Chapter - I

Federalism:
A Theoretical Framework
Federalism emerged as a widely acceptable model or device of state formation and nation-building in modern socio-political environment. Federalism is an active force that helps shape the issues and priorities of contemporary politics with its much acclaimed principles of 'self rule' and 'shared rule'. As a social theory, it recognizes pluralism as the valid basis of collective peaceful co-existence. As a political principle it seeks to stabilize a pattern of constitutional diffusion of power in order to reconcile specific/particularist 'self rule' with common/general 'shared rule'. As an administrative arrangement it coordinates the legitimate distribution of Jurisdiction and authority between at least two levels of government. These levels are central/federal government and the constituent units/states operating simultaneously over the same territory and people. In simple term, federalism in essence is a covenant based arrangement of regulated partnership in a plural society.

William Riker contends that the twentieth century is an "age of federalism". He argues that federalism has replaced empire as a means of governing diverse people over a large land mass."¹ This statement is correct partially because out of 185 politically sovereign states today, approximately two dozen states are federal. It includes most of the larger ones like USA and some others to a large extent are governed by the federal principle of autonomy and decentralization. In other words, today over seventy percent of human population is within the purview of one or the other pattern of federal arrangement.

The history of the concept of the federalism raised back to the fusion of ancient Isrelite tribes and the Amphictionic League of ancient Greece. A federation depends on an
agreement. Its Latin root *foedus* is an agreement or covenant of a very special kind. The words *foedus* is related to *fides* or trust. Therefore, a federation is a bargain based on trust. However, as a political arrangement and as a philosophic concept, federalism is a comparatively modern phenomenon. It is only in 18th Century when the United States of America adopted federalism as a form of government and it has been emulated ever since. Since then the idea of distribution of power on a territorial basis and the philosophy that unity and diversity can co-exist in plural democracy has taken concrete shape.

Since the very beginning, one problem has dominated the debate about meaning of federalism. On the one hand, it concerns those systems which have a federal constitutional structure, but whose political and social forms reduce the significance of the bargaining between the central and constituent governments similar to unitary states. On the other hand, some unitary states are highly decentralized, therefore, the federal states may be centralised or decentralized and so may unitary systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unitary Govt.</th>
<th>Centralized Federalism</th>
<th>Peripheralized Federalism</th>
<th>Confederation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One level of Govt</td>
<td>Two levels of authority, central govt. dominates</td>
<td>Two levels of authority, regional govt. dominate</td>
<td>One level of authority, alliance of co-equal states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig: Continuum of the degree of Centralisation of Authority  
*Source: Adopted from concepts proposed by William H. Riker in federalism:- Origin, operation, significance (Boston: Little Brown, 1964).*
This continuum ranges from centralized federalism in which the central government dominates or encroaches upon the rights of subunits, to peripheralized or decentralized federalism, in which the subunit governments dominate. For a variety of reasons most of the federal states are of the centralized kind. The requirements of national society, the welfare state and in general the growing complexity of society are the factors conducive to centralization of power at national level. However, there are states in which the various regional subunits retain significant power with them.

The Unitary and Confederation forms of government are the two opposite poles of this continuum of federalism. Unitary government is characterized by one level of political authority. In this form, the central government grants and amends the powers of provincial authorities. This type of government may be of France where virtually all important decisions about political life are taken at the central level. On the other hand, except in Canada and Switzerland Confederation government refers to a loose alliance of sovereign states. The United States (U.S.) in the period of the 1981-1987 is a good example of this form. Even earlier, in 1643-1648 the New England Confederation was founded solely for reasons of defence and external relations.

Many authors dislike the formalism in these legal, political and territorial distribution of federalism. Economist and some political scientist speak of a ‘federal society’, defined as a society in which economic, religious, racial or historical diversities are
territorially grouped. WS Livingston, believes that "certain societies are intrinsically federal because they are pluralist, and that federalism is simply the institutional outcome of the forces which exist in these societies." Other authors believe that non-territorial federalism too can exist. They cite examples such as Estonia in 1925 or Cyprus in 1960. In these instances, legal jurisdiction over cultural and educational affairs was accorded to groups wherever they lived and was not based on geographic division of state. In this way, the federalism can not be defined in a very formalistic manner. The concept of federalism become so loose that any form of delegation of power can be included and may be defined in various ways by various people.

Federalism as an idea retained certain essentials, but was moulded and manipulated according to the environment in which it has been practiced. "Even in the choice of adoption of essentials, frequently political pragmatism replaced even the legal requirements". In most of the cases of transplantation of western concepts into non-western and oriental societies, the socio-economic, political and historical constraints lead improvisation in theory and experimentation in practice. This deviation of 'accepted' western model stimulate the thinkers to coin new terminology. K.C. Wheare's description of India being "Quasi-federal" state was the begining of an intellectual exercise. The writing of William H. Riker, William S. Livingston (1954) Carl J. Friedrich (1964), Karl Deutsch (1957), emphasised 'the inter connectivity' and interdependence of units with
autonomous and semi-autonomous identities to form a collectivity that was to be described as unity i.e., nation state union, center and so on. This interconnectivity of the units was explained in terms of bargain, accomplished for a factual demarcation of authority by Riker. In sociological terms, the same was emphasized as a plural base necessitating a super-structure that would accommodate the diversities, and Livingston aimed at the conclusion that a federal political formula would be the most appropriate to reflect the social diversities. Moving from the compulsion of power and power relationship, the later writings used fresh vocabulary to emphasize that federalism never attain a state of finality, or a status of achievement. The ongoing experimentation of co-existence as a continuous process that would demand a constant effort in sharing, exchange and cooperation was reiterated by Deutsch. Emphasizing the territorial basis in terms of territorial identities, Duchacek emphasized in his writing, that it has been very important for communities to be located in a specified geographic area.

The contemporary discourses have emphasized the non-central devolution, decentralization and the recognition of the legitimate political aspiration of the grassroot organisations. Even today this remains the unfinished, unaccomplished part of the federal agenda that was adopted in many new democracies.

The concept of federalism is perceived and practiced by various sections in various ways "it is perceived as power sharing by the ruling elite, as power denial by a regional leader,
an exploitation by the voices of margins, as impositions by the supporters of devolution and as an outrightly dishonest political arrangement by the militant separatist". As a concept, federalism acquires, absorbs and articulates the peculiar country-specific historical and political traits and as such generates country-specific expositions and debates. The importance of geography, territory and territorial implications of division of powers has been recognised and denied in historically specific context. The essence of American federalism, as an "indestructible union of indestructible states" gets diluted in context of India. It is so in view of the constitutional provisions that enable the second chamber-Rajyasabha- to alter the boundaries and change the name etc. of Indian states by a simple majority. In this way, the second chamber of Indian Parliament can make and unmake the Indian states and hence, Indian federation. The former USSR had provided right to secede to its Republics. The right to secede remained a legal fiction till a virtual disintegration led to collapse of the system. The right to secede is directly linked with right of self-determination. However, no federal constitution or no ruling elite has willingly conceded it during the last fifty years. When the federal systems disintegrated they did so but not in accordance of the right to secede but due to other factors. The Malaysian federalism was consciously dissolved to maintain a certain degree of racial balance within the federation. The former USSR disintegrated as a final culmination of the process of 'Prestroika' and 'Glassnost'. After these the disintegration of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia has
been described as the triumph of sub-nationalism over nationalism.

For successful execution of federal arrangement, its evolution and socio-economic and political condition of a country are primarily responsible. The American federalism has evolved as an arrangement of power-sharing through the different phases of revolution, civil war, reconstruction and finally the emergence as a world power. The concept has developed through various stages like Newdeal, Fairdeal, New frontier, and Great Society. More recently, Bill Clinton has formed the "New Covenant" and the republican has championed "New federalism".

For India, federalism is a mechanism that would not just provide for power-sharing, but is expected to be a legal compliment to the principle of 'unity in diversity'. "In the Indian Constitution some special constitutional provisions to retain the special characteristic of some territorial areas were to put extraordinary pressures on the essence of the federalism." For Nigeria, an arrangement that keeps things "from falling apart", for former Soviet Union it was perceived as a mechanism that would protect the cultural autonomy of the units.

**Pluralism and Federalism:**

There are two conceptions of pluralism and plural societies, The classic description of plural society made by Furnivall is that "each group holds by its own religion, its own culture, its own ideas and ways. As individuals they meet but
only in market place, in buying and selling.... there is a plural society, with different sections of the community living side by side, but separately within the same political unit. Even in the economic sphere there is a division of labour on racial lines."\(^6\) Further, "Nationalism within a plural society is itself a disruptive force, tending to shatter and not to consolidate the social order".\(^7\) In a plural society as perceived by Furnivall, the co-existence of the different segments, usually of racial collectivities, one native and the other alien, is not voluntary but through the force imposed by the colonial power from outside. And, nationalism and plural society can not co-exist harmoniously. M.G. Smith expands on the notion of plural society and refers to pluralism as the condition in which there is formal diversity in the basic system of institutions such as Kinship, education, religion, property and economy and recreation but not government. This is so because, "given the fundamental differences of belief, value and organisation that connote pluralism, the monopoly of power by one cultural section is the essential pre-condition for the maintenance of the total society in its current form."\(^8\) This is political hegemony by the dominant cultural segment which is the characteristic feature of plural society.

Smith distinguishes between three types of pluralism:–

(i) Structural pluralism which connotes the differential incorporation of collectivities into a polity but segregated into aggregates and characterise by institutional divergences.
(ii) Social pluralism which involves the organisation of institutionally dissimilar collectivities as corporate segments whose boundaries demarcate distinct communities and systems of social action, and

(iii) Cultural pluralism which consists of variable institutional diversity without corresponding collective segregation.9

Cultural pluralism can exist without social and structural pluralism but these other forms of pluralism cannot be obtained without cultural pluralism. Another important contributor to the debate on pluralism, Vanden Berghe, contends that there are two types of plural societies— the democratic and the despotic. The democratic plural societies have a consensual value system enshrined in their constitution and articulated through their institutions. On the other hand, the despotic plural society is based on coercion and violence and it leads to conflict. Berghe, concludes, "I believe that pluralism is intrinsically associated with conflict and relative lack of consensus and integration."10 For promoting the national integration and maintaining the plural fabric of society, federal polity may be a useful device. "By nature a federal polity is a contractual arrangement in which 'unity of polity' and 'plurality of society' are reconciled."11 The concept of federal nation, both as structure and process serves as a model of society- state building in a plural society. The federal nation concept subsumes the basic ideas and principles of pluralism and federalism, therefore, it provides scope for sustenance, maintenance and promotion of various cultures. In this
situation individual identities are preserved, protected and promoted while tying them together for a collective good. Raymonds Breton writes that, "A federal structure is probably the most consistent with multiple identities and identifications, because it is designed to embrace entities that retain a certain degree of autonomy. Federalism allows for a mixture of autonomy and integration into a larger system conducive to optimal conditions far the protection and enhancement of each level of collective organisation. It is a system that can mitigate inequalities.... It is also a regime that permits different types of identities and identifications to exist simultaneously but at different levels in the overall system".12

There is an interlocking relationship between pluralism and federalism, both are principally rooted in the belief that diversities are not to be downgraded in the pursuit of nation-building, but conversely be respected, tolerated and accommodated. Multiple identities derived from different dimensions of pluralism—especially culture are provided with space for self expression which in turn, develop into a shared sense of identity, shared sense of purpose and common good of peace, harmony and order. The use and interpretation of both the concepts have common grounds due to their common concern for stability, autonomy and order. In fact in the construction of the logic of federal nation, state and the process of federal nation-building, federalism gets preference over pluralism. Pluralism is basically and principally related with the belief in the existence, respect and tolerance of diversities in a society. It has almost no concern with the specific
mechanism and institutional design for accommodating them in a harmonious pattern. The federalism is concerned with a process of accommodation of diversities and multiple identities with a proper space for flourishing them.

The constitutional protection and specific institutional design to the territorially organised social diversities is *sine qua non* to the concept of federalism. Federalism acquires a distinct character and framework from pluralism. Pluralism in its political context is based on the prescription that "state should be as far as possible neutral over the question of personal morality and common conception of good. Indeed, the state should provide a framework within which individuals and communities would pursue their own goals..... and interference with rights of other to pursue their own good should not be allowed or justified in any circumstances except when such pursuit causes harm to others". The inherent premise of pluralism is of 'equality and liberty' which is non homogeneous and non hierarchical in spirit. "The real challenge therefore, is how to evolve the balance between equality and identity". The premise of pluralism is one of the basic value preferences of the concept of federal nation and the process of federal nation-building. However, the structure and process of federal nation state envisage something more and it is in this ambience that federalism gets priority over pluralism, though pluralism and federalism themselves have been subjected to a change in their meanings and contexts. In its changing context, however, federalism has come closer to the social principle of pluralism. Now "federalism is a function not of constitution but of
societies..... and the essential nature of federalism is to be sought for, not in the shadings of legal and constitutional terminology, but in the forces—economic, social, political, cultural—that have made the outward forms of federalism necessary..... The essence of federalism lies not in the constitutional or institutional structure but in the society itself."15

The concept of federalism cannot be divorced from its territorial dimension and their political articulation on a constitutional basis. In the broadest sense Elazar points out that federalism "involves the linking of individuals, groups and politics in lasting but not limited union in such a way as to provide for the energetic pursuit of common ends while maintaining the respective integrities of all parties."16 In this way, the main concern of the federalism is to reconcile the socio-cultural diversities on the one hand and to establish a balance between the conflicting aspirations of state and society on the other. However, federalism is not only a device but also a process which works for social order and peace. "Thus federalism should not be seen only as static pattern or design, characterized by a precisely and primarily fixed division of powers between governmental levels. Federalism is.... perhaps primarily the process of federalizing a political community, that is to say, the process by which a number of separate political communities enter into arrangements for working out solutions......"17

Federalism is not simply a politically fixed structure but also a process of federal nation-building. In the process of
nation-building multiple identities, corresponding with their respective socio-cultural locations are provided constitutional shield for protecting the integrities of the units and to ensure a federal balance among them. The federal state accommodates the different types of cultures and gives them impetus for development in multi-cultural states. In the affirmative sense, multiculturalism means not only co-existence but more significantly, it means confluence i.e. the confluence of divergent cultures. In a cultural confluence, some times its stream may take different/opposite directions and as such a conflict-situation may arise. But conflict situation also contains a positive aspect in so far as this helps attaining a composite culture through dialectical development. Such conflicts, however, have to be of non-antagonistic and non-disruptive nature. However, multiculturalism manifests a new model of integration and it is antagonistic to any type of monocultural assimilation. Assimilationism and secessionism are the two sides of the same coin. Assimilation is viewed as system stabilizing on one hand and secession is considered as system breaking on other hand. But it is assimilation which leads to secessionism. In this way the hall-mark of federalism, in the words of Michael Burgees is 'union' combined simultaneously with 'autonomy'. Thus federalism is concerned both with autonomy and integration. This situation provides space for various cultures to develop and sustain the idea of cultural pluralism in which multiple identities get proper expression.
nation-building multiple identities, corresponding with their respective socio-cultural locations are provided constitutional shield for protecting the integrities of the units and to ensure a federal balance among them. The federal state accommodates the different types of cultures and gives them impetus for development in multi-cultural states. In the affirmative sense, multiculturalism means not only co-existence but more significantly, it means confluence i.e. the confluence of divergent cultures. In a cultural confluence, some times its stream may take different/opposite directions and as such a conflict-situation may arise. But conflict situation also contains a positive aspect in so far as this helps attaining a composite culture through dialectical development. Such conflicts, however, have to be of non-antagonistic and non-disruptive nature."^{18} However, multiculturalism manifests a new model of integration and it is antagonistic to any type of monocultural assimilation. Assimilationism and secessionism are the two sides of the same coin. Assimilation is viewed as system stabilizing on one hand and secession is considered as system breaking on other hand. But it is assimilation which leads to secessionism. In this way the hall-mark of federalism, in the words of Michael Burgees is 'union' combined simultaneously with 'autonomy'. Thus federalism is concerned both with autonomy and integration. This situation provides space for various cultures to develop and sustain the idea of cultural pluralism in which multiple identities get proper expression.
for world peace. ASEAN was next step towards this shift. The revolutionary ideas propounded by Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke and others inspired the people to replace the monarchical nation-state by democratic nation-state, strive for homogeneity. In traditional political science, national unity and states' rights were reconciled within the federal state. This was depicted as a process of continuing unification as a reflexion of social plurality in a political arrangement. Moreover, it was a political bargain between regional and national elite and as a politically viable arrangement to retain a territorial identity in the decades after second World War. In its various forms, it has been associated with peace, security, liberty, democracy, innovation, efficiency and equality. Although, according to Kincaid-"institutionalization of such values under power sharing requirement of federal arrangement often have proved difficult."\textsuperscript{21} These difficulties were surmounted in different federations within the format of the historical compulsions. The western liberal democracies did overcome these through legislation and material welfare. The socialist camp used ideology as the ultimate unifier and the recently decolonised plural societies- the third world- tried to over come these difficulties through innovations and accomodation.

"The political disintegration of the federations in the Eastern Europe and Soviet Union was soon to be followed by a widespread acceptance of the market economics and the inclusion of international economic arrangements within the domestic power-sharing arrangements of the federal state"\textsuperscript{22}
Some of the expression of federal values relate to the approaches of the concept of governance. The agreement arrived at the approach to governance have been influenced historically by the need of mutual defence. This continues to be so even in contemporary times. Europeon Union, has been secured after second World War, aiming at other things but mainly the need of securing peace and united defence against a common aggressor. The drive of Eastern European countries to join the European Union is motivated by the same concern to a great extent. The security umbrella provided by NATO has significantly contributed to the formation of European Union. The non-silence of this idea in South Asia partially explain the constant vulnerability of South Asian region to friction and conflict.

There are some important questions regarding what values are to be emphasized or what objectives are to be achieved? In some cases, the values to be maximized may lead towards diversity, or unity emphasising separatism or centralism. The next question is what type of power sharing will gain consent and achieve the desired value? The process of formation of federal state also determine the propositions of power division. The Centripetal and Centrifugal processes also play an important part when the scheme of power sharing is decided. Kincaid holds that at the core of federal arrangement lies the establishment and maintenance of power sharing relationships rather than structures per se among self governing Jurisdiction which seek to accomodate or maximize certain values appropriate to their common circumstances.
Another development in the structure of federalism, is the establishment of common market to gain prosperity. The common market strengthens the economic relationship and reduces the chances of military conflict among states. "The merging of discourse of globalisation and market economics with that of the discourse of federalism assumes coexistence of federalism and market economics".

**Post-Modernism and Federalism:**

The advent of post-modernism in Humanities and Social Science, is not just a development or academic paradigm but a revolution which reconceptualises human experiences and provides fresh explanations of the world around us. It encourages a substantive redefinition and innovation. Indeed it "proposes to set itself up outside the modern paradigms, not to judge modernity by its one criteria rather to contemplate and deconstruct it."  

Modernity is perceived as a progressive force to liberate human-kind from ignorance and irrationality but it is generally considered that, this promise has not been sustained. The post-modernism provide a critique of all that modernity and has inflicted a crushing below to the gathered experience of western civilization, industrilisation, urbanisation, advanced technology and the nation-state and other features of modernity. It has challenged all the existing world views, beliefs and religious orders.

In political science, it questions the authority of hierarchical bureaucratic decision making structures that
function within a non-overlapping jurisdiction and with a set pattern. In Anthropology, it seeks to protect and promote the local as well as regional primitive distinct cultures, it opposes planned interventions that claims to modify these cultures. In philosophy, it pays the respect for the subjectivity and raises questions on objectivity and reason. A systematic subjective challenge to the modern academic life remains the significant feature of post-modernism.

Federalism as a power-sharing arrangement and division of jurisdiction is under question by the post moderanists. The post moderanist approach remains the latest development in the study of ethno-cultural conflict and nationalism has remained a significant factor in federalism. As Ashutosh Varshney explains, "What distinguishes post-modernism from the main structure of social sciences, is minimally a two-fold claim that power relations are deeply implicated in the formation of knowledge and that much of what passes for objective or scientific knowledge in the human sciences is basically a 'narrative', 'constructed' by the knowledge elites and promoted by institution of power." 25

By the power weilders, the altranative forms of knowledge were supressed or overpowered in history because these forms of knowledge were related with pre-modern forms of knowledge and were patronised by those who had very little power in society. In other words the 'have nots' were supressed in all respect i.e., culturally, socially, litterally, and economically and even their contribution to society was neglected. Now the post
moderanist inspired by that discrimination have a vision to make efforts for research on 'post-colonial' and 'subalttern groups'. Some of the groups that generally draw an attention are women, tribals, peasants and minorities. It is considered that the knowledge about 'marginalised' or deprived groups was produced by the socially and economically previllaged people, who were colonial masters or native elite. In this way, the subalttern groups were rarely represented both in the process of acquisition of knowledge and convassing of federal device. Hence, the post-modernism regard the historical knowledge as contaminated with falsehood and misperceptions. So it must be "deconstructed".

In social sciences, the major disciplines that are revolutionarised by post modernism are History and Anthropology, though Political philosophy and Political science have been partially touched by this new trend. Much of the literature on multiple identities and ethnic conflict is now inspired by post-modernism and the analysis of "representations", "nerratives", "discourses", "contextulisation", "essentilisation", "problamisation" and "deconstructions" are rapidly being tools of exposition both in seminars and individuals meetings. In the area of federalism- the protest by unrepresented or under represented communities is felt. Some times it forges a threat to the integration of state and even questions the basic foundations of federalism.

In contemporary period "the reaction to centralisation by the constituent units and the resentment to 'Statism' by
mariginised groups who feel left out of the political process and economic development has led to a significant body of literature expressed through what are generally described as 'subaltern literature'. These works question the assumed acceptance of the basis of identity formation and seek to articulate the minority voices". These discourses can be described as the discourses of denied groups because these are denied political power, economic development and cultural articulation. In the context of discourses on federalism, the tribal separatism in North-eastern India, the constant assertion of their separate identity by the French Canadians, the recentment of the native Hawaiians to the dictate of Washington D.C., the Pakhtoon demand for autonomy, the mohajir's cry for recognition as a 'nationality' acquire a legitimate component of the emerging political theory. These voices and demands would pose a challenge to the very existence of a federal state if not tackled with a political maturity and participatory democratic norms.

The creation of 'asymmetrical' federations providing a certain degree of 'self rule' in case of Slovakia, 'autonomy' in case of India and the 'right to secede' in case of Former Soviet Union, failed to contain the fragmentation of both the consensus and the polity. Neither ideology nor democracy not even decentralisation, could help in containing this new threat. Federalism is considered as an arrangement which can accommodate multiple identities in society and assume that consensus is the glue that holds centrifugal forces together.
The political movement for separation, the assertion of ethnic identities in different parts of the world indicates towards some new dimensions—right to self-determination, ethnicity and the future of nation-state.

**Self-determination and Federalism:**

The central idea of self-determination is that whether a territory shall become a separate state or remain as such. "Its interpretation in post-colonial era is on people- if it so wills- is entitled to independence from foreign domination i.e. it may establish a sovereign state in the territory in which it lives and where it constitutes a majority."²⁷ It has also been argued that "at the core of self-determination lies a cultural rather than a political claim. The right to self-determination is the right to nation to preserve its existence as a unique social group- as distinct from the right of individual to govern their lives and to participate in a free and democratic political process."²⁸ Therefore it is possible that as a unit a people may claim and get success in attaining self-determination and deny democratic processes to the other inhabitants within the unit. There have been a long debate on the demise of 'nation-state'. In 1973 D'Entraves, wrote that the disappearance of nation-state would not mean the disappearance of state. He maintained "so long as there will be an organisation capable of controlling force, regulating power and securing allegiances, one thing seems certain..... that organisation will still be state."²⁹

The history of self-determination is associated with the doctrine of popular sovereignty symbolised in the French
Revolution. Within the context of French Revolution, self-determination was seen as a 'democratic ideal valid for all mankind'. Later this was replaced by critiques that if sovereignty is to be shared by different entities within and outside state, there can be no rationale of linking popular sovereignty with self-determination. The concept of federal nation-building will have to be understood within the broader concept of nation building as the sum of politics designed to promote national integration within the context of federalism. National self-determination has generally perceived as implying a separatist claim for the establishment of an independent nation-state. The right to national self-determination is however, meant to assure individuals of "their rights to preserve their national life. Under no circumstances does this imply that they must always do so within the frame work of an independant state". But frequently, the populist pressures and aspiration blur this subtle distinction, and national self-determination is demanded as a means to achieve independene.

In the twentieth century the right to national self determination has dominated the political debate at three crucial points. (i) after the first World War (ii) during the debate on Wilsons fourteen points program and (iii) after the second World War throughout the period of decolonisation and at the end of 1980s, following upheavals in eastern and central Europe. It has been interpreted in terms of cultural and democratic version. In terms of culture- it defines 'nation' as a cultural community sharing a language, a tradition and a
historical national consciousness, and seeks for preservation of the cultural uniqueness of a community. In its democratic version it defines 'nation' as 'the governed'\(^{31}\)-the group of individual living under the same rule and in the context of federalism under a federal constitution. However, self-determination is understood as the right of the individual to participate in the governance of the area which they perceive as their native land.

**Federalism and Ethnicity**

The ethnicity can be defined as the expression of the growing political and social consciousness of ethnic groups in an organised political behaviour and articulation. It is ethnic because, it is based on narrow ethnic group consciousness which gets support from primordial loyalties and cultural affinities. It springs from a strong awareness of the self and self-image of ethnic group and a relentless desire to preserve, protect and promote their separate distinct identity. In its political manifestation, ethnicity thus becomes separatist and exclusionist in its demands, frequently assuming secessionist postures. However, in the post modernist view, ethnicity becomes a site for the articulation of the perceived and real denial and post modernism, as an emblem of the discourses of the denied-questions the real and imagined benefits of federal management.

Commenting on the nature of ethnic conflicts, David Brown maintains that "ethnic conflicts are normally not a negotiable political issue but rather clashes between the absolutist ideologies
admitting of a number of compromises." He further maintains that "the imperatives of state nationalism confronts the imperatives of ethnic nationalism. He attributes the surfacing of ethnic conflicts to two related factors. One as means of establishing a claim on the resources of modern state, and second to project the fact and nature of inequality." In the contemporary period, "the ethno-cultural nationalism have been described as ethnarchy with ethnic anarchism." As far as the question of territorial boundaries, political obligation and legally constituted government is concerned, it seeks to reshape states and nations at will.

In brief, federalism as an arrangement has many dimensions and complexities. It has many manifestations. It is closely related with concepts like self-rule, self-determination and nation-building. From the days of ancient Isrelite tribes, it has come a long way to contemporary federal arrangement in 21st century. Indeed Canadian federalism is no exception with its fissiparous and strong integrative tendencies at work in itself. Perhaps, it is a federation still undergoing the process of evolution, a federation in making.
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