CHAPTER-I

DEBATES ON NATIONALISM

Nationalism is co-terminus with the 'matured socio-historical conditions', which are both objective and subjective. It becomes a reality at a certain stage of the human life of the community. There are certain specificities which distinguish it from non-national social formations of the community of previous social existence. In fact, nationalism has had an organic welding of the members, who lived in a distinct territory of their own. They might have their own single market or economic boundary. However, 'we feeling' is the essential ingredient of a nation. It is expressed through sentiment or feeling. There is a similar psychological structure among its members and a common culture evolved by it, although the ideal typical model still remains an abstraction.

A.R. Desai quotes E.H. Carr, who found that 'Nations' in the modern sense of the word, did not emerge until the close of the Middle Ages.1 Regarding the traits of a national community, E.H. Carr remarks: "The term nation has been used to denote a human group with specific characteristics such as,

(a) The idea of a common government either as a reality in the present or past or as an aspiration of the future.

---

(b) A certain size and closeness of contact between all its individual members.

(c) A more or less defined territory.

(d) Certain characteristics (of which the most frequent is the language) clearly distinguishing the nation from nations and non-national groups.

(e) Certain interests common to the individual members.

(f) A certain degree of common feeling and will associated with the picture of the nation in the minds of the individual members.

In fact, the development of nationalism in different countries followed their different lines determined by their respective social and cultural history. The political, economic and social structures are the dominant factors in the formation of a national community. The social classes, which lead the movement or struggle for national liberation, are always present out there. The traits of leading social classes are also present there. Due to its class character every nation is born, constituted and forged in a unique way. As A.R. Desai describes that 'The history of seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is primarily the history of the formation of nations.'

The national sentiment is the dominant emotion of man-woman and the nation is the prime fact of this epoch. The present history, contemporary movements in the spheres of economy, politics or cultures are inspired by conscious national motives and urges, irrespective of whether they are organised to defend and develop the freedom and culture of respective

---

2 Ibid.
nations or that can be used to mitigate, suppress the freedom or culture of other nations. Not only that nation remains a unit in all contemporary programmes of world reconstruction which seek to integrate humanity, on a capitalist or socialist ideology, but all the so-called developed and developing nations of the world recognize the fact ostensibly. In fact, nationalism is playing the most decisive and significant role in the life of entire humanity. Therefore, it is the special subject of study, investigation and inquiry. Nationalism in one form or another constitutes the most potent and ubiquitous force of the late 20th century.

The nation-state is both the parent and child of many national movements. Despite the challenge of an increasingly integrated global market economy, nationalism as an idea still remains one of the most dominant forms of political membership. For many, nationalism is nothing but an incoherent expression unworthy of philosophical scrutiny. But, Will Kimlicka, David Miller, and Yael Tamir have produced sophisticated analysis of the moral dimensions of our attachment to ethno-culturally defined groups and nations.3 Another important addition to this is the edited work of Robert Mckim and Jeff Mc Mohan titled, The Morality of Nationalism.4

The most important feature of this edited volume on the question of morality and nationalism is the attention to the psychological appeal of


4 The reference here is to Robert Mckim and Jeff Mc Mohan (eds.), The Morality of Nationalism (London: Oxford University Press, 1997), p.49.
nationalism. Charles Taylor is of the opinion that this has been neglected by the modernization theories, which dominate the field. Taylor seeks to explain the emotive force of nationalism through a story of the injuries to divinity that cultural minority experience in the face of superior conquering powers.

In the same volume, Thomas Hurka has highlighted the improvement aspect of national solidarity. In fact, the national security can be secured in terms of the nation's history of 'reciprocal benefits' and 'shared suffering'. His argument makes an interesting distinction between the moral status of 'black and aboriginal movements' of black on the one hand, and 'white supremacy movements' on the other. Ripstein says that the contemporary social scientists do not themselves know much about the historical, cultural and ideological pre-requisites of mutual aid. Some national communities are generous to their least well-off segment while others are not. Therefore, a lot more thought needs to be devoted to this issue of nation, nationality within a broad framework of nation-state.

The central arguments of the book titled Ethnicity and Nationalism by Paul R. Brass are – first, ethnicity and nationalism are not 'givens', but they

5 Ibid.
6 Charles Taylor, quoted by Robert McKim and Jeff MacMohan (eds.), op. cit., No.4, p.49.
are social and political 'constructions'. They are creations of elites, who draw upon, distort and sometimes fabricate materials from the cultures of the groups they wish to represent in order to project their well-being or existence or to gain political and economic advantage for their groups as well as for themselves. But one wonders how can something be created out of nothing? We think it is the modern invention of the ancient myths and traditions for the political mobilization to capture power.

The second argument is that ethnicity and nationalism are modern phenomena inseparably connected with the activities of modern centralizing state. In the Indian context, it has been there for long though in its embryonic form and started filling up the vacuum created by the statist model of development, erosion of the 'Congress System', deinstitutionalization of the polity, loss of political legitimacy and, of course, centralization and personalization of politics too.

Unlike Paul R. Brass, Anthony D. Smith and John A. Armstrong\(^8\) consider that ethnicity and nationalism are the reflections of primordial identities. These identities are based upon the search of past which in turn, try to provide substantial proof and evidence of the existence of ethnic identities and nationalism throughout recorded history.

---

In his latest book, *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, Anthony D. Smith attempts at a theoretical explanation and illustration of his approach to nationalism, which he calls 'ethno-symbolism'. Here, he says, there are two approaches which we can be termed as 'perennialist' and 'modernist'. The former believes that nations have always existed throughout history. Some individual nations are themselves perennial, other nations come and go; but there is a continuous presence of nations as social and historical phenomena.

The modernist reply that nationalism proper, and hence full consciousness of nationhood, is essentially a post-enlightenment construction. For them, nationalism is the product of industrialisation and modernisation, literacy and mass communication or uneven capitalist development. They hold that nationalism fulfils a modern, mass need rather than an ancient yearning. Smith criticizes the modernists for ignoring the historical precedents of nationalism, which he locates in long-term cultural and ethnic myths and memories.

---


Brass continues with the same argument that ethnic identity and nationalism arise out of specific types of interactions between the leadership of centralizing states and elite from non-dominant ethnic groups, but not exclusively on the peripheries of those states. Here, he tries to analyse the emerging patterns of the centre-state relations. Recently, we have got a clear picture of a kind of bi-party system at the state level and multi-party system at the central/national level\textsuperscript{14} in India itself. Therefore, whenever there is an alliance between the centralizing and regional or non-dominant elites, the ethnic mobilization and nationality formation do take place. Brass says in a country like India we have many regions consisting of multiple ethnic groups whose elites are engaged in conflicts or co-operation with each other. 'In such situations, state leaders may either choose neutrality or identification with elites from one ethnic group rather than another or may seek to divide one or both ethnic groups in terms of power and support within particular political regions.

Although ethnic identities are always in flux, the solution lies in freezing of a particular system of elite collaboration and elite advantage in order to avoid the conflict situations in the process of capturing power. The logic of Paul Brass's argument is towards keeping such systems open and in flux,

\textsuperscript{14} Note: The political processes in India, particularly in the decade of the 1990s witnessed a significant development, i.e. (i) the decline of the Congress, (ii) the emergence of regional parties, (iii) biparty system at state level such as Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Maharashtra, etc. and the multi-party system at the national level. Finally, we have a coalition government of National Democratic Alliance (NDA).
while attempting to decentralize the overcentralized ethnic groups in the process.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Marx and Engels on Nationalism}

Marx and Engels used the western concept of 'nationhood' as their starting point and adopted the terminology current in the first half of the 19th century. They employed the term "nation" and "society" synonymously in the sense of 'civil society'. Initially, Marx used 'nationality' to mean citizenship, i.e., allegiance to a state. After, the revolutions of 1848, Marx and Engels appreciated the problem surrounding self-determination and the principle of nationality.

Following the West European trend they were assessing nationalism. Their assessment was based upon its effect on the emergence of the bourgeoisie, i.e. nation-state. Therefore, it has been a factor in overthrowing the reactionary system of petty principalities and very helpful in eliminating the remnants of feudalism. The developments took place prior to the introduction of a large-scale domestic market as a pre-requisite of capitalist accumulation. Thus, the identification of the nation with the nation-state, the problem of nationality and nationalism appeared as "a principle arising out of the capitalist bourgeoisie, i.e. world and vanishing with it".\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} See Paul R. Brass, op. cit., p.10.

The *German Ideology* (1974) explains the revolutionary movement of the proletariat as the sign "of dissolution of all classes, nationalities, etc. within present society". Marx firmly believed that in all nations "obstinate nationalism is to be found only among the bourgeoisie and their writers."

He frequently points out to the free trade on national peculiarity: free trade ended the monopolistic markets instituted by the mercantile system and also swept away the barriers between nations, even where the pre-conditions for modern industrialization were still rudimentary. Looking at the growing economic interdependence of nation-states, Marx came to the conclusion that a unified world system and the rapid extension of capitalist market relations were going to emerge in near future. In a capitalist mode of production, production and consumption will be "given a cosmopolitan character... intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations will lead to a reduction of national differences and antagonisms between peoples."

According to Marxism, bourgeois society "embraces the whole commercial and industrial life of a given stage, and in so far, transcends the state and the nation, though, on the other hand again, it must assert itself in its foreign relations as nationality, and inwardly must organize itself as

---
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state." Marx believed that the bourgeois nation-state had the seeds of its own destruction in regard both to its form of government and its national essence. Therefore, the "age-old, deep-seated national egoism" to which Engels refers, will have to give way before cosmopolitan tendencies and the "original isolation of the separate nationalities" will break down under the impact of the division of labour between modern developed nations. Here, the proletariat is to play the crucial role. The awakened proletariat can cause diverse nations to fraternize.

In the Marxian perspective, rhetorical appeals for international fraternity means in effect only "fraternity between the bourgeoisie in all lands" and such appeals can lead to the removal of national antagonisms only in theory and never in practice; the fraternity of the working class of all countries would pave the way for unity between the nations. For the elimination of the private property the capitalist system will allow the peoples of the world to pursue their common interests and will try to end the exploitation of one people by another, which is the root cause of all national conflict and nationalism itself.

The famous formula in the Communist Manifesto: "The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got." Therefore, the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie is also victory

---

20 Ibid., p.48.
over national and industrial conflicts which today cause the various people to view each other with hostility. The Communist Manifesto declares likewise, "In proportion as the antagonism between classes in the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end." Finally, Marx subordinated national liberation to social emancipation.

The formation of capitalist nation-state in our part of the world is a complex phenomenon. The 'concrete historical process' can be explained by making reference to Gramsci's 'Notes on Italian History'. Antonio Gramsci outlines a powerful argument about the 'passive revolution of capital' contrasting the history of the formation of Italian – Nation State with the classic political revolution in France of 1789. According to Gramsci, the new claimants to power in Italy were not in a position to exert pressure on the dominant classes. Therefore, they opted for a path in which the demands of a new society would be – "satisfied by small doses", legally, in reformist manner in such a way that it would be possible to preserve the political and economic position of the old feudal classes, to avoid agrarian reforms, and especially, to avoid the popular masses going through a period of political experience, such as occurred in France in the years of 'Jacobianism'.

Ibid., p.51.
A doctrine during French Revolution of 1789, a group of extreme democrats established a club, but believed in revolutionary transformation of society.
Early Marxian Perspective

Antonio Gramsci is relevant to the historical process of Indian nationalism as well. In situations where an emerging bourgeoisie lacks the social conditions for establishing complete hegemony over the new nation, it resorts to a 'passive revolution' by attempting a 'molecular transformation' of the old dominant classes into partners in a new historical bloc and only a partial appropriation of the popular masses, in order, first to create a state as the necessary pre-condition for the establishment of capitalism as the dominant mode of production.

After a brief introduction, let us discuss the debate on the rise and growth of Indian nationalism. A careful reading of the early generation of Marxist historians of India would suggest that despite apparent political differences among themselves, they agreed that the intellectual history of India in the 19th and 20th centuries was a history of the struggle between the forces of reaction and those of progress.25

Early Marxist historians emphasized the primary contradiction as well as the process of the nation in the making. Unlike the nationalists school of thought, they also took full note of the inner-contradictions of Indian society. But they failed to integrate their treatment of the primary anti-imperialist

contradictions and tended to counterpoise the anti-imperialist struggle to the class or social struggle. They regarded the movement as a 'structured bourgeois movement', if not the bourgeoisie's movement. To K.M. Panikkar and others, they miss its open ended and all class-character. They further criticized R.P. Dutt and other early Marxist writers that they equated the national leadership with the bourgeoisie or capitalist class. R.P. Dutt and Desai interpreted the class character of the movement in terms of its forms of struggle, its non-violent character, strategic retreats and compromises. To them, access to financial resources determined the ability to influence the course and dimension of nationalist policies.

The nationalist school consisting of Bipan Chandra, Mridula Mukherjee, Aditya Mukherjee, K.N. Panikkar, Sucheta Mahajan and others further stressed the primary contradiction between the interests of the Indian people and that of British colonialism. India's national leaders grasped this contradiction. India was regressing economically and undergoing a process of underdevelopment. Nationalist historians thus developed an economic critique of British colonialism.

The anti-colonial ideology and critique of colonialism were disseminated during the mass phase of the movement. This national movement was vital to the formation of a nation or people. Leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendranath Banerjee, Tilak, Gandhi and Nehru opined that India was not yet a fully structured nation but a 'nation-in-the making'. Therefore, the major objective of the national movement was seen both as a
product of the process of the nation in-the-making and as an active agent of the process. This process of the nation-in-the-making was never counterpoised to the diverse regional, linguistic and ethnic identities in India. On the contrary, the emergence of a national identity and the flowering of the other narrower identities were seen as processes deriving strength from each other.26

In this scheme of thought the pre-nationalist resistance to colonial rule failed to understand the twin phenomena of colonialism and the nation in the making. In fact, the phenomena were not visible, or available to be grasped on the surface. It had to be grasped through hard analysis. This analysis and practical consciousness based on it were then to be taken to the people by intellectuals who played a significant role in arousing the inherent, instinctive, and nascent anti-colonial consciousness of the masses.

The imperialist approach emerged in the official pronouncements of the Viceroy – Dufferin, Curzon, Minto and the Secretary of State, George Hamilton. It was cogently put forward by V. Chirol, the Rowlatt (Sedition) Committee Report, Verney Lavett, and the Montague-Chelmsford Report. It was theorized by Bruce T. McCully, an American scholar in 1940. It is liberal version is to be found in the writings of Reginald Coupland and Percival Spear. The conservative version was refurbished and developed by Anil Seal

The Cambridge School

The Cambridge school denies the existence of colonialism as an economic, political, social and cultural structure in India. To them, it was simply a foreign rule, and denies the fact of economic, social and cultural exploitation of India which required the overthrow of colonialism. Thus, their analysis of the national movement is based on the denial of the basic contradiction between the interests of the Indian people and of British colonialism and the causative role this contradiction played in the rise of national movement. They see the Indian struggle against imperialism as a mock battle ("mimic warfare") 'a Dussehra dual between two hollow statues', locked in motiveless and simulated combat.²⁷

The imperialist writers rejected the thesis that India was in the process of becoming a nation and believed that what is called in India in fact consisted of religions, castes, communities and interests. They accepted the existence of Hindu-Muslim, Brahmin, non-Brahmin, Aryan, Bhadralok (cultured people) and other similar identities. These prescriptive groups based on caste and religion were the real basis of political organization and, as such, caste and religion based politics are primary and nationalism a mere cover. Anil Seal writes, "what from a distance appear as their practical strivings were often, on close examination, their efforts to conserve or improve the position of their

own prescriptive groups. This makes Indian nationalism different from the nationalism of China, Japan, the Muslim countries and Africa.  

The imperialist school maintains that the national movement in India was not a people's movement but a product of the needs and interests of the elite groups who used it to serve either their own narrow interests or the interests of their prescriptive groups. Thus, the elite groups, and their needs and interests, provide the origin as well as the driving force of the idea, ideology and movement of nationalism, which is a mere ideology to legitimise their narrow ambitions and to mobilize public support. Hence, the national movement becomes an instrument to satisfy their own interests.

Dufferin, Curzon, Chirol, Lavett, McCully and B.B. Misra talked of the frustrated educated middle classes using nationalism to fight the 'benevolent Raj'. Therefore, it is misleading to view these native mobilisations as directed chiefly against overlordship of the Britishers. Much attention has been paid to the apparent conflicts between Imperialism and nationalism. It would be at least equally profitable to study their real partnership.

The British extended administrative, economic and political power to the localities and provinces, local rulers started organising politics by acquiring clients and patrons whose interests they served, and who in turn, served their interests. Indian politics began to be formed through the links of
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28 Ibid., p.349.
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this patron-client chain. Gradually, bigger leaders emerged who undertook to act as brokers to link together the politics of the local rulers. Since the British rule encompassed the whole of India, all-India brokers emerged. Anil Seal says, "the chief political brokers were Gandhi, Nehru and Patel. People themselves came on the front only in 1918, and after that existential grievances such as war, inflation, disease, drought or depression had nothing to do with colonialism. These were cleverly used to bamboozle them into participating in this factional struggle of the rulers.

Hence, the Indian national movement becomes the cloak for the struggle for power between various sections of the elites. Conceptual categories of nation, class, mobilisation ideology, etc., which are generally used by historians to analyse national movements and revolutionary processes in Europe, Asia and Africa are usually missing from their treatment of Indian national movement. This school not only denies the existence of colonial exploitation and underdevelopment and the 'central contradiction' but also any kind of idealism on the part of those who sacrificed their lives for the anti-imperialist cause. S. Gopal has pointed out that "Namier was accused of taking the mind out of politics; this school has gone further and taken not only the mind but decency, character, integrity and selfless commitment out of the Indian national movement."30 K.N. Panikkar says that it denies any intelligent or active role to the mass of workers, peasants, lower middle class and

women in the anti-imperialist struggle. They are treated as children or dumb creatures who had no perception of their own needs and interests. One wonders why the colonial rulers did not succeed in mobilising them behind their own politics.31

The 1970s witnessed several attempts to question the earlier application of Marxism to the history of Indian nationalism. It was in the year 1972 that official celebrations were held to mark the bi-centenary of the birth of Ram Mohan Roy, a modern Indian thinker of the 19th century.

A volume of critical essays32 brought out on the occasion consisting of several contributions, which challenged the whole premise of the characterisation of the Indian national 'renaissance' and even the categories of tradition and modernity. This volume is the critical analysis of the nature of the relationship between culture and structure, or to put it in a simple language, superstructure and base. There were many modern elements in the thought of the 19th century social reformers and ideologues, but what significance do these elements of modernity acquire when looked at in the context of the evolving colonial economy of the same period, of massive deindustrialisation and destitution; unbearable pressures on the land leading in a virtually irreversible process of regressive rent – exploitation, stagnation

in the level of productivity, of the crushing of peasants' resistance, of the growing social gulf rather than bonds of alliance between a modernised, western educated, urban elite and the rest of the nation.

These questions are posed from within Marxist framework and an unqualified equation of the 'westernisers' with modernism or progress almost inevitably leads to a more positive assessment of British rule and English education. The entire dichotomy of 'tradition-modernisation' served as a cover under which the grosser facts of imperialist political and economic exploitation quickly tucked away in a corner.

Ram Mohan Roy's break with tradition was 'deeply contradictory' – accommodating within the same corpus of thinking numerous compromises with orthodox-Hindu elitist and by his own enlightened standards, clearly irrational ways of thought and practice, and in any case, it was a break only 'on the intellectual plane', not at the level of basic social transformation.\(^{33}\)

Since Ram Mohan Roy accepted the fashionable logic of free trade and visualised a kind of development, the bourgeois development in Bengal in close collaboration with British merchants and entrepreneurs. Barun De, P. Bhattacharya and others challenged this idea. They called it utterly absurd illusion, because colonial subjection would never permit full blooded

bourgeois modernity but only a 'weak and distorted caricature' is possible.\textsuperscript{34}

There were elements of modernity in the new cultural and intellectual movements of nineteenth century. These elements are to be explained and understood in relation to the changing socio-economic structure of the country and the crucial context of power – the reality of colonial subjection. "This kind of location of the discourse limits the achievements of nineteenth century modernisers such as Rammohan Roy within Hindu elitist, almost comprador, framework."\textsuperscript{35}

Class striving for class hegemony and social production is important. Without such a class the cultural influence of intellectuals is reduced to an essentially abstract phenomenon giving no consistent direction of significance social renewal. Mere acceptance of new ideas or their original structure of assumptions did not in themselves mean much; major changes in thought were brought about by the capacity of nascent social forces to achieve goals of social transformation, which were not clarified in the original postulates of reasoning or speculation. In fact, "their influence is limited to tiny intellectual


groups who have no creative bonds with a broader social consensus".36

Partha Chatterjee points out a powerful logical question – "why never did the thought occur in the minds of these newly enlightened intelligentsia, despite their fondness for justice and liberty to question the legitimacy of British rule in India?"37 The perception about colonial rule was entirely different. The very existence of British power was regarded as the final and most secure guarantee against lawlessness, superstition and despotism. One finds excellent example in Dinbandhu's "Neel Darpan".38 Here, an enlightened liberal, conscious of his individual rights, willing to go to great lengths to defend those rights against recalcitrant officials, even succumbing to 'brief intermittent burst of violence, but all the while believing in the fundamental legitimacy of the existing social order.

Among the early nationalist thinkers, the formulation of problem encompasses a great deal of complexities in the relations between thought, culture and power. There lies the fact of the effectivity of thought as a vehicle of change. Secondly, the relation of thought to the existing culture of the society is not always clear. The existing culture is the way in which the social code provides a set of correspondence between signs and meanings.

Therefore, the logical question that a researcher can ask – Had the nationalist thought ever been successful in replacing the old, obsolete structure of society?

Thirdly, can there be a framework of analysis and understanding natural to the cultural context? Was the national movement completely neutral to it? Fourthly, when the new framework of thought is directly associated with a relation of dominance in the cross-cultural context of power, what, in the new cultural context, are the specific changes which occur in the original categories and relations within the domain of thought? That is to say, if relations of dominance and subordination are perceived as existing between cultures, which is what happens in the colonial rule, what are the specific ways in which framework of nationalist thought conceived in the context of the dominant culture, received and transformed in the subordinate culture?

Finally, the above said relations between thought and culture have a bearing on the crucial question about the changing relations of power within the given society under colonial domination. The social consequences of a particular framework of thought produced in metropolitan countries would be drastically different from the colonised countries; the historical correspondence between thought and change witnessed in the age of enlightenment in the West would not be obtained in the colonised East. We would have to answer the question what are the specific relations between thought and change which do obtain in our parts of the world?
Unlike the sociological determinist who is satisfied with the supposedly empirical 'fact' that all nationalist leaderships manage 'somehow or other' to transcend the problems of cross-cultural relativism inherent in the colonial situation. The question of fundamental significance is the relationship between colonialism and nationalism, and secondly, the specific structure of domination which is built under the aegis of the post-colonial national state.

The critique of the 1970s made a serious attempts to damage the old structure of assumptions about the Indian 'renaissance' and the debate on Indian nationalism. It emphasised at numerous points the impossibility of making the distinction between progressive and a conservative trend within the 19th century intelligentsia. In fact, the whole intelligentsia shared the same presuppositions on most of the fundamental questions. Those presuppositions were neither unambiguously modern, nor unambiguously national. Liberal, secular, rational and progressive attitudes were invariably compromised by concessions to scriptural or canonical authority and individual's material advancement. Sentiments of nationalism flowed out of an unconcealed faith in the basic goodness of the colonial order and the progressive support of the colonial state.

All this reflected the absence of a fundamental social class infused by a revolutionary urge to transform society and to stamp it with the imprint of its unquestioned hegemony. India's 'renaissance' had no historical links with the revolutionary mission of a progressive bourgeoisie, seeking to create a nation in its own image'. Partha Chatterjee says, "as the harbinger of a bourgeois
and national revolution, the 'renaissance' was partial, fragmented, indeed it was a failure." 39

Therefore, what was meant to be 'modern' became increasingly alienated from the masses. What seemed to assert greater ideological sway over the nation were newer forms of conservatism. The central feature of Gandhi's thought "Hind Swaraj" is the negation of progress as well as European science. 40 And yet these movements in thought were themselves premised on the same presuppositions – 'modern', presuppositions as those of renaissance.

One of the key issues in the historical discussion of modernity has always been whether it is industrialisation which happens to be capitalist or capitalist industrialisation that constitutes the fundamental process of modernisation as it has unfolded. Marxists insist on the latter, particularly Perry Anderson and Robert Brenner. Theorists of Power, for example. Anthony Giddens and Michael Mann hold to the former view, as also do the theorists of rationality and cognitive transformation as the driving force of modernity, such as Max Weber and Ernest Gellner. All these six names would subscribe to what Gellner called the 'Big Ditch' view of a profound and decisive rupture created by the advent of modernity in the trajectory of specific societies and in the processes of history itself.


40 For details see Romain Rolland, Mahatma Gandhi: A Study in Indian Nationalism; as quoted by Partha Chatterjee, 1986, No.33, p.49.
In fact, the question of rupture is fundamental for anyone wishing to situate oneself in the debate of tradition and modernity in India. Here, we can have three possible lines of argument. India, it can be claimed, is still basically a traditional society. This is a stand an anti-secularist/anti-modernist like Ashis Nandy would take. It is a stand shared by an eco-feminist indigenist like Vandanashiva, Director, Research Foundation for Science, Technology, Ecology and Natural Resource Policy, Dehradun.

A second view is that Indian society is in transition between tradition and modernity. A third view which is writer like Achin Vanaik and others would subscribe is – that India has long been pursuing its own trajectory of modernity,41 different from that in the West but not understandable without reference to it. It is not that 'traditional' institutions, beliefs, values and practices do not exist but that no longer can do so in the 'old' way, and that itself constitutes a decisive change. Even in the long history of pre-modernity there is always change as well as continuity.

As a matter of fact, modernity destroys tradition. But it also reworks and 'preserves' it. Traditions in a pre-modern sense are always linked to localism and local communities that is why over any wide territorial expanse, in "pre-modern India, the existence of a traditional society is always the existence of traditional societies in the plural. In late modernity this crucial
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local contextualism in which tradition thrives is undermined as never before by its principal characteristic capitalist globalisation."\(^42\)

The relations between culture and politics as suggested in the writings of Antonio Gramsci has brought to the foreground of discussion, several problems regarding the conventional Marxist approach to the "national and colonial question" and the nature of 'nation-state' in post-colonial society. "In the East as well as in the West, Marxist had to reject the scheme of interpretation based on the relation of cause and effect between structure and superstructure. They had to reintroduce the concept of social relations of production in political science".\(^43\)

Newly emerged Nationalism in India denied the alleged inferiority of the colonised people. It also asserted that a backward nation could 'modernise' itself while retaining its cultural identity. It thus produced a discourse in which, even as it challenged the colonial claim to political domination; it also accepted the premises of modernity on which colonial domination was based — say the police, military and the entire immense structure of bureaucracy. These contradictory elements in nationalist discourse are yet to be understood properly. Because one finds the same logic of development and modernisation as the dominant order of the day.


Similar kind of argument is found in the works of Subaltern school. Today, it is possible to talk of a 'new social history'.

By the way, the focus is shifting away from economy and politics to issues of (i) culture, (ii) consciousness, (iii) power and (iv) identity. The earliest Marxist book by R.P. Dutt and M.N. Roy were written in the contexts of anti-imperialist struggle and meant as interventions within the movement. They were concerned with the most apparent aspects of colonial exploitation and the class basis of the national movement. In the post-independent India these issues continued to be explored but at a different level of complexity. Confronted with the problems of a developing economy, economists were pre-occupied with issues of productivity constraints and resource allocation, while Marxist historians reflected on the roots of underdevelopment. By the 1970s, the mode of production became the central issue of debate amongst Marxists, and younger scholars went to study 'agrarian transitions' in the different regions of India.

In the meantime, since the 1950s, a series of important Marxist studies on the national movement had been published. General surveys were
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44 Sumit Sarkar, 'Popular Movements and Middle Class Leadership in late Colonial India: Perspectives and Problems of a History from Below' (Delhi, 1983); 'Social History: Predicaments and Possibilities', Economic and Political Weekly, 22-29 June 1985; Sabyasachi Bhattacharya, 'Presidential Address', Indian History Congress, Modern Indian History, 1982; "Paradigms Lost: Notes on Social History in India", Economic and Political Weekly, Annual Number, April 1982.

45 A.R. Desai, Social Background of Indian Nationalism (Bombay, 1948); Bipan Chandra, Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India (New Delhi, 1966).
followed by numerous regional monographs.\textsuperscript{46} It was a shift of a totally different order. Initially, the organisational categories were in a familiar mould: a concern with organisation, social basis, programmes, leadership tactics and strategy. Here, an increasing pre-occupation with the nature of popular initiative was evident.

It was only in the 1980s that 'History from Below' acquired a greater popularity, particularly with the publication of Subaltern Studies.\textsuperscript{47} The earlier Marxist tradition came under attack as being 'elitist', concerned as it was with the elites rather than the subalternical categories. The subordinated groups, it was argued, appeared in this 'elitist' historiography as an inert object of mobilisation and not as human object making their own history. The Subaltern studies agreed with E.D. Thompson, Christopher Hill, Eric Hobsbawm and others, that workers and peasants also have their mind, and it was necessary to understand their vision of the world, their practices, their way of life. Therefore, it becomes imperative to 'rethink' our agenda of research, reorder our definitions of historical relevance and our notion of historical facts. Working class culture, codes of peasant consciousness, spirit possession, crime and criminality, disease and death are becoming important

\textsuperscript{46} This has been supported by Sumit Sarkar, Swadeshi Movement in Bengal 1903 to 1908 (New Delhi, 1973); Gyan Pandey, Ascendancy of Congress in U.P. 1926 to 1934: A Study in Imperfect Mobilisation (Delhi, 1978); Majid Siddiqi, Unrest in North India: United Provinces 1981-82 (New Delhi, 1978); David Hardiman, Peasant Nationalism of Gujarat (New Delhi, 1981).

\textsuperscript{47} Ranjit Guha, ed., Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989), Vols.1-5.
themes of Marxist concern. Now the general trend is to study the symbolic order, perceptions and discourses.48

Social scientists are now thinking about the relations between culture and economy, material and ideal, being and consciousness, objectivism and relativism, structure and process, teleology and progress. This kind of approach is against the logic of reductionism. In England and France, social history developed in opposition to political history. Politics, ex-communicated for over a generation as the subject of old fashioned history; was rehabilitated in France in the late 1960s as the history of power, authority and institutions. In India, the new social history does not attempt similar rupture in the domain of politics. Issues of power and ideology, domination and subordination, conflict, struggle and insurrection, remain integral to most of the Marxist projects.

The trend against reductionism is nothing new in the Marxist historical tradition of India. Bipan Chandra's The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India (1966), is a critique of a deterministic theory of ideology – the tendency to read off ideology and consciousness from a class position. In the highly reductive Marxism of Rajni Palme Dutt, nationalism appeared as a direct articulation of bourgeois interests, and political leadership acquired meaning only when the leaders were seen as 'agents' of specific classes. So

48 N. Bhattacharya, Seminar (New Delhi), 'Rethinking Marxist History', October 1987, p.31.
Gandhi became the 'mastiff' (watch dog) of the bourgeoisie, the 'betrayal' of the masses.  

In Bipan Chandra's framework, ideology, leaders, parties were granted 'relative autonomy'. Anti-reductionism has been the consistent feature in the writings of several other historians (Barun Dey, Asok Sen, Sumit Sarkar, K.N. Panikkar, S. Bhattacharya, etc.). Now the argument has been extended to the study of 'crowd' action, working class behaviour and various aspects of rising militancy among peasant communities.

**SUBALTERN SCHOOL OF THOUGHT**

In Subaltern studies, the subordinated classes have a more active and creative presence. Statements of leaders or political programmes are seen as carrying no universal message. Different meanings were constructed by different classes and groups, and often in contradiction to the construction of leaders. Subaltern actions derived their intelligibility from these specific interpretations, from the way messages were decoded, and not from the absolute logic of a universal programme.

The argument deepens our understanding of the nature of popular action and experience. But critics say reductionism persists, in an inverted form. Codes, rules, norms, values, rituals, pre-figure and govern action, perception, interpretation, etc. have their own meanings depending upon the specificity of context. The peasant rebel, in Guha's fascinating and highly

---

49 For details see Rajni Palme Dutt, *India Today* (Calcutta: Manisha, 1946).
influential book, which sets out to negate the world 'could do so only by translating backwards into the semi-feudal language of politics to which he was born'.

Discussing the amazing freedom of the rumour process, the transformation of utterances in the process of circulation, Ranjit Guha says: 'this freedom is not unlimited. A rumour can be improvised only to the extent that the relevant codes of the culture in which it operates permit.'

Challenge to political authority was in terms of 'pre-formed schemes or code of political thinking' and spoken utterances were assimilated, to 'pre-existing ideological patterns'. Similar formulations are to be commonly found in Subaltern studies. Thus, it appears that cultural norms are something like tradition, pre-given and pre-structured not constituted and reconstituted through practice; actions become pre-regulated, and perceptions are pre-defined. N. Bhattacharya calls it 'determinism in the reverse form'.

In the Subaltern scheme of thought, instead of 'economic' being determinant, 'politics' gains command, and 'culture' governs. This problem is linked to a continued ill-treatment of these spheres; a tendency to see them as distinct discreet entities. Their interconnection is never desired, but their domains in effect remain separate. Unless this separation is transcended and attempts are made to work out their mutual mediations, reductionism of one

---


51 Ibid.

sort or the other is bound to recur. That the standard opposition between 'material' and 'ideal'/symbolic' is false. It has been increasingly recognised by those who have attempted to develop the dialectical rather than the reductive perspective.

To E.P. Thompson and Godelier, 'Material experience', the meaning of life, is culturally structured. 'Kinship relations, presupposing as they do rules governing marriage, consanguinity, inheritance, can be very much a part of relations of production'. Social relations cannot be produced and reproduced without their representation in thought without symbolic ordering. Relations of power are formed and sustained by everyday social practices and legitimating discourses, through the mobilisation of meaning, thought, social and cultural hegemony.53

Many of the Subaltern schools share a deep commitment to a concept of structure borrowed from a variety of structuralisms - linguistic, anthropological, Althussarian and to some extent from some historians of France. On the other hand, their emphasis on 'making' derives from the presuppositions of 'history from below', where the static promises of the former is not always reconciled with the constitutive perspective of the latter.

The problem is, if Subaltern studies of Indian nationalism, human activity is seen trapped within pre-constituted structures of consciousness and power. The limits and patterns of Subaltern understanding and action, even in insurrection, was pre-defined by the internal grammar of a pre-existent language. The creativity and constitutive power of the Subaltern could not

---

53 As quoted by N. Bhattacharya in his article, "Rethinking Marxist History", Seminar, New Delhi, October 1987, p.32.
transform the limits which these structures imposed. Such assumptions seriously compromise the fundamental premise of Subaltern studies, that Subalterns make their own history.  

In fact, the relation is one of 'dialectical tension', if one is subordinated to the other, their internal relation is rendered either unproblematic, or the argument becomes inconsistent.

If all interpretations and arguments are equally valid or false in social sciences, how can we criticise one and privilege another? How can Subaltern history claim a status more privileged than 'elite history' of Indian nationalism? Recent trends in human sciences suggest the possibility and the need to go beyond both objectivism and relativism. Richard Bernstein, Ricoeur, Bourdieu, Charles Taylor and others have been working in that direction. Even within the Hermeneutic tradition the concept of critique has now found an important place.

The teleological aspect in the national history of India has a multi-variant existence. In the colonial discourse of scholar officials of the 19th century, India was seen as progressing towards a whig society through legal educational and social reforms under the benign guidance of their benevolent masters. British faith in the 'pupil's progress' paradigm was weakened by the late nineteenth century, but the whig teleology was appropriated by Indian nationalists. The enlightenment ideals of nationality and progress were

54 Ibid., p.33.

55 S. Bhattacharya, "Paradigms lost" as quoted by Partha Chatterjee, No.33, 1986.
accepted as the natural basis for the development of the nation. Indian history was seen as the unfolding of the ideals of liberal democracy and nationalism. The spirit of national unity was traced back to the remote past, kingship in ancient India was interpreted as constitutional monarchy, the social and cultural movements in the early nineteenth century were compared to the European Renaissance. The idea of freedom, it was assumed, spread through education, and social reforms in turn, led to national awakening.

Although, the argument shifted in the early Marxist accounts of national movement but teleological perspectives continued to persist. Instead of seeking the intelligentsia as the prime bearers of the spirit of nationalism and freedom, popular manifestations of nationalist spirit were highlighted. Articulation of nationalism in its embryonic forms, was discovered in all popular revolts of the nineteenth century. The rebellions up to 1857 became the first phase of national struggle, the revolt of 1857 itself was termed as the 'first war of independence'. 'Renaissance' remained the relevant model for studying socio-religious movements.

This teleological thinking came under severe attack in the 1960s. "In fact, it is anachronistic to talk of constitutional monarchy in ancient India or discover nationalist ideals in the early nineteenth century, or apply the concept of 'renaissance' to the colonial situation. In any historical discourse on nationalism, ideas and institutions had to be analysed through concepts

56 See Romila Thapar, The Past and Prejudice (Delhi, 1975), (Sardar Ballabh Bhai Patel Memorial Lecture kept in the Library, JNU, New Delhi).
appropriate to the specific historical context. It would be illegitimate to expect a person to express himself or herself through categories unavailable at that time. Such a kind of discourse may be at the 'elite' level and hence the 'history from above'.

The history of nationalism demands the study of nationalist ideology through the various phases of its development. The concept of nationalism in India cannot be extended back to the period before the late nineteenth century. The post-1880s period may be regarded as the less problematic period of unfolding of nationalism. This is the universal theme of the period. Each nationalist leader should be studied in the context of his/her complex thought structure with all its contradictions and ambivalences. The concept of 'nation-in-the making' provides one major principle of intelligibility in modern Indian history. It also offers the principle criteria of the relevance in drawing up research agenda. Regional studies are undertaken to explore the manifestation at a local level, and amongst different classes of the unfolding of the grand process.

It would be difficult for a historical and analytical approach to operate with a thorough going anti-teleological perspective. For this requires that we suspend any notion of where the national history is moving towards. We refuse to construct a vision of a world as the basis of existence and action. In fact, this vision surfaces even in accounts which criticise teleology. Ranjit Guha sees the peasant rebel of the nineteenth century India as "the infantile, blundering and alas invariably frustrated precursor of a democratic revolution".
in the sub-continent, who had set out to learn the very first lessons in power.57 One does not find any ambiguity about the telos towards which the history of peasant insurrection leads. The logical conclusion of a consistent anti-teleological perspective can only be an argument for quietism or inactivity which is difficult to reconcile with any notion of Marxist practices.

This does not mean to disregard the critique of whig teleology. It is essential to reject a notion of unilinear progress of the nation-state, and take account of cycles, reversals, or the dialectics between contestatory tendencies. It is imperative on our part to reject the history which has ethnocentric bias.

HINDU NATIONALISM

The idea of nationalism is another important dimension of Indian nationalism. It has been debated and discussed for long. The attempt is to redefine Indian nationalism in terms of Hindu nationalism. The philosophy of 'Hindu Rashtra' is claimed to be based upon a broad agreement that the majority should set the goals of Indian state. The Hindu Nationalists argue that the partition of India on the basis of religion and the creation of Muslim majority state of Pakistan was itself the testimony to the failure of the Nehruvian ideology of Indian Nationalism. They contend,

"Rightly or wrongly, the Congress, in fact, robbed the Hindu majority of its legal right to succeed the British Raj. With Hinduism as its religion, India could have been a secular state.... Intentionally or otherwise the move of Nehru reduced

the Hindu majority to an important political non-entity, a game
that has been played by the successive Congress regimes to
perpetuate its rule and that too on the strength of Hindu
votes.\textsuperscript{58}

The proponents of Hindu Nationalism reject the idea that Indian culture
is a composite or synthetic culture. For them, "India has only one national
culture... which is known as Hindu culture."\textsuperscript{59} They stand for one language,
one culture, one nation, i.e. Hindi, Hindu, Hindusthan.

All others, such as Buddhist, Jain or Sikh cultures are appropriated to
be Hindu sub-cultures, since all of them originated in India. They were born
out of Hinduism. They are part of Bharatiya culture.\textsuperscript{60} This sort of argument
does not explain, after all, why all these religions originate and with what
specific purpose?

While dealing with the problems of minorities, the Indian state should
be guided by its own cultural heritage. They claim that Hindu religion and
culture are very flexible and tolerant. According to L.K. Advani: "Religious
tradition in India has been remarkably free of taboos or intolerance.... In
ancient times, this country had charvaka ridiculing God and religion in a

\textsuperscript{58} Mentioned in Amar Zutshi, "Politics of Secularism", Statesman Weekly, 22
November 1986, p.12. Also see Gurudutt Bharat, Gandhi Aur Nehru Ki
Chhaya Main (India in the Shadow of Gandhi and Nehru) (New Delhi:

\textsuperscript{59} Harsh Narayan, Saminghara Sanskriti Aur Sarvadharm Samata Pravad (New

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., pp.2-37.
forthright manner.... Even such an abashed protagonist of atheism and materialism has been acknowledged as a *Rishi* (sage)!

As a matter of fact, institutionally, Hinduism may be, "rigid but interprets its conventions so broadly and allows the individual such a large choice within the orthodoxy that it is impossible to be a dissenter unless one is dedicated and doctrinaire non-conformist." At present, the way in which the Hindu revivalist organisations are propagating and politicising the religion, religious places of worship and the idea of militant Hindu nationalists that there is little room left for tolerance and the existence of multi-cultural identities.

Finally, a dialogical encounter created space for divergent voices, in tense challenging relation to each other. The encounter has to be dialogical, in the sense, Bakhtin defined it, rather than monological. It proposes a 'persuasive discourse' on nationalism which follows for 'responsive understanding' of, as well as vigorous struggle with other discourses, internal and external to the tradition of Marxism itself.

To conclude, with Partha Chatterjee, Indian nationalism has constituted itself into a state ideology. It has appropriated the life of the nation into the life of the state. It is rational and progressive, a particular

---


62 See Ashis Nandy, "Making and Unmaking of Political Cultures in India" in S.N. Eisenstadt, *Post-Colonial Societies* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), p.120.
manifestation of the universal march of reason. It has accepted the global realities of power, and found a place within that scheme of things. The question is - "has the history of nationalism exhausted itself?" Such a conclusion is unwarranted at this juncture. For hardly anywhere in the post-colonial world has it been possible for the nation-state to fully appropriate the life of the nation into its own. Therefore, merely managing the state power is not and cannot be sufficient to appropriate the entire human struggle for liberation and nationalism. Everywhere the intellectual moral leadership of the ruling classes is based on a spurious ideological unity. "The figures are clearly marked. Where then will the critique emerge at nationalism? How will nationalism supersede itself? A historical discourse can only struggle with its own terms. Its evolution will be determined by history itself".63

METHODOLOGY

Historical method has been followed by natural scientists like Charles Darwin as well as social scientists – Karl Marx and others. Prominent among them were Aristotle and Karl Marx. The Communist Manifesto, a joint work of Engels and Marx is the best example of historical method Aristotle emphasised that history being a great lesson and laboratory of human being, it would be better to follow the historical method while working out or analysing any problem concerning humanity. In fact, Karl Marx went in

greater details of the study of history and he found that throughout history there have been two classes fighting continuously except the primitive communist society.

Analytical method has been followed by many theorists especially classical theorist Aristotle who minutely observed and analysed things. Karl Marx, one of the founders of scientific socialism, has been able to analyse the evolution of human history only by analysing the issues and events.

The present study as well undertakes the examination of nationalism in history by adopting these two methods – historical and analytical. Though, the concept of nationalism is of recent origin, it would not be worthwhile if historical development of nationalism is not analysed properly. Nation-state, nationalism, modern liberal democracies, and the emergence of new leadership in many countries are to be identified as those were contemporary movements and developments in history. However, liberal democratic nationalism could not sustain itself, in some of the Eastern countries which have emerged as nation-states in recent times. Italy under Mussolini and Germany under Hitler, became Fascist and Nazi states respectively. It could be said that there were national monarchies whose leadership infused in them this dangerous ideology.

The beginning of 20th century and the outbreak of Russian Revolution in the year 1917 heralded a new era in the history of nationalism. The USSR under V.I. Lenin’s leadership emerged as one of the first socialist countries based on Marxism with one party system. Followed by this there spread
communist movement in the whole of East Europe, Cuba and North Korea. In the year 1949, the Communist Party came to power in China under Mao's leadership overthrowing the traditional government that had existed there. The nationalism that had developed in the Western liberal democratic tradition has undergone tremendous change in the socialist countries which have promoted dictatorship of the proletariat, one party system and suppression of liberal democratic movement. In these countries there began a movement to identify nationalism with Communist party which is closely identified with the state. Individuals and individualism, whose main proponents were John Locke and Adam Smith, completely vanished in these socialist countries. However, the present phase is characterised by neo-liberalism.

The present study focusses its attention on the development of Indian nationalism (in the post-Indira Gandhi Era). One of the important things, which is to be considered, while studying this problem is that India was a colony of Britain till 1947. After independence the country went for adopting in this traditional society a liberal democracy and various political and social institutions related to it. This was, in fact, a drastic change for the people of India, most of whom had never heard about 'modern' democracy and its characteristic features such as people's participation, elections, political parties, pressure groups, interest groups and trade unions. The new leadership that emerged at the centre under J.L. Nehru was an enlightened one. The leadership under Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel united all traditional
political entities into a nation-state of India under one political leadership at the centre with various others provincial leadership at provinces. Most of them were more or less clinging to the leader at the centre.

The method adopted for the present study assumes great significance when looking into the emergence of a new national leadership, Mahatma Gandhi united many provincial entities and various other people who were struggling and launching movements in order to get rid off the problems created by the caste system in the country. In fact, many of our country people were not aware of the importance of uniting ourselves into a nation-state under one leadership. In this context, one may wonder, how the spirit of nationalism emerged and spread among the people who were in the midst of so many issues and problems. Was it because of the national leadership beginning with Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhale or is it a recent phenomenon. Looking at history, especially from 1885, one can very well understand the gradual evolution of the spirit of nationalism that has played a predominant role in the shaping of recent history. At the same time, the 1857 revolt led by Rani Lakshmi of Jhansi, Mangal Pandey and Bahadur Shah Zafar cannot be forgotten in the development of Indian nationalism. One may witness, in a recent Indian history, especially after 1920s, the various dimensions of Indian nationalism which were infused into Indian peninsula by leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Bhagat Singh, Subhash Chandra Bose and many others. One may have to look into various movements that had
emerged in various regions in the country.\textsuperscript{64}

Hence, the important question that came across was how to study Indian nationalism especially in the post-Indira Gandhi Era. Historical and analytical methods have been adopted to explore explicitly the causes that went into the making of the Indian nation which was the outcome of Indian nationalism. Moreover, the names of Shri Aurbindo, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Rabindra Nath Tagore are also to be taken into consideration while examining the development of Indian nationalism. Simultaneously, there also developed a movement particularly in Maharashtra under V.D. Savarkar to spread the message of Hindu ideology and unite (whole) people of the country under Hindu lines.

The study attempts to examine these various forces and movements in various parts of the country that more or less enabled the enlightened national leadership to create a 'national empire' based on Indian nationalism. Examination of the developments of nationalism in post-Indira Gandhi era would be futile without studying various dimensions – social movements, various forces; political and cultural that have been operating in the Indian sub-continent. It may be said that the methods adopted for the present study have enabled the researcher to investigate in detail the nationalist spirit in the

\textsuperscript{64} Here, it may be reminded that Sheikh Abdullah was confined to the overthrowing of the Dogra Dynasty and established a popular movement in Jammu and Kashmir. The movement launched by B.R. Ambedkar was interested in uplifting the ex-untouchables from oppression let loose by oppressor Hindus in the state of Maharashtra. Ayyankaline, the Harijan leader of Kerala was against India's independence and the spirit of nationalism till the arrival of Mahatma Gandhi in Trivendrum in the year 1924.
post-Indira Gandhi Era. These two methods have enabled us only to have a
documentary analysis. Information, institutions and informal interviews with
leaders of various political parties particularly that of the BJP have helped the
researcher to consolidate his position and prove the objectives framed for the
present study.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study has outlined the following objectives taking into
consideration various changes that have been taking place recently in India's
federal polity. These objectives are as follows.

1) Understanding concept of nationalism with special reference to India;

2) Investigating the organisational context of nationalism during freedom
   struggle;

3) To see changes that were introduced by the Indian National Congress,
   both in pre-independence and post-independence India with a particular
   reference to post-independence era;

4) To examine the Constitution of secular nationalism and its implications in
   India.

5) Specific features mentioned in the Constitution;

6) To comprehend the changing content of Indian nationalism;

7) Examining various faces of Indian nationalism;

8) The role of Congress in this particular sphere of secular nationalism;
9) Its failure, if any;

10) Along with the vacuum created by certain political parties in this process;

11) Tensions within the B.J.P. in the sphere of nationalism;

12) Finally, a critical examination of the policies of Swadeshi and economic liberalisation.

**CONCEPTS USED IN THE STUDY**

Almost all theorists have used concepts. Theorists want to know why people and groups behave in a certain way and have particular attributes. They also want to know how history has undergone evolution and transformation within specified socio-economic and political conditions. The words that we choose to describe this behaviour and attributes are called concepts. The concepts are mental constructs. They provide interpretative understanding and contextual information. These concepts are useful to us because they help in observing and explaining various aspects. Max Weber and Karl Marx in their writings use a number of concepts which enable the reader to understand the things in a better perspective. Max Weber used concepts like class, status and party. Mosca, in his *Ruling Class*, used concepts like political power and religion. Karl Marx used such concepts as class struggle, revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the present study, we have used a number of concepts which are explained below one by one.
**Nationalism**: Nationalism is a doctrine based upon a set of ideas. Its traits, variables and constitutive elements are liable to transformation. It is the consequence as well as expression of a conscious participation in the ongoing political processes and cultural configurations of society with a sense community and 'we feeling'.

**Ethnicity**: The term ethnicity has been derived from the word 'Ethnie'. 'Ethnie' stands for the people who share a common history, tradition, language and lifestyle, but are unattached to a homeland. The term ethnicity is an American coinage in contrast to the notion 'ethnie', which is a French word, and the U.S. is a country of immigrants and a poly-ethnic society.

**Secular Nationalism**: The term secular has been derived from a Latin word 'Saeculum', which according to writer like, C. Williams means 'of this age', 'related to this world'. Therefore, secular nationalism is temporal, neither sacred nor monastic. As a matter of fact, it is a system of social ethics based upon a doctrine that ethical standards and conduct should be determined exclusively with reference to the present and well-being of the people without any reference to religion or faith of particular individual. The genesis of secularism is traced back to the West in the conflict between the Church and the State in Middle Ages. This conflict was intensified after Martin Luther's

---

revolt against the Roman Catholicism in 1529. Consequently, after the emergence of protestantism, secular nation-state as a modern political system, as a socio-economic ideology and a philosophy of life became popular in the West. Finally, the philosophical goal has been a complete separation of the church from the state.

**Hindu Nationalism:** The philosophy of 'Hindu Rashtra' is based upon the fact that Hindu majority should set the goals of Indian state. The protagonists of Hindu nationalism reject the idea that Indian culture is a composite or synthetic culture. For them, 'India has only one national culture... which is known as Hindu culture.' They believe in one culture, one language and one nation – 'Hindu, Hindi and Hindusthan'.

**Constitutionalism:** Constitutionalism is a modern concept that desires a political order governed by laws and regulations. It stands for the supremacy of the laws and not of the individuals. It also constitutes the doctrines of nationalism, democracy and limited government. Constitutionalism, in brief, stands for the existence of a constitution in a State because it is the instrument of the government or fundamental law of the land. A close examination of history in any part of the world shows that constitutionalism is the product of nationalism which comes about; once the people in a given society are united under a particular ruler based on some ideologies.


Rise of a constitutional state is essentially a historical process whose main aspects can be found in the history of political institutions. The attributes of nationalism have a predominant role to play in the modern state because modern constitutional state is necessarily a nationalist organisation. The emergence of the Republic of Bangladesh may be cited as a recent important instance of this fact. The authorities of the former Soviet Union could bring about political unity by giving fullest recognition to the existence of distinct nationalist entities. If nationalism is one of the essential attributes of constitutionalism, democracy is another. In fact, this is the age of nationalism, and democracy in search of equality. Therefore, the concept of constitutionalism must include the ideals of all of the three. Constitutionalism rests upon a balance of classes in society.

**Tension:** Tension is defined in Webster's dictionary as 'inner-unrest'\(^70\) or imbalances, a feeling of psychological stress, often manifested by increased emotion. The present study witnesses a number of inner-unrests caused by various factors in the historical development of nationalism.

**Swadeshi:** 'Swadeshi' is a conceptual category used in the context of freedom struggle during 1903-1908 as a powerful tool against the colonial rule. It stands for indigenous, innovative and regenerative mode of production. In fact, its essence is the assertion of Indian economic sovereignty. Its advocacy lies in self-sufficiency and confidence building.

---

measures as a philosophy of life.

**Liberalisation**: As a conceptual framework it is associated with the free trade and flow of capital. It followed the end of Bretton Woods system of fixed parities among the world's major currencies. The process of openness was accelerated in the 1980s and 1990s, encouraging the creation of a global, $1,250 billion dollar a day foreign exchange market; and it is stimulating the invention of many financial instruments. In fact, liberalisation has been rapidly spreading to emerging economies and India is not an exception.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

Every theorist makes his own conceptual framework which is an important aspect of research leading to theory building. G. Mosca in his 'Ruling Class' says that rulers have become powerful by making use of net. Throughout history, there are some people who have got power through the medium of wealth. To Karl Marx, dialectism coupled with the changing mode of production (MOP), can change the course of history.

In the present study, we are conceptualising that India is a multi-cultural, multi-racial, and multi-religious nation-state which came into existence against colonial history. Nation-state as a secular entity has certain goals like (i) democracy, (ii) development, (iii) secularism and (iv) federalism. Over the years, the model of development has failed to a large extent

---

particularly on these four major accounts. Therefore, the nation-state of India is facing the tremendous crisis of legitimacy.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF DATA**

The data collected for the study mainly consists of primary sources and informal interviews. Collection of secondary sources of data enriched the already collected data for the study. In fact, the title of the research topic itself raises a number of theoretical questions mainly because of the fact that defining the concept of nationalism has been a difficult matter altogether. There were a lot of difficulties in the collection of data. The data are based on both the primary as well as the secondary sources. Documents, bulletins, interviews and political commentaries have been consulted. The original texts of the proponents of 'Hindu Rashtra' have been quoted frequently. Moreover, different authors of distinct ideological persuasions and political analysts have been referred to substantiate the argument.

**PERIOD OF STUDY**

The present study covers the post-Indira Gandhi Era (1984-2000) which is a crucial period in the history of modern secular democratic polity of India. This period was marked by lack of legitimacy, crisis of governance, lack of one-party absolute majority to govern the country, the demand for social justice, rath yatra, etc. The decades of 1980s and 1990s witnessed several significant developments. The Indian nationalism suffered two major shattering blows, first being the anti-Sikh riots of 1984, and second is the demolition of Babri Mosque at Ayodhya in 1992. Therefore, an attempt has
been made to analyse and explain these developments which have their impact on Indian secular nationalism, which took several years to complete the research.

SCOPE AND RELEVANCE OF STUDY

Nationalism is the basic uniting force of modern polity. The people especially the policy-makers have to be aware of the importance of nationalistic spirit in a country like India. One may find the existence of the whole world in it. If the political parties including the ruling party create a national spirit in order to write a particular segment of society avoiding many other communities can create negative tendencies in the process of nation-building. This is what exactly happened in 1984 anti-Sikh riots, and 1992 the demolition of controversial structure at Ayodhya. It is, hence, essential that political parties and others should imbibe in their speeches and policies the understanding of pluralistic society of India. Unity of a country is the unity of the mind of the people inhabiting in a particular territory, that alone can lead to the unity of a country and in this context, the study of this topic is quite relevant.

THE PRESENT STUDY: ITS UNIQUE FEATURES

The present study is the part of nation-building process of modern India with special emphasis on post-Indira Gandhi era. During this period, some of the events that took place could be characterised as anti-national developments, taking into consideration a modern secular, a multi-racial,
multi-religious society as conceived by the Indian Constitution and founding fathers of modern India.

The study touches the political communication process generated by the political parties, political socialisation, multi-cultural, multi-racial, and finally multi-religious nation-state of India. The whole research focuses its attention on achieving national unity by following the relevant policy and perspective. The study has a great motivation of national interest and focuses on India's federal polity. The study is planned methodically, and the attention is focused on each and every important issue that took place during this period. It is not a descriptive study but a study which investigates many issues during this period. The present study is fashioned in a peculiar way with the help of available data.

Conclusion

This chapter, in a way, has two parts: the first part dealing with various schools of thought on nationalism and the second part dealing with the methodology adopted for the present study. As the study does not have a questionnaire method involving many statistical techniques, attempt has been made to fashion the method in order to suit rather theoretical area of investigation. Every effort has been made to give a concrete shape to the evaluation of hypothesis, concepts, and conceptual framework introduced in this thesis. This chapter clearly depicts not only views of various schools of thought but also the suitability of the methodology adopted for this particular topic.