Clearly, Renan emphasises the radically subjective analysis of nationhood and gives analytical importance to the contemporary against the romanticism of the nations was the order of the day. Nation, for him, is a spiritual principle, and the most crucial aspect emerges from the consensual principle of how nations act and their performativity against the divisive politics of race, language, geography, and religion. This aspect of Renan's thinking made contemporary theorists resurrect him in the 1990s.

Renan's importance also lies in putting forward the subjective identification of the factors that influence nationalism over the objective ones. Weber (1963:172), in his "The Nation", wrote that "it is based on sentiments of prestige, which often extends deep down to the petty-bourgeois masses of political structures rich in the historical attainment of power positions". The fervour of nationalism does not have an economic origin and runs deep down to the prestige principle, making itself indispensable in the sphere of values. And those who zealously shoulder the idea have access to specific cultural capital. He establishes the concept of the vital importance of intellectuals to the nationalist consciousness by demonstrating how the particularistic interest transformed into the national mission.

The Weberian analysis introduced a vital idea later developed by Clifford Geertz, Carleton Hayes, Edward Shills, and Elie Kedourie.

The Study of Nationalism, 1944–1980

During the second phase, from 1944 to 1980, the study of nationalism acquired a contemporary rational liberal outlook. The rational liberal understanding was shaped prominently by the ideas of Hans Kohn (1961), Elie Kedourie (1966), and Isiah Berlin (1979). Their main argument rests on the premise that nationalism developed in response to the intellectual and political crisis during the Enlightenment. In this sense, nationalism is a unit bound together, and the group is looking forward to the highest organised activity, forming a sovereign state. As attaining sovereignty might take time, it satisfies itself with autonomy or a similar arrange-

ment. However, this sovereignty operates on a dual principle of empathy towards fellow members of the nationality. Still, it is marked by indifference and distrust/hate for members and outlook within the nations, as well as by the crystallisation of will.

There are also marked differences between the rise of nationalism in the Western and the non-Western world. Kohn (1961) details how nationalism in the non-Western world emerged to protest existing state patterns, primarily to redraw political boundaries in compliance with ethnographic demands and to find expression in the cultural field. Western nationalism originated with concepts of individual liberty and rationality in Eastern/Central Europe and Asian contexts. It pitched on the natural fact of the community and sentiments held together by traditional ties. The second significant contribution of rational-liberal thought is the historical soundness of the critique of nationalism. This aspect generated a debate and set a precedent for Benedict Anderson, Anthony Smith, and Ernst Gellner.

The liberal rationalists draw their influences from the Whig historiography of modern forms of liberal democracy as having progressed from constitutional monarchy. The supremacy of reason can be gauged from Kedourie's (1974) path-breaking intervention, where he recognises self-determination as the only acceptable way to deal with nationalism. Kedourie (1974) regards "National self-determination as the final culmination in the determination of the will: and nationalism is a method of teaching the right determination of the will".

However, while defining loyalty to a particular institution, for example, an 'A' institution, a nationalist must explain the 'A' institution in terms of language, race, or religion and merge their will with the community's will. The rationalist liberals went to the extent of classifying nationalism as a 'new tribalism', criticising ideological politics capable of espousing hate on grounds of race, tradition, and religion. The destruction of traditional hierarchies deprives people of social and emotional bonds of security, leading to alienation. A new innovative strategy was required to secure cultural, political, or religious bonds from the older order. Majorly, the chasm was filled by traditional bonds of language, memories, and

self-conception as a community. This sentiment was exploited for ulterior purposes and gradually acquired an independent force of its own.

Berlin (1979) pitched the doctrine of nationalism as a revolt against reason and identified Euro-centrism in studying nationalism. The European perceptions were used to analyse Asia and Africa; the inhabitants were seen either as beneficiaries or victims of Europe but seldom as people with histories or cultures. Their nationalisms were perceived solely against European domination, so the nationalisms emerging from the non-Western contexts were seen as an explosion of anti-imperialism.

The Study of Nationalism Since 1980

Nationalism in this period emerged in reaction to primordials and perennials, rejecting the naturalism and immemorial of nations as a myth. For modernists, nations are modern social constructs that emerged with increased communication and the growth of contemporary social and political processes like capitalism, industrialism, state bureaucratisation, secularism, and urbanisation. So, nations became territorial political communities constituting the chief political bond and other formative allegiances. Modernism can be approached in three categories: socio-cultural and political.

Like Berlin (1979), who set the tone for establishing a relationship between primordial ties and modernity within the rational liberal framework, Gellner (1983) meticulously intervened in the debate by understanding nationalism as a peculiarly contemporary phenomenon with dual structural connections between society and the modern capitalist economy. Gellner (1983) envisioned nationalism as imposing a high culture on society, replacing local low culture. He emphasised cultural affinity as the underlying principle for developing politically organised systems and the Weberian State[3]. Gellner (1983) defended that nations are a product of modernity's efforts to impose higher cultures. In his

---

3   Weberian state is a modern system of administration based on centralization and coercion. It is a symbol of collective action which means whatever the state