CHAPTER I

SOCIO-CULTURAL REGIONALISM IN INDIA: MEANING, DEFINITION AND NATURE
SECTION I

Introduction

The emergence of regionalism in a federal polity and in a plural society is subject to different stimuli like sociological, political and economic. The context for its assertion in the national life is provided by the democratic ideology and plural social order. Democratization and politicization of socio-cultural groups transform them into a self-conscious political community. Their organization into a political group is motivated by the achievement of certain objectives and goals. These objectives may be accommodative, protectionist, welfarist, autonomist, separatist and secessionist. But the transformation of a socio-cultural group into a politically active community is a complex process of identity formation, its assertion in the political and economic life of a country and in the event of a inter-community conflict. As a multi-stage process, it requires a close analysis of several variables and elements involved in the regional identity formation and its practice in the politics and economy of a nation-state.

Since no single theory is sufficient to explain the phenomena of regionalism, this study seeks help from three set of theories, namely the theories of nationalism – nationality formation, theories of national integration and theories of federalism.
Nationalism and Regionalism

Regionalism is often described as a 'built-in-process within nationalism' or as an inherent tendency within nationalism. In other words, this means that nationalism promotes sub-nationalism or regionalism. Though there exists a pattern of similarity between nationalism, sub-nationalism and regionalism, they are not identical phenomena, especially in terms of objectives. While the basic object of nationalism/sub-nationalism is the creation of a separate, independent sovereign nation-state, the same is not true with regionalism. Regionalism has variegated objectives in a federal system. At most, it demands for the creation of a separate state within the broader political framework of a nation-state, whereby administrative boundary is made congruent with the cultural boundary of a regional community.

But the central analytical concern of both regionalism and nationalism, is the group identity formation, their assertion and transformation into a self-conscious political community. The basic questions in this context are: How the group identity is formed? What are the bases on which group cohesion is built? How and when single factor or combination of factors assumes salience over other factors of group formation? How and when a particular ethnic
category becomes a political community? In order to find an explainable answer to above questions, the theories of nationalism provide important methodological insight to the study of the process of group identity formation.

Malcom Yapp has grouped several theories of nationalism under four captions: the natural, the unnatural, the reactive and the modernizing. In place of modernizing theory, the subjective-objective continuum theory seems preferable. This can further be divided into: (a) cultural theory; (b) ethnicity theory; and (c) communication theory. The Marxist theory of nationalism can be discussed separately. This is necessary for a well-focussed analysis.

Before discussing the theories of nationalism, it seems essential to briefly discuss the meaning of the term 'nationalism'. 'Nationalism' is more a descriptive than a definitional term. There is no accepted definition of nationalism as such. Scholars define and describe it according to their respective academic interests and persuasions. Some scholars define it as a psychological phenomenon, a state of mind where supreme loyalty is placed to the nation-state (a sought-after objective of nationality formation). But for many it is either a political creed or an ideological movement for autonomy, unity and identity of a cultural group. And its praxis is the creation, maintenance and reinforcement of a separate group identity.
It is also equated with the principles of equality and self-determination. And the most desired objective of the ideology of nationalism is creation of an independent, sovereign nation-state. An analytical consequence of this is that nation precedes state. Thus, what does it aim at is creation of a mono-ethnic state. This is a limited perspective of the phenomena of nationalism. But the experiences of third world societies point out at a poly or multi-ethnic or multi-nation federal-state formation where culturally or ethnically differentiated people aggregate to form a composite state-nation system where emphasis is placed on 'unity in diversity'. Underlying assumption is that though culturally people may be different, politically, ideologically and in terms of common interests and common future they can be integrated into a common political formation. Also in these societies, there are instances of state forming nation i.e. creation of a composite national identity by the state.

Strictly speaking, nationalism is not a unidimensional phenomenon. It defies any one-stroke definition, analysis and formulation. Nationalism is a complex phenomena of historical references, sociological inquiry and political formulations and analysis. Thus any study of nationalism requires a processual and contextual analysis.
After a brief discussion of the meaning, definition and content of nationalism, it is worthwhile to analyse the theories of nationalism:

**Historical-Natural Theory**

The basic analytical concern of all historical theories of nationalism is origin, development and growth of nationalist movement. The basic object of such analyses seems to be the delineation of patterns among the nationalist movements. Though their interpretations vary, they seem to be in agreement on one point - that it is a modern phenomenon which made its first appearance in the 17th century, in the Puritan revolution in England. The motivation for nationalist upsurge is provided by the subsequent assertion of liberal-political ethos of liberty, equality, fraternity, political self-determination - that each nationality should form a state. And, "it was only at the end of the 18th century (i.e. with French Civilization) that, for the first time civilization was considered to be determined by nationality." According to this theory, nationality was invented in terms of language and through the strengthening of folk tradition and culture.

The main proposition of Historical - Natural theories, referred by Smith as 'core doctrine' can be summed up in the following words (i) nature has divided people into separate nations with distinguishing characteristics; (ii)
each nation is destined to have a state of its own, therefore, nation legitimizes state. State is needed for self-realization and full expression of cultural identity; (iii) once state is formed, loyalties to state should override other loyalties; and (iv) nationalist assertion is the process of imitation and importation.7

Historical-natural theory has many limitations. It is a diffusionist theory which does not explain why nationalism emerged only at the end of 18th century and not before? It also fails to explain phenomenon of nationism.8 More or less, this is an incomplete theory of "social change and political action".9 Further, it is a theory of historical determinism where nationalism is subjected to 'imitation' and 'importation' to be followed by other societies. What this theory misses out is the spontaneity and subalternity of national feeling or consciousness. Experiences of third world societies show a contextual variation in the origin and growth of nationalism. Each case represents a separate model of nationalism.

Unnatural or Critical Theory of Nationalism

If liberal or enlightenment theory of nationalism generated supporters of nationalism, it attracted criticism from among its followers like J.S. Mill, Lord Acton and in recent period from Elie Kedourie. For J.S. Mill, though
nationality forms an important principle of political organization, it cannot be sole basis of political formations and extension of loyalty. Beyond nation-state, other organizations may exist with which people can associate themselves. Nationalism is only one more step in the history of human progress, but ultimate is the civilization.10

On the other hand, Acton considers state as substantial arrangement for the realization of liberty and moral order. But, state is not an end. Also he rejects the formation of state on the basis of cultural factors. In other words, he rejects one nation - one state theory of nationalism. Therefore, he says:

those in which no mixture of races has occurred are imperfect; and those in which its effects have disappeared are decrepit. A state which is incompetent to satisfy different races condemns itself; a state which labours to neutralize; to absorb, or to expel them, destroys its own vitality; a state which does not include them is destitute of the chief basis of self-government. The theory of nationality, therefore, is a retrograde step in history.

He further writes,

... Nationality does not aim either at liberty or prosperity, both of which it sacrifices to the imperative necessity of making the nation the mould and measure of the state. Its course will be marked with material as well as moral ruin, in order that a new invention may prevail over the works of God and the interests of mankind."11

Elie Kedourie denounces nationalism as a pernicious doctrine 'inflicted on a long suffering of humanity.' He
holds that it is an antiquarian, irrelevant, "a baneful invention of some misguided German philosophers supported by the frustrations of obscure middle-class writers, low-born sons of artisans, farmers and pastors." Kedourie holds the view that the doctrine of nationalism has introduced an extremist style, a frenzied behaviour into the style of politics which subverts political order. It is absurd to reduce state merely to a sociological determinism. Therefore, he strongly objects to Herder's linguistic criterion of national (communities) differentiation. He says,

the world is indeed diverse, much too diverse, for the classifications of nationalist anthropology. Races, languages, religious, political traditions and loyalties are so inextricably intermixed that there can be no clear convincing reason why people who speak the same language, but whose history and circumstances otherwise diverge, should form one state, as why people who speak two different languages and whom circumstances have thrown together should not form one state.

He further says,

There is no convincing reason why the fact that people speak the same language or belong to the same race should, by itself, entitle them to enjoy a government exclusively their own. For such a claim to be convincing, it must also be proved that similarity in one respect absolutely overrides differences in other respects.

He sums up the essence of the doctrines of nationalism in the following words,
... the doctrine holds that humanity is naturally divided into nations, that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained and that the only legitimate type of government is national self-government.\textsuperscript{15}

In an overall estimation, we can conclude that what Kedorie, like other unnatural theorists, objects is the sociological, psychological and reductionist approach of historical-natural theorist. But in doing so, they usually forget the socializing and civilizing impact of language and culture. Though, those objective markers are not only determinants of group identity formation, surely, they play important role in cementing group-cohesion.

Subjectivist - Objectivist Continuum Theory

The basic concern of this theory of nationalism seems to be nation/nationality formation. The question put forward is how identity (national/regional) is formed? In doing so, different objective markers like religion, language, culture, territory etc. are emphasised. Therefore, a detailed analysis of different objective markers and subjective feelings are stressed and emphasized. This has special relevance to the present study, because, the very world 'regionalism' specifies existence of a regional community, for which regionalism is an ideology, an agenda, and a protest movement. Regional community is not an abstract community, but it is a community of identifiable characteristics, shared by people. What are those
characteristics which form and sustain a regional community? What are the bases of community formation? What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of objective markers? How objective markers transform into a subjective consciousness of 'we' feeling, also, why and how a movement succeeds or fails? These are few questions which can be answered partly with the help of this theory.

The most important hypothesis of this theory is that the objective markers do not naturally transform culturally similar people into a Politically assertive community. Subjective consciousness of the feeling of 'we' is constructed by elite, intelligentsia, leaders, and by the political organization. It is further shaped by the forces of modernization, development, inter-community relations or conflicts, and by the different government policies, especially cultural policies.

This theory begins with the questions: What is nationalism? What is nation? Let us examine, the second question first. It is nationality which constitutes nation when nationality acquires or fulfills certain conditions that are specified separately. Firstly, we should examine the cultural theorist which also includes an analysis of approach to identity formation.

For Carlton Hayes, nationality designates "a group of people who speak either the same language or closely related
dialects, who cherish common historical traditions, and who constitute or think they constitute a distinct cultural society." 16 And nationality becomes "nation' only when it acquires political unity, sovereignty and independence. 17 His definition has two parts - one specifies objective markers, and the other holds that it is not merely the existence of objective markers which constitute people into a nation, but only when people think so. Also nation is a political category and not merely the conglomerates of cultural groups.

But, what are these objective characteristics? For Hayes, it is not merely the existence of human groups, geography, race, common soul, which constitute specific group identity. But group identity is an attribute of human culture. Therefore, he accords much importance to language, culture, history and religion. Like Herder, language for Hayes, is the most important factor in group-identity formation. "The formation of most modern nationalities has been historically dependent upon the development of particular languages...." 18 Language performs multiple functions of storage, retrieval and expression of common faith and culture. It records events which undergo as history.

Though he concedes the fact that language contains within it many undeveloped dialects, which, in course of
time, may develop and become, along with other separatist factors, sub-nationities, overall

uniformity of language tends to promote like-mindedness, to provide an inclusive set of ideas as well as words, and like-minded persons tend to develop group-consciousness, to experience a sense of common interest, to constitute a tribe or nationality.¹⁹

Language, though most important, is not sole determinant of identity. History too has special functions. History is the process of recording of events, traditions, personalities, myths and symbols. Through history, memory is carried from generation to generation. Therefore, a lineage-like bond is created among people. But history remains a dead wood of records until or unless it is idealized. Idealization of history builds ‘consciousness’ among people. Further, when history is enjoined by distinct cultural and belief patterns, customs, traditions, a separate group entity is emphasised by the people. This is not the total story. A cultural group with separate language, religion, history, culture is crystallized into nationality by the political institutions as well. Political institutions infuse a sense of solidarity and promote uniformity.²⁰

Most importantly, nationality or identity is not an one-time - one-stroke phenomenon. It is a dynamic phenomenon of construction and change. Therefore, Hayes
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says, "nationalities wax and wane, rise and fall, appear and disappear". Identity formation is a dialectic process of rehearsal, invention, construction and change. Therefore relative importance of variables may vary from time to time and from space to space. Rehearsal here means rehashing old cultural system and belief pattern in a new form. Invention means inventing symbols-social and cultural - from the folk memories of masses, especially of those which are hitherto uninvented. Construction means the construction of new values, symbols, myths etc. about group's past and present. Change requires replacement of defunct value system by a new one which should also be accommodative of all shades of opinion and belief patterns of people. Also important, to observe, is the fact that identity is a relative term. Therefore, individual identity cannot be in total convergence with overall group-identity. But, here, what becomes important is to seek maximum convergence between individual's identity and group's identity. Moreover, identity presumes a set of identities within, which may be in conflict or in harmony with each other. While harmony may promote group cohesion, conflict can weaken group's solidarity. Therefore, if we select two variables - such as culture and language, it can be both in harmony, and conflict. Culture and language are said to be in harmony when they become coterminus with each other. In other
situation, developed language may not be representative of entire cultural systems of all people living in a region. Thus, what becomes important is the degree of representativeness of each variable. Representativeness can be measured in terms of degree of association of people with each variable.

But, in the cultural theorist approach to identity formation, what is stressed is homogeneity, and heterogeneity is usually overlooked. For homogeneity, assimilation is emphasised. Assimilation process can itself generate reactive mechanism, which may witness the growth of two parallel cultures within a cultural community. Thus, one cannot overlook the friction among co-cultures.

If culture is made the basis of national awakening of a group, then one faces problem in selecting culture. In his book Nations and Nationalism, Ernest Gellner makes a comparative study of culture in two societies - agrarian and industrial. In agrarian society, there exists a manifest cultural differentiation along with various strata. And the overall stress is on differentiation and not on homogeneity: "The whole system favours horizontal lines of cultural cleavages, and it may invent and reinforce them when they are absent."23

While comparing cultures in two societies, Gellner further observes,
below the horizontally stratified minority at top, there is another world, that of the laterally separated petty communities of the lay members of the society. Here, once again cultural differentiation is very marked, though the reasons are quite different. Small peasant communities generally live inward-turned lives, ties to locality by economic need if not by political prescription. Even if the population of a given area starts from the same linguistic baseline – which very often is not the case – a kind of cultural drift soon engenders dialectical and other differences. No-one, or almost no-one has an interest in promoting cultural homogeneity at this social level.24

In agricultural societies, as Gellner feels, it is difficult to carve out political units on the basis of cultural space and extent. Further, in this society, there exist two types of languages. One is, what Gellner describes as liturgical language, the written and developed language of ruling elite, and other is that of illiterate or semi-literate masses or of localized peasants, who follow a contextual communication among the fellow men. Therefore, communication gap between the developed segments and underdeveloped segments may prevent creation of a cohesive community. But, how the cultural identity can be formed in a structurally differentiated society? For this, Gellner makes the distinction between those of ‘wild culture’ and ‘garden culture’.25 Wild cultures are those which are produced and reproduced spontaneously and are carried from generation to generation as a part of life. On the other hand, ‘Garden culture’ is, in fact, a cultivated and
constructed high cultures of elite and of specialized institutions. Though some of the high cultures are modified versions of 'Garden culture', generally, they are the construct of national education and modern communication networks, and it gets institutional support and promotion during the industrialization or, more aptly, during modernization phase of the process of nation-building. And the creation of identity or the formation of nationality, is a process of the internalization of high cultures by each socio-cultural group in the society. Therefore, Gellner says:

It is not the case that the 'age of nationalism' is a mere summation of the awakening and political self-assertion of this, that or the other nation. Rather, when general social conditions make for standardized, homogenous, centrally sustained high cultures pervading entire populations and not just elite minorities, a situation arises in which well-defined, educationally sanctioned and unified cultures constitute very nearly the only kind of unit with which men willingly and often ardently identify. The cultures now seems to be the natural repositories of political legitimacy.26

And when the high culture27 is internalized by people, there occurs a fusion of 'will', 'culture' and 'polity', which in turn create a uniform identity (national). In this sense, nationalism is a two stage phenomena. One stage is the selection of symbols from folk culture; and the second stage is the replacement of variegated and segmented low culture by a centrally devised, well developed and literate
homogeneous high culture. And this can survive only within a political shell - the state-of its own. Thus, education and political institutions become concomitant factors in the formation of nationality.

A close examination of Gellner's theory of nationality formation reveals two fallacies - one, cultural identity is a devised work of elite or intelligentsia. In this sense, group's identity is a given identity. In other words, identity is imposed from above. Here one may suspect the degree of legitimacy accorded to imposed identity by the masses. Identity from above may possibly cause the revival of the identity of local groups. These two identities may be in conflict with each other. Total identification with national culture is possible only when society is literally one homogeneous unit. Further problem emerges when society is structurally stratified, where each stratum may have its own set of intellectuals or elite.

Even when a society is a cultural unit, it may consist of other social divisions, which may hinder the process of creation of uniform identity. Further, potentiality of a culture forming a universal identity should be analyzed in terms of (a) the political dynamics of society, and (b) in terms of the intra-societal and inter-society relations and conflict. What is often projected by elite as the cultural symbols of people living within a broadly delineated
cultural or linguistic territory, may be perceived as a symbol of domination and subjection by many people living within the same territory. Such a feeling may occasion conflicts. Parallel symbols may be created. The point emphasized here is that culture may not always be a substantive factor in identity formation. In nutshell, we can say that culture is an important constituent of identity, but not decisive one. More or less, the word 'culture' is too comprehensive for singular generalization. Any study of relationship between culture and identity should take into account the analysis of the effectiveness of the constituents of culture, such as myth, symbols, ancestry etc. It is important to mention that most of these elements of culture are attitudinal which develop and mature into identity over a long period. Attitude sustains only when it is reproduced and expressed through frequent use of symbols and myths by the people.

Objective markers are significant only to the extent of distinguishing two communities along language/dialect, culture/tradition/customs, religion/sects etc. But they do not transform this distinction into group consciousness. For this, subjective consciousness of 'we feeling' is emphasised in the literatures on nationality formation. Hans Cohn refers to it as 'corporate will': "Nationality is formed by the decision to form a nationality".28 This
'corporate will' is ethnographically constructed, psychologically determined and ideologically motivated.

The Subjectivist theory of identity formation selects 'common will', 'common consciousness' or 'national consciousness', 'national character' and national ideology as elements of group-identity formation and perpetuation.

However, the most important factor in determining identity is the existence of 'national ideology'. "National ideology consists of numerous legends which appeal to the specific mentality of every section of the nation." In overall analysis, as Hertz holds, common consciousness consists in setting out common goals for unity, freedom, individuality and prestige.

But who transforms the objectively distinct social groups into a subjectively conscious political community? A cultural group does not transforms itself on its own into a politically conscious community. In the modernization theory, this role is reserved for Westernized intellectuals or elites and various political organizations. Elites perform the function of selection, standardization and transmission of symbols. They also define the boundaries of the given groups of people. Myth is formulated and articulated by the elites among people. On the other hand, political organization channelises them into political demands. Thus, emphasis is placed upon the mobilization of
cultural conflict into a politically articulated community for achieving the objective of independent existence. Group identity does not spring from objective factors, rather it (identity) is subject to mobilization by the elites, when they emphasize "one symbol above others and strive to bring other symbols into congruence with the primary symbol." For Brass, identity formation is a process of convergence of multiple-symbols along a central symbol.

Such a perception of identity formation has certain inherent limitations. As mentioned earlier, 'mass consciousness' is subjected to the mobilization and manipulation by the elites. In this sense, making of community and attendant identity is predominantly an elite achievement. And the emergence of a movement, based on particular nationality formation, is referred primarily as a response to stimulant released by government's policies. Viewed in this manner, without elite consciousness no movement can emerge. Once again, the principle of spontaneity cannot be ruled out. Here what becomes important is the analytical consequences of events which shape and mould the opinion, and consciousness of the people. Further, there is an 'autonomous' domain of the politics of the people, where the principal actor cannot be a dominating elite, and nor its existence will depend on the role of elite politic. Elite politics speaks of vertical
mobilization and generally overlooks horizontal mobilization. Also, while vertical mobilization seeks uniformity, the horizontal mobilization stands for heterogeneity. Also vertical mobilization is from above, while horizontal mobilization is from below i.e. from and among the masses itself.

Mobilization by the elite can generate counter-mobilization against the dominant elite. Resistance to elite mobilization depends on the nature and extent of socio-political and economic divisions that exist within a community. Divisions in the socio-economic and political processes may adversely affect the universalization of appeal, ideology and action of elite politics. Thus what becomes salient from analytical perspective is the social background and class composition of elite within a given community.

Modernization Theory

In the modernization theory, identity is preceded by the formation of 'nation', which is constantly in the process of evolution. Rupert Emerson describes it as a 'terminal community'. He emphasizes national unity as a chief value and instrumentality of nation formation and its survival: "nations have been built up over the centuries through the gradual coalescence of distinct peoples into large communities with a relatively high level of social and
cultural integration." What is stressed here is the assimilation or complete sub-mergence of lesser or minor communities into one. In another sense, political integration proceeds from socio-cultural integration.

On the question of emergence of nationalist movement in the colonial society, the modernization theory seeks explanation in the causal relationship between stimulus generated by the colonial structures and institutions. In other words, movement is essentially a function of response. What are those stimulants? These can be summarized as (i) the disruption of traditional social structure; (ii) universalization of modern education, technology and ideology; (iii) presence of Western educated leaders among natives; (iv) introduction of constitutional mechanism which makes people aware about their respective rights; and (v) creation of new roles and performances which arouse new expectations among people.

Modernization process consists of many sub-process of; (i) differentiation/disruption/dislocation/disintegration of society, (ii) universalization and (iii) spread of modern ideology and technology, which in turn lead to reintegration of society in the framework of national unity and identity.

In nutshell, identity is a residue of modernization, and movement a response function of modernization and development. Nationalism is conceptualized as a political
and ideological movement, generated during the process of modernization and development. Emergence and success of a nationalist movement is conditional to many things.

Though highly deterministic in approach and methodology, the relevance of modernization theory lies in its focus on the process of change, where basic object is the creation of national community along the lines of modern values of secularism and rationalism. And the national community is created on the twin pillars of national identity and national material culture amidst many traditional sub-cultural varieties of a society.

An important tool for the creation of national identity is the effective network of communication system as emphasized by Lerner, and more elaborately by Karl W. Deutsch. The central theme of communication theory, once again, is the process of mobilization. It is referred as a process of learning of mutually compatible and complementary communication habits by people.

Deutsch rejects Subjectivist-objectivist approach as insufficient in explaining the process of nation/nationality formulation. For him, each objective marker is only partly capable for the formation of a community. Therefore, he begins with the concept of division of labour and corresponding system of stratification that exist in society. These two variables taken together show a pattern
of continuity and discontinuities in the formation of group identities. A community is said to be formed when group of persons exchange information with each other over a wide range of topics. Therefore, the basic object of 'information engineering' is the transmission of message quickly with least effort and with least distortion. Therefore, emphasis is placed on the observable ability and inability of people in communication. Here society plays the important role of production, selection and channelizing of goods and services. In other words, society stores and transmits messages.

Three things are important for group-formation: (i) complementarity of habits; (ii) communicative effectiveness of that complementary habits; and (iii) communicative facilities available in a society. "The communicative facilities of a society include a socially standardized system of symbols which is a language, and any number of auxiliary codes, such as alphabets, system of writing, painting, calculating, etc. They include information stored in the living memories, associations, habits, and preference of its members, and in its material facilities for the storage of information, such as libraries, statues, and the like..." Thus what is important "is not the presence or absence of any single factor, but merely the presence of sufficient communication facilities with enough
complementarity to produce overall result". In other words, people is held together from within by the communicative efficiency of objective markers.

Once a group is formed on the basis of complementarity of habits, its consolidation depends on the process of assimilation. Assimilation refers to the process whereby existing difference between two sets of people is kept below the threshold of any political significance. It is further accelerated by reducing or destroying the "competing" information recalled from the unassimilated past, and by reducing or repressing the unassimilated responses to which it would give rise in the present." It gains, as Deutsch says, ground if, "in a given territory, community is growing faster than society." Here what becomes salient is the distinction between the society and community. Also, "assimilation in language or culture involves the learning of many habits, and the unlearning of many old ones - habits, in both cases, which often interlock and reinforce each other..." The rate of assimilation depends on six balances or elements. The first balance is similarity balance where compatibility of linguistic and cultural habits are emphasized. But compatibility in one field and incompatibility in other field may hinder the process of assimilation; the second balance is of learning-teaching balance, where emphasis is placed on the learning capacities
of the new comers, the third balance is contact balance where frequency and range of cross-cultural communication are emphasized, the fourth balance is of material rewards where assimilation depends on the capacity of material rewards in terms of employment, promotion, income, freedom, security, prestige, etc., the fifth is a cultural balance of value of desires where "the rate of assimilation will be influenced not only by the balance of conflicting values within the old culture pattern of the as yet unassimilated population but also by the balance between the common and conflicting values in the old culture pattern on the one hand and in the new and predominant culture pattern on the other." In other words, speedier the assimilation, greater the intra-cultural balance among conflicting values. The last balance is a political balance of national symbols and barriers, which is a unifying balance. The basic objective of assimilation is creating uniformity among the people.

Group alignment is formed on the basis of complementarity of communication habits and complementarity of socio-economic preferences. Also in a competitive market economy and in the competitive culture, the motives for security and the scope for vertical mobility impel individual for group alignment. And it is in this context that nationality "promises opportunity, for it promises to
eliminate or lessen linguistic, racial, class, or caste barriers to the social rise of individuals within it. And it promises security, for it promises to reduce the probability of outside competition for all sorts of opportunities..." in nutshell, nationality becomes essential in a stratified and competitive economy, polity and society.

Another important ingredient for nationality formation is mobilization. Mobilization is done by the institutions and organizations. They perform important function of attaching secondary symbols to primary symbols of group life, around which national consciousness and identity gain content and form. What Deutsch refers as mobilization is social mobilization. The basic function of social mobilization is creation of group awareness or consciousness which is transformed into national awakening by the leaders.

A Critique of Modernization Theory

The primary object of communication theory is creation of internal homogeneity - through the use of modern means of communication such as mass media etc. This homogeneity becomes inevitable in the market economy of production and appropriation. Identity is made conditional to the process of modernization which, it holds, leads convergence and congruence of multiple symbols along a central symbol. This
central symbol is the handiwork of selected few. This central symbol gains content and form not only from the cultural blocks of nationality, but, also from the rudiments of modernity. Modernity seeks either replacement or modification of traditional values. Therefore, structures and institutions become important in the systemic model of modernization. Under the influence of new structures and institutions, a new identity is assumed by the people. This is referred as national identity. This constructed identity selects and process new symbols. Thus old symbols are gradually replaced by new symbols. The implied assumption of this theory is that ethnic sentiment is no longer important; rather political and economic stationing of people become important.

Politics/polity sets out new norms, new values and new culture. They are usually uniform. But this theory misses out the nature and role of state or more perfectly the polity in a plural society. In an ethnically plural and stratified society, state is not only the moderator of conflict but also generator of conflict between state and social groups on the one hand, and among the social groups on the other hand. In other words, conflict potentiality is either overlooked or only scant attention is paid to it by the modernization theory. In the situation of conflict, ethnicity becomes an easy resort to identification within
and without. Conflict attenuates ethnic sentiments. In the modernization theory, ethnic sentiment and nationalist sentiment are seen as conflicting. These two become complementary to each other only when the principle of one nation - one state is adhered to.

As mentioned earlier, in modernization theory of nationality, national sentiment, national consciousness and national identity are the constructs of the process of mobilization. And in this theoretical framework, leading role is again reserved for the elite. Diffusion of national consciousness is done by the elite. It fails to take into consideration the rebel consciousness of subaltern masses, who may reject or rebel the cultural, political and economic model of the dominant people or the elite. The relationship between these two strata - elite and the masses - is not determined by the symbolic content of constructed nationalist culture, but by the nature and mode of economic production, their ownership and distribution, political equations, i.e. power distribution – appropriation equations, and other kinds of social divisions.

In the above discussion, what has been tried to emphasize is that in the study of identity formation, the internal differentiation and cleavages and inter-group conflict become important. Secondly, identity formation, besides ethnic origins of people, is a function of politics
or political process. Thirdly, nature and pattern of inter-ethnic relations or conflict determine the degree of group cohesion. Therefore, identity-formation is not a mechanical phenomenon as modernization theory suggests, but a complex process of ethnicity and politics. Myron Weiner, writing in the context of India says:

the process of identity formation is a complex one with several key elements. One element is the institutional structure which shapes the framework within which group identities are maintained and intensified. A second element can be described as reactive mechanism. Group identities are often formed or reinforced when challenged by others. A third element can be described as policy feedbacks. Government policies in the form of entitlements and reservations induce groups to organize for political action, which in turn intensifies group identities. A fourth element is the underlying cultural conception of state's relationship to group identities. Here, the issue is whether society is seen as subordinate to the state... or whether society is viewed as autonomous, as in India.44

The fourth element is particularly significant in the sense that adaptability of variegated cultural system and the autonomy of social groups are in built process of federal nation-building. State's promotion and protection of an ethnic group may reinforce the group identity. And in protest, the other social groups may organize along the objective markers of group-identity formation, for seeking same promotion and protection as extended to other ethnic groups by the state. On the other hand, desire for autonomy may further reinforce the group's identity. In other words,
if politics is for power and state is the locus of it, then organization of people along cultural or linguistic considerations becomes inevitable in a competitive-plural set up of society.

There exist two sets of relationships in plural and developing society. One is between ethnic groups and politics and other is between politicized ethnicity and the state. While ethnicity provides bases for politics to operate, politics transforms ethnicity into an instrumentally effective political group in the competitive enterprise for power acquisition and distribution. It generates, reifies, and modifies ethnic identity. In other words, politics preserves, protects and promotes ethnic singularity. It is not true that ascriptive affinities of people get sidetracked in the systemic model of modernization and political development. Rather, the process of modernization polarizes people to organize along ascriptive affinities. Politics elevates socio-cultural distinction into ethnic ideology. In the second set of relations, politicized ethnicity legitimizes or delegitimizes the institution of State. On the other hand, in the given context of politicized ethnicity, State becomes increasingly sensitive to ethnic demand. Resource allocation and distribution is done on the basis of ethnic considerations. This provides incentive to ethnic groups to
organize into a cohesive interest group, by retaining distinctive ethnic identities.

From the above discussion we can say that there are primarily two building blocks of identity - ethnic origins of the people and politics or the political process. These two taken together may possibly explain the phenomena of identity formation in a modernizing society. Thus, from the perspective of regionalism, what is significant is not only the existence of distinctive cultural group (with historicity of separate existence), but their sense of being a separate cultural entity which assumes a distinct form of identity only when the stimulants are provided from the state, from the socio-political process and from the inter-group conflict or cohesion in a heterogeneous society. It is only at that juncture that the role of organizations and leaders become significant.

**Marxist Theory of Nationality**

Only scant attention has been paid in the Marxist framework of analysis to the problems of nationality. Their central theoretical concern is the conceptualization and formulations on class, class-consciousness and class struggle. Class is conceived along certain objective category like economic relations in the society. This class consciousness is economically determined and not
subjectively formed along religious, linguistic, cultural or ethnic compositions of the society. For Marx and Engels, this is a false consciousness, which would wither away with the crystallization of society along class. Class consciousness, they hoped, would transcend ethnic consciousness of the people. Though they made nation-state axical to the political life, but they never formulated any systematic theory of nationality.

In the Marxist literature, it is only Otto Bauer and Stalin who attempted to work out on the principles of nationality. Otto Bauer defines nation 'as the totality of people who are united by a common fate so that they possess a common (nation) character'. He identifies common fate with common history and common character with uniformity of language. But he does not lay stress on common territory which is a subject of criticism. He favoured the idea of national cultural autonomy. This concept of national-cultural autonomy was rejected by Stalin and by other Marxist theorists. In the opinion of Stalin the concept of national cultural autonomy "is a halfway house on the road to federalism and ultimately to separation". Though Stalin defined nation as "a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture", he objected the idea of formation of state on
the principle of nationality. Thus one finds a contradiction in his position. How a nationality be stopped from being politically assertive? Though autonomy short of secession was allowed, but only within a multi-national state system.

Nationality or Nationalism:
An Act of Imagination

Stalinist framework of nationality formation is marked by a severe rigidity, where its formation is excessively linked with language. Anderson on the other hand, argues that nationality formation is an act of imagination or a collective consciousness of being one at a particular level of imagination even when people do not know each other. This consciousness is a cultural artifact. Nation, like many other communities, he argues, is an ‘imagined political community’. Inherently limited and sovereign, "it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship."50

Imagined community has affinity of boundary, beyond which the other imagined community exists. According to Anderson, its origin is Euro-centric which with the advent of industry and technology, witnessed the emergence of ‘print capitalism’. This has had a vernacularising thrust
with the assimilation of many more dialects into one, which served as language of power. Written form is more important in consolidating identities than oral one. Literary tradition is important for building community consciousness.

Though language is important, nationalism emerges either for or against a culture. Nationalism should be aligned with "cultural system that preceded it, out of which - as well as against which - it came into being".51

Regionalism and National Integration

Another set of theory useful to the study of regionalism is the theory of national integration or nation-building. This is particularly important while analyzing the nature of regionalism or regional movements in a federal or plural society. The main focus of national integration is the maintenance of national unity and integrity and the creation of national identity across the different socio-cultural segments living within a single territory. But in the name of national identity what is attempted at is a uniform national culture. Therefore, any attachment with primordial identities is often categorized and characterized as parochial and said to detrimental to the process of national unity and state-building. In this perception, regionalism, especially those based on socio-cultural factors, is perceived as a negative phenomenon. In the literatures on political development and modernization,
emphasis has been placed on the creation of a new set of identity (national). It is hoped that during the process of development and modernization of society, an integrated market economy, a new set of communication network, modern education system, and a centralized authority would enable people to assume a new secular identity in place of primordial ones. But in actual experience, the situation is different. Even in a relatively developed and highly modernized societies, ethnic identity is recurrently asserted by the people in the socio-political process of the state. Therefore, ethnicity is still a relevant category in understanding the political process of multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-regional states like India. It is relevant to note that while modernization approach to national integration downgrades the ethnic values, the phenomenon of regionalism on the other hand, reassert them in the socio-cultural, political and economic process of a State.

Let us examine the meaning, definition, approaches and strategies of national integration with special reference to a plural society. Anthony H. Birch⁵² has described national integration as a socio-economic and political process through which different identities are brought together at the national level. The essential pre-requisites for national integration are creation of national symbols,
establishment of national political institutions or a centralized system of governance, creation of national education system and the development of a national pride or patriotism. In other place, closing of gaps between elite and mass is emphasized as an essential pre-requisite of national integration. What is ignored here is the relevance of inter-ethnic relations to the process of integration. In fact, in the name of national integration what is primarily emphasized is either the cultural integration of people in the framework of a constructed national, modern culture, or the emotional integration of the people in the psychological framework of patriotism. And in the name of elite-mass integration what is emphasized is the civic allegiance of people to a centralized authority. But, as mentioned above, inter-ethnic relation seems to be analytically seminal to the process of state - nation building as also to the process of national integration itself.

In an exhaustive and comprehensive enlisting of various meanings of national integration, Myron Weiner,\(^5^3\) says that the integration represents a wide range of political phenomena which includes: (i) territorial integration, i.e., "...the process of bringing together culturally and socially discrete groups into a single territorial unit and the establishment of national identity"; (ii) institutional set up, i.e., the problem of
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"establishing national central authority over subordinate political units or regions which may or may not coincide with distinct cultural or social groups"; (iii) linkage integration, i.e., linking government with the governed; (iv) value integration or more appropriately ideological integration, i.e., "the minimum value consensus necessary to maintain a social order". This is built around either towards modern political values like democracy, equality, justice etc. or towards the cultural values like sharing of common historical legacy, cultural symbols and personalities etc., and (v) integrative behaviour, i.e., "capacity of people in a society to organize for some common purposes". While the first meaning refers to the process of state formation, the others refer to the process of nation-building.

In his communication approach to the process of nation-building, Deutsch puts emphasis on the process of development, which includes a change in economy, growth of urban localities, development of basic communication grids, differential concentration of capital, skills and social institutions cutting across the social class divisions and the increasing mobility of people from one region to other region.54 He says that the national integration is achieved by bringing together the four important units, i.e., 'country', 'people', 'ethnic family system' and 'state' to a
sufficiently high level of development; which ultimately results in the motivational or attitudinal integration of people along different patterns of interlocking communication habits. More or less, in his scheme, national integration takes place only when society witnesses a high level of scientific, technological and economic developments. This results in the political amalgamation of culturally diversified people. The relevant strategies for national integration, in his opinion, are the assimilation and social mobilization. Here assimilation means cultural assimilation of variegated cultural groups into an architected national culture or identity. The people are initiated into the process of modernization which in turn provides them with a new set of identity.

In the pluralistic perspective, with special reference to India, but in a functionalist framework, Rasheduddin Khan sums up the theory of national integration in the following words:

In the semantics of functional politics, the term national integration means, and ought to mean, cohesion but not fusion, unity but not uniformity, reconciliation but not merger, agglomeration but not assimilation, solidarity but not regimentation of discrete segments of the people constituting a political community/state.55

In most of the functionalist definitions of national integration, what is emphasized is the cultural integration
or cultural uniformity in order to make the political community a cohesive one. It is assumed that multiplicity of ethnic or other socio-cultural divisions in the society would endanger the national stability. For them, nation-state is a coherent cultural entity. What they fail to recognize is the nature, bases and extent of social conflict. This becomes particularly important in the context of regionalism. In most of the diverse societies, group loyalties in inter-group conflicts are too localized to leave a divisive impact on the solidarity of a nation. Also in most of the cases, group cleavages, though mutually reinforcing, are non-congruent and mutually cross-cutting.

What is particularly important here is to distinguish national integration as a political concept from that of its cultural meaning. As a political concept, it refers to minimal cohesion necessary for the coordination of different socio-political groups through different institutional procedures. In this sense, integration means a sense of belongingness to larger political community. Therefore, political conflicts, initiated by different regional movements, need not be always looked negatively, for from such conflicts proceed the growth of institutions and structures which are mostly associational and integrative in character. These institutions and structure function as moderators of such conflicts. Another important feature of
such institutions is that it initiates participation of
different socio-cultural groups into polity, which lends
legitimacy, recognition and support to system. Basically
there are two models of national integration – assimilative
and plural.

Assimilative Model

In this model of integration, absorption of secondary
groups (minority group) by the dominant groups or the
homogenization of all socio-cultural variations into one is
emphasized. And the strategies suggested are either of
'melting pot' or of deliberate discrimination between
dominant and non-dominant groups. In this model, group
loyalty is supposed to be in juxtaposition to national
loyalty. Thus, in the name of national identity, uniformity
of socio-cultural value is stressed.

Pluralist Model

Integration in this model signifies a condition of
'unity in diversity'. Here unity refers to political unity
and diversity to cultural diversity. National identity is
an architected but composite identity made out of the
different cultural components of varied socio-cultural
groups. Further, unity is stressed along ideological
commitment across the ethnic divisions. Unity in diversity
further pre-supposes a process of federal nation-building,
where cultural diversity is retained and the political unity is achieved through functional decentralization of institutions, structures and policy making.

In overall perspective, the phenomenon of regionalism requires a pluralist perspective of state-nation building. In this sense regionalism is not anti-territorial nationalism. One finds a symbiotic relationship between nationalism and regionalism. Further, the state-society relationship assumes a federal and flexible character. State protects the identific requirement of society and society retains its faith in the institutions and structures of the state.

Regionalism and Federalism

As mentioned above, it is not necessary that an ethnological regional consciousness readily transforms itself into a movement. For that matter, regional identity is sometimes a given identity. The state is an important actor in this process. This is especially true with a constitutionally documented regional identity. Even when, consciousness of separate regional identity exists, it becomes active only when stimulants from outside is provided. This stimulant is provided by a federal-state through its different policies. Passive regional identity becomes politically active, when it feels discriminated in the state initiated development process. This means that
the emergence, growth and assertion of regionalism in a federal set-up is subject to the feeling of deprivation and negligence in terms of state's policies with regards to different socio-cultural groups living within a single territorial federal polity. A close scrutiny of demands made by different regional movements suggest that: (a) most of the regional movements stand for the creation of different structures and institutions at the local/regional level with sufficient amount of autonomy and resources in order to facilitate the effective participation of local people in the decision-making process at the grass-roots; (b) some regional movements seek secession from the existing states in which their regions are included, due to their grievances of neglect and discrimination in the general process of development; (c) most of the regional movements seek to preserve and to protect their ethnic and cultural identity within a well-defined territory which in certain case, they feel, are threatened by the changing demographic composition of the region due to inflow of migration from other regions; (d) some regional movements seek recognition, protection and promotion of their socio-cultural identities through different constitutionally sanctioned institutional devices.
A study of state-society relationship, thus, becomes analytically relevant to the study of emergence and growth of regionalism in a federal polity.

Theories of Federalism

Since regionalism is a federal phenomenon, it is worthwhile to take into account different theories of federalism. There is no accepted definition of federalism as such. Scholars define federalism in terms of its functional and attributional characteristics. Therefore, the classical theorists put emphasis on the division of powers between two sets of governments through a well encoded constitutional mechanism. But their approach is highly legalistic or juristic. On the other hand, structuralist views federalism as a wide and ever increasing network of institutions and structures, characterized by devolution of powers and authority from top to bottom. In other words, for them, federalism is an hierarchical arrangement of powers among the different layers of government. But for Karl J.Friedrich, federalism is something more than a static and structural arrangement of powers. It designates "the process of federalizing a political community... the process by which a number of separate political organizations... enter into arrangements for working out solutions, adopting joint policies, and making joint problems...." As a process, federalism
involves analysis of entire range of inter-governmental relationship, inter-community relationship and inter-organizational relationship. This further requires analysis of division of powers in a federal system. But how this division of powers can be effected? What shall be the basis of division? Most of the theorists agree on a territorial division of powers which means "...a recognition or creation of geographically delineated authority to deal with matters of territorial import".58 Territorial distribution of authority is a two stage process - the first stage is that of establishing a territorial community and the second stage is that of acknowledging a self-rulled governing system for these territorial communities. Territorial communities are those which share complementary communication habits and its boundary is delineated on the basis of relative continuity and discontinuity of communication habits.59 In fact, within a federal system, the principle of territoriality is applied to create a smaller political unit (state) for variegated groups of people. Creation of smaller political units based on different ethnological considerations have positive impacts on the integration process. By territorial socialization people gets attached with the local institutions and government and through local institutions they are attached to central authority.
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Another school of thought considers federalism as socio-political phenomena, where it serves as a basis of forming political association out of different socio-cultural diversity. Thus, federalism is defined as "the mode of political organization that unites separate polities within an overarching political system in such a way as to allow each to maintain its own fundamental political integrity". Viewed in this sense, federalism refers to the existence of a political system characterized by diffusion of power, non-centralization of powers and authority and territorial democracy or aerial division of power.

As a sociological phenomenon, the essence of federalism lies in the retention of federal qualities of society, i.e., social diversity. Levingston holds the opinion that:

the essence of federalism lies not in the institutional or constitutional structures but in the society itself. Federal government is a device by which the federal qualities of the society are articulated and protected.

Diversity here refers to an entire range of socio-cultural and regional diversities. For a successful federal arrangement, he insists that these diversities should be grouped territorially, resulting in the growth of a federal society. He makes a distinction between a 'federal society' and 'plural society'. In a federal society, socio-cultural
diversities are reinforced by geographical divisions. But in a plural society, diversities are scattered. Federal society insists upon federal recognition of multiple diversities enfolded within a federal system. These diversities are channelized and articulated through a polity, formed on the principles of socio-cultural homogeneity within a specified region or territory.

Taking into account the different approaches to federalism, it can be said that the central themes of different federal theories cover: (i) federalization process; (ii) territorial groupings of socio-cultural diversities ensure growth of federal societies which result in many more micro states within a broader territorial federal nation-state system; (iii) recognition of different socio-cultural identity by an overarching federal polity; (iv) functional devolution of powers and authority among various segments constituting a federal state, and (v) decentralization of decision-making process. Here it is essential to make a distinction between decentralization and non-centralization. While non-centralization refers to a non-conditional diffusion of powers among various self-sustaining centres, but decentralization refers to a conditional diffusion of powers by a central government. As a process, decentralization refers to a "movement from the pole of centralized unity to that of diversity". Whatever
may be the distinction between non-centralization and decentralization, it is now clear that at the core of federalism exists the question of autonomy.

Also evident is the fact that there exists a thematic linkage between regionalism and federalism. The ideology of regionalism stands for more and more federalization of society and polity. It opposes any move towards centralization in the name of national unity or the homogenization of socio-cultural heterogeneity into one within an assimilationist framework of integration. On the other hand, it is in-built nature of federalism which allows regionalism to grow. Its several enlisted characteristics serve as stimulants to the growth and emergence of regionalism. It is in this sense that regionalism is often referred as federal phenomenon. In most plural societies, federal system witnesses a tension between two opposing pulls - centralization and decentralization. This situation serves as a fertile ground for the emergence and assertion of regionalism in the national life of a country.
Regionalism: Meaning, Concepts, Components and Formulations

Meaning and definition of regionalism varies according to the context in which it operates. In France, for instance, regionalism means a protest against overcentralization of culture in Paris or it means reorganization of state boundaries or devolution of administration as in Britain. Similarly, in a decentralist framework of the organization of polity, regionalism constitutes a political demand for the devolution of power and function from central level to the local levels of authority. In a 'union-type' of federal polity, it means granting of more and more authority and autonomy for self-management of socio-cultural problems and local economy by the regional communities. In other words, it means a political movement for self-governance at the local regional levels.

In his sociological analysis of the phenomena of regionalism, Arun K. Chatterji, defines regionalism as a "multi-dimensional composite phenomena as well as built-in process within nationalism". On the other hand, for Kousar J. Azam, regionalism is,
a manifestation of those residual elements which do not find expression in the national polity and national culture, and being excluded from the centrality of the new polity, express themselves in political discontent and political exclusionism.65

Regionalism also refers to as Bernard S. Cohn holds "conscious or unconscious development of symbols, behaviours, and movements which will mark of groups within some geographic boundary from others in other regions for political, economic, or cultural ends".66 For him regionalism is a cultural phenomena. Cultural, linguistic or other ethnic considerations are the beginning point for the growth of regionalism. In the later stage of its development, political or economic factors intervene to transform cultural consciousness into a political movement for varied purposes. Thus the first stage is the regional identity formation. In the intermediary phase, 'identity' is converted into an ideology, or an 'ism' to be asserted in the political, economic and cultural life of a nation. In this sense, regionalism can be defined as an ideology and practice of asserting respective identities by the regional communities in their relationship with the state or government or with other regional communities.

Central to the analysis of regionalism is the concept of region itself. A region may be a 'historical region', 'cultural region', 'linguistic region' or 'structural region.' Region in the present study refers to spatial
location or spread of a particular cultural group who share among themselves certain commonalty in terms of historical memories, language and other ethno-geographic components of that particular region.

Another useful category in the formation of regional identity is the language itself. Language helps the people in imagining themselves as a distinct community. Regionalism is sometimes regarded as synonym for linguism. But this is not always true. Regionalism can exist even inside a so-called linguistic region or it may cut across the linguistic boundaries of several states. Though language is one of the most important determinants of a regional identity, it is not the sole factor. Other significant factor is culture. Culture provides symbolic identity and unity to the people of a particular region. But when a regional community is further divided along other ethnic category such as caste, religion etc., culture also varies along these ethnic units of group formation and mobilization. However, individual culture of each segment of society living in a common territory acquires regional specificity, which differs from the cultural practices of their counterparts living in other regions. Here it may also be pointed out that folk-culture has more mobilizing effect than the standardized elite-urban culture.
Historicity of a region is another significant factor in the formation of a regional identity. A historical region provides an added sense of pride to the people of a particular region. Another important attribute of a historical region is a common memory of the past. History helps in the formation of myth and cult. Symbols are usually selected from the history and from the coded memories of the people. These events are restored and transmitted from generation to generation either in oral tradition or through written language.

'Region' in the context of regionalism is a conglomerate of many ethnological-historical factors which allow people to imagine themselves as a distinct community - differentiated from other regional communities in terms of tradition, culture, language, history etc.

Determining the boundary of a socio-cultural region is another problem of discussion, especially in the context of a linguistic region. Many mutually intelligible dialects are often clubbed together within a single language, even though they can be separated from each other on many counts such as culture, religion, region and other ethnic bases of identification. Therefore, what becomes significant is the socio-cultural context of a language/dialect. A dialect community is one in which communication especially in speech form is easy. A dialect community may also have a codified
system of communication, like the use of symbols. The contents of a dialect is usually provided by the culture, literary tradition, history and other immediate environment of the people.

How the boundary of a socio-cultural region or sub-region could be determined? Approaches in the political geography differs widely. Some identifies it on the principle of language, some on the basis of religion, culture etc. In a comprehensive and holistic approach, Rasheeduddin Khan, says that such an identification should be on the principle of "maximum homogeneity within and maximum identity without". He further says that "while determining the socio-cultural regions the main concern should be to eliminate factors contributing to heterogeneity and to coalesce facts promoting homogeneity".

A socio-cultural region can be determined on the combination of many potential factors like linguistic homogeneity i.e. in-group speech communication, cultural similarity, historicity of the region and other sociological considerations of social composition like tribe/caste/jatis etc. Though it is true that boundary of a socio-cultural region is often flexible and fluid, but one can discern certain homogenizing cultural pattern, peculiar and specific to that region only. As one proceeds from a core to periphery, distinguishing objective markers become gradually
hazy and differentiation within a regional community increases. Determination of boundary becomes difficult in and around the space of a "shift zone" - that is an area where intermingling of words, speech, culture, norms and values take place between two otherwise distinct socio-cultural regions. Thus only the percentage principle can help in determining the maximum homogeneity within. A 'shift zone' covers the peripheries of the two distinct socio-cultural regions.

Also, it is in all probability that regions may be contiguous to each other in one sense, but may not be in another sense. Thus culturally or religiously two regions may be contiguous, but they may not be linguistically. In that situation, either one or combination of other factors, as mentioned in above paragraphs, may help in determining a socio-cultural region and thereby a regional community.

Once a regional community is identified, and territorially grouped, the next stage is transforming them in the ideology of regionalism. In the objectivist-Subjectivist framework of analysis, this task is assigned to elite and leaders who select symbols of identity, standardize it and transmit them. As said above, elite manipulation of identity can lead to counter mobilization by a parallel elite or against the elite by the people, especially when social composition of a given regional
community is highly structured and differentiated in terms of caste, tribes and jatis. Therefore, mobilization and transformation into regionalism would depend on the inter-regional conflict, relationship between state and regional community and a perceived sense of deprivation by the regional community in terms of economic development, political power and cultural development. It may be added that regionalism is generated and legitimized by the process of federal-nation building, when the federal constitution itself recognizes the rights and privileges of the socio-cultural diversities and seeks their homogenization and betterment within constitutionally recognized regions and through the adjustment of the internal boundaries of the federating states on the politico-administrative, economic and ethnic-cum-cultural basis. This leaves scope for generating regionalism and staging of movements by those socio-cultural regions whose boundaries have yet to be adjusted and institutionalized. Regionalism is further institutionalized through forming of a state or sub-state on the principle of maximum linguistic-cum-cultural homogeneity.

Regionalism as a built-in process of federal-nation building implies several things: (i) formation of state or sub-state on the principle of maximum homogeneity - linguistic-cum-cultural; (ii) seeking constitutional recognition, protection and legitimization of socio-cultural
varieties by the state; (iii) decentralization of decision-making and administration on a regional and sub-regional basis within a nation against the excessive centralization of decision-making at one pole only. This means devolution of power from centre to periphery, accompanied by a high degree of structural differentiation, which maximise opportunities of participation of the socio-cultural groups in the structure and process of central decision-making system; (iv) a political movement for the assertion of more and more autonomy (especially in the socio-cultural fields) i.e. to delimit the centre’s areas of influence and interference. This, in other words, means a periodic and recurrent restructuring of centre-state relations or between state and socio-cultural groups; (v) a socio-cultural counter (protest) movement against any monolithic imposition in the field of language, culture and other specific socio-cultural patterns of a region in the name of national unity and integrity by the state/central authority. It is because imposition is considered as precursor of other forms of dominance - political and economic, and (vi) opposition to any move of cultural homogenization by the state on the pretext of national integration.

Regionalism: Categories and Varieties in India

In any classification of regional movements, the factors may overlap. Therefore, one cannot possibly draw a
rigid line of demarcation among various categories of regional movements. But one can make an attempt to classify different regional movements on the basis of examination of the objective and subjective factors which, assume salience or those factor which is invoked much by the exponents of the movement. This in other words, means a scrutiny of the 'bases' on which regional identity is formed and articulated. Further, an analysis of the objectives of movements may be helpful in distinguishing two regional movements.

We can broadly divide regionalism into two broader (macro) categories: (i) Socio-cultural regionalism, i.e. those based on language, religion, culture, tribe, caste, race and civilization. (ii) Politico-economic or administrative regionalism which operates within the realm of division of powers between centre and states in a federal polity. These two macro categories may further be classified into different types/varieties of regionalism.

**Socio-cultural Regionalism**

This category would include those regional movements which draw sustenance exclusively from the social composition and cultural contours of a particular region, where ethnic-cum-cultural considerations are asserted and emphasized in order to determine inter-regional relations or
conflict. Also the potential mode of participation in the movement is the avenue of culture, language and other ethnic components of self-identity. In other words, demand consciousness is built and framed along cultural categories exclusively. Thus, usually socio-cultural regionalism begins and ends with assigning utmost priority to the socio-cultural identity of people. Culture is both a means and an end. Though socio-cultural regionalism is often based on the combination of several factors, quite often a single factor may become a critical factor. Thus, in this category we can bring (i) linguistic-cum-cultural regionalism e.g. linguistic movement such as Manipuri, (ii) tribal regionalism, e.g. demand for Jharkhand state etc. (iii) cultural-cum-caste based regionalism (iv) extra-territorial regionalism based on extended racial, cultural and linguistic affinities e.g. Tamil nationalism or broader division like north vs. south etc. The followings are the objectives of socio-cultural regionalism:

1. Creation of separate state or adjusting the internal boundaries of a state on the principle of maximum linguistic cum cultural homogeneity to seek a homogeneital expression of socio-cultural peculiarities and their development through the use of native skills, instrumentalities and potentialities. In this sense, the linguistic reorganization of state means the congruence of political or
administrative boundary with those of linguistic or cultural boundary of a socio-cultural group.

2. Functional elevation of mother tongue to the level of education and administration within a specific state in order to acquire maximum benefit from the state. At this level often demand is made for inclusion of some language in the eighth schedule of the Indian Constitution, e.g. inclusion of Manipuri, Nepali and Konkani in the eighth schedule of the Constitution.

3. Linguistic Purism: This means non-dilution of the contents (usually the words stock) of a language and restoring the puritan and sacred entity of a particular language. This means blocking the exchange and sharing of vocabulary and other contents between two different language groups belonging to different language family. Purification of Tamil language and Sanskritization of Hindi can be cited as examples of linguistic purism.

Politico-Economic or Administrative Regionalism

In this category, normally the principal actors are the federating states themselves. The administrative regionalism includes within its fold the sub-varieties like:

(i) **Inter-state regionalism** covering issues like territorial dispute over certain piece of land and the river-water disputes. The border dispute between Karnataka
and Tamil Nadu can be cited as examples of inter-state regionalism. In the inter-state regionalism, the extended composite state identity (which includes within it many separate but cross cutting micro cultural identities) is often invoked. The identification with the state and broader territorial loyalty take precedence over other in-group identities. This is evident from riots over Cauvery water dispute between people of Karnataka and Tamilnadu.

**Intra-state or Sub-state Regionalism**

The potential cause for the emergence of sub-state regionalism is the feeling of relative deprivation, neglect and under-development among the people of a particular sub-region within a state. Sub-regional conflict becomes intense especially when ethnic composition of two sub-regions are distinctively different from each other. The basic objective of sub-regionalism is ensuring a fair and equitable share and partnership in the political power structure and economic resource of the state. This is being achieved through some sort of administrative arrangements like sub-state formation within the existing state itself. This may be in the shape of 'regional council' or 'district council'. Here Gorkha Hill Council may be cited as example of this type of arrangement.

In some cases, intra-state regionalism may involve separation of a region from existing state. Usually, in
this case, invoking of the 'homeland' concept becomes an ideal and effective recourse to achieve the objective of a separate statehood. The creation of Jharkhand, Bodoland etc. may be cited as examples of sub-state regionalism.

Intra-state regionalism operates at two levels. One at the level of sub-regions and other at the level of relationship between sub-region and the state.

iii) State-regionalism

It is directed against the central authority. This covers the entire gamut of centre-state relations like large share in revenue, sharing and distribution of resources and devolution and decentralization of political and administrative powers and accountability. This means expansion of the area of State's autonomy and independence.

State regionalism also invokes the distinctive and separate composite identity of the State. This is evident from the use of expressions like 'Bihari regionalism', 'Oriya nationalism', 'Tamil nationalism' and the like.

State's Response to Regional Movements

Paul R. Brass,70 has listed four rules which determine states responses. They are: (i) Secessionist demand could not be conceded, rather, secessionism would be suppressed by all means necessary, even armed action; (ii) Central government would not concede those regional demands based
upon religious differences; (iii) the "demands for the creation of separate linguistic states would not be conceded capriciously nor on the merely "objective" grounds that a distinctive language was the predominant spoken language in a particular region". This in other words means that language cannot be the sole basis of the formation of a state or the reorganization of the existing state, and, (iv) "Central government would not agree to reorganization of a province if the demand was made by only one of the important language groups concerned."

How does the State accommodate the demand of the socio-cultural groups? The Indian Constitution through different provisions ensures and tries to safeguard and protect the interest of the minorities especially religious and linguistic. It constitutionally documents those regions which have distinct ethnic minority composition as 'Scheduled regions'. This is especially true with most of the North - East regions. Constitutional codification of these regions gives them certain amount of autonomy and privileges to keep their cultural identity intact.

On the question of having separate state for separate linguistic and cultural groups,, the initial response of the state was that the boundary of state should coincide with the linguistic-cum-cultural boundary of a region. But this is not the sole determining factor of state formation and
their reorganization in India. Even States Reorganization Commission 1955 (SRC) observed four principles for determining and demarcating the boundary of a state. They are; "(i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity, (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and (iv) successful working of the national plan."71 On its recommendation major language groups like Assamese, Bengali, Kannada, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Oriya, Tamil, Telegu, Gujarati, Marathi and Punjabi have got separate states.

A close scrutiny of formation of states in India would reveal that "together with languages many variable and critical factors like ethnic cum - economic considerations: (Nagaland, Meghalaya, Manipur, and Tripura); religion, script and sentiments (Haryana and Punjab); language-cum-culture (Maharashtra and Gujarat); historical and political factors (Uttar pradesh and Bihar); integration of Princely states and the need for viable groupings (Madhya pradesh and Rajasthan) and of course language-cum-social distinctiveness (Tamilnadu, Kerala, Mysore, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bengal and Orissa) have played a decisive role in the composition of the Indian federation."72

But even within these states, there exist many language, dialects, cultural and tribal groups, which are demanding further reorganization of state boundaries solely
on the basis of linguistic-cum-cultural factors. Thus, in Bihar, there is demand for separate state of Jharkhand (based on tribal-cum-cultural distinctiveness), and the Mithila State (based on language-cum-cultural consideration). In West Bengal, there exists a demand for Gorkhaland, based on ethnic-cum-linguistic factor. In Jammu and Kashmir, the demand for separate state for the Ladakhi people, based on ethnic-cum-religious factor, the demand for Bodoland in Assam on the basis of tribal-cum-language consideration, separate state of Hmar tribals and separate state of Kukiland etc. And a separate state for Uttarakhand in Uttar Pradesh based on geographical-cum-cultural consideration. At present, the Indian state does not favour the idea of further division of existing states. At best, the state can accommodate the regional aspirations through certain institutional and structural devices like 'regional council' or according 'Union Territory status' to certain regional groups as it has been proposed for Jharkhand people etc.

In conclusion it can be said that conceding the demands of socio-cultural regional movements by the Indian state depends on ethnic bases of regional movements, the nature of conflict generated by the regional movements, the nature of movement (violent or non-violent) and the cross-national or extra-territorial implications of the regional movements.
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