.

Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, "Determining the Causes of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities at Risk Data from the 1980s and 1990s", *The Journal of Politics*, 62 (4/2000), p. 1126-1144.

Stephen M. SAIDEMAN, R. William AYRES, *For Kin or Country: Xenophobia, Nationalism, and War* New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Margaret SANFORD, "Revitalization Movements as Indicators of Completed Acculturation", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16 (4/1974), p. 504-518.

Mike SCHMIERBACH, "Method Matters: The Influence of Methodology on Journalists' Assessments of Social Science Research", *Science Communication*, 26 (3/2005), p. 269-287.

Anthony D. SMITH, "The 'Sacred' Dimension of Nationalism", *Millennium*, 29 (3/2000), p. 791-814.

Anthony D. SMITH, *The ethnic origins of nations,* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1991.

Marian W. SMITH, "Towards a Classification of Cult Movements", *Man* 59 (1/1959), p. 8-12.

Mark de SOCIO, Christian ALLEN, "Irredentism in MexAmerica", *Military Review*, 82 (5/2002), p. 68-80.

Jason SORENS, "The Cross-Sectional Determinants of Secessionism in Advanced Democracies", *Comparative Political Studies*, 38 (3/2005), p. 304-326.

Charles STEWART, "Syncretism and Its Synonyms: Reflections on Cultural Mixture", *Diacritics* 29 (3/1999), p. 40-62.

Russell THORNTON, "Boundary Dissolution and Revitalization Movements: The Case of the Nineteenth-Century Cherokees", *Ethnohistory*, 40 (3/1993), p. 359-383.

Denis VOVCHENKO, "Gendering irredentism? Self and other in Russian Pan-Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism (1856-85)", *Ethnic & Racial Studies*, 34 (2/2011), p. 248-274.

Jacques WAARDENBURG, "Muslim Enlightenment and Revitalization. Movements of Modernization and Reform in Tsarist Russia (ca. 1850-1917) and the Dutch East Indies (ca. 1900-1942)", *Die Welt des Islams, New Series*, 28 (1/4/1988), p. 569-584.

Anthony F. C. WALLACE, "25. Towards a Classification of Cult Movements: Some Further Contributions. I", *Man*, 59 (1959), p. 25-26.

Anthony F. C. WALLACE, "Revitalization Movements", *American Anthropologist*, 58 (2/1956), p. 264-281.

Max WEBER, "The 'Objectivity' of Knowledge in Social Science and Social Policy", in Hans Henrik BRUUN, Sam WHIMSTER (eds.), Hans Henrik BRUUN (trans.), *Max Weber: Collected Methodological Writings*, London: Routledge, 2012, p. 100-138.

Christopher WETZEL, *Gathering Potawatomi Nation: Revitalization and Identity* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015.

Peter WORSLEY, *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*, London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957.

Julen ZABALO, Mikel SARATXO, "ETA ceasefire: Armed struggle vs. political practice in Basque nationalism", *Ethnicities*, 15 (3/2015), p. 362-384.