

Ethnosociology Lecture 2 part 3 English School of Ethnosociology

Hello, welcome to this week's lecture by Professor Alexander Dugin of Moscow State University during his Open University course on Ethno-Sociology. This lecture will discuss the social anthropology of the English school. So, now we are coming to the third school of Ethno-Sociology, English school.

The representatives of this school didn't call themselves Ethno-Sociologists, but they preferred to use the term for social anthropology, but in the main frame of this kind of social science, it is the same as cultural anthropology or Ethno-Sociology. So, the origins of this anthropological English school are the same as in the case of American anthropology. This approach of anthropology was developed initially on the basis of the theory of evolution.

The extreme kind of evolution theory is called orthogenesis, from the Greek word ortho-direct, and genesis, the origin. Orthogenesis argues that evolution of the living spaces has the target, and its development follows the direct logic from the simple types of living beings to the complex. So, this approach is projected on the society and form a kind of social Darwinism.

It is the same as the idea that all societies move from archaic and primitive forms towards modern technological and industrial societies. So, this approach was a kind of model for the first generation of anthropologists. Among them, an important role was played by the British anthropologist Edward Tyler, the founder of the evolutionary theory of culture and the author of the classic word primitive culture.

Tyler believes that all societies develop through the stages of perfection, of so-called perfection of social institutions and the educational system. From this point of view, the old institutions of society, customs and beliefs, die when they lose their functional significance, and there came new kind of more developed, more sophisticated societies. Therefore, all forms of culture, and in particular all forms of religion found in archaic society were considered by Tyler as childish forms or embryo, and they have no relevance in the modern societies.

So, Tyler lined up genetic series of different kind of societies and different aspects of society, the institutions, the customs, the rituals, and they are arranged on the basis of the criteria up to which point they are primitive or more complex and sophisticated. So, that is a kind of hierarchy, social hierarchy between type of the society ranging from childish and primitive ones to the most complex and modern. So, the study of identity of archaic society regarded as simplest form of religious, social, political and economic life and institution, that is the basis for anthropological method of this kind of evolutionary studies.

So, Tyler considered that religion also is in the process of development, starting from animism, a kind of vague and primitive ideas about the world people by spirits and souls that make it alive to the most complicated and sophisticated forms of religion as monotheist religion with developed theology. And the method of Tyler was criticized by the next generations of anthropologists. The other figure of classic anthropologists was famous British anthropologist James Fraser, the author of famous book Golden Buff.

Fraser has collected a huge volume of ethnological material ordered by him in some topics and he followed some concrete paradigms of rites, of myths, of legends the figures of the spirits or gods and a kind of paradigms that he discovered in different society with more or less the same sense and the same role playing in the society as a whole. So, what is important by Fraser, who was also a partisan of evolution theory, but the great volume of ethnological and mythological material that described a kind of most common for different myths and subjects and scenario, mythological scenarios that was common to different kind of society that gives us the possibility to create a kind of common comparative model to study these kinds of beliefs and to de-gauge from this study a common functional sense of these beliefs and ritual practices to understand better the primitive form of cultural life. The real turning point in the history of British anthropology was the figure of Bronislaw Malinowski originally Polish anthropologist who made a great revision of previous anthropological English-British tradition and completely changed the situation in the field of the anthropological researchers.

The role played by Bronislaw Malinowski was more or less the same as the role of Franz Boas in American field of anthropology. So, Malinowski with Franz Boas both are considered to be the founding fathers of new anthropology that was very clearly separated from old anthropology based on the evolution theory. As Boas, Bronislaw Malinowski also affirmed that we could not follow the direct line of autogenetic development of different kind of the society and we cannot pretend that the more sophisticated and complex kinds of society are logical and necessary development of the primitive kind.

So, the idea that primitive societies and the complex societies are different, it's obvious, but this difference cannot be explained by evolution of the most primitive ones to the most sophisticated or more complex. So, the idea that different kind of society coexist, some of them becoming more sophisticated and the other resting in the primitive state and there is not one common social agenda for historic development of any kind of society. So, there is nothing as a kind of destiny to be developed, modernized and sophisticated.

It's a kind of historic circumstances that predetermine that one society has evolution in one sense and the other society rests at the same stage as before. So, there is nothing obligatory in the progress. The progress is something due to the circumstances, something occasional, if you want.

That was the most important turning point from constructing diachronical models of explanation of the evolution of the societies and the synchronic attitude, synchronistic approach to the study of primitive and archaic society. That was Malinovsky who has given the name for new anthropology, the name social anthropology. The word social is very important because for Malinovsky it stressed, emphasized the point that we should regard the society as something whole, as something that has in itself all possible meanings of belief, of the practice, of the ritual, of institution and so on.

So, the society was a depository of the senses and studying more precisely what is the paradigm of archaic society, Bronislav Malinovsky proposed a method that was called by him functionalism. So, Malinovsky affirmed that the sense of the name, of the practice, of the institution, of the concrete belief in the archaic society is linked to its function. So, a function is the meaning of any object or symbol in the society.

So, if we could understand the function of such or such practice, that could be symbolic function, that could be practical function, that could be metaphorical function, so we could also define by that all structure of the social complex linked to this or that phenomena. So, any term or any word and any sign in archaic society has its own function that should explain for us its meaning and its place in the whole complex of the society. The differences in the society and differences between functional systems of the societies are explained according to Bronislav Malinovsky, but the fact that different societies confronting with the same challenges respond to them differently.

So, the challenges are more or less the same, the challenges that different societies deal with are more or less the same, but the answers produced by these societies in the response to the challenges are different, and the complexes of these answers, of these responses form a kind of functional system of any society. So, studying this functional system and studying the typical responses from one or other society, we could create a basis for their comparison, but having created the basis for this comparison, we could not be sure that we are dealing with the hierarchy of the responses, because every society has its own historic and cultural response to a particular set of challenges. And if one society responds to one challenge as it does and the other responds differently, so that doesn't mean that one society responds better than the other.

The different kind, for example, of the challenge of death of the man, one society reintegrates the death in the midst of life, so coming to the concept of eternal return of the same. So, death is overcome by the concept of rebirth of the member of society in the same archaic or ethnic group. And the other type of society, confronting with the death of the person, creates the religion of the immortality of the soul or post-human stages of migration of the soul.

So, it's a different response. And the challenge of death is the same, but responses are different. And creating different sets of this response, we receive a kind of ritual

complexes that serve to affirm such attitude, for example, to the death or to the marriage, to the gender challenge, to the family and so on.

And we could not, according to Bronislaw Malinowski, be sure that one religion is better and more effective than the other. So, they are simply different. So, he criticized animistic concept and evolutionary concept of religious beliefs in the earlier anthropologists, so affirming that this kind of interpretation of the primitive religion is based on the presumption that more sophisticated monotheist religions are better and correspond better to the challenge, for example, of the transcendence of the death, the question of the soul.

So, it is a kind of completely incorrect interpretation of what is going on in the real culture of that or that concrete archaic people with its set of beliefs. So, it was more or less the same term as Franz Boas has accomplished in the American school of anthropology. The other particularity of Bronislaw Malinowski was his use of Freudian concept in studying of primitive society where the gender issue, the sexual practice and concept were stressed.

So, it also enriched considerably the anthropological methodology using this Freudian concept and the study of subconsciousness and the sexual archetypes in the sense of psychoanalysis. The new type of anthropology, also functionalist, was Alfred Radcliffe Brown that introduced in the field of anthropology the concept of social structure. He was the first to understand and accept all the significance of the sociological Durkheimian method applying it to the study of primitive society, archaic cultures and ethnical system.

So, for Radcliffe Brown, we are dealing first of all with a society as some absolute complex, absolute paradigm in Durkheimian sense that should be regarded as the highest instance that gives to all part of itself the social function, social significance and social meaning. So, that is the society that distributes the meanings in the social life, that distributes the concept and the meaning of the person, of the individuality, institution, rights, belief, practices, economic practices and so on, ritual practices. So, it is a kind of whole paradigm that is depository of all social semantics.

So, these societies being different, the semantic complexes also are different according to Radcliffe Brown. And the only possibility to study the archaic culture and ethnic society is comparative method. So, we could compare the society, but we could not pretend never that this society is protoform for the other society.

Because, according to Radcliffe Brown, different kind of society could evaluate in the different senses. So, some of them becoming more complicated and sophisticated, more complex. And the other, on the other hand, could evaluate in the sense of simplicity.

They could lose some practice. For example, some population of Siberia, of Evenki, of

Manchurian population, they conserve in their culture some information about ancient times when their parents could deal with metals, with sophisticated procedures of working with some metallic construction. And with the time they have completely forgotten these practices.

So, we could consider the possibility of evolution in the sense of more sophisticated kind of society. And at the same time, we could consider the opposite way of development of the society. We could compare, but we could not pretend that one form of society is protoform for the other.

We could not create hierarchy, historical hierarchy. So, with Bronislaw Malinovsky, Radcliffe Brown insisted on the necessity of participant observation of the society. If we are going to describe correctly this or that kind of archaic culture, we necessarily should live there, should study the language, should participate in the everyday life of this society.

So, participation is absolutely necessary to understand and describe correctly the society. We could not form an idea about such or such archaic culture, basing only information on the other. Because there is very important attitude of the person who studies the society.

If he is not the part of temporary period of this society, he could not correctly describe what is going on. Because relying on the materials of the other, it is always the great possibility of the era of prejudices, of preformed conceptions or preconceptions that could affect profoundly the process of description of such or such culture. So, we could never be sure how we understand correctly or not the society without participation in it.

So, Radcliffe Brown spoke also about a kind of anthropological perception. So, to study some society, archaic culture or primitive tribe, the anthropologist should also understand his own vision of the things. And that is important to explain, to give account about the personal beliefs of anthropologist that could affect in some cases his interpretations of the culture he is studying.

The other representative of English new anthropological school is Meyer Fortis, who was also successor of Bronislaw Malinowski and functionalist in the anthropology. Meyer Fortis paid special attention to the problem of time in the archaic ethnic society, trying to de-gauge in every case the structure of times. So, he came to the conclusion in his researches and his studies that every kind of society has its own time.

So, the time is not something general and understanding of time is variable in different society. So, studying the structure of time we could interpretate the functional meaning of many different rituals and beliefs that remain obscure without this consideration of structure of time. For example, studying African society, Meyer Fortis observed that some archaic tribes possess very developed vision of different periods of time and some

developed tribes, much more sophisticated, have very primitive vision of time.

So, the concept of time could not be also the measure of the level of the development of the society because there are different patterns of structures of time that could serve to establish some comparison but could not give our possibility to deduce from this study the level of development of such or such society. The structure of time is different in different society and it is a kind that represents impersonal, super-individual paradigm that is in the center of the social structure, social institution and belief of such or such society. This is a very important direction, the anthropology of time or ethno-sociology of time that we will use in the future in our analysis of ethnic community.

The other representative of British Anthropological School, New Anthropology is Edward Evans Pritchard that occupied by main problem of transmission of cultures that was in the central problem of his researches also in Africa and among different ethnic groups. So, he also was a partisan of functional or structuralist approach in the spirit of Malinowski or Redcliffe Brown. Evans Pritchard considered the main sense, the main meaning of the culture as something spiritual.

He was in this sense the follower of Dilthey philosophical approach, attitude and philosopher Dilthey considered that there are two different domains of human activity spiritual sciences and material or natural sciences and for Evans Pritchard to understand correctly primitive or archaic society it means to understand first of all its spiritual complex. So, the structure of the main spirituality or how this or that ethnic group understands the creation of the universe, the soul, the spirit, gods and demons So, it is a kind of spiritual picture of the universe that is basic and dealing with that Evans Pritchard stressed that it is necessary also to consider personal religious ideas of the searcher because if, for example, we are dealing the searcher is atheist, so he will try to explain spiritual culture of such or such archaic society by the materialistic or technical means if he is religious person, he will consider, he will compare subconsciously the religious beliefs with his own beliefs and that would affect considerably the result of this studies So, to understand correctly the spiritual life of such or such archaic society we need to revise our proper attitude to the religion questions So, the person of the anthropologist is in the center of the concerns of this tendency and the new anthropology We have seen that also by Radcliffe Brown and with Edward Evans Pritchard that was central So, the figure of anthropologist here is in the center of questioning Is it possible to give objective vision of such or such society without any link to the personal attitude of anthropologist himself So, that was also the first step to create a new rule, a new ethics of modern anthropology So, to be professionally correct, anthropologist should undergo a kind of anthropological psychoanalysis defining his own or her own complexes, beliefs, ideas and without that we could not study the other, not studying, not understanding, not reflecting the content of our own personality Very important British anthropologist that developed also this new kind of social anthropological tendency And the disciple of Bronislaw Malinovsky was Edmund Leach

who has introduced the concept of unstable equilibrium. So, he has developed the concept of functionalism and structuralism in the social anthropology with emphasis of continuous fluctuation of social structures and patterns in the frame of the same culture. So, studying in Burma, Sri Lanka and Ceylon, different villages with particular political and social systems he has come to the conclusion that at the same time, at very short distance between them there exist in this area, in these countries, very different kind of political organization of the villages. He called it Gumsa and Gumloa patterns. Gumsa pattern was with great and accentuated social stratification and Gumloa society was based on equality or near to the communist democratic, radical democratic organization. And these villages, people by the same ethnic group, they were completely different, opposite in their accentuation of the social structure. And there was a kind of permanent transition in these structures observable by anthropologists. So, being different and coexisting in more or less the same geographical space they were under permanent changes, in the process of permanent changes. So, these two types of society, hierarchical one and equalitarian one were considered by Edmund Leach as two coexisting patterns of social types dealing with constantly renewing challenges and responding for them differently. So, there is a kind of inner dynamic or an unstable equilibrium of different kind of society that are responsible for the social changes. And that was studied by Leach in the archaic Asian society Anthropology. And the second person in the ethno-sociology is Ernest Gellner. Very important philosopher and politologist and sociologist. Gellner is a key figure in understanding of the phenomenon of the nation. So, he studied not archaic or ethnic societies but he studied the formation of historic nations. European historic nations. And his main idea was that creation of historic European nations was absolutely artificial process that there was nothing in common between European nations and ethnic group of traditional society bearing the same names. So, for Gellner, nation was something essentially bourgeois that was created by the technical reasons in very concrete moment of historic development of the western society that was nation was modern phenomenon and it had nothing to do with ethnic or pre-modern society based on completely different kind of sociological paradigm. So, technically, Gellner identified in the society three main criteria. Thinking or cognition, joint action or coercion and production. So, all these three main forms of human activity represent a structure that is particular to one or the other kind of society. For Gellner, there are three major kinds of society. Society of hunters and gatherers, archaic one. Agrarian society, second form of society and industrial society. These three types of society have particular combination of modes of thinking of coercion and production. So, every kind of society organize differently these three modes of human activity. So, ethnic, organic unity or community is form of organization of society of hunters and gatherers on one hand and agrarian society. So, there is a kind of unity of the society and collective identity that is common to the archaic form of human tribes or hordes. And when we come from agrarian to industrial society there is important shift in the identity. So, we are coming from collective identity proper to the earlier and previous form of societies to the individual identity. So, the nation is based on the individual identity.

according to Gellner and this kind of national identity imposed on the atomic individuals is a kind of technical step of bourgeoisie of bourgeois society of modern Europe So, modernity is sociological, social phenomenon of changing drastical change of human society from collective to individual In the agrarian society there is or caste, collective identity or groups of villagers, peasantry and everywhere we are dealing with collective identity but it is not tribes nor directly ethnic or archaic groups but it is something organized on the basis of the collective identity And with coming of the modern age, with coming of modernity we are assisting by important shift from this collective identity to the individual one because the people in the cities, in the towns are living as units, as individuals So, they participate in working process as units and so that is kind of capitalist fragmentation of the society in industrial stage of historic development So, industrial societies are formed on the basis of individual identity but the political leaders of this capitalist society discover that if this process would develop society will lack any kind of cohesion, any kind of stability, any kind of order because everybody would conduct himself by its own account So, there will be a kind of chaos And not to let this chaos to realize there was invented the idea of nation as a completely artificial identity based on the concrete individual citizenship but transcended in a kind of new concept that any individual of such or such industrial society form part of the industrial nation or national state And the instrument for the creation of this new kind of artificial identity was nationalism According to the Gellner nationalism goes first Before nation there is first of all nationalism and after that nation So, nation is something artificially created according to the Gellner So, that is a kind of rule imposed from above by the ruling capitalist elite that imposes on the completely disparate, completely divided population fragmented population imposes a new kind of artificial identity imagining national history, national proto-statehood on the basis of completely invented myths modern kind of political and social and historical mythology So, it was a polemic vision of Gellner above all directed against different primordialist thinkers that considered the modern European nation, political nations as direct descendants of ethnic group of the same name So, Gellner deconstructed this pretension and showed that we are dealing with something completely other with completely different sociological phenomenon So, the other political scientists that also developed the idea of artificial nature of nation is living scientists, political scientists Benedict Anderson who introduced the concept of imagined community The main idea of Benedict Anderson is that with concept of nation we are dealing with artificial creations based on the individual identity but proposed to the people as something common as kind of community So, we are dealing with the society in the Tunisian sense that is not considered to be society but with the society that is obliged to think of itself in the terms of community That is a kind of illusion It is a kind of social illusion when to the society that consists from individual identities their idea is imposed that they are organic whole So, it is a kind of illusion Illusion instrumentalized by states by nations by the political elites to have a control over society that otherwise should be chaotic and would lose eventually its cohesion So, the idea is to continue to deconstruct the nation as completely artificial concept that was also before affirmed by

Gelner So, this kind of imagined community should be correct name for the actual nations and if the civil society could manage to organize public life without such illusion So, we could put aside nation because that is a kind of false and completely artificial identity and to live in the conditions of the civil society without any relation to nationhood That nation as a kind of imagined society could be used in historical terms and in one moment one historical period it loses its necessity its sense, its functional meaning and after that we could live without nations at all So, affirms Benedict Anderson It is very important for their ethno-sociology in the sense that with such a constructivist approach we could explain correctly the phenomenon of creation of modern nations and also the kind of evolution of national identity to the civil society in actual period of history So, to end with English school of social anthropology we could say that most important feature of this school was introduction of psychoanalysis by Bronislaw Malinovsky and sociology by Radcliffe Brown in the field of anthropology with stressing the relativist attitude to the society So, that was in the other branch of ethnological and anthropological knowledge in the other branch in the British school of the same attitude as was central point of new anthropology in American school of France both and his disciples So, what is important that sociology introduced in the field of ethnology gives us very developed set of theoretical instruments to study archaic cultures and ethnic groups and to interpret its meanings its beliefs and its practices better Okay, I've had two or three questions that have been passed forward to me that I think are good for us to discuss The first question specifically on this lecture of the English school is what does the English school of social anthropology and our discussion of us tell us about English society? First of all as long as I know social anthropology was considered to be the scientific method to study only archaic culture and society and when we are dealing with modern society or with society of modernity there are only constructivist attitudes that are used So, Gellner and Anderson dedicated some texts on English society but only to demonstrate in order to demonstrate artificial concept of British identity that was created as a kind of political elite in order to keep the individual together atomized individuals of British society So, this is a highly deconstructive idea that there is no English because ancient ethnic groups cease to exist and they have lost completely its previous original collective identity and now we are dealing with individuals thinking or imagining to be British but they are capitalist individuals they are atomized units and nothing more used by capitalist elite to control them and to keep them together up to the point where it is necessary after that there will be no Great Britain no British identity only European or Western society So, in the process of globalization they should easily free themselves from this British nationhood because it is something completely artificial In this sense they addressed Gellner and Anderson and the other anthropologists as is the case of Great Britain but I am a little... it is strange that there are relatively little studies of ancient ethnic identities of the ethnic group that were in Great Britain in the pre-modern ages So, social anthropology concerning ancient ethnic groups living in Great Britain there is relatively less development and it is strange because knowing such amount of material about historic history of Great Britain we lack serious studies

concerning ethnological aspects of ancient people living there A little follow-up, a little bit more specifically what does the way that English sociologists or social anthropologists have thought of ethno-sociology their thought process, their mentality what does that tell us about English society today? It is difficult to say First of all if we accept constructivist point of view we are dealing with a society where there is no such kind of ethnic mentality or ethnic psychology all that is social, all industrial, individual So, to use the word ethnic applying it to the modern English Great Britain society is not correct because there is not any more ethnic levels If we are dealing with constructivist tradition that is predominant in modern English social anthropology and they begin to use the methods of Malinowski or Euclid Brown only studying non-Western, non-European people So, there is ethnical mentality and psychology and cultural complexes but in England it is presumably finished with any kind of ethnic identity and we are dealing normatively with the atomized units So, they could not have links with anything collective only everything is individual in the modern society The only problem is the immigrants immigrants that are numbers in Great Britain and logically they could conserve some ethnical features but it is also not so politically correct to explore them because we doing so we recognize that a different level of modernization of different people in the same society Normatively, all immigrants or native Englishmen are modernized in the equal manner Factually, it is not so but to study that it is against some presumption of political level So, I think that ethno-sociological methods and socio-anthropological methods apply to the study of modern English society is politically impossible Very good So, your answer there brings us I think to one of the other questions that was put forward this question of how ethno-sociology as a field of academia can study the ethno-ethnicity without being deeply immersed particularly when we are talking about a judgmental comparison of different ethnic societies different cultures different levels of development or perceived levels of development this conflict between objectivity and subjectivity How, in your opinion, can we resolve this? It is very interesting because it is not only the question of objectivity but it is also the question of self-analysis and there are two trends First of all, it is a postmodern trend that insists on the necessity to be completely impartial and to refuse any kind of comparison based on the moral judgment so that is better or worse more developed, less developed So, this kind of postmodernist attitude introduces a relativism a radical relativism that is very important and it is very interesting from the point of possibility to understand the other because dealing with the other without permission to himself to judge the other we are discovering the new possibility to understanding to contact, to communication because dealing with the other without any preconcept concerning him it is really that gives us possibility to discover the other as he considers himself and not dealing with our projections but that introduces absolute relativity in the science in the field of scientific social and anthropological research and there is a critical realist the other that reacting against this postmodern relativization radical relativism and pluralism tries to return to the classical for the modernity western modernity scientific methods of hierarchy and taxonomies of modernity where we are dealing with some supposition of rationality some hierarchies and so on we could not

understand the other being modern so we are obliged to deal with supremacist racist, culturally racist type of taxonomies better, worse, more developed, less developed a kind of racism implicit racism, cultural racism the only possibility to go beyond that is postmodernist radical relativism and I think that are two limits of modern discussion in the field of anthropology and maybe that is a kind of dividing line the line that divides two camps modernist and postmodernist but new modernists are not satisfied with the ancient modernists they also try partly to accept postmodernist critics and to make their methods more sophisticated to bridge the gap yes, to bridge the gap but I think that to be objective it is impossible so we could rediscover a kind of trans-subjectivity or trans-objectivity transjectivity, traject, traject not object, not subject, traject and there is the tendency or the trend in the European French sociology that is called sociology of imagination they try to bridge the gap by the appeal to the traject traject, transjectum that is something that lays between object and subject or maybe existential analysis of German philosopher Martin Heidegger so making appeal to the design design that is not object or subject that is something that is between them so I think that postmodernism, postmodernist challenge is very important in that and I'd prefer in this field postmodernist criticism of modernist hierarchical and racist approach implicitly than critical realism that is pure and simple return to the modernism and just quickly, I know we're running out of time but particularly you've given us a very good fairly objective overview of the English School of Social Anthropology but I think that some of our listeners are interested particularly as the basis for your own work for the theory of the multipolar world the fourth political theory, neo-Eurasianism what particular thinkers or aspects of the English School do you find most appealing, most useful in your own work? I think that there are two different, completely different fields in the English School of Social Anthropology first of all introduction of sociology and sociological methods in the field of anthropology and ethnology by Malinowski and by Clifford Brown Evans-Pritchard that is very important because that gives us new possibility to study archaic cultures as something complete not as first stage of the future society but as the social complex that we should regard as something absolute as Duke Hayne proposed to regard the society as a kind of social god that is absolute so if we apply that for the archaic society we could understand them much better it is very important point to study ethnical phenomenon so ethnos is something complete it is not first stage of human development so we could by this means rehabilitate the ethnical groups and ethnical consciousness so that is impossible by the evolutionist and modernist attitude and the other aspect great relevance of the Gellner-Anderson concept of construction of the nations by artificial procedure based on the nationalism also consideration of the nationhood as completely artificial construction of the political capitalist and bourgeois elite it is also fit absolutely to main vision of modernity as a kind of falsification of the social reality a construction of simulacrum so the concept that nation is the simulacrum of the ethnical organic society is very important useful practically in creation of force political theory for multipolarity based not on the national statehood but on the civilizational approach that is not continuation of modern national statehood but something completely different from the

domain of the pre-modernity and post-modernity and not modernity so these authors Gellner-Anderson and the other help us to define better the nature and the essence of the nations and the reason why they are now vanishing so how and why there will be no nations in the future and how the nations were also something artificially created based on individual identity and so if we are assisting now by the process of evaporation of vanishing of the national identity it was included in appearance of the nation in the first appearance on the historical stage of the nation that was precisely the idea of Julius Evola, a traditionalist author that considered nation as completely modern and French phenomenon and not continuation of the pre-modern order of society so it is also very useful this second point for the practical and ideological reasons Thank you