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11.1 INTRODUCTION

Nationalism has been called the religion of 19th and 20th centuries. As a way of thinking about the world, it emphasises the importance of nations in explaining historical developments and analysing contemporary politics and also claims that 'national character' is a pervasive factor differentiating human beings. Nationalism assumes that all human beings should have one and only one nationality which should be their primary factor of identity and loyalty. This means that people should see themselves as members of a nationality and be prepared to make any sacrifices required to defend and advance the interest of a nation. As a doctrine of universal applicability, nationalism claims that all people should give their highest loyalty to their own nation. Nationalism claims to represent the will of the people to be able to decide upon their own destiny, their will to be respected as a people to develop their culture and personality. During the last two hundred years, nationalism has combined with the ideologies of liberalism, socialism and communism and emerged as a winner. Everywhere in the world, nationalism comes first and other ideologies occupy a second position. The national movements in the ex-colonial countries in the first half of 20th century and the disintegration of Soviet Union in the final end of 20th century revealed the powerful force of nationalism. Today, we live in an age where instead of peaceful multiculturalism, nations feel constant threat of being annihilated. Nationalism provides a useful tool for the preservation of their culture. This is all the more important when, in the context of globalisation, there is an attempt at homogenisation of all the communities.
11.2 WHAT IS NATIONALISM

Nationalism is a compound of many factors some of which have their roots in human nature and many of which have a long history. Yet it is a modern phenomenon. To discover it is a difficult undertaking and to define it in succinct phrases is even more difficult. In one sense it is the extension of a group to which one belongs. In this sense, it is a form of collective egotism. In negative sense it is a manifestation of that fear of the 'stranger' with its roots deep in human nature. In modern sense it is born of that love of the familiar land and people which is often regarded as the core of patriotism. According to Hayes, nationalism has been used in many different ways and it is commonly used 'to denote a condition of mind among members of a nationality, perhaps already possessed of a national state, a condition of mind in which loyalty to the ideal or to the fact of one's national state is superior to all other loyalties and of which pride in one's nationality and belief in its intrinsic excellence and its 'mission' are 'integral parts'. Similarly, Hans Kohn defines nationalism as a state of mind.... Striving to correspond to a political fact.' On the other hand Gellner writes, 'Nationalism is primarily a political principle which holds that the political unit and the national unit should be congruent...nationalist sentiment is a feeling of anger aroused by the violation of the principle, or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by its fulfillment.' Giddens points to the psychological character of nationalism 'the affiliation of the individual to a set of symbols and beliefs, emphasising commonality among the members of a particular community'.

In short, nationalism has two aspects: i) the political character of nationalism as an ideology defending the notion that the state and the nation should be congruent and ii) its capacity to be a provider of identity for individuals conscious of forming a group based upon a common past and culture, attachment to a concrete territory. The power of nationalism emanates from its ability to engender sentiments of belonging to a particular community. Symbols and rituals play a major role in the cultivation of a sense of solidarity among the people.

Thus in order to understand the concept of nationalism, we must keep in mind that

- Nationalism is a sentiment that has to do with attachment to a homeland, a common language, ideals, values and traditions, identifying a particular group with symbols such as flag, songs which define it as 'different' from others. The attachment creates an identity and the appeal to that identity has a past and the power to mobilise the people.

- How a sentiment of attachment to a homeland and a common culture can be transformed into the political demand for the creation of a state; how is it possible to make this transition? A theory of nationalism has to deal with questions such as: how does nationalism use and legitimise the use of violence in its quest for the creation of a state?

- An important feature of nationalism is its capacity to bring together people from different social and cultural levels. Nationalism is not merely an invention of the ruling classes to maintain the unconditional loyalty of the masses but also making them believe that they have much in common that is more important than what separates them. This is one of the basic factors in trying to understand the persistence of nationalism.
11.3 DISTINCTION BETWEEN NATIONALISM AND RELATED TERMS

In order to examine the political character of nationalism, a basic conceptual distinction has to be made between nation, state, nation-state and nationalism. The term ‘state’ is a legal institution and usually refers to ‘a human community that claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’. On the other hand, ‘nation’ is a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself.

A nation includes five dimensions: psychological (consciousness of forming a group), cultural, territorial, political and historical. By the term 'nation-state', is meant the 'formation of a kind of state which has the monopoly of legitimate use of force and which seeks to unite its people by means of homogenisation creating a common culture, symbols, values, traditions and myth of origin'. Nationalism is a sentiment of belonging to a community whose members identify with a set of symbols, beliefs and ways of life, and have the will to decide upon their common political destiny.

11.4 RISE OF NATIONALISM AND FEATURES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

The rise of nationalism was preceded by a rise in the national consciousness and differentiation of nationalities which took place between 15th and 18th centuries. Hayes contributes seven factors to the rise of national consciousness: linguistic and literary, political, commercial, economic, ecclesiastical, religious, and cultural. Nations and nationalism are modern phenomena and nations can be defined only in terms of the age of nationalism. According to Gellner, nationalism is the result of some specific aspects of modernisation. It is the phenomenon connected with the emergence of industrial society. Giddens relates nations and nationalism to the emergence of modern state and locates it in the late 18th century. Historically, kinship represented the first sign of formation of larger groups attached to a concrete territory. Through the creation of markets, the intensification of trade, the fighting of wars, the slow but progressive amplification of state's scope, there emerged the formation of a community conscious of itself which differed from others. It is at this stage that one can talk of emergence of nations. Thus the principal factors responsible for the rise of nationalism can be enumerated as follows:

i) the individualistic climate of opinion that characterised renaissance and reformation

ii) collapse of universal authority of the church

iii) the desire of rising commercial classes for uniform trade regulations, abolition of feudal obstacles to trade and for creating conditions under which trade could be carried-on peacefully and profitably

iv) the desire for peace, order and security in an age marked by bloodshed, violence and intolerance

v) personal ambitions of monarchs who allied themselves with rising commercial class in opposition to the more powerful feudal lords
vi) the doctrine of territorial sovereignty, which offered the national kinds the most convenient theoretical weapon with which to combat the claims of rival feudal or religious authorities. The idea of one unified legal system affording order, consistency and certainty in governing of all social relations within a given national area made a very strong appeal.

According to Beetham, three factors can be ascribed to the rise of nationalism: Economic, Military and Cultural. After the renaissance and reformation, the embodiment of universal laws by the state regarding administration and taxation helped in the establishment of national markets, provided unified markets for the expansion of national industry and in the conquest of foreign markets. The creation of national unified economy helped in the development of a welfare state in the 20th century. Secondly, in the military competition among the states, the states based upon common nationality proved better because of the resources of national economy. Also they could rely on the allegiance of unified national army. Thirdly, the nation-state was able to satisfy the cultural – religious, ethnic, linguistic – demands of the people. Thus national consciousness helped in consolidating the position of states and meeting the internal as well as external challenges.

**characteristics of National Identity**

Apart from the political aspect of nationalism as a modern phenomenon rising with the national state, the big question is what creates a national identity. In other words, along with certain rational developments, there are less rational but not less important areas concerned with creating a feeling and emotion. According to Guibernau, broadly speaking, there are three factors which helped in the creation of a national identity: i) development of printing and creation of vernacular languages ii) relationship between national identity and culture, and iii) common symbols and rituals. Let us examine these factors in detail.

The development of vernacular languages after the invention of printing press in Europe played a decisive role in creating a sense of belonging to a community. National consciousness is derived from shared values, traditions and memories within a particular culture which is thought and spoken in a particular language. Though vernacular is not an indispensable basis for the creation of national consciousness, yet it does facilitates that creation. Where nation and state were coextensive, education and the generalisation of literacy not only reinforced the possibility of communication among the people but also helped in the development of a strong sense of community. The development of English, French and German languages and education based upon school system led to the creation of a strong national consciousness. When the state manages to impose a culture 'and language, it is 'nationalism' which engenders nations.' If the state is successful, it manages to develop, apart from political, a combination of several relationships such as economic, territorial, religious, linguistic and cultural. It is this state which creates a nation.

Secondly, the key question with regard to national identity is – who am I? Identity is an interpretation of the self that establishes what and where a person is both socially and psychologically. Identity exists in societies which define and organise them. In the current era, the nation represents one of these communities. National identity is its product. The defining criteria of identity are: continuity over time and differentiation. While continuity lies in the historical roots, differentiation stems from the consciousness of forming a community with a
shared culture, attached to concrete territory which distinguish between members and 'strangers'.

This identity fulfils three functions: i) it helps in making choices such as right to decide about their common political identity ii) it makes the relationship possible with others because nation is a common pool in which individuals with a common culture live and work together, and iii) national identity gives strength and resilience to individuals to identify with an entity which transcends them. Now this identity is created through the development of common culture i.e. values, beliefs, customs, conventions, habits and practices that are transmitted to the new members who receive the culture of a particular community. The process of identification with the elements of a specific culture implies a strong emotional investment. From the point of view of nationalism, a common culture favours the creation of solidarity bond among the members of a given community and allows them to imagine the community they belong to as separate and distinct from others.

Thirdly, in the creation of national identity, a powerful role is also played by symbols and rituals. Nation is a community which has similarities within itself and differences from others. The consciousness of forming a community is created through the use of symbols and repetition of rituals that give strength to the individual members of the community By favouring occasions in which they feel united and by displaying symbols that represent its unity, a nation establishes the distinction from others. For example, a soldier who for his flag dies so because he identifies flag with his country. Also symbols like flag have the power to evoke particular memories or feelings. This helps in the ability of nationalism to bind together people from different cultural levels and social backgrounds. Symbols mask the difference and highlight commonality, creating a sense of group. And last but not the least, individuals who share the same culture and feel attached to a concrete land have the experience of a common past and a project for the future, need to create occasions in which all that unites them is emphasised. In these moments, the individual forgets about himself and the sentiment of belonging to a group occupies the prime position. Through rituals, individuals are able to feel an emotion of unusual intensity that springs from their identification with the entity – the nation – which is above them and of which they are a part.

Thus the force of nationalism springs not only from the rational thought alone but also from irrational power of emotions that stems from the feeling of belonging to a particular group. This double face of nationalism results from the way in which these emotions are either transformed into a peaceful and democratic movement seeking the recognition and development of one's nation above others and eradicate the differences.

11.5 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF NATIONALISM

During the last 300 years, nationalism has gone through different phases. Rising as a cultural and humanitarian concept, it has been used and misused by different ideologies viz Liberalism, Imperialism, Marxism, Fascism etc. It was a potent weapon in the hands of ex-colonial countries in their struggle for national liberation. Nationalism has been approached from a wide variety of perspectives ranging from liberal-rational to fascist-irrational. The main approaches are as follows:

- Liberal Approach to Nationalism
  1) Humanitarian
  2) Expansionist
Marxist approach to Nationalism

Integral - Fascist Approach to Nationalism

Anti-imperialist approach to Nationalism

Let us study these approaches in detail.

11.5.1 Liberal Humanitarian Approach to Nationalism

It was the earliest kind of formal nationalism and is found in the writings of Bolinbroke, Rousseau, Herder, Fichte, Mazzini etc. According to Herder, mankind is divided by nature and by reason into separate nationalities and it is through cultivation of the particular genius of the nationality that both the individual and humanity as a whole make progress towards perfection. Each national organism has its own peculiar individuality, a gift of nature and it is the duty of the individuals who are a part of this organism to cultivate that particular genius. Nationalities are distinguished from one another by historical traditions, by the possession of their own language, literature, system of education, customs and in a well developed nationality by the possession of 'national soul'. Herder emphasised the cultural part of nationalism, his exposition of what basically must distinguish one nationality from another include factors such as geography, climate, historical traditions, language, literature, education and manners. Similarly, Rousseau's concept of 'people' meant a people who share a common language and historical tradition, would have the means and inclination to assert the principle of popular sovereignty and to ensure the operation of political democracy. It is the national institutions which form the genius, the character, the taste, the customs of a people which make one and not another, which inspire the ardent love of the country founded on habits impossible to trace back to their sources.

But what is important to note here is that this sort of nationalism did not preach superiority of one nation over the other and this nationalism was apolitical. 'The human race', Herder wrote, 'is one whole, we work and suffer, sow and harvest each for all'. The happiness of one nation cannot be forced upon another; each must seek and find its own happiness in its own way. Above all nations stand the ideal of humanity as a goal and guiding principle, a potentiality to be developed and cultivated. He opposed imperialism and war of conquest for the purpose of nationality. It is irrational despotism that seeks to bring peoples of different nationalities under one rule. As a liberal and a nationalist, Herder welcomed the French Revolution and saw in it the fruition of enlightenment.

Similarly, Fichte also believed that the individual best serves mankind through service to the nation and cultivation of the particular genius of the nation. Like Herder, he also believed that wherever a separate language is found, a separate nation exists. 'The first, original and truly natural boundaries of states are beyond doubt their internal boundaries. Those who speak the same language are joined to each other by a multitude of invisible bonds by nature itself, long before any human art beings, they understand each other and have the power to continue to make themselves understood more and more clearly.' After the Napoleonic conquest of Prussia, his views on nationalism were couched in highly chauvinistic language, the language national patriots of all countries have used when they have sought to engender resistance to foreign rule. It was out of such appeal to unity that the German national state finally emerged. In Fichte, cultural nationalism became politically conscious and active. In his book The Closed Commercial
State, he argued on behalf of economic nationalism. Unless a nation becomes economically self-sufficient, it could not survive as a political entity. International free trade, Fichte believed, led to imperialism and war rather than promoting unity among nations, it sowed the seeds of discord and rivalry. Let each state strive for economic self-sufficiency and one of the basic causes of war will be removed.

Another representative of liberal humanitarian nationalism was Guiseppe Mazzini. He not only stirred the passions of the Italian people on behalf of national unity and independence from foreign rule but stimulated similar nationalistic movements throughout Europe. Like Herder and Fichte, Mazzini declared that every people have its special mission and that mission constitutes its nationality. This special mission is only a particular fulfillment of the general mission of humanity. As he wrote, 'Humanity is the association of nationalities, the alliance of peoples in order to work out their missions in peace and love; the organisation of free and equal peoples that shall advance without hindrance and impediment... towards the progressive development of one line of thought of God, the line inscribed by him upon the cradle, the past life, the national idiom, and the physiognomy of each. The Pact of Humanity cannot be signed by individuals, but only by free and equal people, possessing a name, a banner and the consciousness of a distinct individual existence'. Mazzini believed that the nation-state was the medium and agency through which history manifests itself in its progressive development towards greater human freedom. Through association in nations, individuals are able to fulfill their destiny in a way that would be impossible for them as isolated individuals. Over and above individuals, comprising them in their totality is Humanity and humanity manifests itself most clearly in nationalities. But instead of rights, Mazzini emphasised on duties. A man has an obligation to himself, to his family, to his community and whatever rights he may be said to have are an outgrowth and reflection of these obligations. The highest obligation of a man has to serve Humanity for only by truly serving humanity can he truly serve himself and his country. Only by forming national states can nationalities serve humanity. But over and above loyalty to the nation Mazzini placed loyalty to Humanity. Although Mazzini favoured wars of liberation that would result in the achievement of unity and independence for nationalities, he looked forward, after the restoration of the map of Europe to its 'natural' national boundaries, to a world dedicated to universal and perpetual peace and unity.

In short, this approach laid stress on the humanitarian and cultural aspect of nationalism, the natural right of man to belong to a nationality and was opposed to the domination of one nation over the other.

11.5.2 Expansionist Approach

Contrary to the vision of thinkers like Mazzini that the war of liberation would result in the achievement of unity and independence for the nationalities, the victories in the liberal wars brought about the very evils which they were supposed to destroy. Rather they became the forerunners and pioneers of wars more destructive and extensive than before. National unification and democracy intensified international antagonisms and made the broad mass of peoples active participants in them. After 1850s, the industrial revolution had spread to a number of European countries and the American continent. The unified nations now had the cohesion and emotional impetus necessary for policies of conquest – whether colonial or otherwise. International disputes now became controversies between nations where the interests of the peoples themselves appeared to be at stake and in which the peoples themselves had the opportunity to play a
determining part. The triumph of nationalism and democracy strengthened the sovereignty of the state and a stepping stone for national expansion beyond its frontiers. This led to a shift in the theoretical justification of nationalism from liberal, humanitarian to 'scientific' and biological one. Nationalism was discovered by some writers to have a biological basis and imperialism was discovered to be but a working out of the evolutionary principle of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. With this change, a scientific justification could be given to imperialist expansion. Since it involved strife between nations, it could be compared to competition between species for survival. For some writers, it was 'natural' and to some, it was essential to human progress for strong nations to struggle for aggrandizement, and for the superior 'races' to prevail. Given this biological urge on the part of the healthy 'races' and the presence of 'backward races', the logic of nationalism changing into imperialism became inescapable. Imperialism could be regarded as entirely consistent with the theory of subjugation and annexation of weaker nationalities and backward peoples by states claiming statehood on the basis of nationality. This imperialist-expansionalist approach to nationalism found expression in the writings of Ludwig Gump lowicz, J.R. See lay, J.A. Cramb, J.W. Burgess, Treitschke etc. Let us study their views in detail.

According to Gump lowize, the 'most natural tendency of state is incessant increase of power and territory'. National expansion is an expression of the very being of a state, it is the inevitable tendency that rulers and people are powerless to resist'. So necessary and so strong is this tendency to foreign conquest that no state can escape it; whatever their size, they will attempt to expand in territory and power and they will cease to do so only when they cease to exist. Similarly, the great defender of British imperialism, J.R. Seelay, urged his fellow countrymen to become conscious of their destiny to undertake their imperial responsibilities with deliberation. He used the word 'destiny' to describe the British imperialistic 'mission' much in the same way that the phrase 'manifest destiny' was used in the United States during the 19th century to justify the Westward expansion and by some to cover even more ambitious territorial aspirations. Another English historian, J.A. Cramb offered an extreme form of British imperialism. For him, the British were a race endowed with the genius for empire and such a race is compelled to dare, to suffer all, to sacrifice all for the fulfillment of its appointed task. 'The civil, the feudal or the oligarchic state passes into the national, the national into the imperial, by slow or swift gradations, but irresistibly, as by a fixed law of nature'. In United States, Burgess talked about the 'mission of the Teutonic nations of conducting the political civilisation of the world'. The backward peoples of the world must be taught by conquest and the rulership of the Teutonic nations how to live. It was declared that the combination of small states into larger political aggregates must continue until the entire semi-civilised barbarian and savage communities of the world are brought under the protection of the larger civilised nations.

Imperialism and war as an expression of nationalism found forceful expression in the writings of Treitschke. He believed that state rather than being a means to an end was a self-sufficient end in itself. The state must seek its own goal within itself and no individual has the right to regard the state as a servant of his own aims but is bound by moral duty and physical necessity to subordinate himself to it. He regarded war as 'the form of litigation by which states must make their claims valid' and it is a drastic though beneficial 'remedy for the ailing nation'. War is a test whereby the weak and cowardly are recognised and 'perish justly'. Small states have a duty to grow larger for such growth' 'is a sign of the moral stamina of a people'. It is essential to the pride of the state and to the belief in its own future that it should seek to grow in size. He urged Germany to embark upon the imperialist ventures that had made England such a great
nation. If Germany was to achieve the status of first rate power among the nations of the Western world, she must acquire overseas territory.

Thus nationalism which was formerly justified as a means of realising and extending the cultural bond among homogeneous group, became an end in itself and a means of imperialist expansion. It became a potent weapon in the hands of industrialised countries of Europe and America to conquer the under-developed lands of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

11.5.3 Marxist Approach

The idea of nationalism and the nation-state had a different connotation in Marxism. Marx declared that the societies were divided not on nationalities but on class basis. The purpose of the state is the protection of vested interests of the dominant class and as such the state does not represent the nationality but the class interest. Writing about his own times, Marx emphasised that although the capitalist-liberal state talks of national interest, industrialisation has created a working class which has a universal interest irrespective of nationality, as a result of which the concept of nationality is almost dead in industrialised countries. Extreme nationalism is an ideological means which helps in the class domination. It is a fiction created by the bourgeois class and is being used by it just as it used religion, ethics, democracy, freedom, science, art or literature. He said that the working class has no nation; it has universal class interest. The salvation of the working class laid in the development of productive forces on a world scale which was not possible in the narrow sphere of nation state. Hence, theoretically, Marx and Engels gave the idea of abolition of nationalities which, according to them, was the creation of middle class ideology.

In Marx's view, nationalism is an expression of bourgeois interests. As he wrote, 'the bourgeoisie conveniently assumed that the nation consists only of capitalists. The country was, therefore, theirs'. He argued that the bourgeoisie as a class had a common interest and 'this community of interest which is directed against the proletariat inside the country and is directed against the bourgeoisie of other nations outside the country. This, the bourgeoisie calls his nationality.'

In German Ideology, Marx refers to the proletariat as a class unlike any other. A class which no longer counts as a class in the society, is not recognised as a class, and is in itself the expression of the dissolution of all classes' and nationalities within the present society. In the modern capitalist society, the more proletariat spends his life working, the more he is impoverished. Marx denounced this situation and thought that the proletariat all over the world would be able to unite and fight. In The Communist Manifesto, he writes, 'the working men have no country...national differences and antagonism between people are daily more and more vanishing...The nationality of the worker is neither French, English nor German, it is labour, free slavery. His government is neither French, English nor German, it is factory air, the land belongs to him is neither German, English nor French but lies a few feet below the ground'. Similarly, Engels echoed Marx that the working class should think in international terms. 'National one sidedness and narrow-mindedness becomes more and more impossible'.

Writing about their organisation the Communist International, declared 'the International recognises no country; it desires to unite, not dissolve'. It is opposed to the cry for nationality because it tends to separate people from people and used by tyrants to create prejudices and antagonisms.
But 1848 seemed to herald a major modification of Marx and Engels’s original stand on nationalism in that they supported the national cause of the historic or great nations such as Hungary and Poland and Germany all of which sought to establish large stable national states. Also Marx felt that the liberation of the oppressed nations will help in overpowering the national division and help in the consolidation of the working class of both nations. The national liberation movement will also help in weakening the political, economic, military and ideological power of the ruling class and will inculcate a revolutionary ideology in the working class of the oppressed nation. Engels introduced the concept of ‘non-historic nations’. According to him, there were certain great historic nations in Europe like Italy, Poland, Hungary, Germany and the idea of unity was justified but there were certain minor nations with no historical importance and legacy like Romania, Czechs and Slovaks. The failure of democratic revolution in Europe was largely due to the counter-revolutionary role of these nations. Before 1917, the radical left in Europe largely endorsed the views of Marx and Engels and opposed the national separation in the name of proletarian internationalism. But some of the specific questions on the Marxist view of nationalism have been solved by history. In 1890, when Germany attacked France, Marx appealed to the working class of Germany that they should not support Bismarck but rather revolt against him. However, the working class supported Bismarck. Such appeals were repeated in the First and Second World Wars but the working class did not agree to not to enter the war and neither did the war stop.

The national question and the question of nationalities came to the forefront after the Russian Revolution because in Russia there were a number of nationalities. Lenin understood clearly the dialectical relationship between internationalism and the right of self-determination of nationalities. He felt that only the right to secede will make possible the voluntary union and cooperation and the long term fusion between the nations. Similarly, only the recognition by the workers’ movement in the oppressed nations about the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination could help eliminate the hostility and suspicion of the oppressed and unite the proletariat of both nations in the international struggle against the bourgeoisie. Lenin also grasped the relationship between national democratic struggles and the socialist revolution and showed that the popular masses of the oppressed nations were the allies of the conscious proletariat. On the other hand, Stalin’s solution to the problem of nationalities was realistic but away from the Marxist tradition. He gave autonomy to different nationalities within the Soviet state. Each nationality could set up a state legislature and develop its language and culture. They were given equal status at the central level. But gradually, all the nationalities were absorbed by CPSU. The important point, however, is that along with class, the nationalities were recognised. Stalin’s policy of ‘Socialism in one county’ intended to make Russia spearhead of the world revolution and more and more of it became associated with the extension of Russian national interest. During the Second World War, the national sentiment was given a free hand. The heroes of Czarist Russia became the heroes of the communist movement of the others in the national interest: A natural result of the war was the awakening of national consciousness in all the communist countries. Hence the communist party of a nation had to oppose the communist party of the other in the national interest and in the context of the idea of international proletarian revolution, became dead. The quarrel among the communist parties of Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the differences between the former Soviet Union and China are clear examples. In Asia, modern nationalism and Marxist socialism came to the forefront almost simultaneously. More recently, the disintegration of Soviet Union and Yugoslavia has proved that the ethnic, religious and other identities are more dominant than the ‘class loyalties’. The bloodshed in Croatia, armed clashes between Russia and local nationalists in Georgia and Moldavia proved beyond point that the national question is very serious.
It is possible to find some similarities between nationalism and Marxism that have contributed to the union of these two forms of ideology in different countries especially after Marx. According to Smith, both nationalism and Marxism are 'salvation movements'. Both describe the present situation as oppressive and want to change it. While Marxism wants a change through revolution, nationalism wants to restore the lost identity of the individual. Whereas for Marxism, the enemy is the bourgeois class, for nationalism, it can be an alien tyrant or a colonial rule. Both find their proper arena of struggle in the modern nation-state. Both rely on mass movements to realise their goal. During the anti-colonial struggles, there was a fusion of Marxism and nationalism in many countries. But whereas nationalism gives preference to culture, Marxism traces back every phenomenon to economic roots. Whereas Marxism locates its enemy in capitalism irrespective of his nationality, for the nationalists the enemies are those who corrupt the purity of the nation. And finally, while Marx accepted the past in order to transcend it, nationalism seeks inspiration from the past in order to link it with the present and restore the original features of the national character.

11.5.4 Integral (Fascist) Approach

In the 19th century, nationalism contributed to the liberation and emancipation movements. At that time it was a progressive doctrine inseparably connected with the democratic universalistic values inherited from the French Revolution. However, in the 20th century, this liberal nationalism was replaced by what is known as integral nationalism. This form of nationalism appeared in the writings of Maurice Barres, Charles Maurras, Aurthur de Gonineau, H.S. Chamberlain etc. In the version of Mussolini, integral nationalism found practical embodiment which was imitated and extended on a most ruthless fashion by Hitler and Nazi Germany. It was Maurras who first used this term and defined integral nationalism as 'the exclusive pursuit of national policies, the absolute maintenance of national integrity and the steady increase in national power'. As a doctrine, this form of nationalism stressed that the individual lives for the state, serves the state and glorifies the state. It gave an organic concept of state, rejected political democracy and favoured aggressive internationalism as a positive good. It conceived nation as an end and exalted militarism and imperialism. It demanded absolute loyalty to the nation and exalted national interest above those of individual and even humanity.

One of the earlier advocates of 'integral nationalism' was Maurice Barres who believed that French nationalism could be promoted by encouraging regionalism, purifying the French language by purging it of foreign words and encouraging the veneration of French military heroes like Napoleon. According to him, a man thinks those thoughts, which he must think as the member of a particular race or nationality. Blood and soil are the twin foundations of nationalism and the determining elements of life, both individual and social. These ideas were extended by another Frenchman Charles Maurras. He defined a true nationalist as one who 'places his country above everything; he therefore conceives, treats and resolves all pending questions in their relation to the national interest. Like Barres, he also argued for the veneration of the dead as the most active of the living' and declared that it is from the dead that the living derive the only initiative they can know. Not only did he cultivate the cult of 'blood' but encouraged the 'cult of the sacred soil'. But as Hayes writes, throughout the writings of Charles Maurras, his integral nationalism appeared as a breeder of hatred. He tirelessly preached hatred of 'alien' influence within France such as Jewish, Protestant, liberal, communist; he ceaselessly directs tirades against foreigners: German, Englishmen, American, and Russians etc. He favoured a hundred percent French nationalism which is at once suspicious and forceful.
Through the writings of Renedetoo Croce, Giovanni Gentile, Vincenzo Globerti nationalism was gradually divorced from liberalism and transformed into a cult of 'sacred Egoism'.

Fascism was an 'anti' movement – anti-liberal, anti-parliamentary, anti-Semitism, anti-communist, partially anti-capitalist, anti-bourgeois, anti-clerical. All these positions combined with exacerbating nationalist sentiments led to pan-nationalist ideas which challenged the existing states and accounted for much of the aggressive expansionist foreign policy of the fascist regimes. According to Mussolini, the foundation of Fascism was the conception of state, its character, its duty and its aim. Apart from the guardian of the people, the state was seen in absolute terms, as custodian and transmitter of the spirit of the people. It is the state which educates its citizens in civic virtue, gives them consciousness of their mission and moulds them into unity. It leads men from primitive tribal life to that highest expression of human power which is Empire. For Fascism, the growth of empire, that is to say, the expansion of the nation is an essential manifestation of vitality, and its opposite is a sign of decadence. War was exalted as a good end and the purpose of war was total annihilation of the defeated nation than rehabilitation. Thus in Fascism, nationalism became completely degenerate and nihilistic.

Closely associated with integral nationalism was the doctrine of racial superiority. It believed that the key to the understanding of history lies in the differences in quality and aptitude among the human races, that mankind consists of separate races distinguished by special physical, emotional and spiritual characteristics. For example, dividing the mankind into three principal races – the white, yellow and black – Gobineau ascribed marked superiority of the White or the Aryan race which is by nature a race of rulers. As a doctrine, racism was the denial of political, civil and social rights and hatred of the 'different'. Though liberal nationalism drew a distinction between 'us' and 'they', but in its fascist form, nationalism took to its extreme form where the existence of the 'other' was perceived as someone inferior as well as potential of factual enemy. In this view, even the existence of the other was seen as a threat to one's life. The 'other' must therefore be destroyed in order to protect one's own distinct existence. Friends and foes are in the form of collectivities. The conflict between them must itself inevitably be a total one in which the foe must be annihilated. It is not a matter of fixing boundaries but rather an attempt to eradicate all those that are different, whatever their ideas or attitudes. This was the case when racism was incorporated into the nationalistic discourse. For example, Nazism defended the creation of Greater Germany. The extermination of those portrayed as the cause of German problems was justified by citing their racial inferiority. The other's existence was perceived as posing a threat to Aryan excellence. Contamination had to be avoided at any price.

In short, both Fascism and Nazism used nationalism as myth. The important consideration was not whether an idea is true or not but whether it can be made to appear true to the mass of people. Mussolini created the myth of the nation – 'our myth is the Nation, our myth is the greatness of the Nation and to this grandeur, that we wish to translate into a complete reality, we subordinate all the rest'. German National socialism resorted to the myth of race. 'Today a new faith is awakening: the myth of blood, the belief that it is by the blood that the divine mission of man is to be defended; the belief, based on the clearest knowledge, that Nordic blood represents that mystery which has overcome and replaced the ancient sacraments'. This was a form of nationalism nourished not on love but on hate; it inculcated fear and not trust. It developed into the very anti-thesis of nationalism while retaining the slogans of
nationalism. It was a 'nationalism that theoretically could tolerate no nationalism but that of one nation'.

11.5.5 Anti Colonial Approach

In the 20th century, the period between the two world wars, the Russian revolution and the rise of Fascism were important landmarks in the spread of nationalist ideas from Europe to the non-European lands of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Collectively, they set in motion the process of national liberation movements, as a result of which many countries got independence from the imperialist powers of Europe. Such revolutionary changes played a vital role in developing a new form of nationalism. New nations like China, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Vietnam grew on the world scene which gave a new meaning to the concept of nationalism. The circumstances which gave birth to these nations were quite different from those of the West. These were the countries which were subjugated by imperialist countries like England, France, Spain, Holland etc. and their economies had been exploited. Imperialist countries considered them their private property whom they sold and pillaged. They destroyed their independence and preserved puppet governments which were too weak to do any harm to imperialism.

A new form of nationalism and a new meaning of concept was born in countries like India, China and Arab lands. Though the new concept of nationalism which became the basis of new states derived much of its ideology and political theory from the West, yet it adopted the theory to its own historical experiences, its particular circumstances and to its own revolt against imperialism. The basis of the new nationalism was that it began with an instinctive and xenophobic hatred for imperialism, a hatred of its representatives, its nationals and anyone affiliated with them. It was a simple hatred against those who had occupied their lands by force, exploited their riches by force, crushed their governments, enslaved their people and who did not hesitate to destroy plunder and steal. This hatred was expressed violently in killings, destruction and assassinations such as Boxer Rebellion as well as in peaceful, non violent forms in India under Gandhi. These states were conscious of imperialism, aimed at its destruction and destruction of those accompanying evils such as conquests, oppression, enslavement, stifling of liberty, exploitation of riches and sowing of racial, regional, communal and class distinctions. At the same time, nationalism was also a creative force which aimed at building a nation based upon the principles of liberty, independence, economic justice and national unity. It viewed national unity as a creative force which could stimulate the people to contribute their share in the national reconstruction. This unity meant two things: i) unity of geographical parts and ii) unity in the diversity of religion, class, caste, communal elements. These states pledged to work for the welfare of all classes, castes and groups because all of them participated and contributed their lot in the struggle for freedom. From international point of view, these nation states opposed military basis, undue alien interference into the affairs of other states, apartheid and believed in non-alignment and international cooperation.

A peculiar feature of anti-colonial nationalism was that in most cases a nation preceded the emergence of the state. Here a difference can be made between the initial form of nationalism as a movement directed against the colonial rulers and engaged in the struggle for independence, and nationalism's subsequent transformation into a political discourse employed by new leaders in their attempt to construct a nation capable of sustaining the legitimacy of the state they inherited from the colonial era. After gaining independence, these colonial states established new
states, drew their borders, built up their capital cities and established a central administration and institutions to suit their economic needs. As a result, each colony was a collection of peoples. Old states or fragments of these were brought together within the same boundaries. All these states were a mosaic of different ethnic communities and tribes. Thus the artificial and imposed character of the states in such territories accounted for most of the troubles after obtaining independence. The major problem faced by these states has been their fragility. The newly created nation states initiated a struggle to replace the pre-national ties with a feeling of national identity and loyalty. But in many cases, the euphoria accompanying the celebration of freedom soon turned sour. The reasons for this stem from the incapacity of the new states to eliminate economic backwardness and the difficulty of creating a coherent civil society out of a population as heterogeneous in itself as in relation to the state. Many of them, unable to sustain the claims of the people, turned towards USA or USSR. But this meant becoming dependent.

Also independence liberated ethnic nationalism within the emergent state nationalisms and in some cases – like India, Pakistan, Malaysia, Indonesia, Nigeria etc – threatened anti-colonialism and nationalism whose objective was the conservation of the state and the replacement of the colonial rulers. While Muslims called for a separate nation state challenging the integrity of the Indian state, caste, class, ethnic origin, religion, language formed separate layers of identity that added to the complexity of creating a single nation out of inherited arbitrarily designed state. After independence, enormous problems were faced to preserve the nationality. The socio-political environment elevated some leaders like Gandhi, Nehru, Sukamo, and Nasser to the category of prophet liberators. Yet, the vast gap between the Western educated elites and the bulk of a mostly illiterate population increased after independence. Most of them did not change the structure of the state and retained colonisers’ privileges. The fragility of their governments led to an increasing hostility as well as movements seeking independence of ethnic minorities within established states. Independence brought civil war in Sudan, Zaire, Chad, Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, Ceylon and a rift between Eastern and Western wings of Pakistan.

The major task confronted by the nationalist intellectuals has been to create a nation to legitimise the state. But given the heterogeneous character of their societies, conflict is unavoidable which stems from two sources: i) the difference arising among the ethnic groups included in the most arbitrarily created states inherited from the colonial rulers and ii) the wide gap between a small affluent elite and a large number of people living in conditions of poverty. In the first case, nationalism is employed as a weapon to ignite old antagonism and disputes, and in the case of second, it could be used to promote alternative image of the nation or channeled blame on the west for all the troubles.

11.6 'NATIONS WITHOUT STATE' AND 'STATES WITHOUT NATION'

As a political principle, nationalism holds that the nation and the state should be congruent. When the nation and the state are co-extensive, the label is rarely used. It is assumed that all parties and groups are nationalists because the nation they represent is already transformed into a state. Here nationalism serves as a unifying factor. However, there are many nations in the world which are without a state and there are and have been states without a nation. For a proper
understanding of nationalism, it is also important to understand how the nationalist discourse is articulated in these states.

Nationalism in 'nations without a state' present substantially different political scenarios depending upon the specific character of the nation-states within which such nations are included. At least four situations can be distinguished:

- A nation state may acknowledge the 'cultural differences' of its minorities, without allowing more than the cultivation and promotion of their own culture and maintenance of some deep rooted elements of socio-cultural traditions. For example, Scotland and Wales although equal partners with England within Britain, are forced to go down to London to solve their domestic problems.

- A certain degree of autonomy within the state is another option such as given to Catalonia and the Basque country within the Autonomous Community System created in Spain after France's dictatorship.

- A nation can be integrated within a federation which permits high degree of self-determination for nations without a state. For example Quebec in the Canadian political system has benefited from wide political powers to decide about their social, economic and political life without actually becoming independent.

- There are certain nations which completely lack recognition from the state which contains them. In such cases, the state employs itself in formulating policies aiming at eliminating the differences within its territory. Violence in the form of military control of national minorities is one option. Palestinians living in Israel, Tibetans in China etc are clear examples of this situation.

On the other hand, the term 'states without a nation' or 'state-nation' is applied to a situation in which a state is arbitrarily designed ignoring the cultural and linguistic identities of the groups falling within its boundaries. A state-nation involves the creation of a state apparatus which controls the legitimate use of the means of violence within its territory, holds internal and external sovereignty and receives international recognition of its status. The notion of the states without nation is applied in the case of ex-colonial countries of Asia and Africa where in most cases there is no sense in which a nation preceded the emergence of the state. Here a difference can be made between the initial form of nationalism as a movement directed against the colonial rule and engaged in the struggle for independence, and nationalism's subsequent transformation into a political discourse employed by new leaders to construct a nation capable of sustaining the legitimacy of the state inherited from the colonial masters. As has been discussed above, a major problem after independence has been that of 'nation building' i.e. transformation of the pre-national ethnic, tribal loyalties into a feeling of national identity. Here the dichotomy between tradition and modernity led to a series of gaps developing between diverse groups integrated into the state. The economic backwardness and the heterogeneous nature of these states accounted for their failure to integrate the diverse ethnic groups and tribes into a national structure. Hence the state exists but it is yet to reach the stage of a unified nation-state.
GLOBALISATION AND THE FUTURE OF NATIONALISM

An important question that remains to be answered is what is the relation between nationalism and the present wave of globalisation i.e., 1) whether globalisation is a threat to nationalism or ii) whether globalisation is producing a new national identity or iii) has it started a backlash in the form of strengthening the common traditional cultures.

There is a global culture prevalent today which has five distinct dimensions. They are i) ethnoscapes which means constant flow of people such as immigrants, guest workers, exiles, refugees etc. across the world ii) technoscapes which means flow of machinery produced by multinationals [iii) finance escapes which is rapid flow of money in the markets and stock exchanges across the world. iv) ideoscapes which means flow of images associated with state and political ideologies such as democracy, freedom, welfare, rights, etc. and (v) mediascapes which is flow of information through newspapers, images and magazines, television, films etc. The intensity and rapidity of this global culture is trying to transform the world into a singular place where process of cultural integration and disintegration take place. The crucial question is whether we are moving towards a common culture or whether globalisation will strengthen a particular culture. According to Guibernau, although as a consequence of globalisation cultures tend to overlap and mingle, we are witnessing a process by which only very few cultures can be elevated to the category of 'global culture' while most cultures find themselves enmeshed in a global struggle for their self-determination. Theoretically, global identity has two weaknesses: i) there is no continuity over time i.e., there is no common past to evoke as a sense of solidarity and ii) there is no differentiation from others (as in the case of national culture). Global culture has to create a sense of community of all peoples which is not possible because of the lack of a 'global' language. The great success of nationalism stems from the capacity to appeal to a socially and politically diversified population and mobilise them. The concept of global identity is far removed from acquiring such capacity and stand as a soft alternative to the passionately felt national identities. On the other hand, the present revival of ethnicity responds to the need for identity but an identity of a local character. At the heart of modern societies lies a rapid multiplication of contacts and a constant flow of information, both of which destroy the homogeneity of individual cultures. Globalisation is pervasive and nobody can escape its consequences. According to Lemucci, highly differentiated relations typical of complex societies are unable to provide forms of membership and identification to meet individuals's need for self-realisation, communicative interaction and recognition. In this context, nationalism appears as a reaction to two intrinsic constituents of modernity that are linked to globalisation: radical doubt and fragmentation. In conditions of modernity and cross current of different cultures, we have reached a stage where nothing can be taken for granted. Thus in a world of doubt and fragmentation, tradition acquires new importance. Nationalism relies heavily upon tradition in so far as it has common memories as one of its central features. Nationalism entails cultural resistance and challenges modern societies by vindicating ‘identity politics’ i.e., the claim for cultural difference based upon ethnicity. This is particularly relevant for the nations without a state. Identity politics involves a progressive element in so far as it stands for the different, the powerless.

In view of the above, we can conclude that the future of nationalism is bright. Inspite of globalisation and the quest for global culture, the current proliferation of struggles for self-determination in several parts of the world indicate that even the democratic nature of nation-
states and granting sufficient autonomy to the minorities within a nation-state has not solved the problem and the use of force still remains the key feature in the definition of nationalism. The role of nationalism as a mass movement has played a crucial role in the conscription of large armies and the waging of war. Currently, nationalism appeals to a wide ranging sectors of population and stands as a dynamic agent that relies on violence as well as promotes peaceful mass mobilisation. The call for independence in the Baltic republics and the disintegration of the former Soviet Union stand as examples of the force of nationalism.

In the context of globalisation, the reluctance to give away sovereignty and loss of control over domestic matters will increase the presence of nationalism in the nation-states’ political discourse. Here a growth of contradictory forces can be seen: On the one hand, to participate in international forums and institutions and the search for the establishment of common policies with other members of the world community, and on the other, to protect the interests of the nation-state. For example, the European Union has not reduced the preservation of the integrity and identity of the nation-state. The European Union is likely to develop a new kind of nationalism. This will not erase local identity but such nationalism will be invoked whenever common action is needed in the economic, social or political areas to fight a common enemy or defend the property of the Union. This could be called the super-nationalism. But the critical issues here will be how to frame a specifically European identity and which group will be considered as ‘outsiders’

Contemporary nationalism uses tradition in the service of modernity. According to Touraine, the nation is a ‘non-modern actor that creates modernity’. Doubts and fragmentation are eminent in modernity because they are unexpected. The absence of a single officially sanctioned method of knowledge reflected a certain kind of fragmentation that differs from the one present in our time. The return to tradition emphasises the value of continuity in a context where constant change and adoption to new social, political and technological environments determine the day-to-day life of the individuals. The concept of nation is rooted in pre-modern times and the perception of culture and language as products of the evolvement of a community over a period of time will retain their strong power to attract the individuals. Tradition will continue to be involved as a legitimatising principle only in so far as it is constantly actualised. The new elements brought about by modernity will be incorporated into and mixed with the traditional forms of life.

Globalisation unleashes a pressing demand for identity among those individuals who regard the totality of inherited ideas, beliefs, values and knowledge that constitute the shared basis of their lives as threatened by the expansion of alien cultures endowed with greater resources. In many cases, nationalism emerges as a response to progressive homogenisation and represents a struggle to defend identity politics. Though the process of globalisation is intensifying, there is no global identity which would suit to fulfill the needs of an otherwise diverse population. Thus nationalism will survive the wave of globalisation.

11.8 SUMMARY

The above discussion on nationalism can be summed up as follows:

Nationalism is a sentiment that has to do with attachment to a homeland, a common language, ideals, values and traditions, identification of a group with symbols such as flags, songs etc which make it ‘different’ from others. The attachment creates an identity and the appeal to that identity has a past and the power to mobilise the people.
• A theory of nationalism has to deal with questions such as: how does nationalism legitimise the use of violence in the quest for the creation of a state, what is the role of national ideology, what is the role of leaders in the national movements and how far can they contribute to the propagation of symbols and ideals,

• One of the most distinctive features of nationalism is the capacity to bring together people from different social and cultural levels. It is the invention of the ruling classes to maintain the unconditional loyalty of the masses and make them believe that they have much in common than what separates them. This is one of the basic factors to consider in trying to understand the persistence of nationalism.

• Nationalism is a phenomenon which emerged after the American and French revolutions. The early liberal writers emphasised upon the humanitarian aspect of nationalism and laid stress upon the socio-cultural aspects of nationalism such as common language, literature, religion, traditions, habits, symbols etc. As industrial revolution matured, humanitarian nationalism turned into imperial-expansionist nationalism. Marxism approached nationalism from the point of view of historical materialism and branded it as an ideology of bourgeois capitalism. During 20th century, Fascism associated nationalism with racial superiority and annihilation of non-Aryan races. In the hands of ex-colonial countries of Asia and Africa, nationalism became a potent weapon in their struggle for national liberation. While the beneficial side of nationalism is laudable, it had a noxious character in the form of Fascism.

11.9 EXERCISES

1) Define the concept of Nationalism and distinguish nationalism from state, nation and nation-state.

2) Explain the different approaches to the study of Nationalism.

3) Critically examine the nation and state in the contemporary political scenario.

4) Evaluate nationalism in the context of contemporary wave of globalisation.