Check for updates

Received: 15 November 2023 | Accepted: 25 January 2024

DOI: 10.1111/nana.13058

WILEY

Performing national practices of solidarity-through-sameness

Hizky Shoham [1,2]

[1]The Program for Hermeneutics and Cultural Studies, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

[2]The Shalom Hartman Institute, Jerusalem, Israel

Correspondence
Hizky Shoham, The Program for Hermeneutics and Cultural Studies, Bldg. 604, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 5290002, Hakatros 50, Petah-Tikva 4973902, Israel.
Email: hizky.shoham@gmail.com

Abstract

The literature on national solidarity is puzzled by the question of how solidarity can bridge social differences and has not asked how it works through sameness; that question was relegated to the literature on national identity. But can solidarity create nationhood through sameness? This theoretical article rehabilitates Durkheim's underused concept of mechanical solidarity and proposes to study sameness not as a human given, identity or group quality, but as a social performance that constitutes similarity between people and thus also solidarity. Whilst mechanical solidarity can function in all types of groups, it is particularly prominent in the context of nationhood. To explain how, the article explores performances of national customs related to food, which convey a conformist and unreflective subjectivity as well as horizontal unanimity. When people do things collectively, they perform national solidarity without necessarily indicating a collective identity that exists out there or agreeing about ideas and values. Contrary to common stereotypes of modern societies as 'complex', the article underscores sameness as crucial to modern nationalism—still the most significant socio-political principle of our era.

KEYWORDS

Durkheim, food, nationalism from below, solidarity, theory

© 2024 Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

1 | INTRODUCTION

What is it that makes groups? Durkheim (1966) famously differentiated between two types of solidarity: mechanical solidarity, which links similar people, and organic solidarity, which forges interdependency across social differences. With a few exceptions, social scientists traditionally dismissed the first of these as stereotypical and unhelpful for the study of modern societies. This theoretical article follows Durkheim in understanding sameness and difference as two social forces operating in all groups and proposes that solidarity-through-sameness is particularly useful for understanding nationhood. I begin my defence of the application of mechanical solidarity to modern nationhood with a careful reading of Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society*. Then, to explain how national solidarity works through sameness, I look at performances of national customs related to food, focusing on two aspects: conformist subjectivity and horizontal unanimity. Let us start with Durkheim on solidarity.

2 | SOLIDARITY: A PRODUCT OF DIVERSITY OR OF SAMENESS?

What is it that creates groups? In a series of publications, sociologist Danny Kaplan (2018, 2022a) distinguished between two paradigms for researching groupness: identity and solidarity. The identity paradigm proposes to study the extent, measure and various ways in which individuals and subgroups identify—or not—with the group's symbolic codes, values, practices and boundaries. It thus sees group identity as an object that exists 'out there'. Even though group identity can be examined as dynamic and contested, particularly in constructionist approaches that emphasise identification over identity (Brubaker, 2002; Brubaker & Cooper, 2000), groupness is still regarded as an object rather than a process. By contrast, the solidarity paradigm analyses groupness as a dynamic social process in which every day social ties extend in various ways to more general social associations, networks and assemblies that produce groups with more flexible boundaries (see also Elias, 1978). This paradigm, still infrequent in scholarship, investigates groupness as horizontal and multi-directional networks of relationships that expand from micro-interactions by staging personal ties in front of a third party or an imagined audience. Kaplan (2018) demonstrated how the public translation of personal narratives of friendship into coherent large-group ideologies such as nationalism is informed by the logic of social clubs in a process of 'strangers-turn-friends' and the emergence of 'cultural intimacy': the feeling that I have something intimate in common with people I have never met (Herzfeld, 2005; Reed, 2006). Moving away from the dominant prescriptive discussion of solidarity (e.g., Rorty, 1989; Bayertz, 1999; most articles in Banting & Kymlicka, 2017), Kaplan's theory of solidarity can explain the dynamics of groupness as it often takes place, not as it is ought to be.

Remarkably, however, the growing discussion about the role of solidarity in groupness ignores a major classical reference: Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society* (1966). I bring up this source not because Durkheim was 'the first' to identify the concept's explanatory potential for modern social life (he was not; Ter Meulen, 2017, pp. 41–54), and not out of some social science classicism. I do so because Durkheim posed a question that is analytically important for the understanding of groupness and of national solidarity in particular—but which has generally been ignored by subsequent social thought: *Does solidarity work through sameness or difference?*

To explain ingroup sentiments and cooperation, Durkheim defined two types of solidarity, based on sameness and difference, respectively. The first type of solidarity operates when individuals are similar. It is called 'mechanical' because it leaves little room for personal choices, sentiments, tastes and so forth; each member of the group can be replaced by any other and the group will still function (Durkheim, 1966, p. 130). The second type of solidarity is at work when the division of labour in society increases and individuals must learn to cooperate despite widening ingroup differences. It is called 'organic' because it sees each member of society as unique and irreplaceable and because, despite their individual roles, members can cooperate like the organs of a living body—fingernails and the heart have different functions (and power), but they contribute harmoniously to the shared goal of its survival.

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Durkheim's answer to the fundamental question of what establishes solidarity between group members, sameness or difference is: both. Solidarity can work through sameness or bridge differences. In modern societies, groupness is constituted when the two operate in tandem as two forces or vectors.

But this duality has been ignored by the bulk of social thought (Thijssen, 2012). Organic solidarity attracted wide scholarly attention because the concept countered the prevalent feelings and images of alienation and atomisation in the public spheres of modern industrial societies. In contrast to the trends in social science in his time, Durkheim argued that modern life also entails interdependency and solidarity (Durkheim, 1972; Ter Meulen, 2017, pp. 54–62. Cf Alexander, 2006, p. 18). Indeed, the scholarship about groupness still wonders how it is constituted by *different* people (e.g. Brubaker, 2002; Sciortino, 2012). At the same time, however, the question of how *similar* people constitute cohesive groups has generally been deemed irrelevant and perhaps redundant, so the concept of mechanical solidarity did not gain similar traction in later social thought. This neglect was exacerbated by Durkheim's attribution of this concept to ‘primitive’ societies—which is why today every social-science tyro knows that it is stereotypical, derogatory and useless. As often happens, this popular opinion is based upon an inattentive reading of the classical text—or not reading it at all. But a careful reading of Durkheim uncovers the relevance of mechanical solidarity for current social thought about groupness (Dingley, 2015; Schiermer, 2014).

Durkheim's discussion of mechanical and organic solidarity opens with intriguing illustrations of both types of social relationships (Durkheim, 1966, pp. 54–63). To exemplify sameness, he cites Plato, who famously related friendship to it; for difference, he employs the contemporary middle-class ethos of a radical division of labour between the sexes and romantic love. Thus, both categories are represented by phenomena he sees as universal.

Things get more explicit in the chapter about mechanical solidarity, ‘which comes from a certain number of states of conscience which are common to all the members of the same society’ (p. 109). Durkheim begins the discussion by developing his criminological theory, which defines crime via society's reaction to the perpetrator's aggression against collective sentiment (e.g. pp. 72, 77). Throughout the chapter he argues that modern criminal law expresses mechanical solidarity, because a crime attacks a collective consciousness that in turn wields society's institutions, mainly government authorities, to retaliate (e.g. p. 102). But mechanical solidarity applies far beyond criminology, in the many circumstances where everyone acts, thinks and feels together. Time and again he clarifies that this social force operates in contemporary societies and not just in ‘primitive’ ones.

In organic solidarity, says Durkheim, criminal law works differently: It is not retributive as in mechanical solidarity, but restitutive. It is not about collective reflexes like vengeance but about restoring the social harmony between individuals and the social order. Durkheim thought that this was indeed a distinctly modern experience, but that even organic solidarity differs from the abstract logic of the social contract, which, whether real or imagined (see also Durkheim, 1938), is insufficient as a basis of social order and of individuals' mutual respect for one another's rights; that order rests on prior solidarity (see Alexander, 2006, pp. 44–45). This prior solidarity, again, can be derived from either type, as ‘a common life that comes from the division of social labor or from the attraction of like for like’ (Durkheim, 1966, p. 122).

Durkheim sums up the differences between the two solidarities as follows: In mechanical solidarity, society is a totality of beliefs and feelings shared by all. In organic solidarity, society is ‘a system of different, special functions which definite relations unite’ (p. 129). In other words, what most Durkheimians have known as ‘collective consciousness’ is grounded theoretically in *mechanical* solidarity—where a group acts together with a common purpose that rises above the individual consciousnesses and has its own mind, purposes and sensitivities, which assembles the individuals (Schiermer, 2014; see also Malešević, 2013, pp. 15, 172). Importantly, the two solidarities are two aspects of social life that ‘really make up only one [society]. They are two aspects of one and the same reality, but none the less they must be distinguished’ (Durkheim, 1966, p. 129)—for the sake of analysis. *Groups exist thanks to two social forces: solidarity-through-sameness and solidarity-through-difference*. For Durkheim, these are not Weberian ideal types but real social forces—social facts—that constitute groupness and are active in most, if not all, groups.

Durkheim saw organic solidarity as a distinctively modern force, which became more dominant due to the industrial revolution and the ensuing professionalisation, specialisation, and increased division of labor. At the same time,

he saw mechanical solidarity as a powerful force in modern collectivities, too. Indeed, he thought that 'primitive' societies operate mainly (or solely) via mechanical solidarity; his book offers a handful of stereotypical and not especially helpful judgements of such societies (e.g. pp. 133–135). Even in his view, however, 'modern' societies operate with both vectors, sameness and diversity. Whilst modern nationalism was taken for granted rather than analysed in his thought (Malešević, 2004), Durkheim considered it a prominent example illustrating the significant role of sameness and conformity in modern life (e.g., Durkheim, 1966, p. 154).

Scholars possibly neglected the power of sameness in groupness due to its commonsensical identification with premodern social organisation (which in the past was labelled 'traditional') and the common conflation of diversity with 'modernity'. Whilst scholars of non-modern societies gradually stopped stereotyping these societies as 'simple', scholars of modern societies still believe in the explanatory power of terms like 'complexity' and 'diversity' regarding their research object and deny the impact of elements of 'simplicity' in the societies that formed after industrialisation (see also Stearns, 1977). When analysing nationalist meanings of mundane practices such as those discussed below, many scholars uncritically dichotomised 'our' conscious and reflective 'performance' from 'their' unaware 'ritual' (e.g., Alexander, 2004; Uzelac, 2010). Besides the stereotyping of non-modern societies, this thinking blocked scholars from noticing the sameness that is the basis for modern industrial societies overall and especially for modern nationalism.

We can easily agree that there is no such a thing as 'primitive society' as well as 'traditional society' (Bendix, 1967; Boyer, 1990; Shils, 1981), i.e. societies where everybody does the same thing at the same time. However, following Latour (1993, 2005), I suggest raising the bet and dropping the ineffective labels 'modern' and 'non-modern.' In particular, I find Durkheim's talk about the 'complexity' or 'simplicity' of certain societies unproductive and propose to discard the narrative that the societies of the modern industrial era are 'complex' as opposed to the 'simple' pre-modern ones. In agreement with Durkheim, though, I see complexity and simplicity as social forces that jointly constitute groupness. Furthermore, simplicity can also be observed in modern social life, particularly within the context of modern nationhood.

Of course, social thought has not ignored the role of sameness in groupness. Neo-Marxist assessments of capitalism emphasised the conformity it enforces on people but understood that conformity as one of its dehumanizing effects and as a threat to solidarity. Sameness had obvious currency within analyses of totalitarianism (Adorno et al., 2019) as well as amongst neo-Marxist scholars of modern nationalism (Balibar, 1990). At the same time, scholars who analysed the role of sameness in democratic societies that used nationalism as a civil society glue tended to conceptualise it through the lens of identity, that is, the assumption that people are similar if and when they jointly identify with group symbols and boundaries. In this line of thought, solidarity was perceived as a result of identity, and not vice versa (Kaplan, 2022a; Miller & Ali, 2014). Theoreticians of group solidarity ignored the notion of sameness because they were mainly puzzled by groups' miraculous ability to coalesce despite ingroup differences (e.g. Sciortino, 2012). Kaplan attributed sameness to an 'identity-based approach [in which] individuals are disposed to experience an emotional bond with those they perceive to be similar to themselves' (Kaplan, 2022a, p. 13; Miller & Ali, 2014, p. 255). In another work (2022b) he attributed sameness to familial metaphors in the conceptualisation of nationhood. Implicitly, this approach assumes that when similar people compose a group there is nothing to explain.

Except there is. Sameness is not a self-evident quality of groups that is simply there. Plato went on at length to explain the mechanisms of friendship based on sameness, because two people who are similar will not necessarily become friends. Durkheim asked how similarity enhances groupness, because a bunch of scattered people who are similar will not necessarily form a group. To exist, a group has to 'convince' its members that something they have in common is meaningful. Sameness is imagined, performed and transmitted to the entire group by various means—meetings, assemblies and common feelings (Durkheim, 2008, p. 322). I therefore propose to study sameness not as a human given, identity or group quality, but as a social performance that constitutes similarity between people, and thus also solidarity, even amongst strangers. The question we have to address is, how do groups perform sameness?

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

3 | BANAL NATIONALISM AND EVERYDAY NATIONHOOD

This general question regarding groups will be addressed here in the context of nationhood. Whilst the dynamics of sameness and difference operate within groups of all kinds and sorts, such as regional, tribal and professional, nations uniquely employ this duality as fundamental metaphors to define themselves. They can refer to themselves as large communities of strangers and as family members simultaneously (Kaplan, 2022b). Understanding the role of sameness in constituting groupness is therefore particularly critical for comprehending the concept of nationhood.

Understanding sameness as performed relies on the recent turn in the study of nationalism towards non-elite nationhood and everyday life. Classical scholarship about nationalism, focused on the political sphere and elite activities, explained that nationhood was constructed through sameness when a common identity was instilled in the group (e.g. Smith, 1991). Billig's (1995) theory of *Banal Nationalism* views the nation as a unified group, with its image reproduced from above by the political elite or the media. From more Weberian perspective, Malešević agrees that 'in some important respects all genuine solidarity is "mechanical"' (2013, p. 15), but nonetheless assumes that in large groups, like the nation, the similarity between members exists primarily because of bureaucracy. However, neither theory explains how this uniformity operates in cultural practices and everyday life. More recent scholarship about non-elite nationalism shifted the focus from nationalism as an 'ism' to 'routine ways of being national' (Edensor, 2002, p. 21) or everyday nationhood (Fox, 2014; Fox & Miller-Idriss, 2008; Skey, 2011). Scholars now study nationhood as a dynamic social force in various arenas, such as media events (Skey, 2006, 2009), museums (Rose-Greenland, 2013), consumer products (First & Herman, 2009), tourist sites (West, 2015), and radio broadcasts (Kaplan, 2009). The solidarity paradigm also focused on performances of friendship or 'clubbiness' in mundane practices where the logic of social clubs is extended to the performances of larger groups (Kaplan, 2018). Whereas banal nationalism analyses top-down forces, everyday nationhood enlightens bottom-up processes and the agency of individuals and subgroups (Knott, 2015; Antonsich, 2016; Skey & Antonsich, 2017). However, since the shift towards everyday nationhood highlights diversity, it left the question of how sameness operates in everyday life still unaddressed.

Following Kertzer's observation regarding rituals that 'solidarity is produced by people acting together, not by people thinking together' (Kertzer, 1988, p. 76), I propose, as a methodological window, exploring not symbolic systems or delineated and well-orchestrated events. Instead, I suggest examining everyday conventions shared by broad strata of the population, with almost no state involvement but that are peculiar to a certain country. Expressing 'nationalism from the bottom up' (Bonikowski, 2016, p. 428) or 'unofficial nationalism' (Shoham, 2021), these conventions can include numerous trivial and inconspicuous habits, customs and traditions, such as 'consumer habits, road signs, and inside jokes' (Löfgren, 1993, p. 190), fashion (Schiermer, 2014, p. 76), locally distinct forms of greeting or applause or tacit norms of proxemics (Alsmark, 1996; Shapira & Navon, 1991) and body techniques (Frykman, 1990; Mauss, 1973).

To analyse everyday conventions as emblems of national solidarity, we have to part ways from the Durkheimian focus on public ritual and other delineated activities in the study of nationalism (e.g. Mosse, 1975). Instead, to understand the meanings of everyday conventions, we should use the branch of performance theory that emphasised cultural pragmatics rather than cultural semantics (Alexander, 2004). Elsewhere, I discussed how the meanings of conventional performances—where people do things simply because others do them—can often be rooted in 'deep conventionality' (Shoham, 2024). In the terms of Alexander's meaning-centred performance theory, conventionality exemplifies a 'perfect' or 'effortless' fusion of performers and audience—a fusion that is often challenging to achieve in more structured performances (Taylor, 2022). When a practice undergoes a process of conventionalisation, it acquires a second-order meaning whilst the scope of the participating group enlarges, especially when the practice becomes a group icon (see Alexander et al., 2012). Here I will focus on performances of trivial habits, customs and traditions related to food that are so popular that they have become national icons.

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

4 | CULINARY NATIONALISM: PERFORMING SAMENESS MUNDANELY

Amongst everyday conventions, food and foodways stand out as a realm of social activity that is both corporeal and extensively discussed. Indeed, the move towards everyday nationhood entails a rising interest in the intersection of food and nationalism (Ichijo, 2017). Ichijo and Ranta (2016, pp. 9–11) differentiate orchestrated nation-branding initiated by intellectual, bureaucratic or business elites in or out of the homeland (see DeSoucey, 2010), from more spontaneous processes of 'culinary nationalism' (see Ferguson, 2010)—when a dish, recipe or culinary custom is recognised as 'national' and becomes an icon. The former usually takes place top-down (even though it cannot work without responsiveness from below); here I am mainly interested in the latter, which is 'initiated' from below even though its dissemination can be aided by elites that recognise the cultural power of the new icon and appropriate it. A food becomes a national icon not necessarily because everybody likes or eats it; foods we eat often do not necessarily attain that status. A food becomes iconic when there are widely held common preferences and practices amongst the population and when it is significant and meaningful for the group (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993, p. 5). This meaningfulness is usually indicated by the food's significant presence in popular culture, the spoken language and the arts as a marker of national groupness (Sobral, 2019, p. 22). Iconised food is, therefore, significant not necessarily as an object but as a practice—something people do. Importantly, these food practices are seldom solitary; people engage in them with family and friends. In fact, spending time together is a primary objective of these iconised food practices, creating networks of solidarity that can extend to the entire nation.

Food can be iconised in varied circumstances and in varied types of nationalism. Ethnic nationalisms can use the culinary traditions of the groups that created the nation, which in turn can result from geographical and economic conditions, for example, rice in Japan or salt cod in Portugal (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993; Sobral, 2019). The iconic dishes of civil nationalism are related to civil traditions, like the classic American Thanksgiving and Fourth of July menus (Giblin, 1983; Pleck, 2000, pp. 21–41; Adamczyk, 2002). Immigrant societies can use foods from the old countries, even those that were the home of marginal groups: as in the case of the pizza in the United States, once disparaged as representative of the 'inferior' Italian food culture but later appropriated (whilst being drastically modified) as an iconic all-American food (Avieli, 2017, pp. 85–86). Settler nationalisms often iconised dishes borrowed or appropriated from the colonised group, such as hummus and falafel in Israel, taken from the adjacent Arab civilisation but iconised as 'Israeli' (Hirsch, 2011; Hirsch & Tene, 2013; Raviv, 2015). Hummus was also used by the rival nationalist discourse of 'nativism' (Parasecoli, 2022) and iconised in neighbouring Lebanon as 'Arab' and 'Lebanese' and in Palestine as 'Palestinian' (Gvion, 2012; Hirsch, 2011). Imperial nationalism can appropriate the foods of the colonised back in the metropole, notably in the case of tea, which English traders—the precursors of colonisation (India) and economic exploitation (China)—brought home and marketed so successfully that the beverage was iconised as 'English' (Gray 2009). In the above-mentioned case of Portugal, salt cod was iconised as a result of twentieth-century nostalgia for the naval empire of many centuries before (Sobral, 2019).

Studies in culinary nationalism ask what it means that tea is 'English,' espresso 'Italian' and rice 'Japanese'. This question in not new; classical food studies undertook to decipher the meanings of food through the lens of structuralism, hermeneutics and semiotics (Levi-Strauss, 1969; Barthes, 1972, pp. 58–64; Douglas, 1972). When understood as representing national identity, food is often analysed as an abstract symbol (e.g. Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993). Here, however, I follow performance theory and shift the discussion from semantics to pragmatics (Alexander, 2004; Alexander & Mast, 2006): Instead of analysing food as a symbol, I propose to analyse culinary customs as performances. And instead of asking why the food represents the group as an object, I analyse the act of eating a specific dish or item as performance and ask: how is this act 'national'? Nothing intrinsic to tea indicates Englishness; this derives, instead, from the fact that it is drunk on a regular basis and in specific settings by many people who do not know each other. Such a common and coordinated act may enable strangers to recognise one another as fellow members not only of a shared identity but also of a social network (Kaplan, 2018) and thus to imagine and perform solidarity-through-sameness. The performative focus permits a better understanding of the togetherness this act expresses, whilst accepting a degree of arbitrariness or even idiosyncrasy in the iconic status of specific dietary preferences,

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

recipes and dining customs. When a perceived 'everyone' in the group does the same thing on similar occasions and recognises a national 'way of life', there is no need for 'flagging' (Billig, 1995) to reassemble the nation and make its members associate with one other. The national habitus (Mauss, 1973) is simply the routine. Symbolic interpretations about possible meanings of these practices can follow, but the solidarity is achieved first through performances of sameness.

A 'national' dish is not an abstract national icon unless there are correlating acts (see Alexander et al., 2012)—specific ways of preparing and consuming food that are often quite ritualised. True, in some cases, the 'national' icon is a product that grows and is consumed elsewhere as well, but nationalist sentiments combined with economic nationalism create a preference for local products, as with rice in post-war Japan, when laws against imported rice were enacted (Ichijo & Ranta, 2016, pp. 94–97; Ohnuki-Tierney, 1993; Cwiertka, 2022). In other cases, it is not a product but a specific style of preparation, like 'French' cuisine (Ferguson, 2010). In yet other cases, these are methods of preparation that in themselves are universal. Such is the case of Italian espresso coffee, which was branded 'Italian' during the twentieth century because the technology was invented in Italy and put to extensive use there—although all of its ingredients were imported (Morris, 2010). In others, these are highly ritualised consumption habits, like English tea, whose 'Englishness' is signified not so much by the beverage itself as by the corresponding teatime ritual and the material objects of the small porcelain pots (Gray, 2009). In Japan, tea was iconised in rather different rituals (Surak, 2012). In India, a 'national' cuisine that transcends ethnic and regional styles relates to specific patterns of consumption more than to this or that cooking and eating habit (Appadurai, 2008).

The most prominent way in which foods and drinks are iconised as national may be the national holiday—'annually scheduled occasions for eating and drinking' (Collins, 2014, p. 54), on which the sense of togetherness is amplified because the common act is performed in real synchronisation through 'calendrical coercion' (Geisler, 2009, p. 17). Examples of culinary traditions attached to a national day abound, as with the aforementioned American 'Turkey Day' (Adamczyk, 2002). In Portugal, salt cod became a 'national food' after it became the main dish of the Christmas Eve meal (Sobral, 2019). In some countries, it was not specific dishes that were iconised, but food customs, like Australian Anzac Day, when male picnickers were expected to consume huge quantities of alcohol outdoors without getting drunk, as a way to demonstrate masculinity and national brotherhood (Kapferer, 2012, pp. 155–161; Smith, 2014, p. 29). A noteworthy and widespread example is grilling meat outdoors as a ritualist way of celebrating the national day, which crystallised independently in settler nationalisms such as Argentina, Australia, Israel, South Africa and the United States (Ichijo & Ranta, 2016, p. 50). In all these countries, a standard pastime was ritualised when performed on the national day and became a national icon (Avieli, 2013; Giblin, 1983; Shoham, 2021). Here the iconic status was attributed not to the food itself but to the specific way of preparing it and the outdoors location—which define a leisure custom. The synchronised performance of a national-day food custom is an almost perfect example of 'people acting together' (Kertzer, 1988, p. 76) as a way of performing sameness.

If sameness is not given but performed, how is it performed and what does it mean? I will now use Durkheim's characterisations of mechanical solidarity to analyse the meaning of sameness with regard to two aspects: conformist subjectivity and horizontal unanimity.

5 | CONFORMIST SUBJECTIVITY

According to Durkheim (1966, p. 130), mechanical solidarity operates most strongly in a conformist society that leaves little room for personal choices, sentiments, taste preferences and so forth. Stereotypically, this was attributed to 'primitive' societies, but the push towards conformist behaviour and personality did not vanish in modern industrial societies. Durkheim identified this conformism in modern criminal law, the collective effervescence of public events (Schiermer, 2014) and other aspects of society. Here I will find it in foods and foodways that are considered national icons.

Common scholarly wisdom regarding nationhood as expressed in conformist behaviour associates it with meaninglessness—sometimes in passing comments about iconic foods. For example, Miller (2017, p. 68) supports his argument that solidarity in nationhood does not necessitate sameness by stating that 'you do not have to enjoy apple pie in order to be an American.' This truism about *being* an American cannot be denied. But what about *performing* an American? Here, conformity is a basic condition for a successful performance of national-ness. To the extent that many Americans consider liking apple pie an important component of Americanness, individuals eating it with gusto are aware that their taste and practices are shared by masses of their co-nationals. Here the individual choice is constrained by conformity to a national icon.

This is clearer when it comes to iconic food and foodways that are themselves ambivalent or controversial for various reasons: moral, as with foie gras, which is strongly identified with France and is sharply criticised by animal rights activists (Ferguson, 2010); aesthetic, as with the Israeli barbecue (Shoham, 2021) or the Scottish haggis (Fraser & Knight, 2019) that convey unflattering images of the nation, or Swedish herring known for its bad smell (Nygaard, 2019); or political, like the Thanksgiving ritual criticised by Native Americans for commemorating their annihilation (Adamczyk, 2002). In some of these cases, those seated around the table are more aware of the ambivalence than in others. In all of them, however, and many others, the contested-but-iconised food does not necessarily convey national pride but rather belonging and group attachment (Miller & Ali, 2014). The vector of solidarity-through-sameness, which disseminates ambivalent images of the nation, does not need an idealised image of the nation (Hage, 2009), because its power stems from the joint acts, not from abstract symbols. During the performance itself, the criticism and ambivalence are simply ignored.

As in 'primitive' mechanical solidarity, in food conventions, the nation is mostly perceived as a symbolic task group. In modern nations, the task can be a civilizing mission or some other noble destiny (Smith, 2000). But in many cases, the task is simple survival (Shoham, 2021)—precisely like the image of 'primitive' societies. With regard to tribal and other small-group societies, this overarching conformism is an overplayed stereotype (e.g. Turner, 1969), but it is an important part of the dynamics of modern nationalism.

Moreover, conformist subjectivity is characterised by a relative lack of reflection and intentionality. True, food is often perceived as a space for leisure and experienced as an arena of free choice (Douglas & Isherwood, 1979), but most reasons for preferring this or that food habit range from the trivial to the idiosyncratic. People eat the food they like and do not develop food habits in order to express their national identity. Rather, they want to have fun and spend time with family and friends in the way they are used to. These conventionalist justifications are part of what Goffman would have termed 'the social flow' (Goffman, 1967) and what Alexander calls a 'natural and necessary dimension of ongoing social life' (Alexander, 2004, p. 535). Alexander opposes 'ongoing social life' to social interactions delineated as 'performance,' where meaningful narratives are performed in public rituals, social narratives, metaphors, and so forth (Alexander, 2003). The social flow does not tend to create solidarity—quite the opposite (Goffman, 1971; Smith et al., 2010), but where it does, as when a national food is consumed by all, everyone is engaging in the same leisure activities or eating the same iconic foods out of mere conformity and thus perform solidarity-through-sameness. After a practice is iconised as representing 'our way of life,' subsequent interpretations of what it means may or may not follow (Shoham, 2022). When people prefer a certain food because it is a national icon—say, espresso because it is 'Italian'—the meanings of this conformist justification do not necessarily lie in performers' consciousness and reflexivity.

These everyday performances of conformity are the opposite of the 'ecstatic nationalism' performed in circumstances of major excitement, such as major media and sports events that leave an impression on mundane life (Skey, 2006; see also Collins, 2014). Consuming a 'national' food imagines and performs nationhood in the most banal way possible, because it lacks even the flagging element (Billig, 1995; see also Knott, 2015, pp. 3–4). Moreover, I suggest that 'ecstatic nationalism' with its varied forms, formal and informal, tends to display elements of solidarity-through-difference. The nationalist symbolic system, as expressed in ceremonies and spectacles, often (though not always) tells a story of the nation as a coat of many colours, an interdependency amongst dissimilar subgroups that can live in harmony despite their differences (e.g. Handelman and Katz in Handelman, 1990, pp. 191–

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

233). Because solidarity-through-difference must be stated, narrated and verbalised, it needs intermediation by cultural, intellectual and political elites, even at the micro level (say, a local community leader in a local community centre). In stark contrast, solidarity-through-sameness is first performed by the body; as a second phase, it can be interpreted—but does not have to. In fact, the more mundane and less 'ecstatic' the performance itself, the more immune it is to these interpretations. Whereas solidarity-through-difference bridges social differences by stressing the interdependency of various societal components, solidarity-through-sameness suspends the differences by performing conformity.

Conformity, as characteristic of small groups in the original concept of mechanical solidarity, can also manifest within larger groups like a nation. This occurs not only because the bureaucracy enforces a unifying perspective (Malešević, 2013) or due to top-down processes initiated by elites (Billig, 1995), but also because of social customs that emerge from the grassroots.

The specific subjectivity demonstrated in performances of solidarity-through-sameness in nationhood is unreflective and conformist. The performed sameness applies as well for ingroup relations, to which we turn now.

6 | HORIZONTAL UNANIMITY

When explaining how mechanical solidarity constitutes society, Durkheim writes that collective consciousness

> is, by definition, diffused in every reach of society. Nevertheless, it has specific characteristics which make it a distinct reality. It is, in effect, independent of the particular conditions in which individuals are placed; they pass on and it remains. It is the same in the North and in the South, in great cities and in small, [and] in different professions
>
> (Durkheim, 1966, pp. 79–80).

What can we learn from this—admittedly unrealistic—description of collective consciousness as dispersed equally amongst all parts of society? Durkheim himself was indecisive about it in his often-quoted analysis of the circular role of public assemblages in transmitting this collective consciousness to all parts pf society (Durkheim, 2008, p. 322). Indeed, no social scientist would accept this horizontal description as realistic: even the most 'simple' and 'mechanical' practice is performed differently and has different meanings amongst different parts of society, and changes over time.

Such horizontal unanimity can be nonetheless detected by thinking about the two solidarities heuristically, as social forces or vectors that together compose the group through a combination of difference and sameness. If a group exists, at least some collective practices should be simple and minor enough to cover the entire social space and be spread horizontally—'the same in the North and in the South'. The more prosaic and trivial such practices are, the more likely they are to be widely disseminated within the group.

Horizontality seems to be particularly active in nationhood, whose crux is the attempt to make society overlap the political apparatus and its symbolic system (Gellner, 1983, p. 1); unlike other kinds of groups, the nation presumes to fully 'cover' its territory (Billig, 1995, p. 20). The scholarship on elite nationalism investigated national identity from the top-down and assumed that symbols, practices, and meanings are disseminated in the public via institutional channels like the education system, cultural organisations, the republic of letters and the mass media (e.g. Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Mosse, 1975). The nationalism-from-below trend accepted this trickle-down picture in principle but, observing the fragmented reception of the orchestrated messages by diverse audiences, identified fractures in the assumed state-society overlap (e.g. McCrone & McPherson, 2009; Elgenius, 2011). Here, too, the new scholarship had conceptualised only solidarity-through-diversity, studied as a vertical force, whilst ignoring horizontal solidarity-through-sameness. Can performance of sameness flatten social hierarchies, diversities, and divisions?

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

A focus on food practices that become icons of nationhood can help us understand how the horizontal vector works. A local dish or food custom becomes a national icon in a chronological development: first it was introduced by someone, at a concrete time and place, and then, after spreading through society, was popularised and eventually iconised (Shoham, 2022). But even when food historians can track the icon's sources and determine when it was not such—the iconizing process dehistoricizes itself in that it conceals the precise source and how it was disseminated amongst the people. Instead, the food or custom is universalised as a social convention typical of a perceived 'everyone'.

This can be done in various ways. In many cases, the originator is forgotten and the dish or food custom is imagined as having been the national icon from 'time immemorial'. Often it is the inventors themselves who are modest about their part, claiming (faithful to the national ideology) that they merely revealed something authentic and long-rooted—as done frequently by authors of nationalist cookbooks (Ferguson, 2010; Sobral, 2019). In other cases, the inventors never meant to invent a 'national' dish or even any dish. Such is the case of the *pasta alla carbonara*, pasta with pepper, cheese, eggs and pork, today considered a mainstay of Italian cuisine but unknown in Italy before Second World War and probably invented by American soldiers in Rome during this war (Benasso & Stagi, 2019). When it became a national dish, it was argued that each Italian region had its own 'authentic' local variant of the ostensibly Italian classic: Campania, Calabria, Sicily, Puglia and so on, whilst the version of the particular region where the dish was invented—Rome—is not considered more authentic than others. Nevertheless, attempts by French cooks and foodies the world over to develop their own version were viewed as potentially contaminating and triggered an aggressive response by the Italian food media and blogosphere (Benasso & Stagi, 2019).

In other cases, the new dish is introduced by elites and then spreads top-down, as with tea in England. Almost unknown in early modern England, it progressed down the social ladder from the upper to the middle and then the lower classes. Despite the evident differences between the classes in terms of consumption patterns, accompanying rituals, and material objects, all of them were using tea to signify 'Englishness' before the end of the eighteenth century. The image was cast in stone in the nineteenth century, even though the meanings of the rituals and objects were class-dependent and hardly uniform. *Tea*, as the light afternoon meal was called, and the accompanying small porcelain pots signified aristocracy, and gradually moved to the middle class. But despite this vertical diversity, for all classes, tea was a symbol of English domesticity, in contrast to beverages drunk outside the home, such as coffee and beer. It should also be emphasised that throughout the social map tea and the implied cult of English domesticity were mainly attributed to women (Gray, 2009).

In many cases, the national icon was created by business entrepreneurs, cultural engineers, educators or politicians. Such is the case of the Italian espresso, defined by a certain form of preparation that depended on the technology of air compression, whilst the ingredients were mostly imported, and their precise mixture constantly changed. Since the spread of espresso was the result of technological developments and economic factors, it was distributed top-down economically and geographically: from the industrial and wealthy north to the rural and poorer south, whilst flattening differences between regions in taste, thanks to commercial campaigns pumping its 'Italianness'. But this vertical spread pattern was concealed. The beverage and the associated customs—drinking it standing and with glass of water—were attributed to 'the nation' (Morris, 2010), an image that eventually caught on outside Italy as well (Morris, 2013).

Nonetheless, more effective horizontal unanimity can be found in food practices whose vertical spread patterns were bottom-up, as in the case of outdoor grilling on the national day in settler nationalisms. In two documented cases the origins of the custom have been traced to the social periphery. In Israel, it originated in the Mizrahi (immigrants from Muslim countries) proletariat and diffused upward to the middle and upper classes; the Mizrahim's plebeian image played an important part in the iconizing process (Avieli, 2017; Shoham, 2021). In the United States, the custom of grilling meat outdoors on the Fourth of July began in the South—amongst the only southern traditions to become all-American (Giblin, 1983). In both cases, the practice is considered 'national' across classes and subgroups not because it is indeed dispersed equally amongst all parts of society, but because it is identified with the 'common folk'.

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

In other cases, it is not the historical course of a dish that identifies it as 'national', but the common culinary judgement that it is simple, poor or crude. This category includes the Scottish haggis and Portuguese salt cod, which were iconised as national due to their identification with frugality and simplicity (Fraser & Knight, 2019; Sobral, 2019). These images rely on the dish's perceived insufficient nutritional qualities and supports the survivalist and resourceful image of the nation.

In all these cases, and similar ones, the dehistoricizing of the custom is much more effective than that of 'invented traditions' that are the result of elite manipulation (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983). The particular dish or custom works as an icon not because it is prepared and eaten exactly the same way amongst all strands and subgroups in society. Rather, its accessibility to the lower strata signifies that it is equally accessible to all. At least in some skeletal way, this makes the iconic food 'the same in the North and in the South'. This dehistoricizing denies the dynamic nature of the practice with regard to both the social space and the time axis and thus performs solidarity-through-sameness as a horizontal force.

However, horizontal unanimity does not mean that the performance erects rigid borders for the group, nor does it imply that the iconic food never undergoes transformations in its practices, meanings and iconic status. When people enjoy the national dish or beverage, they know they are doing a 'national' thing even if their motive is only to enjoy good food and drink. This can work even for tourists, sojourners or immigrants, even undocumented ones—especially in a globalised food world, where national icons are often spread worldwide. Expatriates can also do it through transnational networks; so can non-nationals (Koch, 2016). Consuming or making someone else's national dish does not necessarily mean that one *identifies* as part of that nation, but rather that one is performing *networks of solidarity* through shared practices. To the extent that for New York–based aficionados of French cuisine, for example, it is more than a façade (always a possibility), they participate in French horizontal networks by preparing or consuming this food (Ferguson, 2010). To some extent, even random consumers can participate in these networks. Although the iconic practice presumes to cover the social space of the nation, the scope of the latter is determined ad hoc by the level of accessibility to various individuals and subgroups to the performances.

In other words, solidarity-through-sameness is by no means identical with primordial nationalism. National identity is presumed to assume a certain sameness in social qualities, whether physiological, cultural or political (Smith, 1991). Solidarity-through-difference works when there are chains of interdependency between diverse individuals and subgroups. Solidarity-through-sameness works when people do the same thing at the same time or at least in similar circumstances; it is independent of primordial conditions. Just as different people can be friends, similar people can be indifferent to each other.

Yet in cases where nationalism contributes to the universalistic solidarity of the civil sphere, so can solidarity-through-sameness, precisely because of the universality of the perceived 'everyone' that follows from the conformist logic (Alexander, 2006). But this does not mean that solidarity-through-sameness must be more inclusive of non-nationals from minority groups. The performance of food habits is believed to follow certain conventions, and this belief can cast doubt on the authenticity of the performance by non-nationals. In reality, horizontal unanimity cannot really bridge all the differences and the power relations.

7 | CONCLUSION

Nationhood inherently contains a tension between sameness and difference amongst its members. Whilst nationalist ideologies often strive to reconcile or explain this contradiction, reading Durkheim reminds us that these are two distinct social forces that shape groups in tandem. The intricate interplay between the two forces is particularly prominent when the group is a nation, which comprises a large group of strangers but often employs the language of smaller groups and cultural intimacy.

Contrary to common stereotypes of modern societies as 'complex', the article underscores sameness as the foundation of modern nationalism—still the most significant socio-political principle of our era. A question that could

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

not be fully explored here concerns the impact of frequently associating solidarity-through-sameness with the perceived ‘simplicity’ of ‘premodern’ life on the overstated ‘modernism-perennialism’ debate of the 20th century. This deserves a separate discussion.

Enlightening the mechanisms of sameness was made possible by examining national solidarity alongside identity. Whilst scholars of identity often took sameness as a given, the re-examination of Durkheim's less-explored concept of mechanical solidarity allowed us to treat sameness not as an inherent human trait, identity or inherent group quality, but rather as a social performance that imagines similarity between individuals and, by extension, fosters solidarity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge Danny Kaplan, Siniša Malešević, Lea David, and the anonymous reviewers for their critical and constructive reading of the text; and Dana Kaplan, Dafna Hirsch, and the other members of the Food Studies group headed by Hirsch, for providing valuable references on nationally iconized foods.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Hizky Shoham https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1429-2740

REFERENCES

Adamczyk, A. (2002). On thanksgiving and collective memory: Constructing the American tradition. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *15*(3), 343–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6443.00182

Adorno, T., et al. [1950](2019). *The authoritarian personality*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003059509-22

Alexander, J. C. (2003). *The meanings of social life: A cultural sociology*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195160840.001.0001

Alexander, J. C. (2004). Cultural pragmatics: Social performance between ritual and strategy. *Sociological Theory*, *22*(4), 527–573. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2004.00233.x

Alexander, J. C. (2006). *The civil sphere*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195162509.001.0001

Alexander, J. C., Bartmanski, B., & Giesen, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Iconic power: Materiality and meaning in social life*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137012869

Alexander, J. C., & Mast, J. (2006). Introduction: Symbolic action in theory and practice: The cultural pragmatics of symbolic action. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, & J. Mast (Eds.), *Social performance: Symbolic action, cultural pragmatics, and ritual* (pp. 1–28). Cambridge University Press.

Alsmark, G. (1996). When in Sweden … Immigrant encounters with Swedish culture. In J. Frykman & O. Löfgren (Eds.), *Force of habit: Exploring everyday culture* (pp. 87–101). Lund.

Antonsich, M. (2016). The ‘everyday’ of banal nationalism: Ordinary people's views on Italy and Italian. *Political Geography*, *54*, 32–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2015.07.006

Appadurai, A. (2008). How to make a national cuisine: Cookbooks in contemporary India. In C. Counihan & P. Van Esterik (Eds.), *Food and culture: A reader*. Routledge.

Avieli, N. (2013). Grilled nationalism: Power, masculinity and space in Israeli barbeques. *Food, Culture & Society*, *16*(2), 301–320. https://doi.org/10.2752/175174413X13589681351458

Avieli, N. (2017). *Food and power: A culinary ethnography of Israel*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/california/9780520290099.001.0001

Balibar, E. (1990). The nation form: History and ideology. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, *13*(3), 329–361.

Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (Eds.). (2017). *The strains of commitment: The political sources of solidarity in diverse societies*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198795452.001.0001

Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. Trans. Annette Lavers. Hill and Wang.

Bayertz, K. (1999). Four uses of solidarity. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity* (pp. 3–27). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-9245-1_1

Benasso, S., & Stagi, L. (2019). The carbonara-gate: Food porn and gastro-nationalism. In R. Sassatelli (Ed.), *Italians and food* (pp. 237–267). Springer International Publishing.

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Bendix, R. (1967). Tradition and modernity reconsidered. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *9*(3), 292–346. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500004540

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. Sage.

Bonikowski, B. (2016). Nationalism in settled times. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *42*, 429–447. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081715-074412

Boyer, P. (1990). *Tradition as truth and communication: A cognitive description of traditional discourse*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511521058

Brubaker, R. (2002). Ethnicity without groups. *European Journal of Sociology*, *43*(2), 163–189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975602001066

Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "identity". *Theory and Society*, *29*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007068714468

Collins, R. (2014). Time-bubbles of nationalism: dynamics of solidarity ritual in lived time. In R. Tsang & E. T. Woods (Eds.), *The cultural politics of nationalism and nation-building: Ritual and performance in the forging of nations* (pp. 53–67). Routledge.

Cwiertka, K. J. (2022). *Modern Japanese cuisine: Food, power and national identity*. Reaktion Books.

DeSoucey, M. (2010). Gastronationalism: Food traditions and authenticity politics in the European Union. *American Sociological Review*, *75*(3), 432–455. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122410372226

Dingley, J. (2015). *Durkheim and national identity in Ireland*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137408426

Douglas, M. (1972). Deciphering a meal. *Daedalus*, *101*(1), 61–81.

Douglas, M., & Isherwood, B. (1979). *The world of goods: Towards an anthropology of consumption*. Basic Books.

Durkheim, E. (1938). *The rules of sociological method*. Trans. S. A. Solovay and John H. Mueller. Free Press.

Durkheim, E. [1933](1966). *The division of labor in society*. Trans. G. Simpson. Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1972). A review of Ferdinand Tönnies' *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft – Abhandlung des Communismus und des Sozialismus als empirischer Kulturforment*. *American Journal of Sociology*, *77*, 1193–1199.

Durkheim, E. (2008). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Trans. Carol Cosman. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199540129.001.0001

Edensor, T. (2002). *National identity, popular culture and everyday life*. Berg.

Elgenius, G. (2011). The politics of recognition: Symbols, nation building and rival nationalisms. *Nations and Nationalism*, *17*(2), 396–418. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2010.00482.x

Elias, N. (1978). *What is sociology?* Trans. Stephen Mennell and Grace Morrissey. Hutchinson.

Ferguson, P. P. (2010). Culinary nationalism. *Gastronomica*, *10*(1), 102–109. https://doi.org/10.1525/gfc.2010.10.1.102

First, A., & Herman, T. (2009). Sweet nationalism in bitter days: A commercial representation of Zionism. *Nations and Nationalism*, *15*(3), 506–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8129.2009.00388.x

Fox, J. E. (2014). National holiday commemorations: The view from below. In R. Tsang & E. T. Woods (Eds.), *The cultural politics of nationalism and nation-building. Ritual and performance in the forging of nations* (pp. 38–53). Routledge.

Fox, J. E., & Miller-Idriss, C. (2008). Everyday nationhood. *Ethnicities*, *8*(4), 536–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796808088925

Fraser, J., & Knight, C. (2019). Signifying poverty, class and nation through Scottish foods: From Haggis to deep-fried Mars Bars. In A. Ichijo, V. Johannes, & R. Ranta (Eds.), *The emergence of National Food: The dynamics of food and nationalism* (pp. 73–84). Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350074163.0012

Frykman, J. (1990). What people do but seldom say. *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, *20*, 50–62.

Geisler, M. E. (2009). The calendar conundrum: National days as unstable signifiers. In D. McCrone & G. McPherson (Eds.), *National days. constructing and mobilising national identity* (pp. 10–26). Palgrave MacMillan.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Cornell University Press.

Giblin, J. C. (1983). *Fireworks, picnics, and flags: The story of the fourth of July symbols*. Clarion.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Pantheon books.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. Allen Lane the Penguin Press.

Gray, A. (2009). A moveable feast': Negotiating gender at the middle-class tea-table in eighteenth-and nineteenth-century England. *Food and Drink in Archaeology*, *2*, 46–56.

Gvion, L. (2012). *Beyond hummus and falafel: Social and political aspects of Palestinian food in Israel*. Trans. David Wesley and Elana Wesley. University of California Press.

Hage, G. (2009). Hating Israel in the field: On ethnography and political emotions. *Anthropological Theory*, *9*(1), 59–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499609103547

Handelman, D. (1990). *Models and mirrors: Towards an anthropology of public events*. Cambridge University Press.

Herzfeld, M. (2005). *Cultural intimacy: Social poetics in the nation-state*. Routledge.

Hirsch, D. (2011). 'Hummus is best when it is fresh and made by Arabs': The gourmetization of hummus in Israel and the return of the repressed Arab. *American Ethnologist*, *38*(4), 617–630. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2011.01326.x

Hirsch, D., & Tene, O. (2013). Hummus: The making of an Israeli culinary cult. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *13*(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540512474529

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Hobsbawm, E. J., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

Ichijo, A. (2017). Banal nationalism and UNESCO's intangible cultural heritage list: Cases of Washoku and the gastronomic meal of the French. In M. Skey & M. Antonsich (Eds.), *Everyday nationhood - Theorising culture, identity and belonging after banal nationalism* (pp. 259–284). Palgrave Macmillan.

Ichijo, A., & Ranta, R. (2016). *Food, national identity and nationalism: From everyday to global politics*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137483133

Kapferer, B. (2012 [1988]). *Legends of people, myths of state: Violence, intolerance, and political culture in Sri Lanka and Australia*. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kaplan, D. (2009). The songs of the siren: Engineering national time on Israeli radio. *Cultural Anthropology*, *24*(2), 313–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2009.01133.x

Kaplan, D. (2018). *The nation and the promise of friendship: Building solidarity through sociability*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78402-1

Kaplan, D. (2022a). Distinguishing solidarity from identity in studies of nationhood: An alternative to the civic–ethnic dichotomy? *Nations and Nationalism*, *28*(3), 760–776. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12792

Kaplan, D. (2022b). Imagining national solidarity: Strangers-turned-friends-turned-brothers. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, *9*(4), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1080/23254823.2021.1964997

Kertzer, D. (1988). *Ritual, politics and power*. Yale University Press.

Knott, E. (2015). Everyday nationalism: A review of the literature. *Studies on National Movements*, *3*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.21825/snm.85398

Koch, N. (2016). Is nationalism just for nationals? Civic nationalism for noncitizens and celebrating National Day in Qatar and the UAE. *Political Geography*, *54*, 43–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2015.09.006

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199256044.001.0001

Levi-Strauss, C. (1969). *The raw and the cooked*. Trans. John and Doreen Weightman. University of Chicago Press.

Löfgren, O. (1993). Materializing the nation in Sweden and America. *Ethnos*, *58*, 161–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.1993.9981473

Malešević, S. (2004). 'Divine ethnies' and 'sacred nations': Anthony D. Smith and the neo-Durkhemian theory of nationalism. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, *10*(4), 561–593. https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490900331

Malešević, S. (2013). *Nation-states and nationalisms: Organization, ideology and solidarity*. Polity.

Mauss, M. (1973). Techniques of the body. *Economy and Society*, *2*(1), 70–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147300000003

McCrone, D., & McPherson, G. (2009). Introduction. In D. McCrone & G. McPherson (Eds.), *National days: Constructing and mobilising national identity* (pp. 1–10). Palgrave MacMillan.

Miller, D. (2017). Solidarity and its sources. In K. Banting & W. Kymlicka (Eds.), *The strains of commitment: The political sources of solidarity in diverse societies* (pp. 61–79). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198795452.003.0002

Miller, D., & Ali, S. (2014). Testing the national identity argument. *European Political Science Review*, *6*(2), 237–259. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773913000088

Morris, J. (2010). Making Italian espresso, making espresso Italian. *Food and History*, *8*(2), 155–183. https://doi.org/10.1484/J.FOOD.1.102222

Morris, J. (2013). Why espresso? Explaining changes in European coffee preferences from a production of culture perspective. *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, *20*(5), 881–901. https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2013.833717

Mosse, G. L. (1975). *The nationalization of the masses: Political symbolism and mass movements in Germany from the Napoleonic wars through the Third Reich*. Howard Fertig.

Nygaard, M. E. (2019). Swedish fermented herring as a marker of rural identity: The Alfta surströmmingsskiva. *Food, Culture & Society*, *22*(4), 407–422. https://doi.org/10.1080/15528014.2019.1620585

Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1993). *Rice as self: Japanese identities through time*. Princeton University Press.

Parasecoli, F. (2022). *Gastronativism: Food, identity, politics*. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/para20206

Pleck, E. H. (2000). *Celebrating the family: Ethnicity, consumer culture and family rituals*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674276888

Raviv, Y. (2015). *Falafel nation: Cuisine and the making of national identity in Israel*. University of Nebraska Press.

Reed, I. A. (2006). Social dramas, shipwrecks, and cockfights: Conflict and complicity in social performance. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, & J. Mast (Eds.), *Social performance: Symbolic action, cultural pragmatics, and ritual* (pp. 146–168). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511616839.005

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804397

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Rose-Greenland, F. (2013). The Parthenon Marbles as icons of nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, *19*(4), 654–673. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12039

Schiermer, B. (2014). Durkheim's concept of mechanical solidarity – Where did it go? *Durkheimian Studies*, *20*, 64–88.

Sciortino, G. (2012). Ethnicity, race, nationhood, foreignness, and many other things: Prolegomena to a cultural sociology of difference-based interactions. In J. C. Alexander, R. Jacobs, & P. Smith (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of cultural sociology* (pp. 365–389). Oxford University Press.

Shapira, R., & Navon, D. (1991). Alone together: Public and private dimensions of a Tel-Aviv cafe. *Qualitative Sociology*, *14*(2), 107–125. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992190

Shils, E. (1981). *Tradition*. The University of Chicago Press.

Shoham, H. (2024). Deep conventionality, or, tracing the meanings of conventional rituals. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *68*(5), 640–659.

Shoham, H. (2022). "Our (civil) way of life": The folkloric civil sphere. *Cultural Sociology*, *17*(1), 136–156.

Shoham, H. (2021). The Israel BBQ as national ritual: Performing unofficial nationalism, or finding meaning in triviality. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, *9*, 13–42. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-019-00073-y

Skey, M. (2006). 'Carnivals of surplus emotion?' Towards an understanding of the significance of ecstatic nationalism in a globalising world. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, *6*, 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9469.2006.tb00154.x

Skey, M. (2009). 'We wanna show'em who we are': National events in England. In D. McCrone & G. McPherson (Eds.), *National days: Constructing and mobilising national identity* (pp. 41–56). Palgrave MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230251175_4

Skey, M. (2011). *National belonging and everyday life: The significance of nationhood in an uncertain world*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230353893

Skey, M., & Antonsich, M. (2017). Introduction: The persistence of banal nationalism. In *Everyday nationhood: Theorising culture, identity and belonging after banal nationalism* (pp. 1–13). Palgrave Macmillan London.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. Penguin.

Smith, A. D. (2000). *The nation in history: Historiographical debates about ethnicity and nationalism*. University Press of New England.

Smith, A. D. (2014). The rites of nations: Elites, masses and the re-enactment of the 'national past'. In R. Tsang & E. T. Woods (Eds.), *The cultural politics of nationalism and nation-building. Ritual and performance in the forging of nations* (pp. 21–38). Routledge.

Smith, P., Phillips, T. L., & King, R. D. (2010). *Incivility: The rude stranger in everyday life*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511781803

Sobral, J. M. (2019). Salt cod and the making of Portuguese national cuisine. In A. Ichijo, V. Johannes, & R. Ranta (Eds.), *The emergence of national food: The dynamics of food and nationalism* (pp. 17–27). Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350074163.0006

Stearns, P. N. (1977). Is there a post-industrial society? In L. Eastbrook (Ed.), *Libraries in the post-industrial society* (pp. 8–18). Oryx Press.

Surak, K. (2012). *Making tea, making Japan: Cultural nationalism in practice*. Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804784795

Taylor, A. (2022). Audience agency in social performance. *Cultural Sociology*, *16*(1), 68–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/17499755211029604

Ter Meulen, R. (2017). *Solidarity and justice in health and social care*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107707023

Thijssen, P. (2012). From mechanical to organic solidarity, and back: With Honneth beyond Durkheim. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *15*(4), 454–470. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431011423589

Turner, V. W. (1969). *Ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Uzelac, G. (2010). National ceremonies: The pursuit of authenticity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *33*(10), 1718–1736. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419871003703243

West, B. (2015). *Re-enchanting nationalisms: Rituals and remembrances in a postmodern age*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2513-1

How to cite this article: Shoham, H. (2024). Performing national practices of solidarity-through-sameness. *Nations and Nationalism*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.13058

14698129, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nana.13058 by <Shibboleth>-member@biu.ac.il, Wiley Online Library on [27/11/2024]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License