CHAPTER I

THE NATION AND ITS INTEGRATION

INTRODUCTION

National Integration means National unity or integrity or identity. When all the nations aim at their unity and integrity, it is nothing but the entire World's security.

Let us analyse critically in this first part of the chapter, the concept of 'nation' with the technique of conceptual analysis for the deeper understanding, in order to study the implications of 'Nation' in relation to the ancient political thought of India and Greece and also with reference to contemporary political thought of Aurobindo. The 'philosophical analysis' of the major problem 'one in many' or 'many in one' stands as the Core Doctrine to realise the 'unity' and 'integrity' of India and also of the whole world.

PART I

1. THE CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

1.1 The Concept of Nation

The ideal concept of 'nation' stands for a group of persons who, because of living together in the same territory over a long period, have developed a strong
sense of community based on common historical experience and tradition and common cultural traits including, usually, a common language; and who believe that their cultural identity and interests are, or need to be, protected and preserved by a sovereign state of their own in which they have a predominant position. When there exists among the group also a common religion and belief in common racial descent, this sense of unity and solidarity is substantially strengthened. Members give to the group their first or strongest loyalty. Of the various criteria or bases, a common historical experience and a common language are generally considered to be important.¹

1.2 The Meaning of a Nation

According to Carl Friedrich "the building of the state comes first, and it is within the political framework of this state that the Nation comes into being or at any rate of fruition".² In addition to this, Benjamin Disraeli defined a nation as 'a work of art and a work of time' gradually created by 'a variety of influences - the influence of original organisation, of climate, soil, religion, laws, customs, manners, extra-ordinary accidents and incidents in their history and the individual character of their illustrious citizens'.³ The most complete and rational definition of Stalin, the revolutionary leader of Russia, as quoted by Dr. Rajendra Prasad in his book 'India Divided' is as follows:

A Nation is a historically evolved stable community of language, territory, economic life and Psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture ... . It must be emphasised that none of the above characteristics is by itself sufficient to define a nation. On the other hand, it is sufficient for a single one of these characteristics to be absent and the nation ceases to be a nation. (4)
That is why in 1888, Sir John Strachey, one of the ablest of the British administrators of India, in the nineteenth century, with an excellent knowledge of the country's political and social history has very correctly observed:

This is the first and most essential thing to learn about India - that there is not, and never was an India, or even in any part of India, possessing, according to European ideas, any sort of unity, physical, political, social or religious ... . That men of the Punjab, Bengal, the North-Western Provinces, and Madras, should ever feel they belong to one great nation, is impossible. (5)

1.3 Nation, Nationality and National State

When the word 'nation' comes to be used in several different ways, the word 'nationality' was put into use as being less ambiguous. According to Hayes, the word 'nationality' was coined in the early part of the nineteenth century and "thenceforth, while 'nation' continued, chiefly to denote the citizens of a sovereign political state, 'nationality' was more exactly used in preference to a group of persons speaking the same language and observing the same customs". Hayes criticises jurists for using the word "nationality" to mean 'citizenship' and this is how, Hayes says, they are corrupting the word 'nationality' just as they had corrupted the old word 'nation'. He says, "it can be most properly used to designate a group of people who speak either the same language or closely related dialects, who cherish common historical traditions and who constitute or thing they constitute a distinct cultural society. In this sense, a nationality may exist without political unity, that is, without an organised sovereign state of its own, and, vice versa, a political state may embrace several nationalities, though the tendency has been pronounced in modern times for every self-conscious
nationality to aspire to political unity and independence. A nationality, by acquiring political unity and sovereign independence, becomes a 'nation', establishes a 'national state'. A national state is always based on nationality, but a nationality may exist without a national state. A state (National) is essentially political, a nationality is primarily cultural and only incidentally political.\(^7\) Therefore, 'nation' and 'national state' are nothing but a nationality with political unity and sovereign independence. It is pertinent to mention here that Indonesia, the East Indian Island, is the good model for our Indian National setup.

### 1.4 Nationalism, Nationality and National Group

As indicated above, when a cultural ethnic nationality seeks political expression in the form of a separate sovereign state for itself, it may be said to assert its "nationalism". Nationalism may, thus, be described as the sentiment and consciousness or a community-experience which is nurtured by a "nationality" group that aspires for, or already possesses, a separate, sovereign state in which it has a dominant position. It is a feeling of 'exclusiveness' in the sense of consciousness of being different from others. The members of a nation have a number of loyalties besides that to their "national group", but the important point here is that their loyalty to the nation must be stronger than any other loyalty that they may be having. It is also the 'terminal loyalty', that is, there is no loyalty higher than it or going beyond in except perhaps in a subordinate manner. There exists among men a widening circumstance of sympathy and a hierarchy of communities, but for the member of a 'national group' there should be no community wider than the 'nation'. The intensity of this feeling may, however,
differ in between members of one nation and those of another and it may also vary in the same group from time to time.

1.5 Cultural Nations and State Nations

It may be mentioned here that a ‘nationality’ may sometimes desire only a greater degree in political autonomy within a state that includes several nationalities, although in the modern times it more often desires a sovereign state for itself. The German historian, Friedrich Meinke distinguishes between

What he called "cultural nations" and "state nations". By the former, he meant nations formed by cultural factors like common speech, literature, and religion by the latter, he meant nations formed by the working of common political institutions. (8)

The generally accepted distinction between the cultural and political nationalism is also sometimes described as "territorial nationalism", which does not mean that the two have not interacted. But all those who desire better international relations and a better political organisations of the world would, according to Zimmern must believe to "set their hope, not in the 'Nation State'... but in 'States' which find room for all sorts and conditions of communities and nations".9

1.6 The Influence of Rousseau’s Doctrine

It is not always remembered that the doctrine advocating a separate independent state for each nationality is only a recent one. Actually, for ages before the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there were states that contained
several nationalities in the sense of distinct linguistic and cultural groups and all of these groups gave their loyalty to the same state without aspiring for separate sovereign states for themselves. It was after the spreading of Rousseau’s doctrine of the General will and "popular sovereignty" that the ‘right of the individual’ to choose one’s government was extended to provide nationality groups the collective right of choosing which state and Government they wanted to live under, "Nation-States had formerly been built up, in the course of centuries, from above, by the influence of government; henceforth they were to be made much more rapidly from below by the will, of the people".10

1.7 The Principle of National Self-determination

More recently, Rupert Emerson has expressed doubts about the soundness of the principle of ‘national self-determination’, with what he calls “a little sleight of band”, the eighteenth century proposition that governments must rest upon the consent of the governed, was transmuted, with the help of the assumption that since man is "a rational animal", he will give consent to a government representing his own nation, into "the natural right" of nations to determine their own Statehood". Emerson goes on to observe : "in its most extreme version the ‘right of self-determination’ could mean the right of any group of disaffected people to break away at their pleasure from the state to which they presently belong and establish a new state closer to their heart’s desire". In Emerson’s view "whether and how the right can be incorporated in any reasonably ordered and predictable schemes of things, within an acceptable framework of law"11 is a problem. Such views point out that the right of ‘national self-determination’ cannot be conceded the status of an absolute right.
1.8 India as a Nation - An Analysis

Since the primary word ‘nation’ itself is a complex concept, its derivative concepts like ‘nationalism’, ‘nationhood’ and ‘nationality’, have acquired a variety of denotations, connotations and definitions. A further analysis shows that some scholars do not accept the possession of a common language to be an important factor. They point out the instance of people speaking the same language who are citizens of different states, as also of people living in the same state and speaking the same language but who cannot be considered as belonging to the same national group. Some scholars, acknowledge the “identity of political antecedents” and common historic memories even more important than community of language, race, and religion. It is also true that none of these several criteria is absolutely necessary for the formation of a “nation” in as much as it is always possible to point out instance of the formation of nations even when someone was not present. There is also a group of scholars who think that, in the last analysis, these ‘objective criteria’ are not so important as the ‘subjective criteria’ of a ‘common consciousness’ of a separate identity and that of a ‘common will’ of the group to protect its identity by establishing a separate sovereign state of its own. The scholars of this group, therefore, think that a group becomes a nation once it starts believing it is one. Ernest Renan, the famous French historian of nationalism, held the view that it is ‘the will of the individual which is the basis of a nation and of nationalism’. Another scholar has put it in this manner: "Nationality is an affair of the mind or spirit, not ... of physical relationship. The only way to decide whether an individual belongs to one nation rather than another is to ask him". The subjective factor
is, no doubt, quite important but this is an extreme view of the importance of the role played by subjective factors alone in the creation of a nation. From this analysis, one can certainly infer that neither the subjective factors nor the objective factors alone can determine the criteria of a nation. Therefore, both the subjective and objective criteria are the must in determining any country as a nation, that too more particularly the country like India.

The above conceptual analysis clearly gives us a picture of the interpretations with regard to the words 'nation', 'national state', 'nationalism', 'nationhood', 'national group' and 'national self-determination'. Whatever may be the connotation and denotation of these terms in the world outlook, India's social, cultural and political specialties, can be established very well by the authentic contributions, from these ancient and contemporary Indian and Greek political ideologies of Kautilya (Arthaśāstra), Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and Aurobindo, in order to explicate the growth of National development, during the pre-independence era, in the following second part of this chapter.