Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)
Vol. 39, No. 2 (2019), pp. 351 –362

A Comparative Study of the Philosophical Evolution of the Doctrines of 'Nation' and 'Nationalism'

Abdul Basit Khan
Assistant Professor (OPS), Department of Political Science & IR,
Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan
Email: basitniazi@yahoo.com

Syed Mussawar Hussain Bukhari
Chairman Department of Political Science,
Islamia University Bahawalpur, Pakistan
Email: mussawarbukhari@gmail.com

Yasmin Roofi
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science,
Islamia University Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Muhammad Azhar (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor , Department of Political Science & IR,
Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan
Email: muhammad.azhar@gcuf.edu.pk

Abstract:

The nourishment of the concepts of 'nation' and 'nationalism' as political doctrines mainly by the European scholars since the 18th century altered the course of ideological action for the whole of the international community of states and their respective philosophies are still affecting deeply the global socio-political order. The establishment of the erstwhile "League of Nations" and "United Nations" after the World War I and II respectively was the ultimate practical manifestation of the said notions. The map of the world has substantially been changed since World War II because of the infiltration of the concepts of 'self-determination' and 'self-rule' into communities oppressed by European imperialism and the consequent emergence of various countries as independent states after the downfall of the colonial empires. Scholars, however, agree that because of the lack of cultural and ethnic homogeneity within their respective social fabric, many of these new states are still states without nations hence can be classified as nations in being or nations in hope. Time and again, the ruling elite in such states has to confront and suppress the sub-national tendencies, which often turn into violent demonstrations in pursuit of their objectives. Keeping in view the importance of the subject, the present study comparatively analyzes the philosophical evolution of the doctrines of 'nation' and 'nationalism' propounded by various scholars and establishes that these key political concepts have varied ideological bases and their applicability depends upon the social context and historical evolution of every society.

Keywords: Nation, Nationality, Nationalism, Nation-State

I. Introduction

The history of mankind living in distinct social groups is quite old. With the rise of interaction among diverse social segments, the man started distinguishing certain people on the basis of various parameters like language, color, descent, religion, culture, etc. The demarcation of territorial boundaries with a sense of belonging and possession to certain communities and the development of clash of interests in pursuit of the economic needs led to the emergence of conflict and violence among people. With the technological advancement in the spheres of communication and transportation, inter-continental access became easier. The European people, owing to their intellectual advancement, marched towards the continents of Asia and Africa in order to find new sources of raw material to fulfill their growing economic needs thus germinated the seeds of colonialism in the 15th century. The ultimate result of their over-prolonged expansionism was the outbreak of the two World Wars in 1914 and 1939. The 1st World War weakened the colonial empires whereas the second brought them to their logical disintegration since on the one hand the colonial powers had lost their capability to sustain while on the other hand, by that time, movements for self-determination and self-rule under the guise of national sovereignty had gained substance hence the demand for free nation-states could not be denied any further.

In the meantime, various scholars started to investigate about the factors which bound certain people together and motivated them to achieve common objectives. The philosophical evolution of the ideas of 'nation' and 'nationalism' was contributed by **e**minent philosophers which, *inter alia*, included Harold Joseph Laski (June 30, 1893-March 24, 1950), Ernest Renan (February 28, 1823-October 2, 1892), John Dalberg-Acton referred as Lord Acton (January 10, 1834-June 19, 1902), Hans Kohn (September 15, 1891-March 16, 1971), Karl Deutsch (July 21, 1912-November 1, 1992), Dankwart A. Rustow (December 21, 1924-August 3, 1996) and Ernest Gellner (December 9, 1925-November 5, 1995). Later, the state being the geopolitical reality and the nation being the ethno-cultural entity were conjoined into 'nation-state' which meant for a sovereign territorial unit occupied by a certain compact nation mainly based on ethnic or racial origin. The Dutch Republic of 17th and 18th centuries might be the pioneer example of a nation-state while France and Germany of 18th and 19th centuries are the other leading examples. Although the idea of a nation-state is much pronounced by various scholars, however, very few geographic territories of the world enjoy a single homogenous group within its population in terms of ethnic, religious or cultural orientation which diversity is often termed as the social pluralism. After the World War I, the League of Nations was established with a view to prevent future conflict among states but owing to its failure to secure that objective, was transformed later into the United Nations following the World War II. The latter body somehow proved its effectiveness until the beginning of the 21st century but could not maintain its efficacy after the incident of 9/11 in United States of America (USA) which resulted in USA's invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq in 2001 and 2003 respectively. Apart from all that, majority of the states which emerged after the downfall of colonial empires are still facing the problem of nation-building because of their complex socio-political and ethnic structures. The intellectuals in these states are unable to clear the implications of the doctrines of 'nation' and 'nationalism' borrowed from their colonial masters. In that perspective, this study attempts to comprehend the philosophical evolution of the said political doctrines by comparing various approaches in the following segments. Research Question is "Whether or not any comprehensive and precise definition of the terms 'nation' and 'nationalism' could be constructed?"

II. Research Methodology

The study is basically qualitative in nature. The data related to the topic in hand is collected from various books, encyclopedias, research articles and newspapers. Interviews of scholars from academia have also been conducted to find the answer of the research question.

III. Nation

The term "Nation" cannot be confined in a water-tight compartment; nevertheless, David Robertson propounds a working definition stating that "a nation is a body of people who possess some sense of a single communal identity, with a shared historical tradition, with major elements of common culture, and with a substantial proportion of them inhabiting an identifiable geographical unit (Robertson, 1993:331)." Steven Grosby defines 'nation' as a territorial community of nativity. According to him, one is born into a nation; the significance attributed to this biological fact of birth tells why the nation is one among a number of forms of kinship. It differs from the family because of the centrality of territory. It differs from territorial societies like tribe, city-state or ethnic groups, not merely by the greater extent of its territory, but also because of its relatively uniform culture that provides stability and continuation over time. He adds that each nation has its own perception of its distinctive past conveyed thorough history, stories and myths. These memories, whether accurate or not, contribute to the understanding of the present that distinguishes one nation from another. This component of time-when an understanding of the past transforms into the present-is characteristic of the nation and is called "temporal depth" (Grosby, 2007:7-8). Benedict Anderson, in his essay "Imagined Communities", emphasizes the novelty of the concept of nation and describes it as an "imagined community" which comes into being because of expansion and extension in communication. In his view, people living in different remote areas consulting the similar literature i.e. books and newspapers feel a kind of abstract communication based on circulation of printed words among themselves; the same feelings may form the basis to imagine abstract communities like nations (Anderson, 1991). The term "Nation" basically refers to the process when people develop a sense of belonging to a community and possessing a separate identity. Walker Connor defines a nation as a self-defined ethnic group, nevertheless, what constitutes an ethnic group is contestable; however, it may be defined as a community comprised of distinguishing elements which can include language, culture, religion or race hence a nation can be taken as a homogeneous social group sharing a common ideology, institutions and customs (Mclean & McMillan, 2009:357).

While elaborating the concept of 'nation', Karl Deutsch emphasizes that communication is the chief factor in the process of modernization. Smaller units of society, fed with a standardized code of communication (particularly language), often, become a people; to acquire an effective control over its members, this body of people when organized for political action, becomes a nationality consequently graduating afterwards to a nation after acquiring power to back its aspirations. When it ultimately achieves sovereign status in a state of its own, the consummation to full nationhood occurs (Deutsch, 1966). Laski, however, maintains that a precise definition of the concept 'nationality' is hardly possible because it lacks any measurable factor to which it could be traced. The example of fervid American nationalism testifies that race is of dubious importance; and none of the European nations, indeed, can claim to racial purity. The

language remains an aspect of unquestionable significance in the matter of a 'nationality' yet Switzerland, despite its linguistic diversity, has been able to transcend such difficulties. The political allegiance, too, cannot explain the phenomenon. The nineteenth century was essentially the history of changes in allegiance affected in nationalist terms. A nation is conscious about its separate identity because of possession of a homeland too, yet, it might rather be the aspiration towards recovery than the possession itself that is essential to the concept of nationhood as manifested in the case of Jewish nationalism. The idea of nationality is essentially spiritual in character implying the sense of a special unity which identifies those who share it with the rest of mankind. The unit is the outcome of a shared history, of victories won and traditions created by a corporate effort. There grows up a sense of kinship binding men into oneness. They recognize similarity of their likenesses and emphasize their mutual differences. They claim their own social heritage and have a distinct art and literature (Laski, 1982:219-20).

Dankwart, A. Rustow maintains that the term 'nation' is derived from Latin verb '*nasci*' which meant "to be born", the term originally stood for "a group of people born in the same place, whether that place was thought of as a few dozen or many thousands of square miles." He mentions that in the late Middle Ages, various groups of students coming to the European universities from a particular common region or country developed among themselves a feeling of being distinct "nations". In the eighteenth century, the French used this term in its primary or political meaning whereby the people of a given country developed a sense of commonness without any distinction of rank. In its secondary or legal usage, 'nation' meant a strange people. In 16th century, the English lawyers translated the Latin phrase *ius gentium* as "law of nations" which was substituted as "international law" by Jeremy Bentham in 1780. Earlier, the political and legal meanings of the term "nation" remained distinct; but a blending of the two meanings happened with the rise of the popular government and the concept of sovereignty in Europe (1918-1989). The League of Nations, which *inter alia* included China, the U.S.S.R., Iraq, Thailand, Liberia and Ethiopia extended the title "nation" to all sovereign states without considering their form of government or the character of their social development. However, such redrawing of state boundaries on "national" lines held out no panacea for the ills of world politics (Rustow, 1968:8).

Rustow further holds that nationality might be acknowledged as a matter of degree where no rigid line can be drawn across a continuous spectrum to claim that certain people above that line are nations while those below are not; while none would fully approximate the ideal type but a certain people at a certain time might be more or less a nation. Also, a state may comprise such ethnic groups that do not feel much national allegiance towards it and there may be such ethnic groups residing beyond its borders that do feel more national allegiance to it. He further opines that the leaders of a new nation often tend to allocate their people a rank above merit with respect to nationhood; they often assume the presence of a nation that is still under process of creation. In support of his thesis, Rustow observes that Jinnah did the same after 1940 in his campaign for a Pakistan (Rustow, 1968:9-12).

This nationality theory is the basis of division of nations and is also embedded in the Marxist conflict paradigm. Rustow claims that Marx had rejected the concept of nation because he perceived it as a *bourgeois* ideal likely to imperil the worldwide solidarity of the proletariat. However, the Marxist writers accepted the modern concept of

nation later. In 1921, a federation named as Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) was established which granted constitutional right of cessation to the constituting units. Afterwards, the Russian communists supported various nationalist movements (wars of national liberation) in colonial countries providing another example of the transformation in Marxism (Rustow, 1968:9). The Communist Party of U.S.S.R. directed the Communist Party of India to support the Indian freedom movement and within India the cause of Pakistan. Feroz Ahmad believes that the appeal of Marx's theory still remains enormous which holds that the class division and class conflict are the root-causes of all this 'national' conflict; hence the oppressed masses must seek class unity across national and ethnic boundaries and must not succumb to chauvinistic sentiments (Ahmad, 1998:xy).

Rustow maintains that the nationhood contains both the 'objective' as well as 'subjective' characteristics. The chief objective features include history, geography, economic structure, etc; while consciousness, loyalty, will etc. are the example of subjective characteristics. Both the German metaphysics and Marxist sociology play a certain role to frame this distinction. The objective characteristics are conceived as more or less adequate efforts at definition while the subjective characteristics/formulations are usually genuine attempts at explanation of the phenomenon of nationhood. As warrants of nationality, both these characteristics are important in the construction of national identity. The shared language and history along with prolonged self-government and other circumstances are conducive to promote feelings of nationality; however, these are not the defining characteristics of a nation. He compares the linguistic as well as political boundaries of 1960s and finds that both have turned coinciding even roughly in only two dozen countries with majority in Europe alone. According to his analysis, in nearly half of the world countries, almost 70 percent of the population spoke the same language, and in one out of four countries there was no linguistics majority. Supporting the contention, he cites examples of the multi-linguistic structure of Swiss nation and the retaining of Israeli nationalism despite a history of Diaspora spread over two millennia (Rustow, 1968:9-11). While discussing about the elements of nationhood, Rupert Emerson, however, points out that the mankind instinctively takes language as the badge of nationality. He points out that the presence of single language within a community helps to create the sentiments of nationalism and saves a nation from the pains and agonies of searching a common language for the whole population. In his view, language is a repository of memories, heroic deeds and triumphs of all kinds in which people usually take pride, and all these factors are essential elements in the psychological strings, with which diverse social groups can be tied into an inseparable bond of unity (Emerson, 1960:132). It is worth-mentioning here that Toynbee has denounced to build the criterion of nationality in the 'shibboleth' (derived from 'Hebrew' entailing a test to distinguish certain people from other linguistic groups because foreigners found the 'sh' sound difficult to pronounce (Hornby, 2001:1228)) of language (Toynbee, 1961:536). European nationalism initially considered language as a primary criterion to distinguish nations; nevertheless, Lord Acton, in his essay "Nationality", warns that such identification of political organization across ethnic divisions would potentially have dangerous implications for the society (Acton, 1907).

Kohn believes that the Jewish concept of racial purity is a salient feature of theory of nationality. In the matters of citizenship and immigration, Israel granted an exclusively privileged status to the people of Jewish descent. The Nationalist Socialist Germany, too,

considered the racial exclusivism and rootedness in the ancestral soil as the basis of German nationhood. Irrespective of their political citizenship, all individuals of German descent regarded the German Reich as their true homeland and the center for their loyalty (Kohn, 1968:66). In his essay "Qu'est-ce Qu'une Nation?" (What is Nation?) (1882), the French historian Ernest Renan declares the racial theory a great fallacy; whose domination would ruin the European civilization. He observes that the said theory authorized the Germans to repatriate the scattered members of the German family even against their will.

While talking about history as a feature/characteristic of nationhood, Rustow comments: "History often serves as a reservoir of symbols from which nationalists instinctively select what suits their particular purpose. For all their historical romanticism, they are usually straining for a break with their society's immediate past of dynastic fragmentation or foreign subjection. Hence the glories of a remote past (real or mythical) become their allies against the recent past in the struggle for a better future (Rustow, 1968:10)."

Mr. Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo, a prominent Baloch nationalist from Pakistan, believes that common language, civilization, identity of thoughts and inherited traditions are the characteristics of a 'nationality'; which characteristics are endorsed by Mr. A.K. Brohi (The Dawn, Karachi, October 9, 1978). Feroz Ahmad, however, disapproves Bizenjo's opinion about 'nation' and 'nationality' because in his view the same is based on theoretical definitions, hence cannot serve as parameters (The Dawn, October 24 & 25, 1978). In his book published later, he elaborates the grounds of his disagreement with Bizenjo:

"In other words, Mr. Bizenjo is using the term 'nationality' as a euphemism for nation. And that is dangerous, because 'theory' tells us that nations have certain rights, including the right to self-determination (Ahmad, 1998:3)."[1]

To sum up, it is mentioned that while exploring the definition of a 'nation', the 'Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights' of the European Parliamentary Assembly concluded in its report of December 2005 that there was "no common European legal definition of the concept of 'nation'" and it was difficult, not to say impossible, to arrive at a common definition of the concept of nation. The Committee further reported that:

"5. The Assembly has acknowledged that in some Council of Europe member states, the concept of nation is used to indicate citizenship, which is a legal link (relation) between a state and an individual, irrespective of the latter's ethno-cultural origin, while in some other member states the same term is used in order to indicate an organic community speaking a certain language and characterised by a set of similar cultural and historic traditions, by similar perceptions of its past, similar aspirations for its present and similar visions of its future. In some member states both understandings are used simultaneously to indicate citizenship and national (ethno-cultural) origin respectively. To this end, the term "nation" is sometimes used with a double meaning and at other

[1] To read a detailed and interesting discussion about the ideas of Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo, Mr. A.K Brohi and Mr. Feroz Ahmad about the subject please consult "Ethnicity and Politics in Pakistan" by Feroz Ahmad.

times two different words are used to express each of those meanings." (Retrieved from:http://www.assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=11332&lang=en)

IV. Nationalism

Jean Jacques Rousseau maintains that before examining the act by which a people give itself to a king it would be better, to examine that act by which it has become a people; because this act, necessarily preceding the other, provides the true foundation of the society (Hutchins, 1952). Laski observes that nationalism is actually built upon the basis of the quality of man having a dislike for being alone. It implies a solidarity which would be a priority for the wandering nomads, too, who used to hunt for suitable feeding-grounds. The groups with a healthy herd-instinct triumphed in the struggle for existence, fought against invaders for those territories and ultimately inhabited territories they could call their own. Victory intensified the value of their homeland; hence, giving traditions which influenced even their descendants to enhance the value of what had been dearly purchased. War, indeed, had been the chief factor in building the modern nation (Laski, 1982:219-20). He further asserts that patriotism in a citizen is not the blind following of his nation-state wherever it might lead; and the rights of a nation-state do not allow it safeguarding its own interests at the expense of others (Laski, 1982:226).

David Robertson holds that nationalism is a political doctrine which preaches that a group of people representing a certain community has an inherent right to demand an equal national status in the world order hence should live independently under a unified political system. He adds that nationalism differs from other international movements or creeds because it actually stresses local, at times, tribal identities and loyalties; therefore, the philosophy of nationalism, no matter how uniformly acknowledged, cannot be defined very clearly. The historical, cultural and racial affinities associated normally with the theory of a nationality might better be ascribed to ethnicity. The structure of a nation and nationality has frequently been crafted artificially by the respective governments and politicians (Robertson, 1993:333-4). Ali, however, observes that blending the similarities among diverse segments of the population and creating in a society the bonds of interdependence based on trust and confidence are considered to be the hallmark of nationalism (Ali, 1979:2).

In the European context, nationalism may be understood as a movement uniting a particular people on the basis of commonly spoken language, common territory and a willful submission of loyalty to a single government; nevertheless, given their linguistic and cultural diversity, nationalism had somewhat smooth and comfortable growth in Russia, Switzerland, Belgium, and to some extent, America, too. The European model loses much of its relevance in the socio-economic and political context of the new states of the post-colonial era which did not yet reach the level of economic and political integration which, in turn, would enable the people to think in terms of oneness of the entire population (Kautsky, 1968:112-3). John Stuart Mill explains "nationalism" in somewhat a peculiar manner believing that it makes people indifferent to the rights and interests of all human species except those who speak the same languages and are called by the same name. He terms "nationalism" in its exclusive application as barbaric and remarks that "in the backward parts of Europe, and even (where better things might have been expected) in Germany, the sentiment of nationality so far outweighs the love of

liberty, that the people are willing to abet their rulers in crushing the liberty and independence of any people not of their race and language (Mill, 1865:53)."

The French Revolution being a significant event in the history of the mankind provided the rationale to the demand for self-determination and self-rule culminating into the legitimate use of state authority in modern societies which consequently nourished a feelings and sentiments conceptualized as 'nationalism' (Mclean & McMillan, 2009:358). Kohn believes that the European nationalism dominated the nineteenth century, while, in the twentieth century, the concept of nationalism gained popularity in various European colonies of Asia and Africa. The rise of nationalism is closely linked with the theory of government by the active "consent of the governed" based on "popular sovereignty"; the growth of secularism along with urbanization, industrialization and improved communications; and the lessening of older religious, feudal, clannish, or tribal affinities. He terms nationalism as a revolutionary political movement, which, by overthrowing or transforming the "legitimate" (based on divine or hereditary rights) governments of the past, attempted to establish altogether new political entities i.e. states coextensive with their ethnic or linguistic borders (Kohn, 1968:63-4). He adds that national supremacy is a salient attribute of the philosophy of nationalism. The number of new nation-states increased in 19th and 20th centuries; as a consequence, border disputes among such states also increased since each nationality claimed "historical" rights with respect to its greatest historical expansion; the dispute between independent Serbia and Bulgaria over Macedonia serves as suitable example, because both states, irrespective of their close lingual and religious affinities along with a common past of Turkish subjection, in the pursuit of establishing their national supremacy, could not prevent the said border dispute. The historical discourse testifies that nationalities liberating themselves from the oppression of other nationalities often become oppressors subjecting others to rather worse oppression than they had experienced. Most of the ethnically diverse new states assumed the role of power instrument at the hands of the dominant or "state-forming" nationality and denied equal social and political rights to other nationalities settled therein. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia after World War I and Ceylon after World War II are the examples of such behavior. Nationalism, although, has 'solved' many of the prevalent tensions, nevertheless, created new ones wherein modern aspirations and age-old memories are inextricably mixed (Kohn, 1968:66-7).

Ernest Gellner holds that nationalism is not merely the awakening of an old, latent, dormant force; in reality, it is a new form of social organization. Nationalism emerges only in milieu in which the existence of a state is already taken very much for granted (Gellner, 1983:48). Mclean & McMillan terms Gellner as a functionalist who believes that nationalism is not merely a factor responsible for the awakening of nations to self-consciousness but it also invents nations where they do not exist. They add that during decolonization many of the nationalist movements (based on the ideology of any particular nationalism) emerging in the developing countries having ethnically heterogeneous societies were actually the product of different forces (including processes of modernization); because the only bond unifying the nationalist movement in such societies was a shared sense of difference from the alien colonial power. This shared bond (which was actually a kind of 'negative nationalism' emerged against the colonial power only) disappeared once the colonial power had departed. In British India, the struggle of Indian National Congress (perceived to be a Hindu Organization) and the Muslim League for Indian independence is an example (Mclean & McMillan, 2009:358).

Kohn identifies that in general, all forms of nationalism (Communism, Nazism, etc.) follow some common traits; nevertheless, each form is conditioned by indigenous factors of the society in which nationalism asserts itself; these factors include social structure, the intellectual traditions, cultural history and the geographic location. After the 1st World War, nationalism spread in Asia and by the mid of the 20th century, emerged as the dominant force throughout the non-Western world; hence, after 1947, the political map of Asia and Africa had substantially been changed. Although, nationalism and socialism were taken as antagonistic ideologies in the nineteenth century, however, in some cases in post-colonial period, nationalism, as a revolutionary movement, found its expression in the demand for equal access to economic and educational opportunities for all members of the national group and promotion of the welfare of the socially underprivileged classes. Mexican revolution (1910-1917), in fact, was the first major nationalist revolution which laid equal emphasis on the socialist revolutionary aspects. It set the pattern for the subsequent development of nationalism as a political doctrine in most of the underdeveloped countries and provided impetus for the resistance against foreign political intervention and their consequent economic exploitation (Kohn, 1968:64). He holds that "traditional nationalism and continuing or newly emerging hegemonial claims, coupled with the clashing ambitions of national leaders and the staying power of existing governmental frameworks, strengthened the centrifugal trends among the nations, highly developed and less developed, "old" and "new" (Kohn, 1968:67-8)."

In another perspective, nationalism has to combat two fundamental but opposite and mutually confronting strains; one corresponding to the "open" and the other to the "closed" societies, nevertheless, none of these strains may be found in purity in any manifestation of nationalism because it is always a question of emphasis. The "open" nationalism is inclined towards intercourse because it is generally based on a territorial organization and a political society, constituting a nation of fellow citizens irrespective of race or ethnic descent, hence, represents the more "modern" forms. The "closed" nationalism stresses upon the indigenous character of some particular nation, its common origin (race, blood) and rootedness in the ancestral soil. These factors exhibit the "purity" of a national character safeguarding it from "alien" influences. The "open" nationalism advocates for free self-determination of the individual while the "closed" nationalism favors the biological or historical determinism. Kohn points out that nationalism of United States is an outstanding example of "open" nationalism wherein the people owe their nationhood to the internalization of rather modern attributes like emancipation, assimilation, mobility and individualism. They do not rely solely on common past, religion or cultural traditions. However, the nineteenth century Germanophilism (one who is not a German but friendly to Germany and Germans, their institutions, aims, ways, etc.) and Slavophilism (supremacy of the Slavic and specifically the Russian culture over western European culture practiced among the Russian intelligentsia in the middle of nineteenth century) offer examples of "closed" nationalism (Kohn, 1968:66).

Since its inception, the concept of nationalism has undergone several transformations and has been understood by different writers in various perspectives. It was an elite movement in the beginning, a "bourgeois" movement during the ascent of the middle classes, a mass movement wherein the people at large demanded an extended participation in almost all spheres (social, political and cultural) of national life; nevertheless, the demand for a government by the major ethnic group within the society remains a constant feature during all these phases. People awakened to nationalism see

political self-determination as its goal. To be separate, distinct, and independent from other nations, and equal to them, is the fundamental claim of nationalists for their people. The period of Enlightenment (1685-1815) in Europe can be taken as an age of reason and reorientation in the domains of philosophy, science, politics and communications. The "individualism" and "democratic equality" of the revolutions of the Enlightenment express themselves in these aspirations of nationalists. In the nineteenth century, these demands were shifted from the individual to the collective group. The nationalists claim that the people are an end in themselves, instead of being a means for the policy of others, thus, only in this perspective, they can become autonomous subjects. Pasquale Stanislao Mancini, the Piedmontese (a native or inhabitant of Piedmont, Italy, which is a historical region of northwest Italy bordering France and Switzerland) jurist and Italian minister, holds that the nationalities, deprived of a self-government and subjected to laws imposed from the outside, would become means for the objectives of others and, therefore, mere objects. The quest for a nation-state is based on the demand of political self-determination which is preceded by the fact that the nationalities struggling to achieve a nation-state are a distinct cultural entity because the same is inherent/essential pre-requisite for such claim and struggle (Kohn, 1968:65).

Adeel Khan holds that "too often, nationalism has been interpreted in terms of good and bad, tribal and modern, civic and ethnic, etc. which blurs the most important aspect of nationalism, i.e. that in the nation-state system of today, nationalism is always about either share in the existing state power structure, or, if that is not possible, about creating its own state (Khan, 2003:281)." John Breuilly concludes: "to focus upon culture, ideology, identity, class or modernization is to neglect the fundamental point that nationalism is, above and beyond all else, about politics and that politics is about power. Power, in the modern world, is principally about control of the state (Breuilly, 1993:1)." Referring to various notable scholars, Mclean & McMillan mention that Paul Brass, an instrumentalist theorist of nationalism, argues that the elite exploit traditions of a community to mobilize it in favor of maintaining or extending their own power, hence, nationalism and nationalist movements can better be understood in that perspective. Eric Hobsbawm, the Marxist historian, argues that the elite 'invent traditions' to maintain their power or to perpetuate false consciousness. Anthony Smith, too, accepts that the elite play a certain role in nationalist movements. Paul Collier argues that emergence of the nationalist movements owes to the cost-benefit calculations; and greed is a more powerful and pervasive motive than a particular grievance. Mclean & McMillan conclude that majority of scholars agree that existence of some real or perceived grievances are essential pre-requisites for successful mobilization of a nationalist movement. When a community is split in more than one state, the emergence of a movement is most-expected; nevertheless, it would not always lead to a nationalist movement. A considerable number of people within the divided community might not support the idea of a separate state rather focus on securing autonomy. Nationalist movements might seek separate statehood, however, if their people live concentrated in a specific territory, then the autonomy within existing borders and/or a reconfiguration of political structure providing them a greater say in the political process might settle their problems. When a community is kept oppressed within a territory or a particular regime defects from a compromised settlement about autonomy or power sharing, then, the chances for the emergence of a nationalist movement become higher. Nationalism can also emerge when a community is not merely oppressed but feels aggrieved, for example, when a wealthier part of a country feels that it is subsidizing the rest. Despite predictions that the national

identities will be swept away owing to process of globalization, the importance of slogans of nation and nationalist movements show no declining signs (Mclean & McMillan, 2009:358-9).

V. Conclusion

The preceding discussion reveals that the concepts of 'nation' and 'nationalism' are interpreted and applied diversely by various scholars. A nation is a subjective belief which molds certain groups to surrender their cultural differences and parochial loyalties in favor of the common good of the larger society while nationalism is the desire of such groups to live together peacefully within a geographically compact region; it is the manifestation of a voluntary feeling of spiritual and emotional unity by all the inhabitants of a particular territory. The difference between a nationality and a nation is of degree and not of nature; there might be several nationalities or sub-national groups settled peacefully under the banner of a single nation while preserving their distinct group identity but that depends upon the dominating elite of the larger society that how it manipulates the sub-national affinities through effective application of the integrative tools like negotiation, accommodation, participation etc. State-building and nation-building are distinct features which require technical expertise on the part of the dominating elite.

It is already mentioned that very few geographic entities of the world are enjoying a homogeneous ethno-cultural composition of their population hence can be termed as genuine nation-states. Modern nationalism actually declines its colonial concept which relates it merely to common history and shared experiences of a particular nation. The example of Indian nationalism is pertinent to mention in that regard. The "Indian National Congress" (1885) was the first body which preached the concept of Indian nationalism in the region while the Muslim League, before partition, had apprehensions that the Congress was actually a Hindu-dominated party and the Muslims would suffer in the united India at the hands of the Hindu majority once the British departed; however, the Indian National Congress had managed to refute all kind of skepticism attached with it. The present-day India, comprising various ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious groups, portrays a picture of a single Indian nation despite the distinct historical background of each constituting segment. The Indian Muslims living in United Kingdom and United States are still more faithful to India and proud of being Indians than the Pakistanis living abroad. However, it is a reality that internally the social fabric of India has deep cleavages on the basis of religion and race.

Preferring the state-building over nation-building, the Muslim League in Pakistan failed to promote the sense of a Pakistani nationalism after the partition. The emergence of the Bengali sub-nationalism overpowering the so-called Pakistani or Muslim nationalism professed under the doctrine of Two-Nation Theory and the consequent fall of Dhaka in 1971 was an outcome of that failure. It is worth-mentioning that the Congress had foreseen this situation hence did not favor the partition of Bengal on religious basis. In view of Congress, Bengal would have to be made a separate state or a part of India at the time of partition. In recent times, the Balochi sub-nationalism is also being resembled to the Bengali sub-nationalism of 1960s by some of the foreign and local intellectuals of Pakistan.

An insight into the case of Arab nationalism reveals another interesting story

where various people with same culture, racial background, language and history preferred to live within the framework of distinct states. Keeping in view the theoretical as well as practical behavior of various nations, it may be concluded that a compact cultural and nationalistic homogeneity is a rare element to be found in any human society hence 'unity in diversity' is the only way available to streamline the basic social and ideological cleavages in any territorial union.

References

Acton, J.E.E.D. (1907). Nationality. In *The History of Freedom and Other Essays*. Figgis, J.N. & Laurence, R.V. (ed.). London: McMillan.

Adeel Khan (2003): Baloch Ethnic Nationalism in Pakistan: From Guerrilla War to Nowhere? In *Asian Ethnicity.* 4(2). 281-293.

Ahmad, F. (1978, October 24 & 25). *Nationality: Refuting, A.K. Brohi*. Karachi: The Dawn.

Ahmad, F. (1998). *Ethnicity and Politics in Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Ali, S. (1979). *Nation Building Development and Administration: A Third World Perspective*. Lahore: Aziz.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities. London: Verso*.

Breuilly, J. (1993). *Nationalism and the State* (2nd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brohi, A.K. (1978, October 9). *Apropos of the Wisdom of Our Brother Bizenjo*. Karachi: The Dawn.

Deutsch, K.W. (1966). *Nationalism and Self Communication.* Cambridge: MIT Press. 86-106.

Emerson, R. (1960). *From Empire to Nation: The Rise to Self-Assertion of Asian and African Peoples*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 599-623.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grosby, S. (2007). *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Hornby, A.S. (2001). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (3rd imp.). Wehmeier, S. (ed.). London: Oxford University Press.

Kautsky, J.H. (1968). Nationalism. In *Politics in Transitional Societies.* Kebschull, H.G. (ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Kohn, H. (1968). Nationalism. In David L. Sills (ed). *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (vol. 11). New York: McMillan. 63-69.

Laski, H.J. (1982). *A Grammar of Politics* (7th imp.), London: George Allen & Unwin.

Mclean, I. & McMillan, A. 2009. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mill, J.S. (1865). Vindication of the French Revolution of February, 1848 (vol. 3), In *Dissertations and Discussions: Political, Philosophical and Historical*. Mill, J.S. (ed.). Boston; Spencer. 5-81.

Robertson, D. (1993). *A Dictionary of Modern Politics (2nd ed.).* London: Europa Publications.

Rustow, D.A. (1968). Nation. In David L. Sills (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (vol. 11). New York: McMillan. 7-13.

Toynbee, A.J. (1961). *A Study of History* (vol. xii). London: Oxford University Press.