

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 State³. 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

work, he saw modernity translating the structure and culture of the state and the nation.

Since society was vertically bound before industrialisation, watertight segregation between communities and classes led to the non-commonality of language, memories, religion, or ancestry. However, in the industrial society, the barriers between communities faded due to mass education, which had a standard character allowing for socio-economic mobility. Additionally, if the scale of industrialisation is uneven, the communities that are at a disadvantage will not be able to assimilate. This gap might increase if the state's ruler is not from the same ethnic majority. In this case, nationalism will erupt because members of the 'nation' would not like to be governed by any other ethnic element. Subsequently, standardised education becomes the connector between culture and the political will of belonging to a nation. This way, the identification between culture and politics is not given but the result of a social process. The industrial society is one in constant growth and accompanied by absolute mobility. Inherited roles disappear as constant movement requires equality for social functioning. As members must be able to communicate with each other, an urgency for a common language emerges. The category of 'cultural' assumes a modern and cultural homogenisation acquires a cultural imperialistic form.

Another essential element of Gellner's work is the strain generated by nationalism around entropy-resistant groups. The groups that resist entropy become problematic for industrial societies. The reasons for the resistance could be genetic or cultural. Gradually, because of being exposed to discrimination, these groups will be openly resistant to entropy generated within industrial societies, leading to nationalism in industrial societies. He thus claims that nations are produced by nationalism created through a series of social processes. For him, nationalism is a theory of political legitimacy, which requires ethnic boundaries to be congruent with political boundaries.

performs is always for the community and not particular interests. Territoriality, violence and legitimacy are the essential elements of the weberian state.

Another essential theorisation that emerged in this period is Benedict Anderson's (1983) phenomenal work on nationalism. His primary concern has been understanding nationalism as an occurrence in its own right and not as a shadow of any other variable. Though Anderson's work is considered prophetic in nationalism studies, one can segregate it between his theoretical arguments and the historical account of the rise of nationalism in Europe and elsewhere.

The starting point of Smith's (1983:6) theoretical claim is that a "nation is an imagined community because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of the fellow members, meet them or even hear of them". He contends nations, like religions, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind that emerged towards the end of the 18th century. Discussing the formation and rise of nationalism within Europe against a specific background with the collapse of earlier religious and cultural certainties, Smith (1983:4) visualises nationalism as a "modular form capable of being transplanted with varying degrees of self-consciousness to a great variety of social terrains, to merge and to be merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological factors".

Anderson's second theoretical assertion is that the nation is not only imagined but also a limited and sovereign political community. It is limited because the boundaries are demarcated, and it is sovereign because, within the demarcated boundaries, most nations imagine themselves as free. He connects sovereignty to the religious plurality, where the legitimacy of divinely ordained realms is challenged vehemently. Anderson's final theoretical assertion is that a nation, through deep comradeship, becomes imaginable as a community.

Anderson's phenomenal work also explains the historicity behind the rise of nationalism. Talking about the European experience, Anderson discusses the role of religious communities, particularly Christianity, to understand the rise of nationalism. The sacral cultures were imagined mainly through sacred language and written script, which catered to a tiny literate population hierarchically on the apex. However, the importance of religiously imagined communities could not survive beyond the Middle Ages. One of the predominant reasons for this development was the discovery of the non-European world at the beginning of the 13th

century. The second reason was the gradual demotion of the sacred languages. The status of Latin waned, and the traditional communities were fragmented. The form of the dynastic realm also changed from being the only conceivable political unit to one in which the monarchy organised all the essential functions.

The third important idea Anderson floats is that nationalism has to be situated along with the concept of time. He explains that another reality was dawning, equally instrumental in replacing religious communities and dynastic realms. Anderson links the idea of time with the role of print capitalism. This transformation marks a critical juncture in the birth of an imagined community. Book publishing became the earliest form of capitalist enterprise, and in capitalism's restless search for markets, nationalism became a saleable commodity.

By the mid-seventeenth century, the printing press owners faced a shortage of money. As a rescue measure, printing press owners decided to print literature in the vernacular languages. The advent of vernacularisation coincided with reformation. Anderson (1983:40) notes

The coalition between Protestantism and print capitalism, exploiting cheap popular editions, quickly created large reading publics, not least among merchants who typically knew little or no Latin and simultaneously mobilised for politico-religious purposes. Third was the slow, geographically uneven spread of particular vernaculars as instruments of administrative centralisation by certain well-positioned would-be absolutist monarchs.

With time, print languages influenced the national consciousness by creating unified fields of exchange and communication. He contends nationalism arose in the Americas before arising in Europe. The population shared a common origin and language, which formed Creole states. Creole states shared lingual commonality with the metropole, which led to the transmission of the new doctrines generated in Western Europe. Creoles used their sense of exclusion, along with the opportunities created by print capitalism, as an opportunity to develop Creole identity and, subsequently, Creole nationalism. The pilgrim functionaries and

printmen played an equally decisive role in the spirit of Creole nationalism. However, despite the striking similarity with the metropole, nationalism in Creoles could not convert itself into a Pan-American phenomenon. Anderson makes an interesting observation that by the middle of the 20th century, the educational journey gained a predominant stature gifted by the mobility generated by railways.

The modernist theorisations denote a shift in the analysis framework from culture to capitalism. They contributed to the debate by swapping historical and essentialist notions of culture and power with the forces of modernity. However, structurally heterogeneous imperatives within all modern states give rise to one or the other form of nationalism. This assessment was done by the historicist-lexicographical rebuilding of the nation, imparting importance to the subjective act of imagining vis-a-vis the material conditions.

The educational journey and the role of intellectuals in creating a civil society has an amorphous relation with the nation. Shill (1995) opines that civil society is an essential indicator for sustaining the nation. Civil society is one of the institutional manifestations of the nation and is formed by a sense of mutual awareness. In this way, participating in the collective and not recognising those outside the ambit becomes a political act resulting in the classificatory process of the 'Self' and the 'Other'. Hastings (1997) corroborates the classificatory consciousness and places nationalism as a substantial exposition of a particularistic identity. The nation-state arose from a conviction that one's own ethnic or national tradition is valuable and has to be defended.

On the other hand, economic modernism explained nationalist resurgence through the dynamics of particular stages of capitalism. The economic modernists co-related the roots of nationalism with the world economy and wanted to find an explanatory framework for deriving nationalism. Nairn (1981) notes that the roots of nationalism are to be sought beyond the internal dynamics of societies and, therefore, determined by certain features of the world political economy. The capitalist development process created a vast gap between the core and the periphery. Given the situation, mass mobilisation was only possible regarding national identity outside the forces of domination. This was

followed by nationalism in peripheral countries as a response to uneven development.

In the same period, ethno-symbolism driven by the tireless efforts of such scholars as Anthony Smith (1999), John Armstrong (1982), and John Hutchinson (1987) emerged. Ethno-symbolists asserted that nationalism has stronger roots in pre-modern ethnicity, and their objective is to retain the symbolic legacy of pre-modern ethnic identities. Armstrong (1982) writes that ethnic precursors are essential for properly assessing the emergence of the present nations. The formation of nations should be explored within the more significant phenomenon of ethnicity. In particular, ethno-symbolists are critical of the modernist failure to grasp the recurring nature of ethno-symbolic ties. Smith (1999) expresses that understanding modern nations involves understanding the myths, memories, traditions, and symbols associated with them. He acknowledges that nations cannot be perceived as natural but located in ancient histories and filtered through ethnic consciousness. Ethno-modernists make a difference between nationalism as an ideology and nationalism as a movement. Though nationalism appeared around the later eighteenth century, the ethnic origins of nations are older. Smith writes that artefacts carry forward myths, symbols, memories, and values. As these artefacts and activities change very slowly, the formation of an ethnic group also sustains itself for a long time. Smith (1986) explains that the origins of modern nationalism lie in the successful bureaucratisation of aristocratic ethnic communities with their myths and symbols. Collective memory plays a vital role in forming ethnic and then national identity. Smith (1986:109) notes that in the modern arena, ethnic communities are compelled to become political, and “to survive, *ethnie* must take on some of the attributes of nationhood, and adopt a civic model”. On the other hand, nations rooted in ethnicity are long-term processes. According to Smith, modern nations and nationalism have intensified the meaning and scope of older ethnic concepts and structures.