

Ramón Máiz and María Pereira

OTTO BAUER: THE IDEA OF NATION AS A PLURAL COMMUNITY AND THE QUESTION OF TERRITORIAL AND NON-TERRITORIAL AUTONOMY

ABSTRACT

This article presents a detailed analysis of the concept of nation in the work of Austro-Marxist Otto Bauer. In his view, the nation is conceived as an evolutionary process of political, open and plural construction. His work also unravels the connections of nation with a plurinational democratic state, which was at the time a novel political and institutional vision. The article argues that his work is very relevant today, with rising complexity of the new contexts of global society and the multiplication of migrations and refugees; and the need to respond through an accommodation of minorities through mechanisms of territorial and non-territorial autonomy. Much of these concerns form the substance of Otto Bauer's work.

KEYWORDS

Austromarxism, nation, national minorities, multinational state, territorial and non-territorial autonomy

The principle of self-determination requires conceptually a territorial solution. Its normative requirements (separate membership, stable composition and self-government) “require control over a territory where comprehensive decisions over the use of resources and other such matters can be made, as well as allowing membership of the group to be controlled” (Miller 2020: 105–106). Provided that peoples and territories do not overlap, causing injustice in other groups and oppressing minorities will be the norm (Stilz 2019: 250). So the principle of national self-determination, in its presumed “democratic” transparency, is extremely dangerous for minorities, since “it has the proclivity for the sacrifice of cultural minorities on the altar of national construction, homogenizing cultural communities through the conflation of ethnos with demos” (Nimni 2015: 63).

The forgotten work of Otto Bauer provides us with a concept of nation that not only allows to design a multinational federation, but moreover to elaborate a theoretical articulation of territorial and non-territorial autonomy. Distorted and rejected by the communist movement of the time, from the internationalism of Rosa Luxemburg (Luxemburg 1979) to the instrumentalism of Lenin

Ramón Máiz: Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, University of Santiago de Compostela; ramon.maiz@usc.es.

María Pereira: Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, University of Santiago de Compostela; maria.pereira.lopez@usc.es.

or Stalin, it would also be forgotten by the social-democratic tradition itself that, following Karl Kautsky's own incomprehension (Kautsky 1978), would uncritically assume the monist and centralist theses of the national state. The final failure of the reconfiguration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a plurinational federal system, as well as the impossible unity of the working class within a multi-ethnic state, would forever dictate the contributions of a work to be dispatched in future with the labels of "Culturalist theory" of the nation and "cultural autonomy" (Czerwńska 2005: 137).

Paradoxically, Bauer's theory of the nation would be termed "economistic" by much later thinking about nationalism, which considered it to be indebted to the Marxian paradigm of ultimate determination by the relations of production and social classes: "The nation as a result of the conditions of production of the life of a people." For others, on the other hand, especially in the Marxist tradition, it was always excessively "culturalist", lost in esoteric concepts such as "character" or "destiny": "The nation as a set of human beings linked by a community of destiny in a community of character." In contrast to each other, however, what surprises the eventual reader today is the sophistication of a vision of the national question from the "sociological method" and the "social sciences", which translates into scientifically complex social phenomena and complex situations, from the multiplicity of factors that shape the national collective identity (Blum & Smaldone 2016: XI), against the temptation of any materialistic or idealistic reductionism. In this article, we argue the substantive political nature of a theory that tries to articulate at all times an explanatory diagnosis of the national phenomenon, from the social sciences, with a consequent normative prognosis of plurinational accommodation in heterogeneous and plural societies. Thus, the interest of Bauer's work, as we shall try to demonstrate, goes far beyond the field of study of the history of political ideas and the innovative contributions of Austro-Marxism, and is prolonged in very illuminating analyses that, indebted to a political and intellectual context that is exceptional for many reasons (*Finis Austriae*), have little use for the current debates on the complexities of cultural, ethnic and national accommodation in the multinational states in the context of globalization. In this paper, we shall first analyse the main fundamental components of his explanatory theory of the nation as an inessential community, and then give an account of the normative and institutional consequences (both territorial and non-territorial) in the democratic redesign of multinational States.

1. The Idea of Nation as an Open Process of Nation Making

Once the commonplaces of nationalist and Marxist traditions of the time had been abandoned, what was Bauer's alternative concept of nation? His idea of "nation as a community of destiny that generates a community of character" ("Die Nation aus Schicksalsgemeinschaften wachsende Charaktergemeinschaft") (Bauer 1907: 98–99) has been the source of innumerable

misunderstandings and partial readings (“culturalism”, “psychologism”, “Hegelianism”, etc.), and so this study will now systematically address its scope and nature. Given the importance of this concept in the formulation of the concept of community, both in terms of character and destiny, it is necessary to clarify with some precision its formulation by Bauer. First of all, it should be underlined that there are three concepts involved in the explanation of the processes of national construction by Bauer: 1) Cultural community, 2) National destiny, 3) National character. As will be shown presently, far from culturalist reductionism, the factors involved in the processes of national construction are, in his view, the three mentioned above: economic, cultural and political.

The nation, for Bauer, does not constitute a natural community; instead, a specific cultural community (*Kulturgemeinschaft*) arises from the processes of continuous social differentiation (Agnelli 1969: 132), from the evolution of the conditions in which human beings produce their vital sustenance and unequally distribute the result of their work. On the other hand, the transmission of cultural goods between generations gives rise to a shared destiny of the nation which translates into a relative community of character or *Charaktergemeinschaft* (Bauer 1907: 22). The material substratum of the nation ceases to constitute a kind of obscure natural background, which in Europe at the beginning of the century began to acquire unmistakable racist tones. For Bauer, the development of a national community is not explained by the alleged “natural hereditary transmission of physical qualities”, but by the creative transmission of “cultural goods”, both material and immaterial. Thus, in the explanation of the processes of national construction, two moments are articulated in, at the time, a very novel way:

- a) the materialist dimension of the production and reproduction of existence (development of productive forces, relations of production, mode of production), with the qualitative changes implied by generalization and the incipient transformations of industrial capitalism. It should be emphasized that, for the first time, the process of constructing the national consciousness is derived not from a differentiated ethnicity that stretches back into the depths of time, but from the relations of production and class conflicts of the period;
- b) the cultural dimension, that is, the specific cultural property of each nation, its intergenerational transmission, and the political struggles for inclusion and participation in its elaboration by the working classes.

Every national cultural community is always formed by reciprocal action between individuals and social classes, not as an effect of an immaterial or universal essence or substance that passively unifies them (“Volksgeist”, “Seele”, “Schicksal”, “Geist”, etc.). There is, therefore, no “firm ground” on which to stand (that “Das feste Land” that Herder longed for in the community), nor an ontological foundation to grasp, from which the political presence of the nation can be deduced. We are now, for all intents and purposes, in the world of

modernity, the one Marx characterized lucidly in the Communist Manifesto as that where “All that is solid vanishes in the air”. Certainly, for Bauer, following the footsteps of Ferdinand Tönnies, the *Gemeinschaft* cannot be reduced to *Gesellschaft*, and the collective identity of peoples should not be considered the mere sum of competitive individualities. Similarly, the double meaning of *Gemeinschaft*, as elaborated by Kant in his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, was namely, a *communio*, a substantial static community, and a *commercium*, the reciprocal social interaction associated with the freedom of modernity, Bauer clearly opts for the latter, but in terms of historical materialism and class struggle. Community is, for him, a reciprocal action constitutive, and not merely expressive, of a prior community essence occurring previously in history, and in modernity; this community dimension is indebted to the new relations of production of capitalism and its specific political conflicts. These are the limits of Bauer’s communitarianism. This is undoubtedly one of the most interesting contributions of his theory of the nation: from the capitalist relations of production that translate into class struggle, from the construction of a state that monopolizes political power to ends previously unsuspected and of the creation of a differentiated culture, although exclusive to the emerging classes, the nation is conceived not as a crystallized empirical fact, but as a contingent and indeterminate historical process. This is the permanently incomplete result of the interaction between the three factors already mentioned: economic-social, cultural and political. A process, therefore, which has nothing to do with the “immanent development of the national consciousness”. In fact, it is a random, complex and multi-causal production of a “shifting national being” (Bauer 1907: 43).

Precisely contrary to what one might think, nowhere is this processual, open, non-teleological character of the Nation better observed than in the very concept of national character. The latter is postulated as a bridge between the cultural and linguistic dimension and the relations of production. Bauer elaborates his concept independently on the spiritualism of *Volksgeist* (Hegel, Herder) and on the idea of nation as a totality and metaphysical essentiality that inevitably unfolds in history (as Fichte did in his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*). His perspective is that of the nation as a set of shared and disputed characteristics (values, attitudes, myths and symbols), created by a cultural community of historical destiny in its particular material struggle for existence, yet devoid of any hint of “substantial appearance,” of all “fetishism of the national character” (Bauer 1907: 112).

In this way, the national character assumes very precise features:

- 1) It constitutes the result of a *process* of national construction, and therefore an explanandum not an explanans (Leisse 2012: 238), that is, a factor that must be explained, since it is not a causal dimension of the national phenomenon (Bauer 1907: 27).
- 2) It is always *partial*: the community of character is relative, not absolute, it competes and interacts in each individual with other possible identifications, such as class or religion.

- 3) It is not permanent, but modifiable and *changeable* (“veränderlich”) in the course of history, and is shaped in modernity, rather than on “common ancestry” from time immemorial, through a “new culture”.
- 4) It is *plural*: the community of character does not imply homogeneity at all, but permanent interaction, pluralism and struggle for the inclusion of the working classes. The distance with the concept of nation as a unanimous organic totality of Fichte, constructed by ablating what is heterogeneous from the bosom of the people and from the exclusive tracing of “inneren Grenzen” or “internal frontiers” (Máiz 2012: 37), is clear here in unmistakable terms.
- 5) It *articulates interests and emotions*: Bauer insists, in the face of the theoretical body of classical Marxism, and the advances of psychology and Viennese psychoanalysis of the time, on the need to introduce into the explanation of nationalisms not only the material preferences of citizens, but also their affects, passions and feelings. The study of *national hatred* among majorities and minorities is a good example of this.

Thus, for Bauer, the nation is not an empirical fact crystallized once and for all in history, but is configured as a complex and open political process, contingent on the creation of a community that, devoid of metaphysical, cultural or racial substance, becomes, strictly speaking, a non-essentialist community: “From this perspective, the nation is not for us a frozen thing in time, but a process that is becoming” (Bauer 1907: 105). Or, equally, “the nation as the product of an always unfinished process that is continuously developing” (Bauer 1907: 106).

Hence, for Bauer, “the history of a nation cannot be closed at any moment”, nor can pluralism and internal antagonisms be extirpated from it. The community of destiny, does not only 1) does not constitute an “homogeneity of destiny”, but is also merely a common and conflicting experience of it; (Bauer 1907: 107). In this case, it is not only a question of the social and political changes that accompany them, but also of the national character. No trace may be observed in Bauer of that disdain for politics as an “artificial” and volatile sphere before the rocky naturalness of the nation, which Friedrich Meinecke already noticed in his day in the classic idea of a German nation, that *Deutsche Grösse*, by Goethe, Schiller or Humboldt (Meinecke 1963: 76). Nor can any trace of the “decisionism” and warmongering that characterized the German nationalist mutation after the war, starting with Ernst Jünger and the conservative revolution, be detected.

In short, Bauer explains the nation as the result of a process of national construction in which various features interact, which must be evaluated empirically in each concrete context and conjuncture: 1) economic factors (the conditions of human beings in their struggle for existence, the transformations of the relations of production and productive forces, modifications of labour relations in capitalism); (2) cultural factors (the intergenerational transmission of cultural goods and their changes through the contributions of emerging new

social classes); and (3) political factors (the configuration of the centralist state based on the “atomistic-centralist vision” (Renner 1899, 1994), and overlapping class and national conflicts). As we have already pointed out, this argument is politically decisive, since the history of nations is the history of the ruling classes, and national culture is nothing but the culture of elites, excluding the popular classes. Indeed, Bauer goes a step further: in fact, “what unifies the nation is neither the unity of blood nor the unity of culture, but the unity of the culture of the ruling classes” (Bauer 1907: 104). For this reason, the history of nations is, above all, the political history of the struggles for the expansion and transformation of the national cultural community. Only with progressive enlargement, with the ever-incomplete realization of the cultural community (Bauer 1907: 115), by including the totality of the working classes by means of their conversion into a national class and through access to participation in the production of cultural goods, may a genuine national community one day be reached.

However, this expansion of the national cultural community is by no means the inevitable product of economic evolution, or of intergenerational cultural transmission, but of the political mobilization of the working class and its radical reformulation of traditional national struggles. Thus, in contrast to the policy of conservative nationalism, Bauer postulates an entirely new national evolutionary policy, whose aim is not the nationalist closure on the borders of an own State, under the tutelage of the ruling classes, but the struggle for the “development of the entirety of the people into a nation” (Bauer 1907: 139). From this perspective, the relative enlargement of the national cultural community, undertaken by the proprietary classes in the wake of the bourgeois revolutions, will further the expansion of the nation towards the working classes through the triumph of democratic socialism. That is why this national evolutionist policy is the policy of the modern working class, and not the naive internationalism of workers supposedly deprived of their country, neither the embrace of naive nationalism directed by the bourgeoisie, its interests and its values. Bauer argues that socialism cannot abandon the realm of the nation, in which the struggle for the hegemony of a country is solved, to nationalists, thereby postulating a strictly labour-focussed policy. But to penetrate this strategic field implies, in turn, the need for a radical liquidation of the essentialist concept of a nation inherited from the nineteenth century and its normative derivatives, the monist thesis equally shared, beneath its rhetorical antagonism, by the Principle of Nationalities (“one nation, one state”) and the Principle of the national state (“one State, one nation”) (Bauer 1907: 149).

2.The Nation as a Plural and Heterogeneous Community

It must be emphasized that, as a result of its non-essentialist character, the shared national cultural community does not translate into the pathological obsession with the homogeneity of the national field, even though it gives rise to “a community of destiny that generates a community of character”. On the

one hand, for Bauer, “Community does not mean mere homogeneity” (Bauer 1907: 97); on the other, the community of destiny does not suppose blind “subjection to the same destiny”. Social and especially class differences are important and imply different levels of cultural appropriation and the “shared” national destiny, as well as very different versions and interpretations of the national culture.

However, in addition, Bauer gives an additional twist in his critique of the idea of nation as a holistic and homogeneous totality: in his view, the humanity of modern times is not divided into discrete nations, and therefore: 1) every individual belongs unquestionably to a single nation, and 2) each territory or state to a single nation. In this respect, it is necessary to remember that in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the national groups in each part of the empire constituted a minority in the area which they controlled politically: the Germans, for example, represented only 36% of the population of Cisleithania and the Magyars did not reach 50% in Hungary. On the other hand, the Czechs (the majority in Bohemia and Moravia), Poles, Ukrainians and Slovenians aspired to influence politically Cisleithania itself (Nimni 2005: 3).

One of Bauer’s most relevant contributions of the analysis of the national question, with the normative and institutional consequences that shall be assessed presently, lies precisely in the rejection of the ethnic homogeneity of territories, that is, in the questioning of the classical monist equation of the nationalisms of the nation state or against the nation state: one state = one territory = one nation = one culture. Bauer analyses the social scientific analysis and the normative consequences for the first time (preceded in it, within the legal field, by Karl Renner) of an empirical fact that put an end to the illusive assumption of ethnic-territorial homogeneity. In his understanding, it is necessary to account for phenomena that in modernity would only become more accentuated and widespread. First of all the existence of many border areas in which human beings of different cultures and nationalities mix and have two or more national identities. Or rather, the presence of countries in which massive migrations, caused by the economic crisis or the unequal transition from primitive to industrial capitalism, if not the arrival of numerous refugees from the wars, ethnic cleansing or genocide create in the Europe of the end of the Austro-Hungarian Empire a cultural, national and identity landscape much more variegated and complex than the one foreseen by State nationalisms, or the nationalisms that aspire to construct their own State in the service of a single nation, its culture and interests. These cases, which in their time Bauer considered significant (“non-meagre”), acquire capital political importance because they question from a new angle (the ensuing population and cultural movements) the aforementioned major equation of nationalist monism: one territory = one nation = one language. The presence of individuals whose nationality and culture are minority within the territory in which they reside, who belong to two or more nations, or who even do not belong fully and totally to any, gives rise to a “totally novel” phenomenon of minority or overlapping national identities.

From the primary establishment of the national state, but also from the beginning of nationalities, the civic status of these human beings (the product of diaspora, migration, and the artificiality of the drawing up of borders) becomes an intractable problem: they are very numerous in Europe, blur the national homogeneity of territories and, consequently, become “unwanted and distrustful”, or worse, “in times of national struggles, subjected to assimilationist domination, when not despised as “traitors and turncoats” (Bauer 1907: 102). Thus, minorities and cultural mixed-race people constitute a challenge without a democratic response from the classic nationalist territorial assumption of self-determination and secession. The national cultural community presents here a doubly inessential nature, not only as a contingent result of a process of political construction, but also as a plural matrix of diverse cultural interpretations and overlapping of identities, rendering illusory any attempt at resolution through the application of the pure territorial principle, without engaging openly in the domination and oppression of minorities. Moreover, the territorial principle, by implying that each territory is owned by a national majority and, where it is the case that the majority and national minorities inhabit the territory, leads to the inevitable oppression of minorities by the majority: “The pure territorial principle everywhere subjects these minorities to the majority” (Bauer 1907: 295). In Renner’s words, the territorial principle states that “if you live in my territory you are subject to my legislation and my language” (Renner 1899, 1994: 30). Thus, the construction of territorial and sovereign national states, old or new, involves declaring all foreigners who cross borders as being outside and beyond the rule of law. For this reason, the issue of minorities is a priority for Bauer, who devotes many pages to his quantitative and qualitative study within the Empire, noting that an increasingly smaller part of the population lives in communities where various nationalities and cultures do not co-exist. The strict application of the territorial principle in a time of mass migration implies the endemic inequality of rights and the domination of majorities over minorities and, ultimately, owners of the means of production over working migrants, as Karl Renner liked to specify: “The domination of the sedentary minority over the emigrant majority” (Renner 1899, 1994: 43)

3. The Critique of the Principle of Nationalities and the Proposal of Plurinational Federalism

The explanatory theory of the nation from the “sociological method”, “social sciences” and “historical materialism” in Bauer has profound consequences for his normative political theory and the institutional redesign of the State from the point of view of the territorial organization of power. The first is, of course, a radical double criticism of the centralist territorial state, the model of the *République une et indivisible*, but also of its supposed “democratic” alternative in the Principle of Nationalities and unilateral self-determination. From the analysis of the nation as an open and plural process, Bauer can only

denounce as voluntarist, unsatisfactory and incorrect the naturalist and monistic fallacy that preaches that a state should embrace a single nation, as well as its specular investment in the postulate that the only outcome for every self-respecting nation should be the attainment of an independent sovereign state.

The logical corollary of his theory of the nation, for Bauer, is that neither the nation state (“Nationalstaat”) constitutes the undisputed rule of the territorial organization of political power, nor can the multinational State (*Nationalitätenstaat*) be considered a mere historical pre-modern residue or an Austrian exception doomed beforehand to failure. In contrast to the different versions, from Herder to Fichte, of the dualism that regards the State as an artificial entity and the nation as a natural entity, our author argues that the national state, in the service of “its” own nation, in no way constitutes a natural formation, since both nations and States are contingent results of equally artificial historical, economic, cultural and political processes. On the other hand, the multi-national State does not constitute in any way an atavistic political structure, destined inexorably to its disintegration in multiple national States, as Bauer counters, the evolutionary historical tendencies that explain the principle of nationalities, without any idealization, with the counter-tendencies that the multi-national State retained in Austria until the Great War (Bauer 1907: 153).

The multi-national State, however, constitutes a complex and conflicting democratic challenge: the possibility of accommodating different nationalities on an equal footing, self-government and mutual respect within the same State implies a radical reform of the Imperial structure characterized by inequality and domination among the nations and to reach a difficult pact on an equal footing between nations. Bauer’s analysis is prolific and, given the scientific-social objective of his work, not as detailed and precise as that of Karl Renner. Yet, some of the basic conditions that it posits to democratically redesign a multi-national state may be synthesized:

- 1) If the multi-national State is not conceived as a utopia ideally opposed to the real world, but as an immanent conception that takes on impulse and is constructed from the own “internal evolutionary tendencies in Austria” (Bauer 1907: 332), the undeniable empirical fact of multi-nationality increasingly demands the need for a new covenant of peaceful coexistence among the nations that comprise it, a programme of institutional reforms that will overcome the deadlock of national struggles, based on the very different reality of the different nationalities.
- 2) That the centralist-atomistic liberal view of the Nation State be replaced by an “organic conception,” that is, by the sovereignty shared among various nations: *L’ennemi, c’est la souveraineté*, wrote Karl Renner, by the recognition as subjects of law not only of the individual citizens in their relationship with the State, but also of the juridical-political personality of the internal national communities;
- 3) That these communities be understood as nationalities, in the sense specified above: communities of culture and destiny, plural, contingent

rather than as ancient territories, kingdoms and provinces (“Königreiche”, “Kronländer”, “Länder”), endowed with “historical rights”. In *Staat und Nation*, Renner had already stressed that they had become not only authentic “impossible things”, because they constituted neither social nor national individualities, but antidemocratic structures of domination which, by integrating several nations with various privileges, were constitutively based on the systematic oppression of national minorities by the majority.

- 4) That the multi-national State be organized in a federal way, as a State of States, through self-government and shared government, although through a federalism that recognizes and accommodates multi-nationality, that is, as a federal multi-national State, such as plurinational federalism, replacing the obsolete kaiserlich und königlich structure (Bauer 1907: 377).
- 5) That the defence of the federalization of the multi-national State be not only based on (1) the denunciation of the secessionist illusion of the fragmentation ad infinitum of national States of less territorial scope and the lack of a solution to the problem that all, in turn, have their own minorities dominated by the new national majority; but (2), on the assumption that, from the interests of the working classes, it would provide a more favourable political scenario for their demands and a broader economic space in which to advance their social progress, and lead and coordinate their struggles.
- 6) From this point of view, for Bauer, the nationale Autonomie is the right way for the self-government of nationalities (Bauer 1907: 278), because, in contrast to the national policy of power of the ruling classes, the working class can oppose their economic, social and political demands, together with the national objective of expanding the cultural community to the masses, towards an authentic and inclusive public community system.
- 7) Finally, the federal multi-national State that Bauer postulates also builds from other additional and hardly insignificant features:
 - a) Firstly: democratization. From the revaluation of democratic socialism posited by Austro-Marxism, the democratization of the state of the old Habsburg monarchy becomes the central axis guiding the reform of the multi-national State as a “democratic multi-national state.” The federal theory, deeply Republican in origins, requires the democratic quality of both the Union as a whole, and the Member States. However, democracy itself must be reformulated in a complex sense in order to cope with multinational accommodation. In the first place, it must assume the dogmatic articulation of the (individual, political and social) rights of citizens, with the collective rights (cultural and political) of the nations *qua* nations within the federation. Secondly, it must guarantee the demand for guarantees of democracy and

internal pluralism in each of the nationalities integrated in the federal multi-national State. That is, the federal multi-national State does not dissociate itself from the democratic quality of the federated states (self-government must be carried out through representative mechanisms chosen by universal suffrage, equal and secret, a citizenship endowed with rights and according to a proportional electoral system, etc.). Above all, federal democracy must reconcile the rule of majority decision with respect for national minorities.

- b) Secondly, it reinterprets the unilateral right of self-determination leading to secession, in keeping with the Principle of Nationalities, as the Principle of internal self-determination (“innerstaatliches Nationalitätsprinzip”) (Bauer 1907: 382). That is, as Karl Renner emphasizes in *Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Nationen* (1918, 2015: 89), no indisputable *ius secedendi* exists, but the right to self-government, to political autonomy endowed with broad powers and guaranteed constitutionally, does. This, in turn, translates into a vision of horizontal and non-hierarchical, “shared sovereignty” against the classic Westphalian concept and its pretensions of indivisible, unlimited and untransferable sovereignty. Hence the very core of multinational federalism that is built on a double axis: self-government and shared government, unity and national diversity. In this model, there are no absolute communities: all of them are partial and overlapping, and shared sovereignty is exercised through the self-government of one’s own powers and shared government in matters of common interest.
- c) This internal self-determination, this autonomy, however, is not limited to the reductive scope of the development by nationalities of their own culture. Contrary to what has often been affirmed, we must emphasize that Bauer’s proposal refers not only to a mere cultural autonomy of nationalities, but to substantive self-government in fundamental subjects (Czerwinska 2005: 185). Political autonomy (Bauer 1907: 277), which generates an authentic sphere of political power in its own affairs (“eine rechtliche Machtsphere”) (Bauer 1907: 438), which is projected into broad capacities of “self-legislation and self-administration” (“Selbstgesetzgebung und Selbstverwaltung”) (Bauer 1907: 451), and which covers economic, educational, linguistic, official and even military matters in certain respects.
- d) Thirdly, because of the undesirable effects (oppression of minorities) of the application of the pure territorial principle, Bauer postulates the possibility of introducing the *non-territorial or personality principle*, also elaborated in the day by Meinecke in *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat* (1907) and by Renner in *Staat und Nation* (1898) and *Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Nationen* (1918). However, neither Renner nor Bauer consider the principle of personality as an alternative to the territorial principle, but as an element of correction and

complementary to the first. Its proposal consists in a nuanced articulation of the territorial principle and the personnel. For example, through free individual declaration of nationality and the abandonment of ethnic-racial ascription, territoriality and personality can be combined in plural contexts. In no case is the “pure implementation” (Bauer 1907: 312) of the principle of personality postulated, except for the mechanisms test that, for example, favour the presence of territorial representative bodies together with the possibility of cultural participation (linguistic policies, educational system, administration, etc.), in the sense of reasonable accommodation, by applying the personal principle to the minorities. Thus, among others, dual management mechanisms are proposed in the case of mixed cantons, which allow minorities the right to be cared for in school and in administration in their own language (including linguistic federalism, that is, languages considered as heritage of the whole Union). Unlike, for example, the millet of the Ottoman Empire, autonomous national minority communities, instituted by the principle of personality, are organized here: 1) under democratic rules, and 2) based on individual express consent and internal democracy. These and other proposals gave rise to an intense debate, which was soon cut off by the war, on various formulas of reasonable accommodations that are very flexible and varied, personal and territorial, and which was hardly implemented at the end of the Empire. This accommodation, however, did not exclude the eventual assimilation of some minorities. But unlike Kautsky, who conceived assimilation as the obligatory adoption of the language and culture of the majority, Bauer regarded it as a long process and the eventual result of respect for pluralism and diversity, avoiding by all means the national coercion of the majority over the minority (Bauer 1912, 1980: 621).

Finally, it must be pointed out that this reinterpretation of the right of self-determination as internal self-determination, as territorial and non-territorial autonomy, derives from the pluralistic condition of the federal multi-national. State as a superior ethical and political model against the both naive and oppressive principle of nationalities, although the mechanism of secession does not resolve the horizon of political possibilities. This last option remains a remedial right before the failure of federal state of nationalities. That is, instead of constituting the eminent and unique strategic political objective of the solution to the problem of nationalities and their demands for self-government, secession remains for Bauer as a final option, negotiated and not unilateral, in the event of the repeated impossibility or irresolvable violent conflict (genocide, ethnic cleansing, war, etc.) of multinational federal accommodation. In this sense, it is symptomatic that, even in 1917, Bauer rejects self-determination as a universal political principle, although he does accept it under the critical circumstances of the moment, in the case of the Czech Republic and Poland.

The idea of multinational federalism continued to be the rule for him, and the principle of self-determination was the exceptional outcome in response to an irremediable political failure.

Behind the dangerous chimera of an imaginary world of homogeneous and sovereign national states, serving the interests of a single national majority, the reality of national, ethnic and cultural pluralism not only continued its course in history, but in late modernity increasingly grew. In the new context of global society and the multiplication of migrations and refugees, the ideas of multinational federalism, losers at a given moment, but replete with arguments, concepts and institutional solutions to the problems of collective action, may contain valuable contributions. This is precisely the case of Otto Bauer's work. The accommodation of minorities through mechanisms of territorial and non-territorial autonomy is regaining prominence in today's world, both in political theory and in comparative politics (Nimni et al. 2013; Malloy & Palermo 2015; Malloy et al. 2015).

References

- Agnelli, Arduino (1969), *Questione nazionale e socialismo. Contributo allo studio del pensiero di K. Renner e O. Bauer*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bauer, Otto (1975-1980), *Werkausgabe*, 9 vols. Vienna: Europaverlag.
- . (1912), "Die Bedingungen der Nationalen Assimilation", *Werkausgabe* 9, pp. 596-624.
- . (1907), *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie*. Vienna: Ignaz Brand.
- Blum, Mark E. and William Smaldone (2015), *Austro-Marxism. The Ideology of Unity. Austro-Marxist Theory and Strategy*. Boston: Brill.
- Bourdet, Yvon (1968), *Otto Bauer et la Révolution*. Paris: EDI.
- Czerwinska-Schupp, Ewa (2005), *Otto Bauer: Studien zur social-politischen Philosophie*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Erk, Jan (2015), "Non-Territorial Milletts in Ottoman History", in Malloy, T. H. and F. Palermo (eds.), *Minority Accommodation through Territorial and Non-Territorial Autonomy*, pp. 119-131.
- Hänish, Ernst (2011), *Der grosse Illusionist. Otto Bauer 1881-1938*. Vienna: Böhlau
- Haupt, George, Michel Lowy and Claude Weil (1974), *Les marxistes et la question nationale 1848-1914*. Paris: Maspero.
- Leisse, Olaf (2012). *Der Untergang des östreichischen Imperiums. Otto Bauer und die Nationalitätenfrage in der Habsburger Monarchie*. Marburg an der Lahn: Tectum.
- Máiz, Ramón (2012), *The Inner Frontier. The Place of Nation in the Political Theory of Democracy and Federalism*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- Malloy, Tove H. and Francesco Palermo (ed.). (2015), *Minority Accommodation through Territorial and Non-Territorial Autonomy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malloy, Tove H., Alexander Osipov and Báalazs Vizi (eds.) (2015), *Managing Diversity Through Non-Territorial Autonomy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meinecke, Friedrich (1963), *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*. Munich: Oldenbourg.
- Miller, David (2020), *Is Self-determination a Dangerous illusion?* Cambridge: Polity.

- Molnár, Miklós and André Reszler (eds.) (1989), *Le Génie de L'Autriche-Hongrie*. Paris: PUF.
- Momsen, Hans (1979), *Arbeitsbewegung und nationale Frage*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nimni, Ephraim (2015), "Minorities and the Limits of Liberal Democracy. Democracy and Non-Territorial Autonomy", in Malloy, T. H. and F. Palermo (eds.), *Minority Accommodation through Territorial and Non-Territorial Autonomy*, pp. 73–98.
- (ed.) (2005), *National Cultural Autonomy and its Contemporary Critics*. London: Routledge.
- Nimni, Ephraim, Alexander Osipov and David J. Smith (eds.) (2013), *The Challenge of Non-Territorial Autonomy*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Osipov, Alexander (2013), "Non-Territorial Autonomy during and after Communism". *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 12 (1): 7–26.
- Renner, Karl (1994), *Schriften*, hrsg. Anton Pelinka. Vienna: Residenz.
- Smith, David (2013), "Non-Territorial Autonomy and Political Community in Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe", *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 12 (1): 27–55.
- Stilz, Anna (2019), *Territorial Sovereignty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ramon Mais i Marija Pereira

Oto Bauer: ideja nacije kao pluralne zajednice i pitanje teritorijalne i neteritorijalne autonomije

Apstrakt

Ovaj članak predstavlja detaljnu analizu kocepta nacije u delu austrijskog marksiste Ota Bauera. U njegovom viđenju, nacija je osmišljena kao evolutivni proces političke, otvorene i pluralne konstrukcije. Njegovo delo takođe otkriva i veze između nacije sa plurinacionalnom demokratskom državom, što je u njegovo doba predstavljalo novu političku i institucionalnu viziju. Zastupa se stanovište da je, danas, sa sve većim usložnjavanjem novih koncepata globalnog društva i umnožavanjem migracija i izbeglica – kao i potrebom da se na to odgovori putem prilagođavanja manjina kroz mehanizme teritorijalne i neteritorijalne autonomije – njegovo delo i dalje veoma relevantno. Sva ova pitanja umnogome čine samu suštinu dela Ota Bauera.

Ključne reči: Austromarksizam, nacija, nacionalna manjina, multinacionalna država, teritorijalna i neteritorijalna autonomija.