In the third world, the term 'nationalism' has become so closely intermingled with 'patriotism' as defined by 'national' leadership that social processes operating at 'sub national' or 'local' levels are invariably condemned as subversive or unpatriotic. In the context of Third World nation-states, elites tend to adopt a perspective which attaches disproportionate importance to the values, aspirations and ideas of the 'centre'. It has become increasingly necessary to use the idiom of 'nationalism' to outline the 'specific national identity' which social processes express. The tendency of third world elites to contrast the ostensibly positive character of elite nationalism with the negative character of traditionalism or tribalism or casteism is a gross distortion of reality. Post-Independence Afro-Asian politics and contemporary political process in the industrial world underline the fact that subnational solidarity is of enduring importance as a political determinant. The populations in new states are divided into religious, tribal, communal, linguistic, cultural and other groups whose sense of identity and loyalty is often directed to these collectivities and through these to the newly established state. There exist 'micronationalisms' in these states. It is an error to think of these
sentiments as an irrational and emotinal hangover from the past. Most people in the new states live within the context of these collectivities and derive their sense of identity from them.

During the period of the independence movement, these particularist identifications and loyalties receded somewhat into the background for the sake of achieving unity and the common goal of independence. After independence and a brief honeymoon period of nationalist euphoria, they reassert themselves with force as the new state is trying to grapple with some fundamental problems of organisation and policy. The high incidence of group conflict generated by segmental social divisions in these societies has given rise to a deep sense of despair in many quarters. This pessimism is partly a result of erroneous understanding of the terms 'nation', 'nationality', 'ethnicity' and 'state'. First of all, therefore, we will elaborate on these concepts.

I

NATION, STATE AND NATIONALISM: Some Conceptual Clarifications

The concepts 'nation' and 'nationality' have been subject to two interpretations—one, nation as a political phenomenon, and second, nation as an ethnic and cultural phenomenon. According to the first interpretation, the tendency in national development has been to efface the boundaries between nation and
state so that at a certain stage in democratic development states become transformed into nations. Nationality thus implies the formal adherence of an individual to the state. Polish nationality, in this sense, includes all the subjects or citizens of the Polish state irrespective of the language they speak or the ethnic group to which they belong. The term nationality is here used to designate an undeveloped national group which has not yet attained national sovereignty. In addition to this political concept of nation and nationality there is the view of the nation more as an ethnic and cultural phenomenon. Differences in language and cultural as well as variations in religion, race and customs result in the formation of social groups which, independent of political boundaries, constitute fundamental national units. Nationality refers to a people or a group which, independent of its political aims, forms a totality relatively wider and more comprehensive. Thus, the Ukranian nationality in Poland includes all the Ukrainians in Poland and the Polish nationality in Europe all the Poles in Europe. It follows that not every modern state is to be identified with a nation, as implied in such an expression as League of Nations. The national state must be looked upon only as a particular form of political organisation representing synthesis of nation and state. There is no clear and unanimous opinion as to the exact nature of this synthesis.
A. Nation

A great variety of tendencies have been associated with the term nation and that the perplexing multitudes of senses have developed through the fact that this or that element has been particularly emphasized by a specific nation, party or philosophy. We may start with a glance at the historical development of the ideas connected with the word nation.

Development of the Concept

The word 'nation' stems from the Latin verb 'nasci', 'to be born' and originally meant a group of people born in the same place. In the European universities of the late middle ages, 'Nations' were groups of students who came from the same region or country. Somewhat later a primary and a secondary meaning evolved, political usage adopting the former and legal usage the latter. To French radical writers in the eighteenth century a nation meant the people of a given country without distinction of rank and often in contrast to the ruling monarch. In 1789-1793 the three French estates merged in the National Assembly, abolished the economic and political prerogatives of noblemen and clergy, transformed the monarchy into a republic, and replaced the historic mosaic of regions and provinces with arbitrarily drawn de'partements. Nation was the slogan of champions of constitutionalism, secularism, equality and centralization of those who wish to modernize society and to rationalize its administrative structure. The
The future meaning of the word "nation" was profoundly affected by these revolutionary policies. In its secondary usage, "nation" meant a strange people. The king James Bible, distinguished between the "people" of Israel and the "nations" of gentiles. English colonists in North America spoke of the Sioux, Cherokee and other indigenous groups as "nations" of Indians. Sixteenth century English lawyers translated the Latin phrase "Ius gentium" as "law of nations". The two meanings at first remained distinct enough; when political Orators of the late eighteenth century invoked the nation, they meant the people as supporters of popular government, whether in a sovereign state or in one of its sub-divisions. The victory of popular government in Europe in the period from 1789 to 1918 led to a blending of two meanings, for nations now were proclaimed sovereign. The word now came gradually to refer to a free self-governing people constituted as a state. The League of Nations including such countries as China, Thaïland, Ethiopia, the Soviet Union and Iraq officially extended the term "nation" to all sovereign states inside and outside of Europe regardless of their form of government or the character of their social development. Meanwhile the communist theorists and political leaders in non-European countries contributed to the same expansion of usage. Marx had rejected nation as a bourgeois ideal likely to imperil the international solidarity of the proletariat. But later Marxists such as Otto Bauer and Lenin who witnessed the force of nationalism in Austria, Hungary and in the Russian Empire, accepted the idea.
Formation of the National Congress in India in 1885 and proclamation of the "National Pact" in Turkey in 1920 and of the National Revolutionary Party in Mexico in 1929 were landmarks in the spread of the national ideal to Asia, Africa and Latin America. Gradually the term became associated with the idea of power and sovereignty, the ruling classes were called "the nation" and at last the nation meant a free and self-governing people. A very wide spread modern usage identifies a nation with a people constituted as a state. In this view every state forms a nation and every citizen is a member of the nation. This definition, of course, is an exclusively legal one and disregards factual inequalities. Many states were or are composed of different nations. The Scots and Welsh regard themselves as nations though they live in a common state with the English. It is important to realize that legal and social concepts of nation form entirely different ideas. The moving force in modern history, however, is not the legal concept of nationality but the social force of national conciousness.

Elements of Nationhood

Nationalist writers have done little to clarify what they mean by nation or to explain how nations have come into existence. Scholars have added further ambiguities, by distinguishing "objective characteristics" of nationhood (e.g., geography, history, economic structure, language) from "subjective
characteristics" (e.g., consciousness, loyalty, will) a distinction that carries echoes both from German metaphysics and Marxist sociology. In fact, the so-called subjective formulations are usually genuine attempts at definitions whereas the "objective definitions" are generally attempts at explanation. For common language, common history, prolonged self-government, and other circumstances are likely to promote feelings of nationality but they are not among the defining features of a nation.

Most writers who attempted to define the concept of nation have pointed out objective factors as the decisive criteria, i.e., factors independent of the will of individuals. The most frequent and obvious criterion is Language. Others have stressed the importance of race, religion, civilization and territory. All definitions, however, based on one or several of these factors are inadequate. Stalin identified four characteristics:

1. a common language, 2. a common territory, 3. a common economic life, and 4. a common psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.

The obvious inadequacy of all objectivist theories has induced many political theorists to define nationality as a community formed by the will to be a nation. According to them it is not race, religion, language, civilization or economic interests that make a nation. The national idea is founded on a heroic past, great men, true glory, common experiences leading to the
formation of a community of will. Rupert Emerson defines nation in the following manner:

The nation is a community of people who feel that they belong together in the double sense that they share deeply significant elements of a common heritage and that they have a common destiny for the future.... The nation is today the largest community which when the chips are down, effectively commands men's loyalty, overriding the claims both of the lesser communities within it and those which cut across it or potentially enfold it within a still greater society, reaching ultimately to mankind as a whole. In this sense the nation can be called a 'terminal community'.

Regarding the traits which distinguish a nation from a non-national community, E.H. Carr remarks:

The term nation has been used to denote a human group with the following characteristics:
(a) the idea of a common government whether as a reality in the present or past or as an aspiration of the future,
(b) a certain size and closeness of contact between all its individual members,
(c) a more or less defined territory,
(d) certain characteristics (of which the most frequent is language) clearly distinguishing the nation from other nations and non-national groups,
(e) certain interests common to the individual members,
(f) and certain degree of common feeling or will, associated with a picture of the nation in the minds of the individual members.

The term nation is difficult to define precisely. It is not sufficient to think in terms of a common culture, particularly if the term culture itself is understood to involve complex layers of shared meanings and experiences. Societies generally include many subcultures defined in terms of region, status, ethnicity and other factors, such as occupation and gender. A territorial referent is a necessary component of the idea of 'nation' but this does not necessarily coincide with particular state boundaries. A further criterion is that of 'shared institutions' which may be
economic, social or political. A sense of nationhood emerges out of a concrete historical experience of participation in common institutions. Some degree of political autonomy is involved although it may not go so far as independent statehood.

The 'subjectivist' definition of nation is essentially valid but it needs a careful examination. National aspirations are neither always, nor merely, a striving to be united under a national government nor do they always imply the cult of traditions. The Scotch and Welsh, for example, claim to be nations, though they do not aim at independent national government. The subjectivist theory stresses the will to be a nation; it is usually not explicit enough about the meaning of will and the meaning of nation. It is not so much a clear outspoken will which actually lives in a whole people but a multitude of feelings and vague ideas, animating a large and influential part of the people, that tend to crystallize in a will in certain conditions. In the history of national development, moreover, this will was at first only that of a minority which in the course of time succeeded in gaining more or less the assent of a majority. In firmly consolidated nations everyone knows to which nation he belongs but if a people have not reached this stage or if an old loyalty has been destroyed by historic events, there is no spontaneous national will but merely a welter of conflicting aspirations. The subjectivist theory moreover, needs to be supplemented by allowance for objective factors among which the
national territory at least is indispensable. A community without a territory is not a full nation. The subjectivist theory must not be stretched so far as to obliterate the significance of the objective factors.

B. Ethnicity

The concept of ethnicity is in wide currency in social science writings. The term is American coinage. Ethnicity emerged through interaction between different peoples, it is a product of conquest, colonization and immigration. Ethnicity implies dislocation from one's homeland. Oommen points out that it is the rupture between territory and other primordial attributes which creates ethnicity. In contrast, the nation inevitably has a territorial referent. Ideally, the nation fuses three dimensions: territory, culture and citizenship. It is possible that over a span of time a whole nation can be uprooted from its territory and rendered into an ethnic (a people without a common territory and citizenship). This points out to the historical process and possibility of one category being transformed into another. Historically the factors which contributed to the disjunction between territory and culture varied over time. Prior to the 18th century, geographical explorations and political conquests were the prime movers in this direction. During the 18th and 19th centuries, colonialism and immigration were mainly responsible for the rupture between territory and culture.
C. State:

The distinction between state and nation is fundamental to our theme. The state must be clearly distinguished from the nation. Hugh-Seton Watson makes the following distinction:

A State is a legal and political organisation with the power to acquire obedience and loyalty, from its citizens. A nation is a community of people whose members are bound together by a sense of solidarity, a common culture, a national consciousness. Yet in the common usage of English and of other modern languages these two distinct relationships are frequently confused.¹⁷

States can exist without a nation or with several nations among their subjects, and a nation can be co-terminus with the population of one state, or be included together with other nations within one state, or be divided between several states. There were states long before there were nations. The belief that every state is a nation or that all sovereign states are national states has done much to obfuscate human understanding of political realities.¹⁸

Since state is the most significant form of organisation of men and embodiment of the greatest concentration of power, it is inevitable that there should have been and should still be a great revolutionary struggle to secure co-incidence between state and nation.

Oommen illustrates the variety of situations represented by nation-states in the world today:

1. One-nation, one-state: an ideal type the possibility, of its recurrence being quite remote.
Japan, however, approximates.

2. Parts of different nations come together to constitute a state for geo-political reasons (e.g., Switzerland).

3. One nation is divided into two (or more) states for ideological reasons (e.g., Germany, Vietnam, Korea).

4. Part of a nation is constituted into one sovereign state and the remaining part is attached or affiliated to another sovereign state (e.g., Bangladesh and West Bengal in India).

5. A nation may be divided between two sovereign states and constitute parts of them along with other nations (e.g., Indian Punjab and Pakistan Punjab).

6. A number of nations come to constitute a state (e.g., India, the Soviet Union).

7. A set of migrants drawn from a multiplicity of nations constitute a state (e.g., the U.S.A.).

By showing the intricate inter-relationship between state and nation Oommen clarifies that nation and state need not necessarily be co-terminus and that the term nation-state is of limited applicability. There are not only multi-national and uni-national states but also different states for the same nation.

The idea of the modern state assumed shape and form beginning with Machiavelli in the sixteenth century. The modern state, of course, has its precursors extending back to the Greek polis and beyond.

The essence of a state is that it is a system of government exercising supreme authority, having a
monopoly over the legitimate use of military and other coercive agencies within a clearly defined territory and whose sovereignty is recognised by other states.

Earlier the sovereign was the king and the state apparatus his household creature. The very success of the dynastic European states in globalizing their domains, from the fifteenth century on, gave rise to ramifying bureaucracies of growing power. Parliamentary institutions also challenged the personal suzerainty of the monarch. Through these multiple processes the European state became depersonalised, sovereignty attached no longer to a dynasty, but to a matrix of institutions through which the growing authority of the state was exercised. The dominant paradigm justifying the state presumed that its institutions were the embodiment of the will of the people; no longer was the legitimacy of state authority bound to the pedigree of its king.

The remaking of Europe's political map on the basis of national self-determination through the German and Italian unification movements and political settlements after the First and Second World Wars extended the process. Finally, the anti-colonial revolt in Latin America, Africa and Asia, asserted the higher authority of the populace over the colonial territory, completing the task of investing the contemporary state system with a legitimacy founded upon the mandate of its people.
With the rise of mass politics and the emergence of self-conscious linguistic cultural collectivities in 19th century Europe a series of nations succeeded in acquiring statehood through unification movements in Germany and Italy, out of the wreckage of Austria and Hungary, the Ottoman empire and some domains recovered from Russia and Germany. Nation preceded state in these instances. Then came the anti-colonial revolts in Latin America, Asia and Africa. In colonial countries the anti-colonial nationalist leadership had to make convincing demonstration that their claims to inherit the authority of the territorial state carried the sanction of the populace at large. In seeking the mandate, the anti-colonial leadership began the process of transforming the often arbitrary colonial state into a nation. The task was however, far from complete at the time of Independence. The state now became itself the main vehicle in the hands of the nationalist elite for fulfilment of the mission. Nationalism as anti-colonial struggle has laid the basis for the nation; now the state had to complete the task.

D. Nationalism

From nation comes the idea of nationalism. As there exist basically two interpretations of ‘nation’ i.e., political and cultural, hence two interpretations of nationalism as well. Here, we may call upon the definition by Hans Kohn:

Nationalism is a political creed that underlies the cohesion of modern societies and legitimizes their claim to authority. Nationalism centres the supreme loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the people upon the nation state, either
Nationalism then, is an ideological formulation of identity. It is, as Gellner conceives, primarily a political principle which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent. Nationalism as a sentiment or a movement can be best defined in terms of this principle. He strongly posits for the merger of culture and polity saying that nationalism is to endow culture with its own political roof and not more than one roof at that. It is a state where "the fusion of will, culture and polity becomes the norm". But, when does that take place? Societies, says Gellner, pass through three distinct phases: pre-agrarian, agrarian and industrial. Nationalism is most likely to emerge in the industrial age. The political principle and sentiment of nationalism is not natural but a product of the industrial age, a complex historical destiny towards which every society inevitably moves.

In an effort to free the concept from ideological straight-jackets, Breuilly talks of nationalism as a form of politics whose objective is to obtain and use state power. Nationalism is used to refer to political movements seeking or exercising state power and justifying that with nationalist argument which is a political doctrine built upon three basic assertions: (i) there exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character; (ii) the interests and values of this nation take priority over all other interests and values; and
(iii) the nation must be as independent as possible. This usually requires at least the attainment of political sovereignty.

The spread of nationalism on a global scale is a result of the Europeanization and modernization of non-western and pre-modern societies. As a phenomenon of modern European history, the rise of nationalism is closely linked with the origins of popular sovereignty; the theory of government by the active consent of the governed; the growth of secularism; the lessening of the older religious, tribal, clannish or feudal loyalties; and the spread of urbanization, industrialization and improved communications. Although certain traits are common to all forms of nationalism each form is conditioned by the social structure, the intellectual traditions and cultural history and the geographic location of the society in which nationalism asserts itself.

Although the literature on nationalism is vast, little attention has been paid to cultural nationalism. Scholars have chosen to concentrate on the apparently more significant political nationalist movements, their mass mobilising strategies against the state, and their attempts to build a representative citizen state. Accordingly to John Hutchinson—

It is true that cultural nationalism is usually little more than a small coterie of historical scholars and artists concerned to revitalize the community by invoking memories of the nation as an ancient and unique civilization. But periodically it has expanded into a major ideological movement that, challenging both established political nationalist movements and the existing state, has
sought to regenerate the nation on communitarian lines. Indeed in many contexts (e.g., in Eastern Europe and Asia) this 'grass roots' movement has played a central part in nation building.

By 'cultural nationalism' Oommen refers to "the articulation of popular aspirations by the people to preserve and nurture their 'natural bonds' rooted in religion, caste, tribe, language or region".

The political notion of nationalism has strong unitarian undertones. Concern for homogeneity led to nationalism and homogeneity in turn became a test of loyalty, the underlying supposition being that a society is strong only if it is homogeneous. This inner-impulse towards homogeneity, latent in political notion of nationalism, brings it into frequent relations of tension with cultural pluralism.

E. Nationalism, National Integration and Nationality Formation

The tendency in the literature on political development and modernization has been to focus upon 'national integration' as a process of state building and to treat all other loyalties except those to the state as parochial and divisive in their impact and detrimental to 'national integration'. Identities based on primordial ties based on religion, language, caste, tribe, and race militate against the formation of the 'national identity which endangers the very existence and persistence of nation states. This tendency is manifest in the fear that regional, linguistic, racial, ethnic or caste consciousness is inimical to 'national'
interests. This perspective thus counterposes the national and the local, idealizing the former and viewing attempts to realize regional local aspirations as fissiparous. The tendency here is to view social pluralism as a liability and political centralization as the remedy. Oommen observes:

If in Europe, empires dissolved into nation-states usually respecting the norm, 'one nation one state' (barring a few exceptions), the colonies by and large retained their 'multi national' character even when they got partitioned as in the case of India. Given such a situation, the primary task of nation building was to maintain and reinforce the nationalist expectancy, the content of which was three-fold: political integration, economic development and cultural pluralism. To the extent cultural pluralism is perceived to be an obstacle to the realization of the first two objectives the situation is often described as one of national crisis, decay and disintegration.

Within the context of the Third World nations leaders tend to adopt a perspective which attaches disproportionate importance to the values, aspirations and ideas of those at the centre and practically no importance to the more local and localised levels of political struggle.

'National integration' as a process of reducing the elite-mass gap and transforming loyalties from parochial to national orientations is a simplistic concept to apply to the pre-dominantly multi-ethnic and multi-national states of Asia and Africa. It is not only that inter-ethnic relations become more important to the integrative process in such states but also that the processes by which intermediary loyalties are developed are largely ignored in this approach. There
is no doubt that vast movements of change have been taking place throughout Asia and Africa in the broadening of identities of local populations, but the transformation rarely involves a quantum leap from family-kin group, or villages to the modern state. In between many old social categories have frequently intervened and been adopted as new forms of identity and as new vehicle of participation in the modern state.

In the literature of political science the most widely accepted interpretation of contemporary nationalism assumes that nationalism somehow 'detribalises' the tribes which by some mysterious process of socio-political mutations become once again 'retribalised' in the context of post-colonial era. It obscures and falsifies the very complex dynamic process of inter-relationship that are in evidence in most new states. The tribes qua tribes do not vanish and tribalism does not dissolve in the acid elixir of 'nationalism' upon the retreat of colonialism. Tribes become nationalities, local caste groups join broader caste associations, language becomes a symbol of group identification and religion becomes a basis for community.

Political understanding of Asian and African political processes has suffered from an over emphasis on particular ephemeral institutions and from a neglect of historical dynamic processes of identity-formation. One of the characteristic features of the vast quantity of literature on the subject which quickly accumulated
during the fifties and sixties was its relative indifference to political and social development taking place at sub-national levels which are germane to our understanding of nationalism.

An important analytical consequence of the national integration approach has been the failure to consider alternative models of state-nation relations other than either nation-state integration or secession yet both the history of Europe and contemporary developments in Asia and Africa reveal a wide range of pluralistic solutions to problems of state-nation relations in multi-ethnic societies. There are such vastly different societies as the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Belgium and Guyana, which vary in their degree of political integration, but in which the accommodations that have been reached among diverse linguistic, religious and racial groups have not involved either cultural amalgamation or political secession. An alternative to the national integration approach lies in sociological theories of nationalism, viewed as a process of nationality formation rather than state-building. Sociological theories do not begin with the nation-state. They pose such questions: under what conditions do ethnic groups develop into nations; how does the process unfold; what are the relations between policies of the state of developing nationalities; and how can the state influence the processes of nationality formation?
Cultural Pluralism, Multiple Identities and Nationalism

The trinity of state, nation and nationalism define the political field of cultural pluralism. In most of the developing world identity patterns derived from shared language, culture, religion or caste have been important determinants of political alignments and conflicts. The power of the communal factor in politics was seriously underestimated at the time of Independence. Only gradually this dimension of political development began to receive the deserved attention. As studies began to accumulate and political leaders experimented with various formulas for coping with this challenge, awareness of its enormous complexity has grown. Crawford Young makes a very poignant observation:

The identity groups existed at widely varying levels of intensity of collective awareness. Further, close inspection reveals that many widely used communal labels cover multiple layers of self-consciousness; it proves far from clear what the appropriate unit of analysis is. The definition of group is in constant flux; any theory of ethnic conflict must incorporate change as a central element. Political events are an important independent variable in determining the saliency of cultural conflict at any moment in time. At one moment, ethnic conflict may appear to eclipse all other factors in the political equation; a few years later the same cleavage may appear entirely muted, and quite irrelevant to explication of the political process.

Young, further states three propositions concerning cultural pluralism:

(i) the set of groupings which constitute plurality are not necessarily permanent, frozen collectivities, but in a state of flux in response to long-run forces of social change, shorter-run alterations in political context, and continuous processes of interaction with other groups; 
(ii)
the individual actor is not necessarily assigned by birth to a single cultural aggregate; the possibility exists of two or more simultaneous cultural affiliations or more than one layer of meaningful identity or cultural migration from one identity to another when social circumstances alter; (iii) each cultural aggregate may vary widely in the degree to which its identity pattern is given ideological formulation, ranging from highly developed theories of a group's collective history, cultural heritage and common destiny to amorphous, ill-formed and only barely manifest self-awareness.

G. Identity

Identity is a subjective self-concept; cultural self-definitions are among the social roles individuals may assume in a given situation. Ego is conceived in relation to alter; identity is relational and is shaped by the nature of the "relevant others" in the social arena. The matter is succinctly stated by Theodor R. Sarbin:

It is axiomatic that in order to survive as a member of a society, a person must be able to locate himself accurately in the role structure. The simplest way to accomplish this is by seeking and finding answers to the question "who am I?" Since roles are structured in reciprocal fashion, the answers can also be achieved through locating the position of the other by implicitly asking the question "Who are you?"

A sense of membership in a given cultural community involves recognition of certain features of the group which render it distinctive; implicitly, these attributes are contrastive. Appreciation of uniqueness requires perception of what differentiates the group from others' speech code, symbols, values, religion, ritual or physical appearance.

The importance of the "relevant other" in the definition of cultural roles helps to clear the
frequent fluidity of identities and in particular the changes which often occur in an urban environment. Urban residence places persons in juxtaposition and social interaction with culturally differentiated individuals make people aware of their specificities. Subjective identity itself is affected by labels applied by others. Through a feedback process, when a designation achieves general currency, it might be gradually internalised by the group itself.

A crucial characteristic of cultural identities is their variation in intensity. Not all cultural segments have the same degree of collective solidarity. Some are particularly susceptible to erosion under changing circumstances; others are held with extraordinary fervour.

Intensity represents degree of cultural mobilization. The Detutsch approach of measuring the phenomenon in terms of the growth of effective, dense communication channels within a group taps one important aspect.

We also find particularly valuable the perspective developed by Joshua Fishman, who differentiates ethnicity from what he terms nationalism in function of the degree to which identity has been ideologically formulated. This distinction was first stated in his studies on ethnicity and language loyalties in the United States:

An ethnic group becomes a nationality when it has an image of its collective past and when its members are aware of and responsive to that image. Such a development most certainly presupposes a
specialized group of persons exclusively concerned with creating and propagating general symbols and values, at once expressing and expressive of this collective past. We know next to nothing about the conditions under which these plural and parochial values become transformed into or replaced by a singular set of national ones.

Subsequently, in his efforts to summarize the state of socio-linguistics in understanding change processes in the Third World, he further elaborated on his views:

At the socio-cultural level it is the transition between ethnic group and nationality that is crucial to our immediate purposes (although prior transitions occurred along the band to clan stages). As a result of symbolic elaboration the daily rounds of life that constitute traditional ethnicity (including ways of speaking, dressing, harvesting, cooping, celebrating, worshipping etc.) come to be viewed not as minimally ideologized (which is not to say unrationalized), localized, and particularized "innocent" acts but, rather, as expressions of common history, common values, common missions, longings, goals.

Taken together, the density of communications within a cultural segment and the degree to which it has acquired an ideological statement of its uniqueness, historical virtues, and future destiny account for a large part of the variation in intensity. Young points out that the ideologization of identity depends upon the emergence of cultural entrepreneurs, almost always associated with the rise of a professional middle class and intelligentsia; although the basis for historical mystique may exist in rich measure in the reservoir of folk tradition and myths of origin; the move from the oral repository of the traditional elders to the written page multiplies the potential mobilization of identity. This cultural educated class has many tasks to absorb its energies: the language must be standardized and a literature of verse and prose
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accumulated; history must be recorded and a vision of the future defined.

Young makes a distinction between the 'cultural entrepreneur' and the 'political broker'. Cultural entrepreneur devotes himself to enlarging the solidarity resources of a community, and the political broker mobilizes ethnicity in a given situation, crystallizing collective aspiration in the social and political realm. He elaborates:

the cultural entrepreneur commits his energies to multiplying the capital. Language is a crucial expression of identity and will command much of his attention. The prestige of the language is affirmed by making it uniform so that it can serve as an effective written medium and intensify the solidarity of the entire potential speech community through ending the discontinuities of mutually unintelligible dialect. The language is at once modernized and classicalized; it must be equipped with a vocabulary which describes the artifacts and conveys the ideas of a technological world and at the same time is bound to its origins by the resurrection of classical usage (if any can be found). Literature is of prime importance to an ideological culture; it provides a powerful medium of socialization, where the symbols of commonality are made familiar and intimate, where history is conveyed through poetry, gable and saga, where a catechism of identity is elaborated. The history of the group must be unravelled and rewoven as epic poetry. The founding fathers, the great kings, the triumphant generals, the high priests must be rescued from obscurity and accorded their place of veneration in the cultural hagiography.

II

NATIONALITY: Its Meaning and Aspects

The study of nationality must begin with agreement about the meaning of the term. The phenomena which we are going to examine are partly objective or external, the dimensions of which are territory, history,
economy, language, and partly subjective or internal facts like consciousness or sentiment. The external facts, of course, can be ascertained with a much greater degree of accuracy than the internal. National consciousness has a complicated psychological structure and shows many historical and social varieties. National consciousness or national sentiment is an exceedingly elusive thing. Its manifestations can be studied in political literature, public speeches or national institutions, but the interpretation of such documents or objects in regard to the underlying national spirit is always more or less insecure. The interrogation of numerous individuals belonging to the nation in question about their national feelings would be very difficult.

Territory, history, language, and popular will, (all these) are significant in the formation of national identity, though not in the way it has often been assumed. We will, later on, devote a separate section to language; other factor will be discussed here.

A. Territorial Identity: the Significance of Territory for a Nation

By national territory is understood the country with which a nation by long tradition is so intimately connected that it regards it as the homeland and as an integral part of its whole existence. We can hardly imagine a nation without a more or less contiguous area which it inhabits and in which it is rooted, both physically and spiritually. The close community and
personality implied in the idea of a nation presupposes this connection with a territory.

One should distinguish the awareness of territorial unity arising in the process of the formation of a nation from the attitudes of small territorial communities such as rural communities. National territory that is claimed by a nation as its country, is not identical with the home country in the narrower sense. Home country is the place where we have been born or which is nearest to our heart through long residence and many cherished memories. Affection for the national territory is implanted in our mind by a common history, by the force of public opinion, by education, by means of literature, the press, national songs, monuments and in many other ways. Our feelings for the small territory are the products of many intimate personal experiences in a decisive epoch of our life. Home sentiment has more the nature of an organic growth while national sentiment is more artificial, though there are many connections between them. Territorial affinity in the period of the formation of a nation is connected with the development of economic, cultural, linguistic and political ties which cover the whole area of the settlement of the ethnonational community. By its nature this process is not direct continuation and development of the old territorial links (prenational state formation of the type of feudal principalities). It destroys and transforms them. They give way to new links which in time consolidate a national area, engender a trend
towards national differentiation and the creation of nation-states. This trend manifests a close connection between the common language and the ethnic territory. The national consolidation occurs chiefly according to the languages spoken. The fact that the language boundary does not always coincide with the state boundary does not fundamentally change the matter. This discrepancy arises due to the incompleteness of national processes, the uncertainty of language boundaries in some areas, and the existence of transitional dialects whose relationship with a given language can be difficult to establish at the present stage of knowledge.

The boundaries of the area of settlement of practically every ethnic community have changed during the many ages of its existence, due to migrations, conquests, natural calamities, emergence of states and the alteration of state boundaries.

Although national delimitation occurs mainly on the basis of language, the process is also influenced by other factors, such as economic and cultural ties, the historical tradition and political considerations as well as the character of ethnic process in the territory of the given ethnic community. Consequently, in the political and administrative organisation of a national area the link between language and ethnic territory has almost never manifested itself in an absolutely pure form.
B. History

In any case, nationalist attitudes to history should not be taken at face value. 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. They generally will find those symbols most suitable that are respected among modern nations, that unite rather than divide their nation within the boundaries they propose, and to which their followers have a better claim than their rivals or antagonists.

History itself is not, as has sometimes been said, a cause of nationalism; it is simply the past time during which events and circumstances occurred that led to nationalism. Two essential questions are: what in history brought nations and national feeling into being; and how groups of individuals acquired the belief that they each had different common histories? The answers are: through their own remembered experience (as in folklore) and through their popular patriotic writers and historians.

These writers and historians have, of course, embellished their histories of these countries with glorious legends of heroes and great deeds. These are
well known and easily recognizable. They have also contributed to two other kinds of myths that are not so easily detected; they have made it seem (1) as if all or most individuals within a nation really have a common past, and (2) that this common or national past originated much earlier than it actually did. Historians are obliged to seek the earliest evidence concerning any group they are studying, and to recount whatever deeds, glorious or otherwise, did occur.

C. National Character

It is not only false memories but mistaken images as well that mislead people. For a long time now it has been assumed that the peoples of nations have developed peculiar or unique national characters, and this supposition has been a commonplace of politicians, patriots, and a good many other individuals. It forms a powerful element in every national ideology and commonly implies the glorification of one's own national character and the denigration of that of the national enemy.

National character can only be defined as the totality of traditions, interests and ideals which are so widespread and influential in a nation that they mould its image, both in the mind of the nation concerned and in that of others.

The beliefs which a nation holds concerning its own character and that of other nations are usually a mixture of some truth with a large amount of
exaggeration and distortion. But even illusions are mental facts which may have a great share in producing national solidarity, national ambitions and national rivalries.

The traditions, interests and ideas of which national character is composed refer partly to the life of individuals and partly to that of the nation. Every nation has certain predilections as regards food, drinking, housing, clothing and other ways of life and also habits of thought and sentiment.

There is confusion as to what traits and behaviour constitute character. Moreover, in spite of many studies, empirically derived data is also lacking. Much has been talked and written about national character. For example, Frenchmen are intellectually honest and clearheaded, Germans are industrious, Finns are ultimate democrates. The characteristics assigned to a nationality may be attributed with equal propriety to other nationalities. Modern France is no more marked by intellectual honesty than was ancient Italy. Modern Italy possesses no greater aesthetic aptitude than Spain, or Switzerland and so on.

D. The Idea of National Personality

Personality in an individual, as in a nation, is a combination of unity, freedom, distinctiveness and distinction. The idea of 'national personality' irrespective of its reality is a very potent factor in nationalist ideology.
The ideas of the national will presupposes personality. Only a person can have a will or be responsible. This personality, of course, is a legal fiction, but its practical application is often strongly influenced by the image of national personality prevailing in the ideology of the nation concerned. This image usually exaggerates the unity and stability of national personality.

The longing for personality is expressed in the use of symbolic figures personifying the nation like British lion, the German eagle, Russian bear, German oak.

Boyd C. Shafer says that the nonsense that has been written about national character remains nonsense though the prose is poetic. Of course, there are Germans, Frenchmen, Chinese, and Japanese who fit national stereotypes and some who do not. What is German character, as that of Goethe or of Hitler?

The chief arguments against the idea of a national character are: (i) the wide diversity of individual characters and cultural traits in each nation, (2) the absence of very marked and decisive differences of individual character and cultural traits between nations, and (3) the frequent changes which have taken place in views held of the character of specific nations.

E. The National Ideology

A developed national ideology comprises not only distinct political doctrines but also a particular
interpretation of history and a specific philosophy. The substance of the national ideology consists of ideas on the character of the nation and that of other nations, or the past, present and future of the nations, on its mission in the world, on the tasks of the state and on the duties of the individuals towards the nation.

The function of a national ideology is to bind all classes firmly together to unify their mentality, and to establish or strengthen the influence on policy of those classes which are the main seat of the national ideology. These aims often cannot be attained by preaching the same ideology to all classes. German militarism and nationalism, before the last war, produced several sets of ideas for winning the support of classes for war. One was designed for the masses which were averse to aggressive wars, and was to prove that Germany was in constant danger of being attacked by England, France and Russia who wanted to annihilate Germany and that therefore, the gigantic German armaments were truly defensive. Much use was made of the argument that Britain was jealous of Germany's export trade and wanted to destroy it. Another ideology was inculcated into other section of the nation which were less averse to war, such as the educated middle class, students and officials. According to it, Germany lacked 'living space'. If her youth could not find good posts and trade was going badly this was due only to the greed and rapacity of England and France. They had divided the world between
them and left nothing for Germany. Though single tenets of those different ideologies frequently contradict one another, they were very often simultaneously believed by many persons.

III

LANGUAGE AS A SYMBOL OF SOCIAL IDENTITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH NATIONALITY - QUESTION

When one tries to understand 'cultural nationalism', language becomes important. Language as a symbol of social identity has came to have increasing political importance with the rise of nationalism, so that the existence of common language is now often thought to be an important precondition of political identity. The relation of language to nationalism presents a number of interesting sociological problems. With the increased emphasis on nationalism in modern times the question of the symbolic meaning of race and language has taken on a new significance. While language differences have always been important symbols of cultural differences it is only in comparatively recent times, with the exaggerated development of the idea of the sovereign nation and with the resulting eagerness to discover linguistic symbols for this ideal of sovereignty that language differences have taken on an implication of antagonism.

The linguistic theory of nationality is quite influential in definitions of nationalism. The theory in question holds that nations are pure language groups and that political boundaries must therefore be drawn
to coincide with the distribution of individuals speaking the same tongue. The key to a nation's survival is the retention of its language. Language is the decisive element in any culture, expressing most clearly the collective personality of the group. It follows that nationalism is predominantly a linguistic movement and that differences in language will, under certain conditions, produce strife and lead to national secession.

There are two sets of objections to the language theory. The first casts doubt on the identification of nations with language groups on following grounds:
1. Two populations sharing a common language, but inhabiting different states, need not belong to the same nation. Both French and English are spoken by a number of nations outside France and England (Haiti, the Walloons, Quebecois, French speaking Switzerland, United States, Canada, Ireland, Australia), and the same applies to Portuguese and Spanish speakers.
2. Language is not as precise a criterion as the Romantics supposed, and hence the difference between language group is often ambiguous. The three functional grades of language development - the patois, dialect and language - fluctuate with political social and geographical circumstances over time, it is not easy task to pin point the structural difference which will enable us to pick out a distinct language group.
3. Not all language differences are noticed or, if they are, they are not necessarily divisive; nor are all language disputes instances of nationalism.
Linquists have documented cases in Scandinavia, the Congo and West Africa where mutual intelligibility is not hindered by the fact that the languages of the different groups are structurally distinct.

4. Even where linguistic differences were minimal, severe national strife arose. Serbs and Croats, Hindi and Urdu speakers, Czechs and Solvaks share an identical linguistic structure, but that has not prevented the emergence of separate nationalism.

5. Identification of language group with nation overlooks the extremely important category of 'nations-to-be', all those state-nations of Africa which contain different language groups but whom their nationalist leaders hope to weld into a single nation, whether the inhabitants will speak the same language or not. So long as the elite share a common administrative language, the nation at large may remain multilingual.

The second set of objections to the language theory is directed at its inflation of as an explanatory factor. The German Romantics actually had very little in the way of an explanation of language's role in the rise of nationalism; but this omission has been supplemented by modern accounts. Gellner, for example, argues that linguistic education is the chief social bond of industrial societies. As modernisation erodes traditional structures and makes large numbers of people mobile, culture - in the sense of communication and especially language - becomes all important. Culture replaces structure. It defines both belonging
and citizenship. Identity, in turn, is cultural now-a-days. But to classify men by culture is to classify them by nationality.

Gellner is not the only theorist to stress the role of language in the rise of nationalism. Linguists interested in nationalism have correlated changes in language and script with the development of national consciousness. In addition, they have pointed to the philological researches of nationalists and to the strong relationship between the modernisation of languages and literary renaissances, on the one hand, and nationalist movements on the other. What their researches indicate is that linguistic and literary changes depend to a large extent upon social and political change, of which the rise of nationalism is a central element. It is by virtue of their burgeoning national sentiment that nationalists become interested in philological and literary research; and the new plays and novels tend to be expressions of or rising tide of national consciousness. Similarly, where the vernacular is elevated and modernised it is by virtue of nationalist tenets and ideas, not as a precondition of those ideas.

A. Language and Culture

Language is not merely one of several aspects of culture, prima inter pares, in that it makes possible the development, the elaboration, the transmission and (particularly in its written form) the accumulation of culture as a whole.
A controversial type of correlation between language and culture involves whole philosophies or ways of life held to be characteristic of particular cultures (though often not brought to the level of conscious formulation). The interest of anthropologists was drawn to such co-relations by Edward Sapir who not only recognised a linguistic relativity, covarying with cultural relativity but also postulated a linguistic determinism operating on culture.

Human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society.... The fact of the matter is that the "real world" is to a large extent unconsciously built upon the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.

B. Language and Society

Linguistic phenomenon are analyzable both within the context of language itself and within the broader context of social behavior. In the formal analysis of language the object of attention is a particular body of linguistic data abstracted from the settings in which it occurs and studied primarily from the point of view of its referential function. In analysing linguistic phenomena within a socially defined universe, however, the study is of language usage as it reflects more general behavioural norms. This universe is the speech community; any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by
means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage.

Now, a few scholars have attempted even to ask, much less answer, such vital questions as these: What is the exact nature of relationship between language and society? Where are linguistic structure and social structure co-related? Can we say that one will be dominated and the other follow? If a particular change occurs in language what reflection of this can we expect to find in society and vice-versa? In the last few years linguists and sociologists have begun to focus interest on these topics. And we have acquired a new term for this interdisciplinary field: Sociolinguistics.

In speaking of 'linguistic' diversity, Bright says that language is not uniform throughout time and space. These types of diversity are closely related to social facts. They are now coming to receive detailed study. Any classification of sociolinguistic diversity must recognize at least two types of variables: one is the type of factor which conditions different linguistic choices; the other is the degree of difference which occurs. As regards conditioning, we may distinguish three principal factors: (a) the social identity of speaker, (b) social identity of person spoken to, and (c) situational context of the communicative act.
R.A. Hudson raised some very relevant questions about the nature of language in general or in relations of language to society in particular: how should global linguistic categories like ‘language X’ be defined? How should particular instances of them be delimited? Do such categories, indeed, correspond to any kind of objective reality in terms of which these make sense? Can distinct types of global category (e.g., language versus dialect) be distinguished? How are global categories related to one another? How should communities be defined and delimited for these purposes? Do communities defined on a linguistic basis have any kind of objective reality? It is not easy to give definite answers to most of these questions but it is possible to cast serious doubts on some widely accepted answers to them.

C. Language and Dialect

It is very difficult to find a general definition for language and dialect. We first need to consider the concept ‘language’. Khubchandani points out that the notion of "language" to a speaker is not the same thing it is to a linguist. Languages are generally classified according to their grammars. To a linguist, the formal characteristics of a particular speech have a priority in determining whether it can be grouped with language, A or language B. But to a speaker, language is more significant symbolically in terms of identifying himself with a group than in terms of its purely formal criteria, which are apriori considerations for a linguist in defining language. Consequently in
a pluralistic society a speaker's declaration about his or her mother-tongue is purely individual, based mostly on considerations of social identification and group loyalty rather than on the speech he or she uses for primary communication.

Usually there are three most widely recognised types of language variety: 'language', 'dialect' and 'register'. All three types are problematic from the point of view of finding a general definition for each one which will distinguish it from the others.

In fact, the distinction between 'language' and 'dialect' was developed in Greek because of the existence of a number of clearly distinct written varieties in use in classical Greece, each associated with a different area and used for a different kind of literature. Thus, the meanings of the Greek terms which were translated as 'language' and 'dialect' were in fact quite different from the meanings these words have in English now. The point of this discussion is to show that there is nothing absolute about the distinction which English happens to make between 'language' and 'dialect'.

What then is the difference, for English speakers, between a language and a dialect? On the one hand, there is a difference of size because a language is larger than a dialect. That is, a variety called language contains more items than one called a dialect.
The other contrast between 'language' and 'dialect' is a question of prestige, a language having prestige which a dialect lacks.

It is probably fair to say that the only kind of variety which would count as a 'proper language', is a 'standard language'. A standard language passes through the following processes:

1. **Selection**: Somehow or other a particular variety must have been selected as the one to be developed into a standard language. The choice is a matter of great social and political importance, as the chosen variety necessarily gains prestige and so the people who already speak it share in this prestige.

2. **Condification**: Some agency such as an academy must have written dictionaries and grammar books to 'fix' the variety, so that everyone agrees on what is correct. Once codification has taken place, it becomes necessary for any ambitious citizen to learn the correct forms and not to use in writing any 'incorrect' forms he may have in his native variety.

3. **Elaboration of function**: It must be possible to use the selected variety in all the functions associated with central government and with writing, for example, in parliament and law courts, in bureaucratic, educational and scientific documents of all kinds, and of course, in various forms of literature.

4. **Acceptance**: The variety has to be accepted by the relevant population as the variety of the community, usually, in fact, as the national language. Once this
has happened, the standard language serves as a strong unifying force for the state.

We can now clarify the question by distinguishing between the two meanings of "language" based, respectively, on prestige and size. We can say that on the basis of prestige, a language is a standard language. In principle this distinction is an absolute one: either a variety is a standard language or it is not. When we turn to the other distinction, based on size, the situation is different. Since everything becomes relative, for example, in comparison with one variety a chosen variety may be large, yet compared with another it may be small. Another widely used criterion is that of mutual intelligibility. If the speakers of two varieties can understand each other, then the varieties concerned are instances of the same language; otherwise they are not. There are problems in its application:

1. Mutual intelligibility is a matter of degree, ranging from total intelligibility down to total unintelligibility. How high at this scale do two varieties need to be in order to count as members of the same language?

2. Varieties may be arranged in a dialect continuum, a chain of adjacent varieties in which each pair of adjacent varieties are mutually intelligible, but pairs taken from opposite ends of the chain are not.

3. Mutual intelligibility is not really a relation between varieties, but between people, since it is
they, and not the varieties, that understand one another.

Thus, we can say that there is no real distinction to be drawn between "language" and "dialect". We are still far from having any objective criterion for quantifying linguistic differences and for determining the boundaries between a "language" and "dialect".

The magnitude of various linguistic problems in newly independent countries appears to be quite outside the experience of most European countries either in past or in the present. In most of the Western homogenized nation-states, identification of the "standard" core and demarcation of boundaries of a mother-tongue are no longer sources of tension. One does not find any apparent conflict between the stabilized standard and actual speech variations in a language area. In many plural societies one often finds contradictions in the language scene concerning different aspects of speech behaviour namely, patterns of language use, levels of competence, unconscious attitudes (image) and conscious assertions (postures) about speech activity.

Language is a complex multi-lateral phenomenon. Khubchandani points out three distinct contours of speech behaviour which are relevant for our discussion here—(1) what people do with speech, that is, language usage; (2) What people think they do with speech, that is, language image; and (3) What people claim they do with speech, that is, language posture.
One notices many instances in the pluralistic societies of Asia and Africa where the boundaries distinguishing two languages are not sharply delineated. Classifying and labeling languages in India has proved to be a source of controversy. Among the Indo-Aryan languages, one language tends to fade into a related one with no clear break between them. Hindi and Urdu share substantially the same phonological and grammatical systems. However, they are written with different writing systems. Their historical and cultural statuses are different. Another aspect of the problem is that some speech varieties are hard to classify. A case in point is Maithili. The case of clear lines of demarcation among some of the Indo-Aryan languages leads to a situation that Khubchandani calls "fluidity".

(D) **Attitudes to Language Choice**

We speak of language loyalty when a literary variety acquires prestige as a symbol of a particular nationality, group or social movement. Language loyalty tends to unite diverse local groups and social classes, whose members may continue to speak their own vernaculars within the family circle. The literary idiom serves for reading and for public interaction and embodies the cultural tradition of a nation or a sector thereof. Individuals choose to employ it as a symbol of their allegiance to a broader set of political ideals than that embodied in the family or kin group.
Language loyalty may become a political issue in a modernizing society when hitherto socially isolated minority groups becomes mobilized. Their demands for clear participation in political affairs are often accompanied by demands for language reform or for rewriting of the older official code in their own literary idiom. Such demands often represent political and socio-economic threats to the established elite which may control the distribution of administrative positions through examination systems based on official code. The replacements of an older official code by another literary idiom in modernizing societies may thus represent the displacement of an establishment elite by a rising group. Although demands for language reform are usually verbalized in terms of communicative needs, it is interesting to observe that such demands do not necessarily reflect important linguistic differences between the idioms in question. The conflict in language loyalty may even affect mutual intelligibility as when speakers claim that they do not understand each other reflect primarily social attitudes rather than linguistic fact.

We can say that linguistic or cultural homogeneity of even one group is, in a sense, a fiction. Both, culture and language, are hierarchical notions embodying in them elements which could be called subcultures or dialects which viewed from another angle are cultures or languages.
METHODS OF ANALYZING NATIONALITY

As we mentioned earlier also that "national sentiment" or "national consciousness" is very fluid phenomenon and appears in the most variegated forms and degrees. It is very difficult to study national sentiment. It is not the same or equally strong in all the members of a nation. Many have very little of it or none at all, at least in normal times, though it may be latent in them and only break forth in a time of national emergency under the impact of a great wave of national emotion. It is mainly certain sections of a nation which cultivate national aspirations, and which are more or less recognised as national leaders or spokesmen.

The study of nationalism can be conceived in the realm of movements. The movement is the vehicle of expression of the idea of nationalism. By conceiving of it as a movement we can operationally define it.

It is advisable, however, to distinguish between movements which, because of their limited goals, never attract more than small groups of people and those which aiming at comprehensive and fundamental changes in the social order, become true mass movements of historical significance. It should be noted that all movements have political implications even if their members do not strive at political power. Group consciousness, that is, a sense of belonging and of solidarity among the members of a group, is essential
for a social movement, although empirically it occurs in various degrees, this consciousness is generated through active participation and may assume various socio-psychological characteristics.

Although social movements are by definition not corporate bodies as action groups, they need some kind of organisation that enables certain persons to act as authorised spokesmen and representatives. The relations between the various organized groups constituting a movement are not always free of tension. The tactics and strategy of a movement are inter-dependent with its ideology and its form of organization, for example, a movement aiming at revolution needs a more authoritarian organisation than a movement believing in gradual reform.

Notwithstanding the substantial increase in the number of publications on social movements in recent years very little thinking has gone into the methodological issues involved in the study of movements. It is necessary to resort to data collection through multiple techniques, like participant observation, content analysis, informant interviewing etc.

Oommen discusses methodological issues in the study of social movement under two heads: the problems relating to the scale of movements, and the issues relating to the units and levels of observation. The scale of movement is influenced by the size and social composition of participants and its time span, all of which pose problems of operationalization. In order
that a mobilization may be called a movement the minimum size of participants can be settled by defining it either in terms of absolute or in terms of proportionate number with reference to the universe under question. However, the issue of defining participants still remains a vexing one, as there are core, rank and file and peripheral participants in all movements. The issue is complicated because the participants simultaneously share three basic identities: primordial/ascriptive, class/occupational and political/ideological. The widespread tendency on the part of researchers to ignore this complex and combined identity of participants and to invoke that specific identity which suits the researcher's perspective has often resulted in poor research pay-off and led to misleading conclusions. The analysis of social movements has constituted an amorphous and diffused field of sociological research and theory that is sometimes conceived as part of the general field of collective behaviour and sometimes as part of the study of voluntary associations.

Most of the studies of social movements demonstrate the preponderance of *ex post facto* analysis; ongoing movements are not studied. Oommen says that it is necessary and highly desirable to analyze ongoing movements. Several methodological problems beset such a research endeavour. Some of them are the following:

1. The phenomenon under investigation is in a flux, movement lives from moment to moment and it is very difficult to make any definite statements about them.
2. The time span of a given movement may be too long for any particular researcher to be involved in its continuous study.

3. Movements may trigger suddenly and the researcher may not be prepared to plunge into the study or may have to face too many bureaucratic constraints to leave for the field immediately.

In spite of several such limitations it is desirable to undertake the study of ongoing social movements because it is the only method through which the processual and micro-aspects of a movement can be understood. The *ex post facto* analysis which are based on records are bound to be one sided as the records invariably reflect only the ideas and activities of the leadership, which give only the view from the above.
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