
UNIT 9

NATIONALISM*

Structure

9.0 Objectives

9.1 Introduction

9.2 Nationalism: Some Underlining Conceptions

9.3 Theories of Nationalism

9.4 Types of Nationalism

9.5 Critique of Nationalism

9.6 Let Us Sum Up

9.7 Key Words

9.8 Further Readings and References

9.9 Answers to Know Your Progress

9.0 OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of this unit are,

- to acquaint learners with the complexities surrounding the idea of Nationalism.
- to discuss the inter-relation of the idea of Nationalism with associated concepts like Nation, Nationality, State, and Patriotism.
- to discuss some theorizations concerning the origins of Nationalism, as well as its types.
- to present a critical assessment of the concept of Nationalism.

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The term 'Nationalism' has a long and varied history, for it was used to signify different (though seemingly associated) ideas at different points in time by theorists as well as by the

* Dr. Ashutosh Vyas, Consultant (Philosophy), School of Interdisciplinary and Trans-disciplinary Studies, Indira Gandhi National Open University, Delhi.

masses. Nationalism attained different connotations in the hands of different scholars, who tried to define this idea through their own vantage points. These descriptions tend to vary alongside variations in conceiving the relation between individuals and other humans, kinship patterns, nature of self and other, socio-political identity, geo-political earmarking, etc.

Each individual harbours unique and even uncommon interests, attitudes, perspectives, experiences, etc. and these unique aspects play a critical role in determining our individual identities. Yet despite the differences, there is another deeper aspect of our identities, which rather than focussing on our diversity helps in highlighting the commonality and sameness. The feeling or the belief that “I and my other fellow-beings have some *shared* and *common* culture, tradition, history, ancestry, etc.” can be described as the feeling of “Fellow-Hood”. This feeling of commonness and shareability helps us identify our selves through and with others, whom we believe to be like us in significant ways.

Broadly speaking, Nationalism may be described as “a feeling of ‘fellow-hood’ which is founded in the consciousness of some commonly shared culture, belief, tradition, history, etc. which may be felt as granting self-determination”. This description provides us with a starting template for analysing and understanding the variations and complexities surrounding the idea and the phenomenon of Nationalism.

9.2 NATIONALISM: SOME UNDERLINING CONCEPTIONS

The words Nation, Nationality, State, and Patriotism appear in close association with Nationalism in our common everyday parlance. A discussion of what these terms have been taken to connote, seems crucial in understanding the idea of Nationalism as such.

If we look around us, we would find that the origin of each nation tends to tell a uniquely different story. While some Nations comprise of a diversity of citizens, languages, geographical terrains, religions, social patterns, kinship systems, etc.; there are still other Nations which are based in an underlying uniformity. In addition, some of the Nations that have their basis in uniformity, tend to have historical traces reflecting diversity with regard to the elements and characteristics which appear uniform now.

Some scholars (*See*, Sunalini Kumar, 259-60) believe that in terms of historicity, Nation is a relatively recent phenomenon as its emergence may be traced to the decline of the Roman empire and the unfolding of the French Revolution. As the king had to share his power with the religious centres (Church) and the economic centres (Landlord), he hardly ever enjoyed or

exercised absolute integrated authority over the populace. However, with the coming in of industrialization, new means of production led to the growth of businesses, simultaneously giving rise to a class of people who had direct control over the monetary system; and along with this, religious revolutions started challenging the authority of the Church too. The destabilization of the religious and economic centres of power proved to be a ripe opportunity for the King to exercise his power in an integrated and absolute manner. Kings began earmarking geographical boundaries and identifying as population those who resided within the demarcated boundary. This geo-political demarcation became the birth-ground for the idea of Nation. In addition to this, the Modern State is believed to have emerged due to the rise of a new economic class (comprising of business and industrialist capitalists), which challenged the absolute authority enjoyed by the king by organizing the populace on the grounds of the uniformity endowed to them. Nation, which came to be identified in terms of a population having cultural, linguistic and racial uniformity, became co-extensive with the State.

In modern discourse, a sovereign state is considered to be the main representative of political autonomy and political self-determination. Hans Kohn believes that Nationalism necessarily demands the presence of a Nation-State (*See*, Sunalini Kumar, 260). Max Weber too argues that Nationalism can be seen as a movement propelled by the desire either to establish a unique Nation-State or to further strengthen its power. He opines that Nation is a community of feelings that express itself properly in its own State (*See*, Sunalini Kumar, 260). This tendency of necessarily correlating Nation with the State is classified as the 'Modern Nation State' or simply 'Nation-State' (Sunalini Kumar, 260). While for some thinkers Nation (whether Ethnic or Civic) and State come to be associated in an inseparable relation, there are still others like Gandhi for whom State is not a necessary requirement for a Nation at all, rather he seems to regard it as a hinderance to national unity and individual cooperation.

Some scholars (*See*, Sunalini Kumar, 264-65) had emphasized that in colonized countries the emergence of Nations is not original. This is because, due to colonization, the people of these countries came into contact with the European culture, values, concepts, and vocabularies; and they subsequently ended up using those concepts in their own freedom movements too. However, thinkers like Tilak, Gandhi, Savarkar etc. argued that in the Indian context especially, such a claim cannot be maintained for according to them, India was already a nation before its colonization by the British. Interestingly, even though these thinkers presented this common view, yet their principles, reasons, and philosophical grounds for

making these suggestions differed. For instance, while Gandhi was in search of a spiritual/cultural unity, Savarkar found this unity in one's race/religion, which according to him was further based upon his classification of 'the land' understood not only as one's fatherland (*pitribhu*), but also as a holyland (*puṇyabhū*). (Savarkar, *Hindutva*, 68-69).

Etymologically, the term 'nation' is believed to have originated from the Latin '*natio*' and '*nasci*' which means 'to be born from' (See, Grosby, 44). Owing to this, one of the chief constitutive elements of a Nation is regarded as being 'common and shared nativity' which appears in the form of "kinship" or "ethnicity." Some scholars describe a nation as 'motherland/ fatherland' or as 'homeland'. Motherland and fatherland suggest that Nation is to be identified as the birthplace of one's parent, whereas "homeland" implies that Nation is the place one "inhabits" (Grosby, 48).

Ernst Renan pointed out that often "race is confused with nation and a sovereignty analogous to that of really existing people is attributed to ethnographic or, rather linguistic groups" (Renan, 37). For Renan, commonly shared kinship, race, language, geographical boundary (space), etc. do not form a nation, but rather it is the *will to live together* (See, Renan, 52-54) which lies at its core. Renan and J.S. Mill, both, hold that communities which subsequently came to be recognized as Nations were in fact organized through forming associations and recollections of the critical incidents in the past, and reliving and participating in them with collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, etc. For Mill, sympathies, which are commonly held by some, provide the ground for co-operation among those having the will to form a government/political framework, under which this co-operation manifests and evolves. (See, Mill, 3; Renan, 52). Both the Civic and the Ethnic Theories of Nation and Nationalism (to be discussed in section 10.4) consider this participation with the past as a crucial element for the identity of Nation.

Steven Grosby defines nation as "...a territorial relation of collective self-consciousness of actual and imagined duration" (Grosby, 11-12). "Collective self-consciousness" can also be viewed as a relation grounded in commonality and shareability. However, this common sharedness, does not merely mean belonging to the same race, or having identical sensibilities or biological instincts; rather, it "refers to a social relation of each of a number of individuals as a consequence of those individuals participating in the same evolving tradition" (Grosby, 11-12). Further, for Grosby, the current territorial relations which find their presence in an actual and/or imagined duration, imply two things, one, an understanding of the present

through the past (whether historically accurate or not, which gets conveyed through myths, stories, folklore, etc.) (Grosby, 8-9); and second, a belief in the existence of “a territorially formed ‘people’ that is believed to have existed over time” (Grosby, 11).

J.H. Hoyes believes that “...a nationality is any group of persons who speak a common language, who cherish common historical traditions, and who constitute, or think they constitute, a distinct cultural society in which, among other factors, religion and politics may have played important though not necessarily continuous roles” (Hoyes, 21). For Hoyes a group of people having common and shared social-cultural relations can be denoted as a Nation.

Our interactions with our environment (natural and social) can be seen as the basis for a set of habits, attitudes, customs, etc. which are common within a group of people, thus denoting a kind of nationality. This way of understanding ‘nationality’ presents it as an organic and natural phenomenon which does not presuppose (a necessary) division between “us” and “they”; between “self” and “other”. The reference point for demarcating our nationality is our nationality (understood through organic interactions) itself, and not the nationality of others. Furthermore, such an understanding of Nationality identifies the feelings of love, attachment, respect, pride, etc. for one’s nation as also being natural and not imposed. These feelings are what constitute Patriotism. Hoyes writes “everybody who is born and reared where his ancestors have lived from time immemorial is almost certain to feel a sentimental attachment to that locality” (Hoyes, 24). This very attachment for our native surroundings is what extends onto one’s political country. This extension may also be accompanied by the desire of self-determination or political autonomy. Nationality admixed with this kind of Patriotism is what Nationalism* amounts to.

Generally speaking, then, Nationalism may be taken to imply the belief that if a group of people bind on the basis of some common characteristics (such as, race, history, tradition, language, culture), then they *should* unite themselves in terms of a sovereign political framework. Existence of a nation/nationality or belief in the existence of a nation/nationality along with this associated feeling of political autonomy can be viewed as the constituent

* Some scholars draw a distinction between patriotism and nationalism in terms of the relation of one’s own nation/country with the other nation/country. “When one divides the world into two irreconcilable and warring camps- one’s own nation in opposition to all other nations- where the latter are viewed as one’s implacable enemies, then in contrast to patriotism, there is the ideology of nationalism. Nationalism repudiates civility and the differences that it tolerates by attempting to eliminate all differing views and interests for the sake of one vision of what the nation has been and should be” (Grosby, 17).

elements of nationalism. Yet the succeeding sections would show how perspectives about nationalism vary based on how someone defines a Nation, Nationality and its relation with the individuals living therein.

Check Your Progress I

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answer with that provided at the end of the unit.

1. Write a note on the historical background of the emergence of a nation in European context.

.....
.....
.....

2. Highlight the significance of common shared consciousness in making of a nation.

.....
.....
.....

9.3 THEORIES OF NATIONALISM

The previous section helped us develop an understanding about the significance of critical concepts such as nation, nationality, state, and patriotism. The current section will engage the learner with some theoretical proposals which explicate the concept of nationalism, explaining its origin, its nature, and its rise in contemporary times. Though there are several theoretical frameworks for understanding Nationalism, but the current discussion would be limited to three popular theories, viz. Primordialism, Ethno-symbolism, and Modernism.

9.3.1 Primordialism (or Perennialism)

Primordialists believe that since Nation is an already existing and continuous entity, therefore the feeling of nationalism too must be seen on similar terms. Individuals find themselves already united and tied together as and through a race, a language, a culture, certain rituals, a

religion, etc. This underlying sameness is experienced as something that is and can be shared with an-other harbouring this sameness. It is this commonality and feeling of shareability that binds individuals as a nation. These feelings are not entirely imposed from outside, but rather they are much deeply ingrained, so much so that they become part and parcel of our personalities and self-identities. The feelings of shareability, commonness and sameness manifest in a sense of togetherness, fellow-hood, and Nationalism.

Primordialism comes in broadly two versions. The first version states that while it may be possible that Nationalism does not exist, but still, what is undeniable is that Nations exist. In extension this version implies that while it is possible that individuals sharing sameness are not united by a sense of togetherness, yet it suggests that they should be so united, for this sameness finds its full expression via the authority granted by 'self-determination'. The Second version of Primordialism states that both Nation and Nationalism exist already. The feeling of being a member (togetherness) of the Nation, may sometimes fade and blur, but it never completely diminishes or vanishes. Whenever favourable conditions and contexts become apparent, the feeling of togetherness and Nationalism becomes conscious. This latter version of Primordialism, presupposes and grants natural origins of nation and nationalism, such that Nation and nationalism are not regarded as being mere concepts that have been constructed or fabricated at some point in history; rather sameness in terms of race, ethnicity, culture, religion, etc. is taken to be something which is a naturally given.

In contrast however, it may be also be pointed out when we are born in a structure where our elders and ancestors have already lived, which they have imbibed to the extent of feeling that this structure is an essential aspect of their existence and identity, then those identity determining contents are implicitly taught and transferred to the next generation. That is to say, to some extent at least, we learn and adopt our identities from what we see and what we are taught.

PONDER BOX-I

Does this argument about learned identities which has been put forth to counter Primordialism appear satisfactory to you? Think of reasons why/why not?

9.3.2 Ethno-symbolism

John A. Armstrong, Anthony D. Smith and John Hutchinson are the main proponents of this theory. This theory states that Nationalism is a product of symbols (such as; flag, song, deity, etc.), myths, and tradition. While the idea of Nation may either be constructed or natural, but

it is to be understood as a synthesis of symbolization; shared myths, customs, habits, and rituals concerning ideals, values, patronage, sacrifice, etc. that have been transferred across generations. For the Ethno-symbolists, Nation is not a recently constructed phenomenon, rather it is something that originated in the distant past. The theory establishes that an Ethnic Consciousness had existed in our forefathers for long. Without considering this pre-existent ethnic consciousness, Nation and Nationalism cannot be understood fully. According to this view, therefore, a unique history, culture, and socio- geographical pattern, etc. are essential for the emergence of nationalism.

9.3.3 Modernisms

According to the Modernists Nation is to be understood as a socially and/or politically constructed community of people; and Nationalism comes into existence due to and in the course of modernization and its accompaniments, especially industrialization, urbanization, mass-modern education, etc. The modernists argue that it was these phenomena that paved the way of community feeling, cultural commonness and shareability of identity, where the sameness may either be of an “imagined community”, or an “invented tradition”, or that of an “imagined geo-political location”.

Benedict Anderson developed the idea of an “imagined community” for explicating the nature of Nationalism. He explained that while members of a nation can never practically know most of the other members, yet most of them feel as if they stand united with all the others and that they have something in common with them, something which is deeply rooted in who they all are. However, for Anderson, this feeling of a commonly shared essential character is merely ‘imagined’, and the media and print culture plays a significant role in its emergence, articulation, and precipitation.

The idea of “invented tradition” states that some of the seemingly traditional cultural practices/customs, are in fact a much recent phenomena, which might have been intentionally or consciously invented, yet comes to be seen as being traditional (*See, Eric Hobsbawm, Introduction of The Invention of Tradition, 1-14*). This is how Nationalism too needs to be viewed, i.e., even though Nationalism and its associated practices and institutions are a modern invention, still they are perceived as if they have existed always or have emerged in a remotely distant past.

The idea of an “imagined geography” was proposed by Edward Said. This idea may be taken to suggest that person may perceive themselves and some others as belonging to and being part of a particular spatial location, which was earmarked through imagery, (theoretical and/or literary) texts, social/political discourse, myths, etc. (*See, Orientalism, 38-51*).

9.4 TYPES OF NATIONALISM

Theoretical discussions surrounding Nationalism have identified some of its important types which tend to depend upon and vary with the perspective that the concerned theoretical framework maintains with regard to the concept of Nation, the concept of State, the relation between Nation and State, the relation between Individual and Society, etc. The following discussion would begin by explaining Ethnic and Civic Nationalism. It is important to note here that certain other types of nationalism can be understood as either being an assimilation of both ethnic and civic nationalism, or different versions (variations) of any one of these. Interestingly, we need to also note that that some types of nationalism appear to challenge certain constitutive elements inherent in the ideas of Nation and Nationalism, such as Pan-nationalism which presents a challenge to the idea of geographical boundary or defined (or imagined) space.

9.4.1 Two Main Types; Ethnic and Civic

9.4.1.1 Ethnic Nationalism

Ethnic nationalism presupposes the presence of ethnic commonality (or commonalities) amongst the people. The formation of a Nation, according to this view, is therefore to be identified in terms of certain ethnic commonality determining factor(s). This ethnic commonality may be grounded in a common language, a common religion, common religious practices, or a common (ethnic) ancestry or lineage, etc. Ethnic nationalism advocates that if a group of people share some kind of ethnic commonality, then this group has (and/or should have) a tendency towards realizing political distinct-ness and autonomy or “self-determination”. The full flourishing of this “self-determination” is further conditioned on the group forming its own state/political institution(s). More so, this theory emphasizes the ideas of nativity and a native land. This emphasis comes in broadly two versions, hard and soft. In the hard version, the nation-state believes in the idea of ethnic nationalism rigidly and asserts that nationality or citizenship is to be determined on the basis of one’s ethnicity (which may be identified through a single or multiple factors). This assertion implies that

those who do not belong to or identify through the ethnicity determining factor(s) being considered by the nation-state, will not be regarded as citizens of the nation state (or would rather be identified as second grade citizens) even if they are found to have been residing in the territory of that nation. Soft version of ethnic nationalism, on the other hand, defines nationality or citizenship in terms of blood-based lineage or descentance from a citizen of that nation-state.

9.4.1.2 Civic Nationalism

Civic nationalism states that ethnicity and nativity cannot be the only building blocks of any nation-state. The defenders of this view argue that firstly, a common kinship is extremely difficult to locate in any nation-state due to the un-availability of a “pure” race; and secondly that no (modern) nation state can be established on the basis of a singular commonality. Civic nationalism, instead, advocates the need of some “universal values” for forming a nation. These include freedom, equality, liberty, fraternity etc. which are often identified as “Liberal Values”, and this is the reason why Civic Nationalism is also called Liberal Nationalism.

PONDER BOX-II

Keeping in mind the concepts of Ethnic and Civic Nationalism; reflect upon the nature and the idea of The Indian Nation-State (with reference to the arguments conceptualized and developed during the Freedom Struggle; Constitutional Debates; and the Indian Constitution).

References to Civic/Liberal Nationalism can be found in the “Social Contract” Theory. The Social contract theory attempts at giving a plausible explanation of how the State emerges. It argues that the need and the urge for saving one’s own life, for ensuring well-being and welfare for oneself and others are what gave birth to the need of a contract among individuals and groups. This contract is what underpins and constitutes a sovereign state. Ernst Renan, one of the foremost scholars to describe civic nationalism, proposed that this contract is rooted in what may be identified as the “will to unite” or the “will to live together”. Renan’s ideas further suggest that without this “will” no group of people can form a nation (nation-state), despite having common ethnicity and nativity. Renan presents several examples to show not only that common ethnicity or nativity are insufficient for the formation of a nation-state, but also that there are nation states which are entirely founded upon (liberal) universal

values rather than on any common and shared ethnic character^{*}. Nation-states based on the idea of civic nationalism, determine citizenship on the basis of the law of the soil (where you are born) and/or on constitutional values of that nation-state.

In contrast, Ethnic nationalists would argue that the “will to live together” cannot arise without the feeling/presence of some common and shared ethnicity, and that in the absence of this feeling, the “will to live together” is merely an apparent imposition from which no nation-state can come into existence in its true sense.

9.4.2 Other Types of Nationalism

Anti-colonial nationalism is a product of anti-colonial movements that started in retaliation to colonization by The British Empire. The consciousness of wanting to be free from the British Rule, which came in the backdrop of the uniformity of being members of a colonized country, gave room to the claim of inciting and manifesting a national-spirit across all individuals of that colonized country. The claim was that the colonized Nation was already a Nation prior to colonization. And the need then was to reclaim and re-affirm a national sovereignty in-dependent of the British Rule. Mahatma Gandhi, in *Hind Swaraj*, argued that the presence of the four *piethas* (Spiritual places/seats) in the four directions of India is proof enough of its Nationhood prior to the British Rule. Nativist nationalism grants citizenship by virtue of being born within the territory of a nation. Racial nationalism, Religious nationalism, and Language nationalism are based on the commonality of race, religion, and language respectively. While Territorial nationalism is based on (actual or imaginary) geographical boundary, Pan-nationalism defies any territorial boundary and focuses only on the idea of common ethnicity. Economic nationalism advocates that economic activities within the territory of a nation should be controlled by state. Socialist nationalism advocates that nation should be based on socialist values.[†]

Check Your Progress II

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answer with that provided at the end of the unit.

1. Describe civic nationalism.

^{*} Dr. B.R. Ambedkar explicitly agrees with Renan’s ideas about nation and nationalism, and can be seen as an advocate of civic nationalism. (See, A Nation call for Home, in Dr. Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches, vol. 9).

[†] Apart from the types of Nationalism mentioned here, there are many other types that emerging based on movements concerning gender, race, ethnicity, etc.

.....

.....

.....

9.5 CRITIQUE OF NATIONALISM

Our discussion thus far has highlighted how the essential characteristics of nationalism consist in the presence and recognition of a common and shared identity (ethnic or civic, or both); a deep sense of attachment with this identity; feeling of self-determination (which finds its fructification in and through a State or some other political framework); and the presence and recognition of a boundary (imaginary or real) which segregates the nation from other territories and Nationals from Non-Nationals. In the light of these features, the current section would highlight some key criticisms raised against such an idea of Nationalism.

The Pacifists try to draw our attention to the militarization aspect of nationalism. Militarization presupposes that there is a constant threat to life from others, and that safety and security of life is to be ensured through the procurement of arms and weapons. One of the results of revering militarization is Jingoism or Chauvinism. Further, the inclination towards militarization makes one forget that the aim of human life is peace, thereby leading us into a kind of self-deception. This deception and delusion makes us vulnerable to propaganda, half-truths, false advertisement, twisted historical facts, etc. promoting power-hunger, deceitfulness, and a general sense of repulsion from and fear of the (ethnic, national, religious, cultural) other.

Nationalism emphasized the idea of identity and the identification of the individual with their own nation. It has been argued that this identification with one's own nation presupposes human divisiveness, which is further based on the division between "us/self" and "they/other", but not on recognition of the diversity of the cultural expression by the various group of people. When patriotism comes to be attached with this identification (with nation/nationality/nation's identity), then the "other" is not seen as just "an-equal-other," but as being hierarchically disparate (whether superior or inferior) to "us/self/our nation". This is how the other is identified from the vantage point of nationalism and national politics. This tendency of a common and shared national identity, and its presupposition of divisiveness however goes against the idea of multiculturalism which recognizes the multiplicity of

numerous cultural expressions within the world/a society/an individual with equal (political) relevance. The disregard of multicultural values appears to be one of the leading causes of disputes between nations.

In contrast to the modern conception of Nation whereby a Nation cannot be seen without the state, Gandhi advocated the idea of “stateless nation” or “stateless society”. He believed that though in spiritual terms, we are and were a Nation, but from the political and economic point of view our focus should be on “local rule” or “*Grāma-swarājya*” rather than on attaining State-hood. Gandhi’s idea of village-self-rule suggests that for him, the State signified an artificial entity which hinders human flourishing. He believed that no human can survive in an artificial relation, since the creative force of humans demands “real” and “organic” relations where all dimensions of life interact with each-other; flourishing and adapting in accordance with the other dimensions.

Rabindranath Tagore, in his lectures on Nationalism, opines that nationalism treats each individual as an object, imposing certain identity defining characteristics onto them, and/or at the same time drawing exclusive focus on those attributes of their character which are conducive to the furtherance of its nationalist ideals. He suggests that while Society, which happens to be a voluntary self-expression of being a Social Being, is an end in itself; Nation is an abstract and artificially imposed ideal, in which individuals organize themselves to fulfil predetermined mechanical (un-organic) roles. For Tagore, nation and nationalism focus on “utility” and “survival of the fittest” and that is why it promotes only those aspects of one’s identity which fulfil its utilitarian aim, simultaneously treating the other aspects as hindrances. It lacks any sense of care or concern for others.

In contrast “co-operation” is an organic consequence of human life and creativity. Though Nation gives the assurance of security, but at the same time it demands the people to behave in a pre-fixed fashion exhibiting the sanctioned identity defining characteristics. Tagore sees this assurance of security as a threat to freedom. He writes, “the living ideals must not lose their touch with the growing and changing life. Their real freedom is not within the boundaries of security, but in the highroad of adventures, full of the risk of new experiences” (Tagore, *Nationalism*, 9).

Check Your Progress III

Note: a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answer with that provided at the end of the unit.

1. Highlight the main criticisms given by Tagore against the idea of Nationalism.

.....

.....

.....

.....

9.6 LET US SUM UP

The discussions in the preceding sections highlight that there is no one unanimous way of defining or describing ‘Nationalism’. Each theory tends to adopt a divergent perspective which varies in terms of presuppositions regarding the ideas of nation, nation-individual relation, identity, etc. The discussion becomes even more complex since Nationalism is not merely an abstract theoretical concept but a feeling and a phenomenon which is rooted in history and in real life experiences. By discussing the various types of nationalism (civic and ethnic, and their various sub-types), the unit has presented a synoptic view of some of the popular perspectives adopted with regard to this idea; subsequently giving an overview of the key criticisms of the idea of nationalism.

9.7 KEY WORDS

Civic Nationalism : Nationalism based on some accepted values/principles.

Ethnic Nationalism : Nationalism based on ethnic identity.

Modern Nation/Nation-State : Nation congruent with state.

State : A political framework/institution.

9.8 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Acton, Lord. “Nationality.” in *Nation & Nationality*. Delhi: Critical Quest, 2010.

Ambedkar, B.R. “A Nation call for Home”, in *Dr. Ambedkar: Writing and Speeches*, vol. 9. Mumbai: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1991.

Gandhi, M.K. *Hind Swaraj*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Press.

Gandhi, M.K. *Constructive Programme*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Press.

Grosby, Steven. *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger (eds.). *The Invention of Tradition* (Introduction, 1-14). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107295636.001>

Hoyes, J.H. *Essays on Nationalism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.

Kumar, Sunalini. "Nationalism" in *Political Theory: An Introduction*, Rajeev Bhargav and Ashok Acharya (eds.). Delhi: Pearson, 2008, 258-272.

Mill, John Stuart. "Of Nationality," in *Nation & Nationality*. Delhi: Critical Quest, 2010.

Renan, Ernst. "What is a Nation?" in *Nation & Nationality*. Delhi: Critical Quest, 2010.

Tagore, Rabindranath. *Nationalism*. Delhi: Fingerprint Classics, 2021.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Savarkar, V.D. *Essentials of Hindutva*. Accessed https://ia803109.us.archive.org/25/items/essentials-of-hindutva-veer-savarkar_202106/Essentials%20of%20Hindutva-Veer%20Savarkar.pdf

Savarkar, V.D. *Hindutva*. Mumbai: Swatantryaveer Savarkar Rastriya Smarak, 1999.

Sharma, Jyotirmaya. *Hindutva: Exploring the idea of Hindu Nationalism*. Penguin Books in India, 2003.

Web-links

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sovereignty/>

9.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

(Learner should develop their answers with the help of the hints given below.)

Check Your Progress I

1.

- Decline of the Roman Empire and the unfolding of the French Revolution.

- King had to share his power with the religious centres (Church) and the economic centres (Landlord).
- With the coming in of industrialization, a new economic class had emerged.
- Religious revolutions started challenging the authority of the Church.
- Kings began earmarking geographical boundaries and identifying as population those who resided within the demarcated boundary.
- Modern State is believed to have emerged due to the rise of a new economic class (comprising of business and industrialist capitalists).

2.

- “Collective self-consciousness” can also be viewed as a relation grounded in commonality and shareability.
- Common sharedness refers to a social relation of each of a number of individuals.

Check Your Progress II

1.

- Civic nationalism states that ethnicity and nativity cannot be the only building blocks of any nation-state.
- A common kinship is extremely difficult to locate in any nation-state due to the unavailability of a “pure” race.
- No (modern) nation state can be established on the basis of a singular commonality.
- Civic nationalism advocates the need of some “universal values” for forming a nation.

Check Your Progress III

1.

- Nationalism treats each individual as an object.
- Society is a voluntary self-expression of being a Social Being, and it is an end in itself.
- Nation is an abstract and artificially imposed ideal.
- Nation and nationalism have a utilitarian aim.

- Co-operation is an organic consequence of human life and creativity.

