

The Concept Of Western Nationalism (Liberalism-Marxism)



Dr. Najib Ullah	Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, Qurtuba University of Science and Technology Peshawar najibullah@qurtuba.edu.pk
Dr. Ghulam Qasim Marwat	Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, Qurtuba University of Science and Technology Peshawar profqasim@gmail.com
Dr. Hamida Bibi	Assistant Professor, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar tazkiasayed@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study critically examines the concept of Western nationalism through the ideological lenses of liberalism and Marxism. Tracing its roots from the French and Industrial Revolutions, the paper explores how nationalism emerged as a transformative force in the West, reshaping political boundaries and global dynamics. The work categorizes theorists into four schools: traditionalists, modernists, post-modernists, and Marxist thinkers, each contributing distinct perspectives on nationalism's evolution, utility, and consequences. Scholars like Toynbee, Carr, Kohn, and Gellner provide foundational insight into the liberal interpretation of nationalism, focusing on its impact on social mobilization, state formation, and global integration. In contrast, Marxist theorists such as Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin critique nationalism as a bourgeois construct serving capitalist interests and imperial expansion. The study emphasizes how Western nationalism influenced movements in colonized regions, particularly in the Muslim world, culminating in ethno-national rivalries and independence struggles. Ultimately, the paper positions nationalism as a central and contentious force in modern history.*

Keywords: Western nationalism, liberalism, Marxism, modernization theory, ethno-nationalism, imperialism, nation-state, Muslim nationalism, Toynbee, Hans Kohn, Lenin, Gellner.

Introduction

The industrial revolution coupled with the French Revolution in the mid-Seventeen and late Eighteen centuries respectively, unleashed a new era defining the role of Church and the state giving birth to Nationalism based on Nation-State in Europe. It is, therefore, believed that Nationalism first appeared in Europe (Kodourie, 1970). Within a short period of twentieth century, it led to the re-drawing of state boundaries along national lines and transforming the entire face of global politics (Firdausi, 1988, pp. 8–9). Focusing on Muslim world, nationalism has played the central role in abolishing the five-hundred-years old Ottoman dynasty and replaced their Khilafat by western

liberal reformism (Lewis, 1980). In British India, western nationalism is responsible for the emergence of Indian nationalism (Seal, 1973). It has also been instrumental in generating national rivalries between the two major communities, Hindus and Muslims (Ispahani, 1970, pp. 331–332). As a result, the rise of Muslim nationalism is also a natural consequence of this ideology (Siddiqui, 1969). therefore, it is necessary to understand the phenomenon of nationalism more rigorously because of its multi-dimensional implications for the subsequent study of social sciences. There are fourth categories of the writers who discussed nationalism at pages length which will be discussed in the subsequent pages. Firstly, the

study of the writers who supported the universal values of the civilization, irrespective of nationalism; secondly, modernization theorists who believed that technological development would eventually lead to the global integration of the world (Amin, 1991); thirdly, post-modern writers of nationalism who discussed the rise of Ethno- nationalism as a global reality (Amin, 1991). The fourth group represent the dependencia school of thought, inspired by Marx (Amin, 1991), who rejected nationalism and considered it a device of the bourgeoisie for identifying their class interest as the interest of the entire society (Connor, 1984).

TRADITIONAL THEORISTS

In this connection we shall first undertake the study of Toynbee who is communitarian in the western tradition. He critically observed the attitude of the west towards the rest of the civilizations of the world with their economic and political policies, but failed to bring about changes in their respective cultures. As he wrote:

"This thesis of the unity of civilization is a misconception into which modern western historians have been led by the influence of their social environment. The misleading feature is the fact that in modern times our own western civilization has cast the net of its economic system all round the world, and this economic unification has been followed by a political unification on the same basis which has gone almost as far that all the states of the contemporary world, form part of the single political system of western origin. While the economic and political maps have now been westernized, the cultural map remains substantially what it was before our western society started on its career of economic and political conquest (Connor, 1984)."

To him, the cement of common culture is indispensable for the construction of world state (Toynbee, 1954a),

Toynbee considers that nationalism is a negative force, which appeared on scene after the demise of the temporal authority of the church. Democratic nationalism was developed, in this situation. The emergence of economic nationalism was the natural result of the

industrial revolution. Toynbee observed that in this situation each nation-state was striving desperately for economic self-sufficiency. As the nation's one by one became industrialized, it suited their parochial interest and to pursue a cut-throat competition with all their neighboring nation-states (Toynbee, 1954b), which led to disruption and world anarchy and followed by great modern wars of nationalism. He analyzed that world nationalist democracies became the instruments of the general will of their citizens, therefore, they engaged in 'total war' where the combatants remained not only selected soldiers but the whole population of the countries concerned (Toynbee, 1954a). Toynbee notes that the west has failed to forecast the effect of the impact of democracy and industrialism of the rivalries of nation-states. He wrote that they have misunderstood human nature. "They did not understand that even an economic world order cannot be built on merely economic foundations, in spite of their genuine idealism, they didn't realize that man shall not live by bread alone (Toynbee, 1954a).

Toynbee wrote that western society was in happier posture in pre-nationalistic age of the eighteenth century when it was rested on religious foundation. But with the emergence of nationalism new social forces of revelries appeared and it was a time of trouble for the western civilization. Therefore, he wrote that the intelligible units of historical study are not nations or periods but society and their civilization (Toynbee, 1954a).

Toynbee objectively observes that the principal theme of the twentieth century history is disintegration because the creative minority of the society has lost its creativity and started relying on force. In the previous growth stage, creative individuals of society led their successful responses to successive challenges (Toynbee, 1954a). To him, forcible political unification in a universal state is another conspicuous mark of disintegration for the state and society. He is confirmed that the breaking down of civilization is due to an inward loss of self-determination and not to any external blows (Toynbee, 1954a). In this connection he notes that the emergence of communism, fascism and

nationalism are the un-mistakable sign of disintegration in the western civilization. He critically observes the root causes of the false ideas of western historians that they are taking into account only their own western civilization and consider all other civilizations as valueless:

The unity of history - involving the assumption that there is only one river of civilization, our own, and that all other are either tributary to it or else lost in the desert sands may be traced to three roots: to ego-centric illusion, the illusion of the unchanging east, and the illusion of progress as a movement that proceeds in the straight line (Toynbee, 1954a).

Toynbee specifically notes that the dominant element in the European society is race consciousness and its intolerance may eventually provoke a general catastrophe for the western civilization. To him, it is conceivable that the spirit of Islam might be the timely reinforcement which would decide this issue in favor of tolerance (Toynbee, 1954a).

(The dominant element) in our modern western society are race consciousness and alcohol, and with struggle with each of these evils the Islamic spirit has a service to render which might prove, if it were accepted, to be of high moral and social value. The extinction of race consciousness between Muslims is one of the outstanding moral achievements of Islam, and in the contemporary world there is, as it happens, a crying need for the propagation of this Islamic virtue (Toynbee, 1953, pp. 205–206).

In this connection Edward H. Carr interpreted the nature of nationalism, internationalism and communitarian feelings. He recognized that internationalism has usually been the creed of dominant nations at global level, as the cry of nationalism has been the ideology of the dominant ethnic groups in the domestic context (Toynbee, 1953, pp. 205–206). He notes that communitarian feelings, both at international and national levels, may easily degenerate into imperialism if the principal groups lose sight of the values and start relying on force (Carr, 1964, p. 85).

Carr defines three periods in the evolution of modern nationalism. The first period begins with

gradual dissolution of medieval unity of empire and church and establishment of the nation-state. The major characteristic of this period, Carr defines that nations tended to be identified with their sovereigns. International relations during this period were, therefore essentially the relations between the sovereigns of different lands (Carr, 1964, p. 85).

The second period, in his view, ensued from the turmoil of the Napoleonic wars and ended in 1914. It is generally accounted the most orderly and enviable of modern international relations. During this period a compromise was struck between political and economic powers so that each could develop on its own lines. Nationalism did not become a destructive force for international relations because laissez-faire system became truly international under the world-wide expansion of capitalism (Carr, 1991).

The third stage, according to him, extended from 1914 to 1945. During this period nationalism began to operate in a new political and economic environment characterized by great disaster. To him, the phenomenon cannot be understood without examination of the three main underlying causes which provoked it:

- 1) The rise of new social strata within the effective membership of the nation
- 2) The replacement of single world economy by multiple national economies
- 3) And the increase in the number of nations (Carr, 1991).

Carr observed that the rise of new social strata to full membership of the nation marked the last three decades of the 19th century. Its land mark was the development of industry, the rapid expansion of urban population, the extension of franchise and the introduction of compulsory education. He notes that compromising attitude of the nations would develop a peaceful environment in the world (Carr, 1991).

Among the traditional writers of the west, Hans Kohn (1819-1971) is a prophet of liberal nationalism and world community and has been recognized as one of the learned as well as most prolific authority on modern nationalism. His

pragmatic writings influenced a generation of scholars. His categories are uncritically employed by the present-day liberal writers on the subject. He defines nationalism as 'an idea, an *idée-force* which fills man's brain and heart with new thoughts and new sentiments, and drives him to translate his consciousness into deeds of organized action (Carr, 1991). It recognizes the nation-state is an ideal form of political organization and nationality, is the source of creative energy and economic well-being (Wolf, 1976).

Hans Kohn's argument pervading through all his writings are that enlightened nationalism and liberalism are compatible, and as such nationalism could promote individual liberty. In his early writings, Kohn distinguished between cultural and political nationalism. He thought that nationalism could be beneficial and progressive force in history only if it was based on ethical, cultural and non-political ground. To him, cultural or ethical nationalism was the best to minimize the tension between an individual and society and such a nationalism could promote world unity and not further divisions. Kohn argued that political nationalism was the ruling and ordering principles of the nineteenth century, but it need not govern the twentieth century. Like nationalism Kohn defended western imperialism which would help to build European empire and ultimately single civilization of the world (Kohn, 1948).

He wrote that east and west should come together and the way should be paved for the unity of mankind. He believed that the very growth of nationalism all over the world, with its awakening of masses to participation in political and cultural life, has prepared the way for closer cultural contacts among all the civilizations of mankind. It reveals that Kohn was more concerned with world unity than with nationalism; to him nationalism was to be spiritual force with only indirect political implications. It was to be based upon universal standard of justice and equality and therefore, able to unite the best elements in eastern and western traditions (Kohn, 1948).

While throwing light over eastern thoughts, Kohn welcomed the sentiments of nationalism

found in literature of the Indian thinkers. He praised Tagore's nationalism as one of freedom and not of domination' built on service to justice and truth (Kohn, 1948). As Kohn was selective in his studies of Indian nationalists, he was attracted by the moderate and constitutional policy of Gokhale. As an educationalist, Gokhale tried to educate the people morally and guide them to intellectual maturity rather than to gain the substance and symbols of outward freedom. To bring about Hindu-Muslim unity Gokhale used to send his young trained Hindu disciples to live among Muslims and render them social services (Kohn, 1948). To Kohn, the Indian National Congress was also the first all-Indian demonstration of nationalist sentiments. Through this organization the loyalties of the heterogeneous population of India were to be merged into one national whole, viz. Indian Nation. To him, the founder of the organization (Allan Hume) was creating a representative united nationality to attract the attention of England for the political development of India. As he wrote:

Congress was to merge in one national whole all the different and hither-to hostile elements that make up the population of India, it was to direct the process of re-birth of the nation so evolved, intellectually, morally, socially, and politically and to strengthen the tie that binds England and India by changing whatever is unjust or injurious to India (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–371).

In this regard among the Indian nationalists Kohn appreciated the views of Banerjee, Dayananda, Ram Krishna and Vivekananda who wished to link Indian moral principles with the best features of the British political traditions (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–371). Throughout his career the problem for Kohn was 'how to enlarge democracy and all that it implies - liberty and equality, dignity and happiness'. To include men of all classes in all nations, Kohn's liberal credo was directly threatened by the rise of the dictatorship which espoused an alternative value system and it too sought world unity. To Kohn such efforts are or were leading toward hatred and ultimately to civil war on a planetary scale. Kohn condemned Fascism, Nazism and pan-Asianism as they had deviated from the liberal

values of the west and sought to destroy western rational humanism (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–371). In his early writings, Kohn praised the supra-national policy of the former Soviet Union as the true embodiment of the value of the western enlightenment, but after the second world war, he became extremely critical of the Soviet Union. (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–370).

While comparing east-west nationalism, Kohn accentuated the beneficial effects of western technology and rational thoughts. He tried to promote world unity by pointing out how the best of western thoughts could complement the wisdom of East. Still, it was clear to him that European nationalism was, to him, originally, humanitarian and liberal but soon became destructive. Kohn admitted that the Asian states were becoming oppressors of alien nationality and every impulse of freedom. In this situation Kohn observed that European political nationalism was losing its exclusive authority as the creed of the age (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–370). He shifted his ground and his earlier distinction between cultural and political nationalism developed into good political nationalism versus bad political nationalism. In this comparison Kohn detailed that bad nationalism is fundamentally opposed to any common human values and the other i.e. good nationalism recognizing the essential oneness of mankind and the desirability of rational world order. Kohn condemned the bad political nationalism and declared that eastern nationalism is revolt against the western nationalism (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–370). To Kohn, western nationalism arose in areas with a strong middle class, while eastern nationalism arose in areas with a weak middle class. He compared that western nationalism was based intellectually on the eighteenth-century enlightenment, emphasized on rationality and individual liberty as the basis of progress. In this connection eastern nationalism was a reaction against enlightenment, and it stressed the irrational and the group or collective unit as the basis for progress. Western nationalism was an indigenous or original development; eastern nationalism was derived from the west. One of the outstanding characteristics of the western

nationalism was that it tended to limit state power. On the other hand, eastern nationalism tended to glorify power. Ken Wolf observed that at the final stage western nationalism aimed at world unity. Comparatively, eastern nationalism was narrow and exclusivist (Kohn, 1991).

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Kohn over idealized western civilization and nationalism. To him, west for three centuries was in control of the globe and of civilized progress. He justified imperialism as the middle link in a chain that began with European nationalism and ended with Asian counterpart. To him, nationalism united the members of European nations into political states and then impelled each state to prove its greatness by extending its political and economic domination to foreign people. This attitude of the west inflamed the nationalism of the oppressed people. Thus, the emergence of Indian nationalism and later on the rise of Muslim nationalism in India were come also be said as the direct consequences of the British imperial policies in India (Kohn, 1991).

MODERNIZATION THEORISTS

In the post-World War II period the economic and political forces compelled the social scientists to pay special attention to human integration at international level and bypassed the issue of nationalism. They believed that the modernization process of technological development would push the world beyond the war and nation-state based on economic interests. Modernist theorists believed that in the process of integration the political actors in several distinct national settings would be persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities towards a new larger centre, whose institutions would possess or demand jurisdiction over the pre-existing nation-states. They focused upon the European Economic Community and believed that the establishment of nation-state is in retreat and integration has become a historical fact (Kohn, 1929, pp. 363–371).

The work of two important scholars, Karl W. Duetsch and Earnest Gellner have inspired the subsequent research program of modernist thinkers on nationalism and then the formation

of larger political communities.

Duetsch re-interpreted society, community and nationalism in the context of the process of modernization. He believed that society and community are the products of common historical experience and both are developed by social learning. He defines nationality as:

Political and social struggle of the modern age, nationality, then means an alignment of large number of individuals from the middle and lower classes linked to regional centres and leading social groups by channels of social communication and economic intercourse, both indirectly from link to link and directly with the centre (Amin, 1991).

The concept of social mobilization is central to Duetsch understanding of nationalism in the modernization context. To him, social mobilization is the process in which old social economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people became available for new pattern of socialization. Nationalism, then, fulfills an emotional need of individuals. To him, in the new social environment another ideology may serve the same function. To sum up, according to his survey research modernization and nationalism go hand in hand (Deautesch, 1991, p. 28).

Eamnest Gellner is yet another prolific authority among the modernization theorists on nationalism. He believes that nations may have had a long history before they finally reach their destination.

He writes that mankind has passed through three stages. The pre-agrarian, agrarian and the industrial. Nationalism is the product of the third stage but it is not the case that the age of nationalism is a mere summation of the awakening and political self-assertion. Actually, God given spirit for classifying men and pre-existing cultures plays an important role in turning masses into nations. He writes, 'Nations can indeed be defined in terms both of will and of culture, and indeed in terms of a convergence of them both with political units' men will to be politically united with all those, and only those, who share their culture (Glenn, 1991, pp. 29–33).

The cultures, in human social life, seem to Gellner the natural repositories of political legitimacy. He observes, 'Nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively and it most often transforms them radically (Gliener, 1991, pp. 64–69).

Gellner believes that in the agrarian age peasants were not conscious of their culture. It was only in the industrial age when they learnt the difference between the dealings with co-nationals and others. In the industrial age labor migration, wages protection, with the democratization of nations, popular control over state affairs and bureaucracy became prominent features within their social horizon. In this situation soon they learned the difference between dealing with a co-national, one sympathizing with their culture, and someone hostile to it. This very concrete experience taught them to be aware of their culture, and to love it (Gliener, 1991, pp. 64–69).

As regards the future, Gellner believes that standardized homogeneous, pervading the entire population and centrally sustained high cultures, would provide the basis for the future integration of humanity (Gliener, 1991, pp. 64–69).

Scholars associated with theories of modernization were challenged from two directions. One by Marxist dialectical tradition who considered that the capitalist class is forced to organize itself nationally to enable it to take over the reign of state power and that they must gain mass support for their actions. They depict themselves as representing the national interest. Thus, they stressed the inadequacy of nation-state as an appropriate unit of analysis and even challenged the foundation of literature of the liberal tradition (Stalin, 1970, p. 553). Another attack came from within the liberal tradition. Edward Schils (Glenn, 1991, pp. 29–33) and Walker Connor stressed the global reality of the rise of ethno-nationalism. In this regard John Glenn observes the primordialist ethnicities. According to him,

"Ethnicist argument originally stemmed from social anthropology and the findings of field

work conducted on a variety of ethnic groups in Africa and South East Asia. Such writings suggest that within any particular ethnic group there exists a common feeling of significance and solidarity towards that community and this is in itself derived from the existence of a common culture and a belief in a shared history and ancestry. It is these antecedent communities passed on from generation to generation within each particular ethnic group that act as fundamental constitutive building blocks of the social group." (Glenn, 1991, pp. 29–33).

Walker Connor gave due recognition to ethnic diversity in his post modern approach to nationalism. He elaborated critique of modernization theorists and holding criticized their thrust for integration and discounting of their tendencies of disintegration. He attacked Deutschs' state building theory from three directions. 1", as to the assumption of the modernists that ethnic identity will wither away as the process of modernization occur is not supported from the contemporary data. Connor argues that less than 10% states of the world are homogeneous (Connor, 1991, p. 39). Ethnic consciousness has been definitely increasing, and not decreasing in recent years. 2nd, again he criticizes the Deutschs' seminal work on nationalism, communication, social mobilization of individuals from their rural surroundings into the industrial heartlands (cities) and said that such individuals uprooted from their old environment are assimilated in a new pattern into dominant culture of the state. He observes that:

"On the one hand, this work contains a few passing acknowledgments that increasing contacts between culturally diverse people might increase antagonism. On the other hand, there are several passages that might lead the reader to conclude that Deutsch was convinced that modernization, in the form of increase is urbanization, industrialization, schooling, communication and transport facilities, etc. would lead to assimilation." (Connor, 1962, pp. 322–341).

Connor argues that if there is no characteristics combination of opinion, it is possible so solve the question of inter-ethnic confrontation and to

revive the unifying potential of nationalism. He analyzed:

"Ethnic strife is too often superficially discerned as principally predicated upon language, religion, customs, economic inequality, or some other tangible elements. But what is fundamentally involved in such a conflict is that divergence of basic identity which manifests itself in the 'us-them" syndrome. And the ultimate answer to the question of whether a person is one of us, or one of them, seldom hinges on the adherence to overt aspects of culture." (Connor, 1962, pp. 322–341).

Another stalwart among postmodern writers, A. D. Smith viewed that the study of nationalism needs to be reoriented to take account not only of new social forces with industrial revolution, but also of the retention of older ties and sentiments often long antedating the modern era. In this regard Smith defined that collective self-determination of the people, the expression of national character and individuality are fundamental fused ideals of nationalism (Smith, 1991). To him, in modern age, the study of nationalism remains incomplete, if ethno-centric nationalism is not concerned at primitive stage and, poly-centric at final stage. Smith is also of the opinion that modernization theorists in their definition of nationalism overlook the importance of its ethnic roots in the past (Smith, 1991).

MARXIST THEORISTS

The modernization paradigm was not only criticized from within the liberal tradition of the west, by analyzing the rise of the world ethno-national movements, but it was also got attacked from the dependencia school of thought, inspired by the Marxist dialectical tradition, uncovered the structure of colonialism and stressed the inadequacy of nation-state (Amin, 1991).

Marx and Engel (Gleason, 1990, pp. 22–23) loyalties are determined by economic realities rather than national sentiments. They consider nation, nationalism and nationality parts of the super structure, by product of the capitalist era. According to Marxian approach, nationalism is an evolved phenomenon that comes into

existence only with the demise of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. Prior of the capitalist stage there were human groupings, such as tribes, clans and peoples. With change in the modes of production, human relations were shifted from other hermeneutic elements, and they were developed on economic basis which gave rise to the creation of nation (Gleason, 1990, pp. 22–23). Nationalism, they considered, was mainly bourgeoisie ideology, which served the functional purpose of integration of various localities under one nation at one particular historical stage. In their views state and nation had been co-related during the transitional period from feudalism to capitalism. State institutionalized the bourgeoisie power, while nationality functioned as the ideological core around which bourgeoisie consolidated its domestic powers over the working class, peasants and solidified a nation vis-à-vis other capitalist nation. Nationalism favored bourgeoisie in almost every aspect of life. It diverted the proletariat from realizing its own class consciousness and interest.

About the future of nationalism, both Marx and Engel were confirmed that it was an ephemeral phenomenon, the early stage of capitalism and would disappear with the maturity of capitalism. They saw the movement of history from the capitalist nation-state towards an international socialist community. For shifting the paradigm from nationalism towards socialist world community, they chalked out a complete programme as follow: in the first stage the communists would support the national bourgeoisie in their national liberation movements but would not merge their own socialistic identity in this strategy with them. In the second stage, the communists would seize power and would establish a classless and post-national society free of economic exploitation. Their well-articulated programme to party workers was as follows:

The struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is of first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie... the working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the

proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeoisie sense of the word. Working men of the world, unite (Marx & Engels, 1997, p. 84).

Marx and Engel were thoroughly social activists, acutely involved in advancing the proletariat movement. They were often guided by what they perceived as the most conducive to economic progress rather than abstract notion such as nationalism (Marx & Engels, 1997, p. 84).

In this regard Lenin was a modernization theorist in the Marxist tradition. He refined and elaborated the original Marxist position. He recognized that Marxism could not be reconciled with nationalism. Lenin believed that nationalism had emerged as the most serious rival ideology to socialism, affecting the ranks of the socialist party and their potential constituency: the proletariat. As an international communitarian in the socialist tradition (Gleason, 1990, pp. 22–23), he also considered nationalism a transitional phenomenon. He had two-stage historical tendencies for the creation of international unity. The first was the awakening of national life, national movements and the creation of nation-state. The second was the development and growing frequency of international intercourse in every form. Such as, the breaking down of national barriers, the creation of national unity of capital, of economic life in general and common struggle for the achievement of scientific developments were the main targets placed before them. As a principle, the former predominates in the beginning of its development; the latter characterizes a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society (Suslove, 1971, pp. 20–21).

Lenin laid great stress upon the role of colonies. He held that national bourgeoisie of Europe had been able to transfer the 'finance capitalism' to their respective colonies and in this way their economic resources were exploited. This situation not only provoked the revolutionary struggle of the colonized countries against imperialism, but also led to contradictions

among capitalist states. Walker Connor observed

The division of the world into colonies was now nearly complete, and World War I was the first of series of imperialist wars among capitalist states for one another's colonics. It followed that the contradictions among capitalist states and within capitalist states, could be exacerbated by the driving of wedges between colonies and the mother countries (Connor, 1962, p. 32).

As a modernist thinker of Marxism, Joseph Stalin, re-interpreted Lenin's thesis on nationalism and brought to light his proletarian revolutionary program against the bourgeoisie nationalism. He defines:

The national problem can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and the road to victory of the revolution in the west lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movements of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism (Stalin, 1970, p. 554).

Stalin considered it necessary for the proletarians to support the national liberation movements of the oppressed and dependent peoples (Stalin, 1970, p. 553). In this regard, in the light of Leninism, Stalin elaborated various economic, political and social policies by which an imperial power maintains and extends its control over other areas or peoples. According to this doctrine, nationalism in Asia and Africa rose due to the existence of European imperialism and colonialism (Kodourie, 1970) as imperialism is the expression of capitalism. Stalin defined, under Lenin's inspiration, that capitalism eventually changed into finance capitalism and finance capitalism must seek overseas colonies and exploit their inhabitants. This exploitation evoked resistance in the masses of Asia and Africa. In this situation they embarked on national liberation movements. Under Lenin's inspiration Josef Stalin wrote about the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples and proletarian revolution (Kodourie, 1970).

In solving the 'national problem' Stalin proceeded to elaborate Lenin's thesis as under:

1. The revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples in the dependent and colonized countries against imperialism is the only road that leads to their emancipation from oppression and exploitation.
2. The most important colonial and dependant countries have already taken the path of national liberation movement, which cannot but lead to the crisis for world capitalism (Stalin, 1970, p. 554-555).

As a result of the dissemination of Lenin's doctrine of nationalism, Elie Kedourie observed, "Nationalism is on the one hand the expression of industrial capitalism in Europe and on the other a reaction to European 'imperialism' in the colonies and semi-colonies (Kodourie, 1970).

At the end, Stalin asserted that it was only in the period of Leninism that existence and rights of the hundreds of millions of Asiatic and African oppressed peoples were acknowledged (Kodourie, 1970).

The present study suggests, among the liberal theorists Toynbee, Carr and Hayes note the negative consequences of nationalism, inevitably leading to hatred for others, to rivalries and wars among the humanity. To Toynbee, there must be socializing institution devoted to the cause of internationalism, do discount the negative force of nationalism, while on the other hand Kohn believes that the road to internationalism lies through liberal nationalism.

The modernization theorists focused on the social mobilization of the societies where old social, economic, psychological and traditional commitments are broken. Such theorist studied the question of integration and cession of the newly mobilized societies. In this situation, to them, nationalism fulfill their emotional need, however, they also allow, militarism or another ideology to serve the same function. In this regard, Karl Deutsches insides into both the patterns if integration and cession continue to relevant. More importantly his work inspired a generation of post-modernization scholars whose work virtually amounts to paradigm shift.

Among the post-modernization theorists, Walker Connor's work catalyzed the beginning

of a new field of comparative ethnicity study. The primary theme of this paradigm focused on disintegration. The importance of this paradigm lies in the fact that it brought a wholly different of looking at national and international policies. Their emphasize on ethnic groups brought into light the issue of multiple loyalties into sharp focus. To them, an individual could hold several loyalties and loyalty to the national-state was only one of them. All such theorists lumped together a number of loyalties ranging from racial to religious, under one heading.

Marx and Engels had envisioned the movement of history from the capitalist nation-state towards international socialist community. Lenin refined this position while Stalin reiterates Lenin thesis. Subsequent theorists of this paradigm were more concerned with consolidating the gains rather than advancing them in the ideological spirit.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, in this study have discussed the question of nationalism as the central dilemma of humanity in contemporary history. The study was based on a survey of the twentieth century writers belonging to two traditions, liberalism and Marxism with particular attention on their influences on the systems of the rest of the world.

The concept of nationalism affected the Muslim world while they were under the rule of European directly or indirectly. It is the content of the next chapter how Muslim intellectuals responded to the Western concept of nationalism.

References

- Amin, T. (1991). *Nationalism and Internationalism in Liberalism, Marxism and Islam*. International Institute of Islamic Thought.
- Carr, E. H. (1964). *Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939* (p. 85). Happer and Row.
- Carr, E. H. (1991). *Thise Phases of Nationalism* (J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith, Eds.). Oxford University Press.
- Connor, W. (1962). *Nation Building or Nation Destroying* (pp. 322–341). World Politics.
- Connor, W. (1984). *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*. Princeton University Press.
- Connor, W. (1991). *A Nation id Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic group* (Hutchison & Smith, Eds.; p. 39). Oxford University Press.
- Deautsch, K. W. (1991). *Nationalism and Social Communication* (Hutchison & Smith, Eds.; p. 28). Oxford University Press.
- Firdausi, Z. A. (1988). *Eagle Over Pakistan* (pp. 8–9). Book Traders.
- Gleason, G. (1990). *Federalism and Nationalism-The Struggle for Republican Rights in the USSR* (pp. 22–23). West view Press.
- Glenn, J. (1991). *The Soviet Legacy in Central Asia* (pp. 29–33). MacMillan Press.
- Gliener, J. (1991). *Nationalism and High Culture* (Hutchison & Smith, Eds.; pp. 64–69). Oxford University Press.
- Ispahani, M. A. H. (1970). *Factors Leading to the Partition of British India* (pp. 331–332). George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Kodourie, E. (Ed.). (1970). *Nationalism in Asia and Africa, With an Introduction by Kedourie*. Frunk Can.
- Kohn, H. (1929). *A History of Nationalism in the East* (pp. 363–371). George Routledge and Sons.
- Kohn, H. (1948). *The Idea of Nationalism*. Mac Milien.
- Kohn, H. (1991). *Western and Eastern Nationalism* (Hutchison & Smith, Eds.). New Yarie Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, B. (1980). The Ottoman Empire and its Aftermath. *Journal of the Contemporary History*, 15(1), 29.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1997). *The Communist Manifesto* (p. 84). Penguin Books.
- Seal, A. (1973). Imperialism and Nationalism in India. *Modern Asian Studies*, 7(3), 322.

- Siddiqui, M. H. (1969). The Rise of Muslim Nationalism in India. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, IV(4), 59.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *The Crisis of Dual Legitimation*. Oxford University Press.
- Stalin, J. (1970). *Nationalism outside Europe* (E. Kedourie, Ed.; p. 553). Frank Cass.
- Suslove, M. A. (1971). *Leninism and the Revolutionary Remaking of the World* (pp. 20–21). Progress publisher.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1953). *Civilization on Trial* (pp. 205–206). Oxford University Press.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1954a). *A Study of History* (1st–4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1954b). *Chang and Habit*. Oxford University Press.
- Wolf, K. (1976). Hans Kohn Liberal Nationalism. *Journal of the History of Idea*, 4, 651.