UNIT 12 FORMS OF NATIONALISM

Structure

12.1 INTRODUCTION

Nationalism has arguably been the most powerful of historical forces that has shaped the self-definition of individuals. It has also been a complex phenomenon defying uniformity in terms of historical experiences or universality of conceptualisation. However, there are different forms of nationalism, the differences accruing from the specific historical conditions and the special social structure of any given country. In this unit, we shall look at the forms of nationalism as they have emerged in specific historical contexts; identifjl the socio-economic and political forces within which specific forms have emerged; and the broad framework of relationships within which nationalisms can be understood and explained.

12.2 NATIONS AND NATIONALISM

You have already seen in the last unit that Nationalism, generally understood, refers to the self-definition and self-consciousness of 'a people' as a unified entity. It concerns itself with the manner in which people see themselves or identify as ***one*** (e.g., as an ethnic community) and the precise purposes towards which this one-ness is directed (e.g., self-determination). An expression of solidarity or interconnections among people, as well as recognition by others of this solidarity, is integral to nationalism. There are different ways in which this solidarity is conceived and articulated. While scholars of nationalism have differed on their delineation of what binds people together as a social solidarity, e.g., their ethnic roots or their desire for self-determination, by and large, they agree that nationalism involves (a) some level of integration among members of a ***nation*** (b) an idea of the whole (nation) or the collective identity (c) a degree of understanding of the nature of membership in the whole and its relationship with other similar wholes (or nations).

In other words, nationalism involves the self-definition by a people that they constitute a nation, the consciousness that there is something about them as a nation that makes them different from

other nations, and that there is a larger imperative from which the self-definition as nation derives. While social solidarity, collective identity and a sense of individual self and its relationship with the whole are essential conditions for a people to call itself a nation and be recognised as such, the ***manner*** in which social solidarity is brought about and a collective identity articulated, is of primary importance for understanding nationalism. The way social solidarity, collective identity and questions of political legitimacy are interrelated, play a crucial role both in the production of nationalist self-understandingsand the recognition of nationalist claims by others. It is here that Benedict Anderson's description of nations as 'imagined communities' becomes helpful as a conceptual tool for understanding nationalism and its forms. Anderson proposes that all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact and perhaps even these are imagined (Benedict Anderson, ***Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,*** Verso, London, 1983,1991). Communities, including nations, may then be distinguished or compared, not on the basis of their being false or genuine, or being natural, real or imagined, but by ***the style or manner in which they are imagined.*** There may be different ways of distinguishing communities, such as their scale, extent of administrative organisation, degree of internal equality, and so forth. But the distinctive form of ***imagining*** collective identity and social solidarity that is associated with nationalism is our primary concern in this unit.

Nationalisms have differed in their content and form, depending on historically contingent situations and contexts. Anthony D. Smith defines nationalism as 'an ideological movement, for the attainment and maintenance of self-government and independence on behalf of a group, some of whose members conceive it to constitute an actual or potential nation like others'. Smith's definition aims to capture the core content of nationalism, which he sums up in the phrase 'ideal of independence'. The logical corollaries of such attempts to attain and maintain **'national'** independence are:

I) Securing fraternity and equality among co-nationals or citizens by integrating them into a homogenous unit.

2) Unification in a single nation-state of extra-territorial co-national.

3) Stressing cultural individuality through accentuation of 'national' differentiate.

4) The drive for economic autarchy and self-sustaining growth.

5) Attempts to expand the nation-state to maintain international power and status.

6) Renewing the cultural and social fabric of the nation through sweeping institutional changes, to maintain international parity.

While the writings of modern nationalists may reveal a wide variety of concerns, in concrete instances, nationalist movements select their goals from these corollaries, depending on the circumstances. Thus the ideal of communal fraternity, the desire for popular sovereignty, the need for communal regeneration and self-help, the notion of finding one's identity through self-purification, the search for 'roots', the need to belong, a new sense of human dignity realisable only in a national state, the ideals of participation and of building the 'new man', the idea that every nation should have a state for its self-expression, and every individual attach himself to the nation-state for self-realisation, the return to the communal Golden Age, the identification

with nature and 'natural man' etc., appear as recurrent and persisting themes. In these set of ideas and aspirations, Smith identifies three key notions, which form the *sine* qua *non* of modern nationalism. These are the ideas of (collective) autonomy, individuality and pluralism, which together form the modern 'ideal of independence'. The doctrine of autonomy of the individual is associated with Kant. In its collective form, it'owes, however, to Rousseau and Fichte. Because of its communal individuality, the group should be free from external interference and internal divisiveness to frame its own rules and set up its own institutions, in accordance with its needs and 'character'. The group is self-determining, because its individuality gives it laws that are peculiar to it. Only the assembly of all the citizens of the community acting in concert can make laws for the community; no section, no individual, and no outsider can legislate.

12.2.1 Ancient and Modern Concept of Nationalism

Before we look at the specific historical forms of nationalisms, it is important to note that despite variations in the manner in which nationalisms have thought of the 'autonomous collective' or the nation, the modem understanding of nation is remarkably different from its earlier usages. In ancient Rome the Latin word ***natio*** meaning 'a group of outsiders', referred ***to the communities of foreigners*** who lived in Rome as aliens and did not have the privilege of Roman citizenship. Moreover, the term ***nation*** had a derogatory connotation, in so far as being a 'national' placed one below Roman in terms of status. The term nation understood as 'a community of foreigners' was applied to communities of students in medieval universities. These students rarely belonged to the place where the university was situated and with their professors, they were identified with certain intellectual positions. This led to a modified understanding of 'nation' not only and primarily as a 'community of foreigners', but also, rather, as a 'community of opinion'. The concept 'nation' no longer connoted a situation of disadvantage, but its application was still very limited. It was also temporary as a student lost his identity as a nation immediately upon completion of studies, and discontinuing his association with the University.

The dominant meaning of the word 'nation' as a 'community of opinion' was utilised in yet another situation: the medieval ecclesiastical councils. These councils represented the various positions in regard to the organisation of the Republica Christiana and were composed of representatives of both secular and ecclesiastical Christian potentates. Referred to as 'nations', the meaning of the term was modified again and came to mean 'representatives of (cultural and political) authority' or cultural and political elite. 'National identity' became honorific, but it again remained temporary and limited to a small group of exceptional individuals. It was in this new honorific sense, however, that the concept was applied, in the early 16th century, to the people of England, to be transformed yet again, to be understood as a synonym of the 'people', and acquiring its modern political meaning as a 'sovereign people' (Liah Greenfeld, 'Etymology, Definitions, Types' in ***Encyclopedia of Nationalism,*** Vol.I, Academic Press, 2001, Pp.251-265.)

This modem meaning of nation as connoting a sovereign people or a community of equals made nation-hood a desirable status. Moreover, the concept also assumed an unprecedented universality. The concept 'nation' became the overarching identity embracing every member of the 'English people', each one of whom had a national identity. It must be noted that with the new meaning and widened scope of nation, a dramatic change occurred in the meaning of 'people' itself. Before it came to be associated with the nation, the term people, was generally used to refer to the 'masses', the 'rabble' or the lower class, and the nation referred to the elite. The equation

of the two concepts – 'nation' which meant 'elite'-and 'people' which meant 'plebs' - implied a reconceptualisation of both the concepts. The 'people' as 'nation' acquired immense prestige and far from being the depoliticised rabble masses, were redefined as an object of loyalty and the basis ofpolitical solidarity. With the new association, when one talked of the English, French, German, or Russian people, one referred to all the constituent members, the free and equal members constituting the citizenry. This was accompanied by a major transformation in the social order. Defined as a nation, the community, inclusive of all classes, had to be imagined as sovereign, and as a community of equals. It was this aspiration for a transformed social solidarity as the basis for a new form of political camaraderie, which informed nationalism. In its modern meaning as 'a sovereign people', the word nation came to have yet another connotation, when applied to other populations and countries which, also lay claims to political, territorial and/or ethnic qualities to distinguish them as nations. As a result of this association, 'nation' changed its meaning once again, and came to signify 'a *unique'* sovereign people'. The new meaning of the nation, associated as it was with the 'uniqueness' of a sovereign people, came to assume a particularistic nature. In other words, the structural conditions viz., industrialisation, social mobility, bourgeois revolution, movements for democratisation, which were associated with the notion of 'nation as a sovereign people', were relegated by the idea of nation as a sovereign people, who were also distinguished by particular ethnic characteristics. The new meaning of the nation, it has been felt by some scholars of nationalism, has transformed profoundly the nature of nationalism. It may be pointed out that both the connotations of 'nation' exist today, and reflect two radically different forms of nationalism, with different forms of national identity and consciousness, and two radically different types of national collectivities. A discussion of the two forms will be undertaken in section 12.3 Nationalisms: Civic and Ethnic

12.2.2 Characteristics of Nation

While the manner in which social solidarity and cohesion was thought of differed, and as mentioned earlier, depended on historically contingent socio-political forces, the following characteristics of a nation may be seen as constituting a 'pattern of preponderance':

1) Boundaries of territory or both.

2) Indivisibility – the notion that the nation is an integral unit.

3) Sovereignty or at least the aspiration to sovereignty, and thus formal equality with other nations, usually as an autonomous and putative self-sufficient state.

4) An 'ascending' notion of legitimacy – i.e. the idea that government is just only when supported by popular will or at last when it serves the interests of 'the people' or 'the nation'.

5) Popular participation in collective affairs – a population mobilised on the basis of national membership (whether for war or civic activities).

6) Direct membership, in which each individual is understood to be immediately a part of the nation and in that respect categorically equivalent to other members.

7) Culture, including some combination of language, shared beliefs and values, habitual practices.

8) Temporal depth – a notion of the nation as such existing through time, including past and future generations, and having a history.

9) Common descent or racial characteristics.

10) Special historical or even racial characteristics.

The above characteristics, while forming the characteristics of a nation, are also features of the rhetoric of nation or the claims that are commonly made in describing nations. Moreover, sovereignty, integrity, and social solidarity also inform the aspiration and mobilisation to constitute a nation. Notwithstanding the 'pattern of preponderance' identified above, historically nationalisms have differed in the manner in which this solidarity was envisaged, and the way in which it was sought to be achieved. In the following sections we shall examine some of these forms of nationalism.

12.3 NATIONALISMS: HISTORICAL FORMS

12.3.1 European Nationalism: The Cases of England, France and Germany

Nationalism has taken diverse forms historically. In all cases, however, there seemed to have existed a group or groups of people, thrown up by processes of socio-economic change, who felt constrained by their traditional identity and the definition of social order expressed in it. In the case of England, for example, the growth of capitalism, industrialisation and urbanisation, led to the emergence of a middle class, which found itself at odds with the traditional elite. At the same time, the kind of social relations and economic transactions that capitalism envisaged were at variance with the traditional hierarchies and idea of reciprocity that informed the traditional structures of state and society. The structures of state that subsequently evolved saw a greater distancing between the spheres of politics, and the social and economic spheres, the latter characterised by notions of liberty and freedom. The bonds that held such a society together were a mutual recognition of individual liberty and a sense of allegiance to the state. Thus the English idea of the nation was individualistic, and throve on notions of individual sovereignty and allegiance to the state. Ideas of freedom and change were, however, not confined to England.

Enlightenment thought, which animated social thought and practice in Europe, triggered movements for political freedom against the Monarchy in France. The revolutionary struggle for liberty, equality and fraternity, transformed the basis of the socio-political structure. Ideas of equality and participation in collective life became the mainstay of the new social solidarity. The French nation was marked by a horizontal camaraderie and characterised by what has beeh called a 'daily plebiscite' emphasising its participatory, republican nature. The prominent social forces that rose in the struggle against dynastic rule were the lesser landowners or gentry, an emergent national middle and even lower middle class and professional intellectuals as spokesmen. As distinct from the English individualistic and civic nationalism, French Nationalism along with German exemplified another form of nationalism that emerged in Western Europe namely, Collectivist Nationalism. The French and German forms are, however, different in so far as French nationalism emphasised civic ties, whereas German nationalism emphasised an ethnic

basis for solidarity. In the wake of the Napoleonic Wars, the Germans built the foundations of a modern government on the vestiges of medieval rule, cemented by a pride in their past culture. The table below shows the forms of historical nationalisms:

Historical Types of Nationalism

	Individualistic		Collectivistic	
	Civic	Ethnic	civic	Ethnic
Type	I	None	II	III
1st case	England	-	France	Russia
Paradigmatic case	England, USA	-	France	Germany

Source: Liah Greenfeld, 'Etymology, Definitions, Types', Encyclopedia *of* Nationalism, Volume I, Academic Press, 2001, p.261.

In the following paragraphs we shall examine the three model cases of Nationalism in Western Europe, viz., England, France and Germany.

England

The contours of Nationalism started taking shape in England in the early sixteenth century in the context of the decimation of the feudal order in the late fifteenth century. Fifteenth century English society was feudal, and informed by ideas that assumed that inequality was natural, divinely ordained, and therefore, permanent and unchangeable. The justification of inequality and hierarchy was sought in the divine plan or the cosmic order. An individual's status in the social hierarchy was part of the divine order of things, fulfilling its appointed purpose in a larger providential scheme. There were three major feudal orders or 'estates', viz., the nobility, the clergy and the toilers, each with a defined and separate role, with restrictions on inter-order mobility. A massive restructuring of this order was brought about by the War of the Roses that ended in 1485 and saw the accession of the Tudor dynasty to the English throne. The war resulted in the decimation of the traditional, feudal aristocracy and created a vacuum at the top of the social hierarchy, necessitating some degree of upward social mobility. The new aristocracy that replaced the old clergy and nobility were the officials, primarily University-trained laymen who belonged to the minor gentry and the lower strata. The emergence of the new aristocracy transformed the basis of English society. No longer was status dependent on birth. Merit and ability became significant criteria. Moreover, the growth of capitalism, gave a new respectability to economic activity for profit rather than for mere subsistence. A new class of merchants contributed towards redefining social stratification and justifying occupational mobility. The new aristocracy justified this new framework of upward mobility with the help of a new social consciousness that distanced itself from the feudal imagination of divine order and providential schema of things. The new consciousness was nationalism, which reflected the changed order of society wherein every member of the 'nation' or the 'people' enjoyed the dignity of the elite, was equal as well as free; invested with the right of self-government or sovereignty. The people

or the nation collectively was in turn defined as sovereign. It is important to recognise that the sovereignty of the nation in England was derived from the presumed sovereignties of each member in the imagined national collectivity and that the nation was defined as a composite entity which existed only insofar as its members kept the social compact, and had neither interests nor will, separate from the interests and wills of these members. English nationalism, according to Liah Greenfeld, therefore, was essentially individualistic, and also civic in the sense that national identity was identical with citizenship or voluntary membership in the community.

France

Much before nationalism emerged in France, there existed a distinct French identity around the specificity of French Christianity as distinguished from and superior to the Roman, claimed by the French kings. From the twelfth century onwards, the king was seen as the 'true' vicar/priest of God on earth, and there was no distinction between religious and political spheres of activity. In the early modem period, however, a secularisation of French identity occurred, primarily due to the religious wars in the sixteenth century, which contributed to the French identity assuming a political form. The idea of the state as the area, over which the king had authority, transformed French identity from being a good Christian to membership in the community of the king's subjects. The community of subjects was structured by a chain of relationships, constituted by a hierarchy of officials, which bound the king's sphere of authority. Over time, the hierarchy of officials came to wield authority and evince loyalty in their own sphere of authority. This emergence of a parallel system of loyalty served to give an identity to the state as a network of structures distinct from the king and replaced the latter as the object of loyalty in the minds of the subjects. It must also be pointed out that the primary movers and beneficiaries of this distancing between the king and the state and the consequent change in the focus of the subject's loyalty were members of the French aristocracy. Unlike England, where the nobility enjoyed a degree of autonomy from the king within the feudal set up, the absolutist nature of the monarchy in France, meant that the aristocracy was dependent on royal power for their status and wealth. The aristocracy remained opposed to royal absolutism and struggled against it continually. No longer wishing to see the king and state as one, it insisted on interpreting the state as the community of France – the French people and territory – as a nation. This interpretation of the French people as nation, was influenced by the English notion of nation, and imported into France by French intellectuals whose association with the aristocracy contributed to the redefinition of the identity of the nobility in France.

When the concept 'nation' was first imported into France, it was seen as synonymous with the nobility and it continued to be identified as such uptil the French Revolution (1789). Even after 1789, the 'nation' referred to people, represented by the elite who through their assumption of the role of representation affirmed their political power. Unlike England, French nationalism was collectivistic, authoritarian and based on an inequality between the masses and the representatives who assumed the role of representing them. At the same time, unlike English nationalism, French nationalism was civic, i.e., membership in the French nation was not dependent on ties of race, ethnicity etc. It defined itself in terms of an openness of membership based ultimately on participation as citizens. It is here that some scholars of nationalism see a contradiction between individual freedom which a civic criterion of membership implies and the authoritarianism, which its collectivistic nature indicates.

Germany

Unlike English or French nationalism, German nationalism owed its creation to the dissatisfaction of middle class intellectuals, rather than the aristocracy. It must be pointed out that the middle class intellectuals or the 'educated bourgeoisie' enjoyed a higher status despite the fact that most of them had belonged to the lower classes, before they acquired a University education. The value of education in upward mobility began to wane in the 18th century for various reasons. The primary reason perhaps was the aspirations and promises that the Enlightenment movement brought in its wake among intellectuals, which led to disillusionment and dissatisfaction as the increase in the numbers of intellectuals was accompanied by unemployment and poverty among them. The fall in status triggered a reaction against Enlightenment, by the 'educated bourgeoisie'. This intellectual response termed as Romanticism, consisted of diverse strands, characterised generally by expressions of discontent with the changes that followed the two revolutions, French and Industrial, and sought to replace the notion of the rational self with the creative self. Rejecting the notion of a well-ordered rational society embodying progress, Romantic critiques opened up the possibility of diverse understandings and expressions of relationship of the self with nature. The Romantics did not formulate a philosophy for a German political system for a long time until the Napoleonic invasion evinced the articulation of a German fraternity. Thus unlike the French experience where the rulers were targeted, the Romantics presented the cause of the rulers as the 'German cause'. Since the representatives of German Enlightenment were discredited owing to the antagonism against the French, the German national consciousness was determined by Romantic philosophy. The latter advocated overcoming the self and recognised communities as the only true selves or individuals. The only true communities were those that were held together by ties of languages, which in turn were determined by ties of blood or 'race'. Based on these principles, the idea of the nation was conceived as a natural community, created by race and language. The German nation was thus envisaged, quite like the French nation, as a collective entity. Unlike the French case, however, it was primarily an ethnic community, its membership determined by natural ties, which were innate and could not be acquired. (For details on English, French and German Nationalisms see Liah Greenfeld, 'Western Europe', ***Encyclopaedia of Nationalism,*** Volume *I,* Academic Press, London, pp.883-898)

12.3.2 Non-European Nationalisms

So far we havk seen that nationalism requires social solidarity, collective identity and a sense of the autonomous self and its relationship with the sovereign collective. All these aspects were evident in the three European experiences in Nationalism we have discussed above. Scholars of Nationalism like Benedict Anderson have, however, emphasised the notion of nation as a discursive formation, referring to ***a way of thinking*** about social solidarity and collective identity.

In what has come to be seen as one of the most popular conception of the nation to have emerged in the past years, Benedict Anderson characterises the nation as 'an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign'. By 'imagined' Anderson means the fact that 'the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion'. This imagining is limited because the process is spatially limited to the boundaries of the nation, rather than being co-terminus with humankind. It is sovereign because

its ***telos*** is the nation-state. Finally, says Anderson, 'it is imagined as a ***community*** because regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal relationship'.

An important argument by Anderson, with which we are primarily concerned in this section, is the assertion that once emergent, ***nationalism assumed a modular form,*** from where it was available for future mobilisations. Anderson identifies three ***models*** that were available for emulation, viz., (i) ***Creole nationalism of the Americas*** where imagined communities were created by 'pilgrim Creole functionaries and provincial Creole printmen', whose economic interests were pitted against the metropole (ii) ***Linguistic nationalism of Europe*** with a strong populist bent, and based on a national-state (iii) **'Russifying'** nationalism, or the imposition of cultural homogeneity from the top. The broader point in Anderson's schema is that the three 'modular' forms were available to the colonial intelligentsia to emulate. While these pre-existing forms (print-languages, the idea of the nation) helped shape and define anti-colonial consciousness, it was the bilingual intelligentsia produced by colonial education that interpreted the modular experiences for the masses, and also became instrumental in bringing about the demise of colonial rule.

Colonial rule, it may be noted was a significant historical experience for almost all of the Americas (in the 17th and 18th centuries) and of Asia and Africa in the 18th, 19th and the 20th centuries. Nationalism in colonial societies tended to be anti-colonial and emerged, according to Anderson, from the frustrations and solidarities of an earlier group of colonial elites. As in the European experiences discussed above, anti-colonial nationalisms too, emerged within the specific context of the balance of social forces and frameworks of political rule. Examining the emergence of nationalism in Latin America, Anderson points out that the Hispanic (colonial) rule in Latin America was carried out through an administrative framework that produced a peculiar career pattern. Spanish America was divided into a variety of administrative units. The top officials in the administrative framework came from Spain and returned to higher positions in Spain after serving in the colony. While these officials on the highest rungs of the colonial bureaucracy were 'outsiders' and experienced an upward or vertical mobility in their careers, a large body of Creole officers who served under them, was subjected to a different career trajectory. The Creole officers were Spaniards by descent, language and to an extent, culture. They were, however, locally born, and it was this difference in birth that restricted the career opportunities available to them. Their career graphs were laterally circumscribed, in the sense that while they could move within the colony of their birth, they could not, unlike the 'true' Spaniards, move from one Spanish colony to the other (say Mexico, Chile etc.), or 'return' to Spain. This distinction between the career patterns of the Spanish and Creole officers generated a sense of **'frustration'** among the Creole elite. At the same time it also encouraged a sense of 'solidarity' among them and 'identification' with the 'homeland' that is, the (colonised) place of their birth. The fact that the Creole officers moved from one place to another in the colony, gave them knowledge about the land. As educated elite, they were able to transmit their sense of identification and solidarity through the print media, providing a cultural basis for national identity and unification. Anderson feels that all these factors lay behind some of the earliest nationalist movements in the colonies. The struggles for national liberation were led more often than not by the privileged elite, i.e., people who spoke the same language and shared the same religion as of those whose rule they challenged. In Anderson's view, it was not in the imperial metropole but in the colonies that people first came to conceptualise themselves as bearers of distinctive nationalities. Once its development began, however, the notion of nation entered a cosmopolitan

discourse, ultimately informing European thought and radical politics of the 18th and 19th centuries, and anti-colonial nationalisms throughout the world. (For details see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 1983, 1991 and Craig Calhoun, *Nationalism,* Open University Press, Buckingham, 1997, Chapter 6: Imperialism, Colonialism and the World-System of Nation-States)

12.3.3 Nationalism as. Difference

Andersons's demonstration of the origin and spread of nationalism was innovative for showing that nations were not entirely determined by structural coriditions or sociological factors like race, religion or language. They were also not, as Gellner would have us believe mere fabrications. Nations were 'imagined' into existence and this imagination was assisted by several factors, the predominant one being that of 'print-capitalism'. Several scholars have, however, found Anderson's metaphor of 'modularity' or 'modular forms' of nationalism, misleading and problematic. Craig Calhoun, for example, rejects Anderson's argument that there are 'modular forms' that could be transplanted into new cultural settings without 'basic' or fundamental alterations. Similarly, Partha Chatterjee rejects the argument that the historical experience of nationalism in Western Europe, in the Americas, and in Russia had supplied to all subsequent nationalisms a set of modular forms, from which nationalist elites in Asia and Africa had chosen the ones they liked. In fact, Chatterjee uses Anderson's conception of nation as an imagined community to reject the argument of modular forms of nationalisms. If nationalisms in the rest of the world have to chose 'their' imagined communities from certain modular forms already available to them, 'what' asks Chatterjee, 'do they have to imagine'? Claiming that Anderson's formulation prescribes the colonisation of anti-colonial resistance and imaginations of nationalism, Chatterjee posits that anti-colonial nationalisms were not based on an identity with the 'modular forms of the national society propagated by the modern West'. The most powerful as well as creative forms of nationalist imagination in Asia and Africa were in fact based on a *difference* with the modular forms. In his earlier work ***Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse,*** Chatterjee had read the appearance of nationalisms in the late colonial world, as part and parcel of imperial domination and colonial oppression, and a 'derivative discourse', therefore. It blocked the way for authentic self-generated, autonomous development among communities, which remained dominated by self-seeking, ultimately collaborationist 'nationalist' politicians, intellectuals, bureaucrats and capitalists.

12.4 NATIONALISMS: CIVIC AND ETHNIC

The above discussion makes it clear that despite having some core characteristics, there is in fact no uniform 'nationalism', nor are there a set of determinate conditions or structures which would produce one kind of nationalism as distinct from the other. Historically, we have seen, nationalisms have emerged in different forms and have unfolded in different ways. There is, however, a tendency among social scientists to categorise nationalisms into two broad and dichotomous categories. The two categories are conceptualised in different sources in oppositional terms, as 'political vs. cultural', 'Western vs. Eastern' and more recently 'civic vs. ethnic' nationalisms, reflecting a general divide among scholars on the question of origin and nature of nationalism. This categorisation is often accompanied with attributions of 'good' nationalism (patriotism) and 'bad' nationalism (chauvinism) to civic and ethnic nationalisms, respectively. Such a categorisation assumes that the two forms of nationalism are inherently distinct, separate,

and discrete, ignoring thereby the commonalities that may exist, and the broader framework of socio-economic structures of which the two are a part.

The three pairs of dichotomous categories, viz., 'political vs. cultural', 'Western vs. Eastern', and 'civic vs. ethnic', focus attention on the same dividing line, but with slightly different emphasis. While agreeing that all nationalisms are cultural andpolitical, the dichotomy political vs. cultural stresses the relative salience and historical priority of principles of political organisation vs. preoccupation with language, literature, history, and folklore in various nationalisms. In the Westem-Eastem dichotomy, the categories 'East' and 'West' are generally cultural, rather than geographical markers. A 'western' nation is implicitly defined as 'civic', and the 'eastern' nation as 'ethnic'. The categories 'civic' and 'ethnic' closely contribute to the 'political' and 'cultural' types, with a greater emphasis, in the case of 'civic' on the concept and institution of citizenship, and an implicit understanding in the of 'ethnic', that perhaps reflects a deeper emphasis on 'natural' or 'biological' forces such as race, 'blood and soil', which form the ultimate reality underneath nationhood and national identity.

The dividing line reflects the view held popularly and also by some social scientists (notably Hans Kohn) that nations are the most complete manifestation of the oldest identity of mankind. This view holds that nations have a long and continuous history reaching well into the pre-modem period. Almost all nationalists trace the origins of their national identity far back into the pre-modem period. Other scholars of nationalism like Ernest Gellner and Anthony Smith while not agreeing that nations are manifestations of natural ties do not deny that 'earlier' ethnic ties and memories of 'pre-modern ethnic identities and communities' do influence nationalisms. Jurgen Habermas, writing on the issue of the future of the nation-state, in the context of the processes leading to a unified Germany, the European Union, the global economy, the nationality conflicts in Eastern Europe etc., points out that the meaning of the 'nation' has changed from designating a pre-political unity of a community with a shared historical destiny, to something that was supposed to play a constitutive role in defining the political identity of the citizen within a democratic polity. Thus the manner in which national identity determined citizenship has in fact been reversed. The nation, in the context of these developments would rather be conceived as a nation of citizens, which derives its identity not from some common ethnic and cultural properties, but rather from the practice of citizens, who actively exercised their rights in equal interest of all. This formulation is reminiscent of Ernest Renan's dictum, 'the existence of a nation... is a daily plebiscite' using which, Renan was able to counter after 1871, the German Empire's claim to the Alsace by referring to the inhabitants French nationality. Renan could conceive of the 'nation' as a nation of citizens which derived its identity not from some common ethnic and cultural properties, but rather from civic practices of citizens who actively exercised their civil rights.

12.5 SUMMARY

The above discussion has shown that there is no 'general', 'uniform' or 'modular' nationalism that can be applied universally. Historically, different types of nationalism have occurred with different conceptions of national collectivities and constructions of nationhood. The common denominator of all these different movements, ideas, policies and projects is the nationalist discourse. In other words, what unites nationalism is the discourse and rhetoric of nationhood, which has at its core ideas of self-consciousness and self-determination. Self-consciousness and self-determination are woven around the notion of 'people' as a unified entity. The idea of the

nation has emerged historically as a category denoting an identity or one-ness and this sense of one-ness, identity and unity, to a large extent, was contingent on notions of equality which informed the modem meaning of the nation. The aspiration for nationhood with its emphasis on sovereignty and equality has been the basis of all nationalisms. The manner in which the social-solidarity or the community of equals was thought of, or came into being has been different. In all cases, however, nationalism sought to bring forth the idea of the nation as a promise of liberation from existing structures of domination and inequality. Thus English nationalism emerged in response to the changes which industrialisation and urbanisation brought in, unleashing a kind of social relations and economic transactions which were fettered by and were at odds with the traditional structures of hierarchy. While the English nation was envisaged as solidarity held together by mutual respect for individual liberty and a sense of allegiance for the state, the French revolution threw up the idea of the nation which throve on equality and participation in collective life. If the basis for solidarity in the French case was the idea of civil participation, the German case was distinguished by its emphasis on a cultural identity determined by language and blood ties. The idea of cultural specificity as the basis of a distinctive national identity was also to be seen in anti-colonial nationalisms, which emphasised their uniqueness as the basis of sovereignty. Scholars of nationalism often fall into the trap of categorising nationalisms as 'civic and ethnic', or 'western and eastern', or 'political and cultural', where civic nationalisms are associated with western forms and associated with positive attributes. While concepts of 'civic' and 'ethnic' are useful, they do not capture all the significant differences (differences that are translated into differences in political and social institutions and behavioural patterns) between historical nationalisms. Moreover, when taken as dichotomous, oppositional and exclusive, they fail as both descriptive and explanatory categories.

12.6 EXERCISES

1) At the core of nationalism are ideas of social solidarity and popular sovereignty. Show how these core ideas manifest themselves in different forms in English and French nationalisms.

2) Explain how the idea of the 'people' gets constituted in different ways in French and German nationalisms.

3) What is the relevance of Anderson's notion of nationalism as modular forms? How far do you think the notion of modular forms can be sustained by actual experiences of nationalisms?

4) What according to you are the virtues and limits of the categorisation of nationalisms as civic and ethnic?