

CHAPTER - II

'Nationalism' and 'Internationalism': a Conceptual framework

Nationalism : A Conceptual Framework

INTRODUCTION:

The 'ideal' of nationalism emerged in the last quarter of the 18th century Europe and turned to be a 'movement' which covered the remaining parts of Europe. Nationalism could not remain confined only to Europe rather, it turned to be a force behind the resurgence of the movement of nationalism in Afro-Asian countries. The ideal and the movement of nationalism embraced the whole of the world by the middle of the twentieth century.

It has certain broad general characteristics, and it comes as a high level of social, political, cultural and not the least, economic integration. Historical background of the emergence, the growth of the concept in Europe and its comparison with the non-western model, with the help of philosophic, sociological and political approaches, to a greater extent, help the understanding of nationalism both as an 'ideal' and 'movement'.

The growth of the ideal during different phases has undergone changes, reflecting different connotations, namely,

'Enlighteners', and 'Romantics', 'Radicals' and 'Traditionalists', 'Populists' and 'Anti-Colonialists'. However, even then, it is revealed that the purpose this ideal served, remains more or less the same. As an ideal, it came as ideological commitment for 'independence', 'Unity' and 'welfare' of the people.

The concept reveals structural variations and its history shows several transformations, the possession of similar elements and exercise of similar potentialities and skills required similar attributes. ⁽¹⁾ One sort of uniformity is visible in its formation as well as in its growth making it a universal phenomenon.

The age of nationalism represents the first period of history with some common characteristics. Its sojourn started from France through the Revolution in 1789 and covered the world by mid-twentieth century. One of the chief characteristics of nationalism is its universality as it represents, to a greater extent, the first phase of universal history. We are 'identified first and foremost by our nation and in moments of crisis we swell into fervent devotion and passionate obedience to the call of duty.' ⁽²⁾

Like all historical movements, nationalism has been supported by political, intellectual and economic development of the period, and is closely related to the objective conditions of the period. This has been, and still is, the story of the nationalist movement. It is equally regulated by the subjective and objective factors. The two significant elements, disintegration of older form of social and communal life and the emergence of

analysis. A. D. Smith, a sociologist, prescribes 'poly-centric' and 'ethno-centric' formula of classification, regarded as 'one of the most useful by sights of Smith's distinction'.⁽⁷⁾ Psychologists emphasizing 'group mind' have projected two major forms : 'conscious nationalism'; 'sub-conscious - nationalism' or 'un-conscious - nationalism'. Economists took colonial or imperial classifications. L. L. Snyder has classified it on zonal basis linking it to different political ideologies : Europe - fissiparous nationalism; Africa - black nationalism; Latin America - populist nationalism ; the U.S.A. - melting-pot nationalism; the U.S.S.R. - messianic nationalism. However, without justifying the validity of his own classification, L. L. Snyder admits that 'geographical configurations of new nationalism are presented merely as a convenient framework for study.'⁽⁸⁾

Nationalism and nations form the recognised foundation of the present-day international society and organisations. However, the regional military alliances have come over the zonal economic organisations. Sub-nationalism, nationalism, regionalism and internationalism have emerged throughout the world as contemporary forces to be reckoned with. The growth of the 'world economy' is the result of interdependence of nations.

However, nationalism comes as an important force both inside and outside the state. The 'idea of nationalism, remains as cement that holds together the state : even though it is increasingly clear that the cement is mainly sand'.⁽⁹⁾ These

expressions reveal one side of the picture. The politico-economic, socio-cultural conditions and social consciousness of the period gave birth to the nation, and thereby the idea of nationalism.

The idea of nationalism has been the concern of almost all the branches of social science. The rise of the modern state, the emergence of the national communities, and of nationalist ideas, ideologies and sentiments along-with the emergence of new strata such as bureaucrats, bourgeoisie, and intelligentsia did not allow any branch of social science to afford to ignore this development. Since it has been the concern of philosophers, historians, sociologists, political scientists political leaders and many others, it would be desirable to apply an inter-disciplinary account to the study of the concept of nationalism.

A. Philosophical Analysis:

In philosophical analysis of nationalism, emphasis is given on cultural aspects, such as, language, customs, traditions, education and morality. Psychological factors, such as, race, history, national consciousness, national character, also get prominence in the reckoning. All these traits form the basis of philosophical interpretation of nationalism.

The analysis of nationalism, on the basis of religion, morality, sentimentality and consciousness, supports the belief that nation is the natural unit of the society which is 'inherent' and

makes it an organic concept. Among the many supporters of this view the names of Rousseau, Herder Hegel and Fichte are important. In this view, the basis is man who identifies himself through his relation to his ancestors in terms of religious, psychological and moral background. It furthers the notion that each nation is different from the other and has its independent personality expressed through its character, virtue, destiny and mission. These features have been explained by Mazzini, Rousseau, Burke, Jefferson and Herder. 'Nationalism' in the broadest sense referred to the attitude which ascribes to national individuality a high place in the heirarchy of values.⁽¹⁰⁾ A nation has consciousness, a living personality - means the nation goes through process of self-realisation and self-discovery. A national awakening involves education and propaganda, restores sub merged identity and fragmented solidarity. This is reflected in hatred and friendship with other countries based on the belief of the superiority of race and blood. National sentiment is expressed through ideologies and programmes for the devotion of the people to their nation and advocacy of its interests and aspirations. 'National sentiment transmits consciousness, attitudes, aspiration, loyalties in one form or the other'.⁽¹¹⁾ Apart from being regarded as 'sentiment' - 'consciousness', nationalism comes essentially as 'spiritual' and moral idea. This further inculcates among the people of feeling which is also known as 'patriotism' based on the firm conviction that the best country in the world is one in which 'you have happened to be born.'⁽¹²⁾

Psychological overtones have been the partners of old and new nationalism. 'Psychological motivations, always at work in the older nationalism, have been carried into modern nationalism in an intensified form. (13) Even to-day, symbols conducive to the strengthening of the hold of unity such as the 'battle-field', places of birth of national heroes, places of pilgrimage, the rivers and mountains, the territorial bond play important role in the creation of national sentiments. 'No single theme occurs constantly in national anthems, songs, legends, and symbolism than the reference to particular virtues, beauty and excellence of the lands and waters with which each nation has been happily endowed'. (14)

The emotional attachment is also reflected through language. Though the 'Bible' preached in one language and regarded other languages 'man-made', the growth of vernacular everywhere became responsible for the formation of modern nations. Luther's translation of the Bible into German, Webster's attempt in the U.S.A. to make English American, and partition of Pakistan into 'Bangladesh' are the glaring examples. 'There are no better means for polishing and giving perfection to a language, than for youth to be trained in the grammar of their own tongue. (15)

that

So, the view / nationality receives its impress, its character, its individuality from cultural and historical forces, became the concern of many eminent scholars. One such scholar is renowned C. J. Hayes, who holds: 'I would define nationality

as a cultural group of people who speak a common language or closely related dialects and who possess a community of historical traditions' ⁽¹⁶⁾ form the basis of cultural nationalism. To him, 'nationalism is the fusion of patriotism with a consciousness of nationality' ⁽¹⁷⁾. This definition attaches a secondary role to political, economic and geographical factors. Citing the example of Jewish or Israeli nationality without political nationality, he held that cultural nationalism might exist without political nationality. According to Kohn, ⁽¹⁸⁾ three essential traits of nationalism originated with the view, 'The idea of chosen people', 'the consciousness of national history' and 'national messianism led to the origin of nationalism in case of Israel, do not stand the test of logical analysis, because nationalism emerged at a particular stage of human development after the collapse of feudalism. Smith later on removed this discrepancy by distinguishing 'Ethnocentric' nationalism from 'poly-centric' nationalism. ⁽¹⁹⁾ Until 'people are conscious of nationality and make it the prime object of their patriotism they do not produce cultural nationalism' ⁽²⁰⁾. Mazzini, Burke, Kant and Hegel endorsed this view. However, Herder proclaimed the idea of 'folkloristic and philological background responsible for the division of the world on the basis of language, ⁽²¹⁾ making the concept potentially revolutionary.

Fichte's notion of the 'volk' and his concept of 'national self-realisation' through political struggle and the contention that the 'individual will' must be absorbed in the

organic state, along with Hegel's views of organic state and glorification of war, made Bismark, and later on, Hitler, the product of this brand of nationalism.

Within^a/nation, the fascist doctrine holds that the elite is superior to the rest, and may impose its will upon them by force. Similarly, among nations elite-nation is superior to others and is entitled to rule them. (22) Thus it turned to be a very dangerous doctrine having no regard for other nations and individuals within the state. By society, they meant 'nation' and a nation, they explain, is based on persistent biological similarities in terms of language, customs and religion; differentiate the whole group from other national groups, and define the direction and limit of its development. (23)

There is enough value in the concept of 'cultural nationalism' since both cultural and psychological factors have been assigned greater proportion explaining one important aspect of nationalism. However, when we analyse 'national culture' it is as elusive as 'national character'. Furthermore, 'National character' and 'national consciousness' are explained in terms of 'power', 'prestige' and 'domination'. (24)

B. Sociological Interpretation of Nationalism:

To claim that cultural and psychological factors played an important role in the formation of nations and in advancing the ideas of nationalism, is justified, what is not is

the denial of increasing role of social, economic and political factors in the formation of nationalism.

Scholarly interest in the study of nationalism has recently become the major concern of the historians, and the sociologists. It is only in the 1960's that mainstream sociologists have discovered the significance of the study as a subject in itself, and as a testing-ground for current sociological theory. (25) Earlier social scientists were more concerned in 'ethical', 'philosophical' and 'historical' approaches and spent more time on the thinkers like J. S. Mill, Renan, Acton and their contribution. Only after the First World War, more neutral and detached attitude came with the historians like Hayes, Kohn, elder Seton-Watson, Alfred Cobban, Louis Snyder who depended on sociological factors in their assessment. (26) But it was Emerson, Pye, and Halpern who included the study of Third World nations making the study exclusive. The burgeoning of the interdisciplinary in nationalism indicates the key position of the field and phenomenon. (27)

According to Smith, 'the nation is a large, vertically integrated, and territorially mobile group featuring common citizenship, rights and collective sentiments together with one (or more) characteristics which differentiate its members from that of similar groups with whom they stand in relation of alliances or conflict.' (28) In this definition emphasis, has been laid over ethnic, political and psychological factors which, in general, form the features of nationalism.

As the concept of nation has attracted everyone in a different way, also sometimes in a way which is not different, the literature on the subject helps to take into account both 'ethnocentric' and 'poly-centric' factors in order to have the proper assessment of the concept.

The moral of the tale is that nation is only one variant in a social pattern, and has certain distinctive elements and the combination of those elements defy orderly analysis. However, the elements which insistently recur, are territory, language, a common historical tradition, inter-connection between the state and the nation. (29) The sociologists insist that the difference between the state and nation be maintained. Smith asserts "I argue here for an 'ethnicist' definition of nation ... the mainpoint must be retained -- the conceptual distinction between the 'state' and 'nation'". (30)

A new approach, out of 'man's propensity to organise into groups' and readiness to work together for achievement of common purposes, has been regarded as the essential behavioural pattern of modern national society. The nation survives on a variety of factors and among them it is the development which unites them. (31) Human resources are mobilised for collective accomplishment and the nation stimulates productivity and generates enthusiasm. It advances the integration as territorial integration, value-integration, elite - mass integration, so that justice, equity and economic development are achieved.

So, the force of nationalism brings together culturally and socially discreet groups into a single territorial unit to accomplish certain objectives of unity, integrity and development. Nationalism is also a 'movement', with distinct concerns for identity, purity, regeneration, self-emanicipation and vision of future. To a sociologist, nationalism has been, and still is, a movement. Earlier, the movement was launched by enlighteners, romantics, radicalists, liberals and even now it is launched for one or the other objectives in the shape of 'populism', 'nativism' and the ideologies of world salvation, like socialism or communism, but as movement the most important and enduring of the more limited modern ideology is nationalism. (32) Nationalism is regarded as movement of various classes and groups to remove political, social and economic obstacles to accomplish economic political and social development. The analysis of nationalism is the contribution of the sociologists. 'By firmly embracing the nationalist movement as the unit of analysis', writes Smith, 'we have taken the first step in this direction.' (33)

The sociologists, taking into account the nation as a 'social group' and 'movement' as the expression of nationalism have also attempted two competing theories, one, which views nationalism as a process of successive integration of social groups and; the other, which views nationalism as a process of conflicting relations among social groups. As systematic comparative analysis of the two shows that their synthesis can generate a more powerful theory. (34)

The integration theory offers the most plausible

explanation of the process by which groups are constituted. Here again, two different theories operate within the theory of integration namely theory of social communication; and the erosion of primordial loyalties. Both of these theories are complimentary to each other. Integration is the process of bringing together culturally and socially discreet groups into a single territorial unit with the aim of establishing national identity within the unit.

Deutsch explains social communication as the prerequisite for group integration. The degree to which communication is hindered depends upon the balance between the rate of 'assimilation' and the rate of 'mobilisation' which is channelled through technological innovation, the expansion of mass-media, the shift to non-agricultural occupation, urbanisation, industrialisation, transportation, language and trade. The assimilation can be measured by the proportion of individuals in an area with languages and historical traditions different from those of the majority.

Depending upon the rate of mobilisation or assimilation factors, modernisation either facilitates or retards the level of communication through which a people becomes a nationality transforming into a nation-state. Elsenstadt, Smelser and Silvert belong to this group supporting erosion of primordial loyalty theory of nationalism. To other, nationalism is being conditioned by the process of modernisation and the related process of structural differentiation. Modernisation brings about structural

differentiation dislodging the people from performing their traditional roles. Consequently, nationalism grows for the purpose of linking traditional modes of social organisation with the nationality assigning new roles. Thus the erosion of primordial loyalty adds to the process of integration.

Conflict Theory.

In contrast to 'integration' background, the 'conflict' in the context of nationalism explains that 'competition' among groups gives rise to the demand for the control of the distributive systems. It is applicable in the pluralist model of society which take groups to be mutually exclusive. Inequality is inherent in all the systems which is increased by the level of modernisation leading to high level conflict among different groups. This leads to group identification intensifying and developing group integration. The effort starts for the control of distributive system and when this process takes place at social level, nationalism is generated.

Three theories of nationalism may be identified under this category, such as economic theory, social class theory and ethnic theory. Economic theory explains that there is inherent class slant to the economic interest in pursuing nationalism. The movement against foreign capital at the hand of national monopolies always wants to control resources and jobs. The social class which controls the distributive system rules and country resulting into growth of inequality and conflict. Bretter and Johnson, apart from

many others, support this theory.

Social Class Conflict Theory:

Many propounders of the theory, attempt to reconcile Marxist analysis with the concept of nationalism. To them, nationalism results from a set of demands advanced by these social classes which have unequal access to the resources. The origins of the conflict may be either of internal or external character but the conflict remains as constant. The emergence of an urban bourgeoisie and intellectual class, the product of the modernisation, develop such interests which are opposed to the elite controlling the distributive system. On the other front, the conflict is also visible between local intelligentsia and native aristocracy. Yet all these conflicts, maintained in different contexts, generate the demand for the control of the distributive system.

Ethnic Conflict Theory of Nationalism:

Modernisation erodes 'primordial loyalties' permitting identification to be based upon larger regions of linguistic and ethno-cultural similarities. On the otherhand, it also creates cleavage of interests between or among ethnic groups in acquiring access to political and economic resources. If their expectation is frustrated they turn antagonistic. The more extensive the demand, the ^{greater the} / chances of integration increase for achieving an autonomous political identity.

However, it can not be assumed that sociologists have been able to provide with a complete theory of nationalism. Even then, one cannot ignore their contribution to the inclusion of 'group' and 'movement' as units of analysis. Furthermore, their introduction of 'integration theory' 'conflict theory' and in much more improved form the theory of 'synthesis' has surely enhanced and enriched the study on nationalism. It has further helped us in depending less on philosophical and psychological overtones by shifting the emphasis over to sociological factors. The studies made on third world nations, by them, have also enhanced the scope of better understanding of the concept. In the area of suggesting typology of nationalism Smith's contribution is praiseworthy. His definition of nationalism as an ideological movement, for the attainment and maintenance of self-government and independence on behalf of a group, some of whose members conceive it to constitute an actual or potential nation like others. (35) deserves mention. Herein Smith 'includes both subjective and objective bias which theorists of nationalism have supported one rejecting the other. (36)

However, sociological and psychological approaches have been criticised by Kohn who holds 'nationalism as a group consciousness is therefore a psychological and sociological fact, (37) but any psychological and sociological explanation is insufficient. To him nationalities are the product of the historical development of the society and 'it is by only recent history that man has begun to regard nationality as the centre of his political and cultural activity and life.' (38)

C. Historical Analysis of Nationalism:

The nation-state, as we know it today, is essentially the product of ^{the} modern era, Its earliest development may be traced in Europe from 16th - 17th century onwards. Subsequently, it has been spreading over to five continents of the world especially from the late 18th century - both gradually and quickly. (39) Before that there was no nation in the modern sense of the term because nationalism was not something original or natural to man like family or physique, however, today it is the strongest loyalty of human being throughout the world. (40) Nation is a historical phenomenon which has been always determined by the political ideas and social structure. Here, 'only a study of the historical growth and a comparative analysis, of its different forms can make us aware of its perils and promises. (40) Historical studies also reveal that throughout most of the recorded history whenever civilization advanced from 5000 BC to 1700 AD. there was tribal nationalism. (42) Tribalism had a kind of nationalism as each tribe had distinct language/dialect, peculiar pattern of social organisation, culture and religious customs and traditions. The roots are traced in Hellas and Jews and have marched forward through Roman traditions to the 'Renaissance' and 'Reformation'. Three essential traits, the ideas of chosen people, the consciousness of national history and the nationalism massianism' were found in the history of the Jews. (43)

The advancement and diffusion of agriculture and

industry and primitive nationalism under tribalism underwent sea change in the empire of Assyria, Babylonia, Persia and India to name a few. And hereagain 'there was conflict between nationalism and internationalism.'⁽⁴⁴⁾ The factors which were military, religious, linguistic and economic were responsible for the qualitative changes. Military conquest of various tribes converted the structure alongwith religion which brought so many tribes together. The linguistic and literary factors also brought forward consolidation. So writes Hayes 'Let me repeat, common language, common historical background when these by some process of education become the object of popular emotional patriotism' the result is nationalism.'⁽⁴⁵⁾ The concept of 'nationality' was born out of fusion of tribes into empire. Hayes regards 'nationality' as a cultural group of people who speak a common language or closely related dialects' and who 'possess a community of historical traditions, religious, territorial, political, military, economic, artistic and intellectual traditions'.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Thus, 'within a political structure of empire we may expect to find mutually homogeneous societies with separate traditions and folk culture in addition to an ethnically heterogeneous mediating elite with a dynamic national civilization or high culture.'⁽⁴⁷⁾

Further, the growth of the political institutions such as feudal courts of the king composed of his principal vassals; the assembly consisting of wealthy persons often called the community of the realm, were able to bridge local provincial and social barriers producing common sentiment and public opinion helping the

formation of nationality. The other most important factor, the rise of modern militarism which through conquests led to the birth of large nations. When examined the history of European system appears largely to be a military one. Thus 'one of the most important factors which fostered the rise of modern nationalism was militarism.'

(48)

(49)

Renaissance and Reformation:

Towards the end of the Middle Ages, nation-States began to take shape and this transition was formed by two great movements; Renaissance and Reformation. Both were passionate search into the past and fervent hope for the future, the first conscious emphasis on 'cultural nationalism' emerged. The concept of 'individualism' and 'secularism' appeared on the scene. These movements opened the possibilities which were achieved in the 18th century. One thing is clear, Reformation encouraged the growth and use of vernacular in which the Bible was translated leading to the growth of national church.

(50)

Equally important was the national economic policy of mercantalism which literally broke the feudal order and made the state an economic unit by asserting its undivided authority in the matters of trade and externally it sought to promote wealth and therefore the power of the state. Lutherianism found its chief support among the princes and nobility, calvinism among the trading middle class, the urban artisans and intelligentsia in line with the social structure of Geneva and Zurich. It is well shaped in

(51)

the construction of Hugh Seton Watson 'arguments as to whether capitalism bred the Reformation or the Reformation Capitalism, may be left to those who specialise in determining the priority of hens and eggs. (52)

The modern nationalism has been, thus, an extraordinary complex of economic, political, social and intellectual development. The invention of printing press, rise of national vernacular. The revolutionary growth of capitalism and the 'middle class', the role of monarchy in suppressing feudalism, secularising and consolidating their realm on national basis; the establishment of national Churches, the increasing competition of one people with another changed the emphasis from mankind to nation. (53) The modern history of nationalism shows three partly overlapping periods of its evolution, the first was terminated by ^{the} French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars; the second was essentially the product of the French Revolution which lasted till the Treaty of Versailles; the third period, which started to take shape after 1870, reached its climax between the two world wars. (54)

The doctrine of nationalism dates back to the age of the French Revolution. During the period, there were two groups of nations in Europe 'old' and 'new'. The former consisted of those nations which had acquired political shape, national consciousness and political awareness. Among these nations there existed cultural and political unity. France and England are the best examples of the period, as both of them were ruled by the monarchs and the

noblemen spoke the same language, paid obedience to the sovereign who signified the community as a whole and stood for France or England. The emergence of state marched ahead with the nation resulting into nation-state.⁽⁵⁵⁾

Nations have arisen from the ashes of empires. There were three empires : Habsburg; the Russian and the Ottoman empire out of which, under liberal current, Greeks and Slavs launched movement against Ottoman empire, the oppressed Latin Americans against Spain, insurrection of 1830 in France, Belgium Germany and Italy, more wide spread insurrections of 1848 in France, Italy, Switzerland, Bohemia, Hungary and Ireland, the policy uprising of 1831 and 1863; the Crimean War of 1854-60, 1866 and 1870; the wars of German unification in 1848-49, 1864, 1866 and 1870-71; the Balkan war of 1877-78 and the mighty struggle of 1861-65 in the united states for the preservation of national union and emancipation of the enslaved race.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Thus the whole of Europe was engulfed under the nationalist movements. There was wide spread migration from country to town, from farm to factory, breaking the traditional localism, associated with the growth of national army and national education. The ideas like the 'survival of the fittest', 'red-blooded men', 'struggle for existence' replaced 'romanticism'. Mostly, nationalism flourished in industrialised countries; their 'national production', 'national wealth' and the 'national resources' produced and handled by big business and industries ulti-

mately turned to imperialism. Nationalism grew less and less liberal and more and more militarist, imperialist and intolerant. (57)

The statesmen, the businessmen, the intellectuals fortified by effective agencies of propaganda, prepared for the world war. However, the outcome was the Right to self-determination. Taking the advantage of the economic distress, both demagogues and dictators captured the world scene which led to the second world war.

Though Afro-Asian countries are not new, their nationalism came from European concepts, and gathered momentum particularly after the Second World War. Hereagain, the movements started in cities and were led by the elites. Three factors : 'dissatisfaction with the process of Westernisation, a growing belief in communism as liberating force; and a rising nationalism intensified by resentment of European domination surfaced. In all these motivations imperialism was the most dominant.' (58) Among the participants, if the question is asked; who were nationalists? The answer is, they were intellectuals. (59)

D. Marxist Analysis of Nationalism:

Nationalism expresses itself in the most varied and opposite ideologies and has been expressed by 'class' approach.

The very processes of formation of nation, the growth of 'national liberation' movement and the rise of the nation-state have been explained as a result of the growth of social production.

This growth in production, strengthened the economic link between the people, increased density of population leading them to unite into broader social communities under the nascent capitalist system, eliminating feudal disunity by political unification of territories, the consolidation of economic links between various parts of the country and the merger of the Local markets into a national market. (60)

All these provided the basis for the development of 'common language', 'psychological make-up', and also certain traits of 'national character', manifested in the species of nation's culture. In the words of Engels 'since the end of the middle Age, history has been working towards the formation of large national states in Europe, with the development of Commerce, agriculture, industry and thereby the social might of the bourgeoisie, national feelings rose everywhere and partitioned as well as oppressed nations demanded unity and independence.' (61)

Discussing the class-struggles quite prominent under the nation, Lenin held 'for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its varied classes became quite prominent as the division of the society into classes which was earlier obscured became exposed due to the connection between class division and economic relations.' (62) To them, the formation of the nations whether in western Europe, or North America or anywhere in the world, is closely connected with the growth of the capitalist relations and not the ethnicity 'when a bourgeois nation turns into a socialist

racism and nationalism have different origins and to Marxists, nations arise out of social process while races out of natural processes. From racial point of view, one nation comprising of a particular race is superior to others and that superiority is justified in terms of 'colonialism', 'aggressive wars', and extermination of people from one country to another. But anthropology, history and other social sciences overturn the unscientific conception, since inequality is the product of history and not that of nature. Erect postures, the structure of skeleton, size of brains, arms and other biological characteristics are common to all races. (68) This suggests 'they united and not disunite mankind'.

National Question:

Both Marx and Engels reject the bourgeois approach based on such abstract principles as 'morality', 'freedom' 'justice', and discuss it from purely historical background in terms of the proletarian revolutionary struggle. (69) In 'communist Manifesto' they point out 'In the national struggles of the proletarians of different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of their nationalities', (70) Since they have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole. (71)

Lenin took the cause of the national self-determination and held 'increased national liberation movement under imperialism does not mean that social democrats should reject what the bourgeois call the utopian struggle for the freedom of nations to

secede, but on the contrary it should make greater use of the conflicts that arise in this sphere too as grounds of mass action.' (72) He supports right to self-determination even when that is demanded by the bourgeoisie.

Lenin grouped the countries into three : the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe and ^{the} USA come under one category, 'every one of these great nations oppresses other nations both in the colonies and at the home.' (73) The second group, consisted of Eastern European countries, where it was in the twentieth century that bourgeois democratic struggle developed. (74) In the third group of countries consisting of semi-colonial and colonial countries, he focussed, socialists must not only demand the unconditional or immediate liberation of the countries but also must render determined support to move revolutionary elements in the bourgeoisie democratic movements. (75)

Later on, things moved in such proportions that the thesis of Lenin on self-determination along with Soviet Russia's eminence as nation was vehemently criticised on the ground that unholy alliance has developed between communism and nationalism'. Stalin, soon confronted with certain hard realities, in his struggle for power, supported nationalism when it was directed against their enemy and of condemning it when it was directed against the interest of the Soviet union. (76) In his case study, Duchacek opines, to treat nationalism as a class phenomenon is wrong, and quotes Kohn in his support that 'it was a sentiment which bound a group of people

together irrespective of their class loyalties.

The declaration that the working men of all countries should unite, is yet to be achieved. The socialists of England in general heavily imbued nationalism, Fabians even favoured imperialism and racism. Bernstein favoured extension of political rights to workers alongwith share in national property. Oswell held 'no real revolutionary has ever been an internationalist'.⁽⁷⁷⁾ To Smith, Afro-Asian scene exhibits 'proliferation of Marxist nationalism and highly nationalistic Marxism.'⁽⁷⁸⁾

Both theoretically and practically, the relationship between socialism and nationalism has developed from cool hostility⁽⁷⁹⁾ to warm liaison even to the proposals of marriage. However, Marxists have been able to advance the idea of 'nation', 'nationalism', national 'consciousness', 'racialism' and national liberation movement' based on class approach. The unhealthy distinction, between the state and nation causing a lot of problem in comprehending nationalism, has also been given goodby^{by} the Marxists. Furthermore, in one way they also advance the concept of proletarian internationalism.

E. Political Analysis of Nationalism:

So far we have found 'nationalism' as a belief, as an ideological commitment, for 'independence' 'unity' and 'welfare of the people'. Nation comes as a recognised unit of analysis for both internal and international politics. As an ideal, it has high malleability and as a movement, it has covered the long march from

its elitist inception to its present mass - perfection and that too within such a short period. Different classifications of nationalism have been attempted on the psychological, economic, historical, sociological and political grounds but agreed one is still due. What is common is the common concern shown by social scientists of all/^{the} branches. However, we should also see how the concept has been dealt with by the political scientists.

Since nationalism has many facets, it can be approached in different ways one such interpretation is juridical in nature. The modern state came as the supreme law making authority at the time when the concept of nationalism emerged on the scene. The names of Bodin, Hobbes, Bentham and Austin can be advanced for the juridical explanation of the state. The concept of modern-state and nation came together during the Renaissance period after the end of the Middle Age. Secularism, sovereignty, nationalism and democracy emerged during the same period. The emphasis is given in political philosophy that 'the nation is not the cause but the result of the state. It is the state which creates the nation not the nation the state.'⁽⁸⁰⁾

Though nation is distinguished from the state and there are reasons which can be advanced in support of this view, the fact remains that it is the state which absorbs most of the nationalistic appeals. 'The state is the organic structure of the nation and the statism and nationalism embody essentially same sort of appeals to the emotions and reason of the citizen.'⁽⁸¹⁾

The doctrine of state absolutism is commonly associated with the creeds of nationalism for it is a nation rather than a ruler or government to whom the citizen is called to surrender his individuality. Earlier, the state achieved its legitimacy through its monarch or religion; it is now legitimate if it is the embodiment and expression of nation. The progression, summed up, shows how the basic loyalty has shifted from the stage of the tribe, the city-state, empire to the nation. And within that stage of progression, there is second kind of movement by which the structure and conception of the political nation has changed. (82)

Writings on nationalism and the state have not linked the two as often as might have been expected. (83) The role of the state has increased and it had created state tariffs, regulated commerce, banks and insurance and a new group of bureaucrats and army which distinguish one state from another. When compared with nation, the same attributes also correspond to it. 'The modern-state and the nation-state are co-extensive phenomena. In the modernisation, development and nation building imply the same programme. (84) Kohn also holds ^{that} it recognises the nation-state as an ideal form of political organisation.' (85) Nationalism, secondly, comes as an idea or ideology in political thinking but there is no agreed view. To some 'nationalism is a set of ideas, but as they travel from continent to continent, these ideas add up less to a political theory than to a political rhetoric, a form of self-expression by which a certain kind of excitement can be communicated from elite to the masses.' (86) Nationalism has developed

linkage with the major ideologies like, dictatorship and democracy, conservatism and liberalism, secularism and socialism including fascism and communism. Like its company with different ideologies it is also expressed by different names such as cultural nationalism, 'religious nationalism, linguistic nationalism' 'a distinction worth keeping in mind since nationalism is in fact unpredictable in its invasions of many areas of social life'.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Nationalism is, generally, understood in terms of ideology. 'In discussing nationalism we have been discussing ideology, for nationalism is an ideology.'⁽⁸⁸⁾

Nationalism and Democracy:

Nationalism is inconceivable without the ideas of popular sovereignty.⁽⁸⁹⁾ The first clear expression of this ideal occurs during the French Revolution where we read 'only sovereign is the nation and man's first loyalty is to the nation.'⁽⁹⁰⁾ The revolution brought with it the assertion of sovereignty of people and the interest of the whole nation got priority in both internal and external relations of the nations. The collective personality of the nation became more important than the particular ruler.⁽⁹¹⁾ Collective grievance of the people were never ventilated at such a higher level before the emergence of nation. Liberty, equality and fraternity became the catchwords of the French Revolution. The concept that 'men are born free' and 'equal in rights' got prominence. The rights were treated natural and 'inalienable' as they

could only safeguard liberty, 'property' and 'security' from oppression.
(92)

Nationalism and democracy are closely related to each other. The right of self-determination champions democracy. 'In a nationalist philosophy the freedom of the nation state is the supreme freedom, which absorbs and engulfs ... the freedom of the individual.
(93) The prime 'starting point is that the government must rest upon the consent of the governed, to which the nineteenth and twentieth centuries added the assumption that, since man is a national animal, the government to which he will give his consent is one representing his own nation'.
(94) As Wilson put it, 'the central empires had been forced into political bankruptcy because, ^{they} dominated 'alien peoples over whom they had no natural right to rule'.
(95) Thus nationalism took the shape of international democratic movement.

Nationalism and Secularism:

Under the Medieval empire in the West people failed to detect clear line between, cultural affairs of the state and religious life. The sovereignty of the state was confused with the divine rights of the kings. But with the rise of the centralised sovereign state, accompanied by the emergence of new social groups such as city burghers, secular state officials a new relationship of secular character emerged on the scene.
(96) The loyalty to the religious communities was replaced by the loyalty to the nation.

Secularism, started to be counted as an important condition for the success of democracy. The secular tradition that has contributed to national synthesis, long drawn from Greece and Rome and discovered in the Renaissance became highly influential in the 18th century Europe. (97)

Thus, nationalism has been added explicitly with the idea of 'secularism'. Nationalism is essentially secular and essentially democratic. (98) In the conflict between church and monarchy, after Renaissance, the universalism of church was replaced by national church, religion was claimed to be divorced of politics or rather brought under the control of the state.

Nationalism and Socialism:

The association of nationalism with socialism is one of the very important trends of the present-day world. This has been true, 'whether the national leader was Sun Yat. Sen in China, Mustafa Kamal in Turkey, Nasser in Egypt or Nehru in India'. (99) All regard the close connections between the two ideologies. 'It is more appropriate to say that mixture of the two : nationalism and socialism merely reflects the spirit of the day. (100)

The emergence of nationalism is supposed to try for national regeneration, a call for the development of the people. The French state, dynamized by the Revolution, abolished the feudal regime entirely by its decrees of 4th August 1789, interest tariffs by 1790, standardised weights and measures. Thus the notion that

the state ought to serve the nation was very much/^{the} contribution of the French. The political development, welfare of the people emerged as companion of nationalism. This process has reached the state where it corresponds to regeneration and vision for future. It symbolises the readiness of the individuals under the nation to work for common purpose. It stimulates productivity so that justice and equity is achieved. The nation is a sociological category and not a biological one. The needs it serves are social needs; how to realise aspirations, how to overthrow a rejected order, how to live together. But it does not satisfy psychological needs only, it is also a set of demand upon society.

Today, there are many countries which have adopted non-capitalist path of development. The concept of welfare state in the non-socialist world denotes a compromise between the extremes of individualism and socialism. This approach notes that a political system comes into being to satisfy certain needs paramount (101) among which is general welfare.

Apart from socialism, nationalism's link is also established with 'fascism'. Within the nation, the fascists hold (102) the elite is superior to others and is entitled to rule them. Outside the nation, the elite nation is entitled to rule other nations.

F. CONCLUSION:

Nationalism as a political ideology strives for 'independence' i.e. the right of self-determination, and tries to maintain 'unity' and integrity within the territorial jurisdiction of the nation-state. Furthermore, nationalism emerged at a particular stage of human development whose exponents were middle class people. It has been an extra-ordinary complex of social, political economic and intellectual development. The doctrine of nationalism dates back to the French Revolution and has arisen out of the ashes of ^{the} Empire. As the ideal of the modern age, it has close relationship with major contemporary ideologies such as, democracy, secularism. As an ideal it also accommodated 'the welfare of the people' as its goal and in order to achieve that it grew attachment with the 'welfare state', 'socialism' and even 'communism.' Statism and nationalism convey same appeals to the people in the modern world. The modern state and the nation-state are two co-extensive phenomena to a movement. It has covered the long march from 'elitist' inception to 'Mass' perfection. Nation is the recognised unit of international politics, and so is the movement of nationalism for internationalism. Nationalism is quite important but no less important is internationalism.

II: Internationalism : a Conceptual framework:

A. Historical Growth of the Concept of Internationalism:

There are numerous works on the theory of international relations, however, 'no comprehensive text exists on the philosophy of international relations, and only fragments on the history of thought in that field. (103) The structure of international society emerged before the 18th century but systematic thought on the subject, is relatively of recent origin. (104)

Though an attempt is made to trace link in classical antiquity and the mention is made of 'universality' of stoics in Greece. By 1648 there was ample evidence that civilization was rapidly supplanting Christianity as standard of moral assessment of non-christian states. The emergence of a post feudal system of international relations raised a number of crucial questions, such as, how were the new rulers to behave towards each other, and what type of foreign policies should they pursue? This led first to the revival of 'natural law' and the other, the growth of the modern state. The first was associated with Aquinas and the other with Machiavelli. In their writings, emphasis shifted to largely secular international society. (105) Yet, Machiavelli was lacking in providing a comprehensive conception of the new types of international relation.

The Treaty of Westphalia laid the formal basis of

new international order first, by terminating wars of religions occasioned by the Reformation. It finally removed Pope and Emperor on equal footing and lastly it legitimised an international order based on the existence of independent sovereign states.

The present system has emerged from the collapse of the feudal systems after Renaissance and Reformation, the former laid the foundation of secularisation of political, whereas the Reformation set in motion national action of the once universal concept of christendom. (106) New means of communication and commercial revolution shook the foundation leading first to the modern idea of the state and subsequently to the European nation-state system that was formally institutionalised in the treaty of Westphalia.

When the modern order emerged in the 16th or 17th century out of emphasis of middle ages the parochial basis of the nationalism also emerged. Outside Empire, France, England, Spain and later on Austria emerged as modern states, having predominant power of absolute kings. By the time of the French Revolution, the nationalist feeling prevailed in advanced countries of Europe paving the way for a new modern international system. The modern system of internationalism differed in its operation from all earlier systems 'because now onward the relationship was formulated only between the states. (107)

Therefore, it was not a coincidence that Robespierre advocated international understanding and co-operation by drafting a declaration of international law and submitted it to the National

Convention on 24th April 1793 mentioning therein : 'Men of all lands are brothers' and 'nations should assist each other', 'No nation has the right to interfere in the administration of other nations . Treaties between nations are sacred and have to be respected'.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ France being the modern state, and French Revolution being the pioneer of modern nationalistic movements, also contributed to the healthy growth of internationalism.

the

After the French Revolution, the critique of international absolutist system began to gather strength and the emphasis shifted more and more from purely political considerations to the economic element, and in particular to the system of mercantalism generally referred to by its critics as the 'Colonial system'.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ The economics of mercantalism valued wealth as an instrument of power, and that the economics of mercantalism tended to reinforce the bellicose tendencies in the politics of absolutism. The object of mercantalism was not to improve wealth in order to improve the material life of the nation, but to organise production in such a manner as to ensure state predominance over other peoples.⁽¹¹⁰⁾

It was taken for granted that industrial capitalism would almost expand indefinitely in volume of production and international trade.

Technological break through in the industrial revolution were at the bottom of the major transformation in the international political system. The emergence of imperialism led to

the production of weapons for imperialistic war and advocated extranational expansionism resulting into colonisation of Afro-Asian countries.

However, the development of an everchanging modernity shifted thrust towards freedom, self-determination, liberalism and nationalism which also marched forward. In all these categories, much perhaps most of the work was 'transnational in character reacting across state boundaries and initiated by or acting upon private individual or groups. Inevitably the merchants and shopmasters, the emigrants and entrepreneurs carried their intellectual baggage with them and the years of developing economic interdependence also saw a growing transfer of knowledge, skills and attitude. (111)

The new scales became visible as the industrial revolution moved on. Europeans became the bankers of the world. The consequence of the shrinking and the linking of the world, of increased wealth and increased mobility, the spread of western education and the growth of transnational organisation, extended far beyond the political issues of security. In the early 19th century students from Afro-Asian countries started going to Europe and by the end of the century, developed a world wide educational structure, loose and uncondensed it is true, but this opened wide the door of the western knowledge. However, not since the Renaissance the Europe had also experienced such an important literary and cultural merging. Together with the influence of English writers, the translation of Russian authors

in English, the Germanization of Shakespeare, dominance of Italian and French composers, philosophy and art, along with Eastern literature, philosophy and art, made a world culture in the shape of emergence of 19th century high cosmopolitan character.

An event of supreme historical importance of the twentieth century, is the collapse of colonial system as a result of the many years of national liberation struggle. Equally important is the fact that the fundamental change has taken place in the global alignment from the disarray of the old mechanism which imperialism had used for decades. It is a qualitative shift in human history. (112)

The most striking qualitative change came with rapid increase in interdependence among nations. The world energy crisis, food crisis, the population explosion, hijacking, the traffic in drugs, protection of the world environment are the few problems apart from the major problem of world security, which require international solution.

In analytical terms, the frontiers of national politics have disappeared. Every explosion of political, economic, or social force within this closed system inevitably radiates to all frontiers of the globe. No part of the globe can be politically deemed to be undesirable or strategically unimportant. Every state is in some way relevant to every other state. (113)

After the Second World War, the emergence of a

large number of states as politically independent entities infused in them a feeling of deprivation in the existing international socio-economic and political system mainly because the economic levels of these countries being controlled by the developed countries. Out of this emerged the genuine need for interdependence culminating in the emergence of the concepts of Group of 77, the "south" the "Third World" and the "Non-aligned World".

The dependency paradigm assumes that underdevelopment in the periphery or the developing countries is the result of development in the capitalist countries. Hence, development of the developing countries requires cessation of relations with the capitalist world.

Advocates of the world system theory believe that the demand for the New International Economic Order is justified. A balanced development in the North as well as in the South is the prerequisite for a congenial world system.

All these brought a sense of feeling of interdependence among the developing countries as a common understanding requiring for a common platform.

B. International Organisation:

Ever since the conclusion of I.T.U. in 1860s and U.P.S. US in 1870s a Web of international technical, economic and political organisation have emerged. The globalisation of problems since 1945 has brought about a considerable transformation

in the attitude of national governments (114) towards international institutions.

The First World War started over a purely European squabble engulfed the whole of the world. International peace and security became the concern of the whole world and for the satisfaction of these pressing needs, the League of Nations was established. A definite political conception evolved out of the vapour internationalism of early times. 'The League of Nations' implied a new ideal, for, now not the brotherhood of man or the unity of the workers in Socialist International catches the imagination, but a world in which the nations directly promote (115) peace in the organisation of their foreign relations. The League was not a state, nor was it a super-state. It was an organised association of sovereign states, created by a treaty; a Confederation world-wide in scope. It had a legal personality, it owned property, had a treasury and a budget of its own. But it had no territory no citizens or subjects, no army, navy or police.

The League was given the historic mission of eliminating war - but not the means by which to accomplish that mission (116) and hence failed to arrest the outbreak of the Second World War. 'The U.N. with all that it represents and embodies and more so with all its moral potential, is an immense achievement of the progressive forces of the world.' (117) However, the establishment of the collective security was made the task of the League of Nations, after the Second World War'. The U. N. O has been entrusted with

the same job and has been successful in averting the world war till now. The world has entered such a phase where the most explicit and articulate section of a large body of conventional wisdom favour the important role of international organisation. The modern technology of communications, industry, welfare as well as the growth of economic, ecological and social problems on a regional and global level present irresistible pressures towards international co-operation and ultimate political unity. So (118) supranational organisational decision making system has been the need of the time. The membership of the newly independent Afro-Asian states under the U. N. has changed the character of the international organisation. One of the main functions of the international organisation is to 'nurture and play upon man's co-operative and socialable instincts to conflict.' (119)

International organisation is the agency through which integration of the world society is expected. The pluralists find for political, economic, and moral change the justification of the increased role of international organisations by restricting the sovereignty of the nation-state. They insist upon the 'community of states' leading to the integration of the world society.

On the other hand, the functionalists constitute the most explicit and articulate section of a large body of ~~conventional~~ conventional wisdom about international organisation. New functionalists stand for supranational decision making system. As an

operative philosophy they plead for a peaceful, unified and co-operative world.

But the federalists offer the clearest alternative to the present international system based on formal legal approach providing a blue print seeking to substitute world order by 'world-federation'. The world federation with a central authority having force will enable the world to remain free from scourge of war.

The theory of international relations is still in infancy and when a theory is in its infancy, 'it is, sometimes, difficult to be sure it is there at all'.⁽¹²⁰⁾ Surveying the theories of international politics, as we find them in text books, it appears that much of the current thought can be described as 'Utopian'.⁽¹²¹⁾ The world, it is said, is becoming small conflicts are becoming unimportant. World trade is superseding national economics. A world literature is taking the place of national literature. National sovereignty is becoming outmoded. International organisations are multiplying. Soon the antiquated nonsense of nation-states and national government will go into museum of recent archaeology.⁽¹²²⁾ There are also pessimists who envisage the world as a large battleground, a period of extreme danger. There are 'mixed-utopias' where picture of ever-increasing unity is projected for one's own camp and prophesying the crack and chances of another camp being destroyed in terms of communist and non-communist world. However, this dichotomy has already disappea-

red from the world scene.

Having read these arguments not once, but many times, (123)
it seems safe to predict we shall read them many times in future.

Ideally a student of international phenomena should have all extensive grounding in international history, politics and culture, since the unifying theme is the humanistic concept of politics.

Politics blends the affairs of the people acting as individuals, groups nations, alliances, empires, and trans-national and international organisations, seeking to maximise the collective well-being. Further, any understanding of international and domestic politics should assume that international and domestic politics are not necessarily separate entities but inter-related levels of political activity each of which affects others. In a world of increasing interdependence domestic and international variables

(124) fuse so closely. Hence there is need for a conception that of cosmopolitanism and a revised principle of state-autonomy based on the justice of a state's domestic institutions and a principle (125) of international distributive justice.

C. Idealistic Interpretation of Internationalism:

As to interpretation of international state of affairs, three groups of thinkers namely 'Idealists', 'Realists' and 'Behaviouralists' can be traced. However, internationalism in the field of thought generally, has taken the form of idealism. Prevailing scholarship, after the First World War, adopted an essentially legalistic, moralistic (i.e. idealistic) approach, and looked upon war as both an accident and sin, accident because of

absence of international institutions and sin, for it revealed the darkest side of the human nature. It was based on liberalism and humanism. Unfortunately, this era of liberalism did not last and the expansionist policy of Germany in the 1930s undermined the idealist search, and efforts for a rational, legal, world order shattered leading to the Second World War.

With the rise of the nation-states, there emerged the idea and ideal of a system of equal, free and self-determining nationalities, all being peacefully side by side in harmonious mutual relations. Idealist nationalism amalgamated pacifist humanitarian elements with liberal democratic elements. International movements, expressive of internationalism, such as Puritan Revolution, French Revolution, Bolshevich Revolution, turned world-embracing development.
(126)

D. Realism:

A new generation of scholars, known as 'Realists,' rejected the previously dominant legalistic and moralistic guidelines arguing that policies based on power could afford a semblance of global security since the 1930s. They regard international relations to be a subdivision of political science and philosophy with unique features. To them the discipline of international relations comes as nearly anarchic relations existing among sovereign political entities, recognising no supreme international judge, resorting to threat or use of force or outright war in order to preserve or protect their interests. They posit international relations as the

study of disorder.

Hayes, explaining the nature of realism, explains:

'There is still another very important element, the supplanting of the intellectual and cultural vogue of romanticism by what conventionally has been called 'realism'. This realism has been the product of novel factors absorption in the mechanical and utilitarian aspects of the industrial revolution, admiration for the 'practical man' of 'big industry' and 'big finance'; acceptance of a 'mechanistic theory of the universe' and of a 'materialist interpretation of human behaviour'; interest in sociology, with its 'laws of society' and its fact finding inquests, distrust of human reason and trust in pragmatism and human will; adaptation of the biological hypothesis of Darwin to support such conceptions as the 'inequality of races', the 'struggle for existence', and 'survival of the fittest'; enthusiasm for Nietzsche's 'red blooded trend' and for his superman.'

(127)

After the Second World War, the Realist School criticised predecessors for being too idealistic, moralistic and legalistic in their research or policy. Although realists have raised many criticisms there is one basic flaw in their argument. By overemphasising their idea that the world is an immoral and lawless place unwittingly they might bring about a Hobbesian world of 'might makes right' which they presumably and ideally have liked to avoid. If we want to achieve an ethical and lawful world order, our conduct ought to conform to our own ethical and

legal principles. If we donot respect our own values we can
(128)
hardly expect others to take them seriously.

From Machiavelli and David Hume to E. H. Carr and
Hans J. Morgenthau, power, has been an important variable in inter-
national politics. Lasswell, Kaplan bring the watershed between
the older intuitive and ambiguous treatments of power and the
clarity and principles of more recent discussion. 'The frequent
predicting has been noted so often by scholars' ... How is it
(129)
that weak powers influence the strong. Among the associates,
of Realist school, are Max Weber, Carr, Morgenthau Schuman, Spykman,
Reinhold, Niebuhr, Wafers Thompson, Kissinger and others. They
see politics as the struggle for power, to them adoption of lega-
listic, moralistic and even ideological behaviour in politics tend
to run contradictory to the forces of nature and to result either
in pacifism or defeatism.

To the idealists, the realist maximss appear morbid,
reactionary, cynical, and quite often self-serving. Idealists
include pacifists, world federalists, humanitarians, legalists and
moralists. This school is identified with great names such as
Henry de Saint, Simon, William Lad, Mahatma Gandhi, Richard Cobden
Aldous Huxley, Woodrow Wilson, Bertrand Russell and Margaret
(130)
Meade.

We should also take note of the fact that practising
politicians, unlike, political science scholars, frequently employ
idealistic rhetoric like, a good political person does not do what
is possible; rather he does what is good. He provides for the
good, life involving justice, obedience to legitimate rules and

respect for his fellow beings both within and outside the country. Idealists disagree with the realists in their belief in power politics, furthermore, they assent man has the capacity to learn, charge and control his behaviour, civilization means learning to co-exist, operating under fair laws. Political activities are categorised between 'politics of violence' versus the 'politics of persuasion' and the latter may be referred to as the politics of logic, of morality, of co-operation and interdependence.

E. Behaviouralism:

In the mid - 1950s, there emerged the third school of thought which rejected both the 'realist' and the 'idealist' traditions, claiming themselves as 'behaviouralist'. They consider international relations to be too broad and a complex field. They take international relations to be an inter-disciplinary field, apply empirical method, employing quantitative techniques and model-buildings. Some Social Scientists such as Deutsch, Kaplan, and Rosen have advanced tentative hypothesis. 'Thus far the scientific school has produced 'more promise than performance'. Although the behaviouralists have thus far offered the political science community sophisticated research-tools taken from other social sciences also a body of 'pretheory' that tends itself to testing and verification procedures, their main contribution has been the leadership of the methodological revolution. (131)

There are some problems inherent if an analyst argues that politics is anything that human demonstrate it to be,

then he or she equates politics with all possible co-operative or conflictive behaviour, in other words, all human interaction. There is precious little interactive behaviour that can be left out of this catchful definition. This is perhaps to ignore the essence of good politics, which is peaceful and dignified co-existence, peaceful and equitable regulation of competition, peaceful and equitable redistribution of wealth and status - in short, peaceful and just change.
(132)

In the last analysis, for the scientists to assume the incorruptibility of fellow scientists, is to enter into the idealist school of thought. The theoretically oriented student of international relations faces serious problems some of which can never be overcome because they are part of the human conditions. The theorists in international relationship do not enjoy an abstract, impersonal relationship with the object of his study. Personal involvement, characteristic of the data, and the very nature of the process of acquiring knowledge combine to make the formulation of theory very difficult.
(133)

However, the emphasis in the behavioural approach is always on suggesting that human behaviour should be systematically observed and generalisations rooted in and supported by empirical evidences should be formulated and tested and retested by the scientific method. The subject of international relations is such that no single method could be cohesive. The debate between the classical school represented by Hadley Bull, favouring the idealist/traditional method and the scientific school represented by Morton Kaplan, upholding the necessity of

modern scientific tools and techniques, has thus been reconciled by David Singer that the subject of international relations needs philosophy and intuition with scientific precision.

F. Pluralism:

The four approaches : pluralism, functionalism, neo-functionalism and federalism, try to explain the state of affairs prevailing under the international system to explain integration in the international society.

Pluralism is identified with the circumvention, reduction or abolition of the Sovereign power of the state on the ground of diplomatic, economic and social exchange between nation-states. The sovereignty is further restrained by membership of nations under international organisation. Their aim is 'community of states' leading to the integration of the world-society. The absolute sovereignty is taken to be obsolete. At root the term merely denotes superiority and sovereignty is absolute only in case of a powerful country. (134)

The pluralists insisted on moral, political and economic change within the states and need for improved interaction between the states to solve their problems peacefully and co-exist in a stable harmonious system of sovereign entities.

G. Federalism:

Philosophically the federalists perhaps have most in common with the pluralists. Federalism, as a branch of

idealism, argues that the basis of the centralised and legitimate force is necessary at global level to deter individual actors in a given society from the breaking of rules that guarantee collective co-existence without sacrificing fundamental individual rights. The world federation with a central authority having force at its disposal will enable the world to remain free from scourge of international war and many of its derivative civil wars.

In a world of independent states war is inevitable because change is inevitable but the world also needs peace more than ever and hence age old dream 'that there might be something larger than the state, and that the state might therefore be subordinate rather than independent.' (135) It is quite true that a review of current events and trends might throw a variety of indications that the projected state-centric view fails to meet the demands.

Political civilisation has continued with multiplicity of independent states' common origin of the mankind which suggests higher loyalty. The loyalties can be reconciled and the tension can be ended only by constructing a single political supra-national state. In doing so, the federalist approach relies on the formal legal approach presenting peace plan or constitutional framework. For federalist scholars, integration is an end product rather than a process. Following successful application of federalism in the united states it became a blue print for well-meaning scholars to substitute world order for the uncertainty

and disorder of war and the international balance.

The federalists appear to offer the clearest and the strongest alternative to the present set-up, but as the international society is composed of heterogeneous states and they differ very much on the fundamentals, it is very difficult if not impossible to achieve it. On the otherhand, it would be wrong to assume that the gradual world federation is impossible because of the world's diversity. 'If experiments in federal government in U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. can continue with some success then there is no reason as to why global federal arrangements may not some day have the opportunity to develop. (136)

H. Functionalism:

The two schools of British and French functionalism grew out of criticisms leveled at mercantalism as well as out of the writings of enlightenment concerning international absolutist system. Banking over the literature of criticism they also provided some constructive thinking about the future of international relations. They believed firmly in the 'harmony of interests' within the state and saw no reason why that not profitably be extended to the international sphere. They claim themselves to be 'realist'.

The classical age of British functionalism began about the 1840s. Affected by ^{the} French Revolution and Industrial Revolution Cobdon, Bright, J.S. Mill and Green argued for non-intervention, and free-trade as essentially and mutually rein-

forcing ingredients of a pacific system of international relations.
(137)

More and more the state in its old form was perceived as stationary and outmoded in a rapidly changing society and in adaptation to the newly emerging conditions. David Mitrain (1888-1975) came to realise that a number of useful functions on the part of the state could be applied to international relations. To him, the post-World War II situations came as culmination of functionalism. International political divisions were to be overlaid with a 'spreading Web' of such inter-state agencies, in which, and through which, the interests and life of all countries would be integrated. International system of welfare resting on inter-state welfare institutions would eventually prove successful.
(138)

E.H. Carr also advocated on this line introduction of functionalism as a means of satisfying the world's economic needs, leaving the state intact as the principal focus of political loyalty.
(139)

St. Simon (1760-1826), August Comte, (1798-1857) also developed the idea of internationalism. Simon's ideas amounted to no less than a theory of scientific universalism.
(140)

Industrialism, to him, was a social system with an international dimension and hence no individual country could proceed without collaboration with others. Comte, a follower of Simon, became the founder of the philosophical school of positivism. He considered that the data of history, properly interpreted, could provide the means of making predictions and as such a contribution

towards peace by putting an end to the struggle of man Vs man. He suggested that free enterprise was a temporary phase and the supreme directing force 'homogeneous class' would eventually control all countries of the world. 'It is still early, and Comte's vision of the genesis of a world wide technological managerial society may well come true in the long run. (141) Writes Parkinson. His hint was to forget the political difference and to concentrate on the solution of technical problems for integration as the unity of the world remained in the unity of world thought.

Briefly, these ideas reflect a near consensus that the modern technology, of communications, industry, welfare, the growth of economic, ecological and social problems on a regional and global scale present irresistible pressures towards international co-operation and ultimate political unity. (142) These theorists take the state as the chief barrier to rational organisation for human welfare. 'Nations remain the focus of men's irrational dysfunctional and often destructive emotions. As such, they could be attacked directly, but can be rendered harmless gradually if welfare needs are arranged through the continuous development of common activities and interests across them.' (143)

I. New Functionalism:

Both pluralism and functionalism represent traditions but new functionalist approach emphasises the fact that 'political integration comes about less through pressures from functional needs or technological change as such and more through

the interaction of political forces, interest groups, parties, governments international agencies - which seek to exploit these pressures in pursuit of their own interests.' (144) To the functionalists, the state was barrier but to the neo-functionalists, interaction of the state was required to a limited extent. (145)

New functionalists stand for supra-national decision making system, growth of central institutions through forward linkage, the state, the supra-national state is also the aim of federalism.

The technological, economic and social forces have transformed the world is truism but whether it will lead to a global political unity only the time will prove. However, the patterning of relations in global politics is moving towards some form of integration. It is uncertain how quickly this movement will proceed or which values and interests will predominate, but the realities of transition beyond the state-system seems almost irresistible. (146)

Neo-functionalists view integration as a process as well as outcome. They prefer to emphasise co-operative decision making processes and elite attitudes in order to assess the progress towards integration.

J. Integration:

The four approaches, pluralism, functionalism, neo-functionalism, and federalism, as theories of analysis of inter-

national relations, are so different that one is encouraged to ask the question, if integration theory has any central Core of actions, themes or hypothesis. (147) one should not have to choose among these approaches to the study of integration because the genesis of political units of national, regional or global level is too complex a phenomenon to be left to any method or conceptual approach. The recommendations and findings of federalists, communication analysts and new-functionalists should therefore be considered as useful steps in the ladder of understanding. (148) To him, communication leads to co-operation; co-operation leads to negotiation and negotiation leads to integration.

Furthermore, the concept of integration should be reserved only for peaceful political unification. The regional organisations can be conveniently divided into: regional defence organisations; economic organisations or functional organisations; Hybrid organisations containing elements of both political and economic and occasionally military and cultural co-operation. Since World War II advances in technological fields as transportation and communication have promoted commercial links among states. Our era is one of the growth, inequality and increasing interdependence.

In this area, integration comes as an instrumentality of the modern multi-state system, sees it very broadly as method and form of co-operation among nations for many purposes based where institutions are set up through which joint decisions can be arrived at. Kaplan's view of integrative process, in the international system, compliments and indeed resembles with pluralist

(149)
view. It grants some autonomy to the state expecting responsiveness in catering to the needs of the people.

Conclusion:

To sum up, pluralism insists upon community of states, probability of conflict resolution, self-sustaining growth of interdependence, increase in capacity for decision making, social learning through communications and interaction between 'elite' and 'mass'. Functionalism advocates administrative network responsible to community needs, degrees of 'fit' between the structure and the functions; need satisfaction, reluctant co-operation to solve economic and technological problems for state. New functionalism stands for supra-national decision making system, growth of central institutions through 'forward-linkage' states, supra-national state is the aim of federalism where there will be distribution of power and this will be achieved through constitutional revolution, dramatic distribution of power. Another approach by Deutsch, known as Communication approach, seeks to measure process of integration by watching the flow of international transactions in trade, tourists, letters and immigrants.

R E F E R E N C E S:

Nationalism and Internationalism

1. Sonderman, Olson and Mc Lellan. The Theory and Practice of International Relations (Prentice Hall, 1970), p. 36.
2. Kohn, Hans. The Idea of Nationalism (New York, 1961), p. VII (Preface).
3. Emerson, Rupert. From Empire to Nation (Scientific Book Agency, Cal. 1970), p. 93.
4. International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol. XI (Macmillan, 1965), p. 65.
5. Smith, A.D. Nationalism in the Twentieth Century, (Robertson, Martin 1979), p. 1.
6. Tivey, Leonard. (Ed). The Nation State (Martin Robertson, 1981), p. 52.
7. Strokes, Gale. 'World Politics', Vol. XXXI, No. 1, Oct. 1978, p. 152.
8. Snyder, L. L. The New Nationalism, (Cornell, Univ. Press, 1966), p. 68.
9. Tinker, Hugh. 'The Nation State in Asia', Tivey (Ed). The Nation State, op. cit., p. 51.
10. 'Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences', (Macmillan, 1963), Vol. 11.12 p. 23.
11. Smith, A.D. Theories of Nationalism, (Duckworth, Lond. 1971), pp. 167-68.
12. Sehman, F.L. World Politics, (Mc Grew Hill, 1968), p. 336.

13. Snyder, op.cit., p. 41.
14. Emerson, op. cit., pp. 105-06.
15. Kohn, The Ideaop. cit., p. 496.
16. Hayes, C. J. Nationalism : A Religion, (New York, 1960), p. 3.
17. Ibid., p. 2.
18. Kohn, The Idea, p. 36.
19. Smith, Theories, p. 258.
20. Minoque, K. R. Nationalism, (Oxford, 1965), p. 60.
21. Bernard, Herder's Social and Political Thought, Quoted by K.R. Minoque, p. 61.
22. Ebenstein, William, Today's Isms, (Prentice Hall, 1964), p.115.
23. Coker, F., Recent Political Thought, (World Press, 1957), p. 467.
24. Smith. Theories op.cit., p. 153
25. Ibid., p. 258.
26. Ibid., p.257.
27. Ibid., p. 258.
28. Ibid., p. 175.
29. Emerson. From Empire op.cit., p. 102.
30. Smith. Theories p. 176.
31. Strokes, Gale. 'The underdeveloped theory of Nationalism', World Politics, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, October, 1978, p. 157.
32. Smith. Nationalism op.cit., p. VII.
33. Smith. Theories op.cit., p. 174.
34. Hah Hong Do and Martin. 'Towards A synthesis of Conflict and Integration', World Politics, Vol. XXVII, No. 3, April, 1975, p. 361.

35. Smith. Theories op.cit., p. 171
36. Ibid., p. 173.
37. Kohn, Idea op.cit., p. 12.
38. Ibid., p. 13.
39. Kennedy, R. K. Asian Nationalism in Twentieth Century, (Macmillan, 1971), p. 1.
40. Smith. Nationalism op.cit., p. 1.
41. Kohn, Hans. Nationalism and Liberty, the Swiss Example, (George Allen and Unwin, 1956), Introduction.
42. Kohn. The Idea, op.cit., p. 36.
43. Ibid., p. 36.
44. Hayes, C. J. H. The Historical Evolution of Nationalism, (Smith, New York, 1931), p. 1.
45. Hayes, Nationalism a Religion, op.cit., p. 5.
46. Ibid., p. 6.
47. Francis, R. K. Inter-Ethnic Relations (Elsevier, New York, 1976), pp. 36-37.
48. Grandhard, R. S. The State (Norlon and Co. 1979), p. 101.
49. Hartz, W.F. Nationality in History and Politics (Routhledge, 1966), p. 223.
50. Kohn. The Idea op.cit., p. 119.
51. Carr, E. H. Nationalism and After, (Mac. 1945), pp. 5-6.
52. Seton Watson, Hugh. Nationalism Old and New, (Lond. 1965), p.5.
53. Hayes, Encyclopaedia, op.cit., p. 241.
54. Carr, E. H. Nationalism op.cit., pp. 1-2.

55. Seton Watson. Nationalism, op.cit., p. 6.
56. Ibid., pp. 89-91.
57. Ibid., pp. 245-47.
58. Snyder. The New Nationalism, op.cit., p. 140.
59. Kohn, Prelude op.cit., p. 27.
60. Glezerman, G. Classes and Nations, (Progress, Moscow, 1985), p. 12.
61. Ibid., p. 24.
62. Lenin, V.I. 'The Right of Nations to Self-determination', (C.W. Vol. 20), p. 396.
63. Glezerman. op.cit., p. 24.
64. Ibid., p. 25.
65. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
66. Kohn, Hans. World order in Historical perspectives, (Cambridge, 1942), p. 93.
67. Glezerman, op.cit., pp. 19-20.
68. Ibid., p. 115.
69. Ulyanovsky, R. 'National Liberation', (Progress, Moscow, 1978), p. 9.
70. Marx and Engels. Selected Works, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1957), p. 120.
71. Ibid., p. 119.
72. Ibid., p. 159.
73. Ibid., p. 163.
74. Ibid., p. 164.
75. Ibid.

76. Ducheck, I.D. Nationalism and Communism, (Holt Rinehart, INC, New York, 1966), p. 184.
77. Tivey, The National State, op.cit., p. 169.
78. A.D. Smith. Theories op.cit., p. 115.
79. Ibid., p. 164.
80. Rocker, Radulph. Nationalism and Culture, (New York, 1937), p. 200.
81. Coker. Recent Pol op.cit., 441.
82. Hinsley, F.A. Nationalism and International system (Hodder Stroughton, Lond. 1973), p. 24.
83. Tivey, The Nation State, op.cit., p. 1.
84. Ibid., p. 36.
85. Kohn. The Idea op.cit., p. 16.
86. Minoque. Nationalism, (B.T. Batsford, Lond. 1969), p.153.
87. Ibid., p. 18.
88. Dyke, Vermon Van. International Politics (Indian Reprint, Bombay, 1969), p. 205.
89. Kohn, The Idea op.cit., p. 3.
90. Smith. Nationalism op.cit., p. 1.
91. Kohn. Prelude to Nation, op.cit., p. 1.
92. Bridges, R. C, Paul Duke (Ed.), Nations and Empires, (Mac. Lond., 1969), pp. 65-66.
93. Barker, Ernest. Reflections on Government, (Oxford, 1958), p.2.
94. Emerson. From Empire op.cit., p. 297.

95. Ibid.
96. Seton-Watson. Nationalism Old and New, op.cit., p. 17.
97. Smith. Twentieth Centuryop.cit., p. 38.
98. Seton-Watson. op.cit., p. 3.
99. Snyder. The New Nationalism, op.cit., p. 33.
100. Ibid., p. 34.
101. Ebenstein, Today's Isms, op.cit., p. 115.
102. Columbius, T.A. and Wolf, J. H. Introduction to International Relation, (Prentice Hall of India, Delhi 1981).
103. Parkinson, F. The Philosophy of International Relations, (Sage, 1977), p.7.
104. Ibid., p. 9.
105. Ibid., p. 28.
106. Lerche Charles and Abdul A. Said , Concept of International Politics, (Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 12.
107. Hinslay, F. H. Nationalism and Internationalism, (Hodder Strongton, 1973), p. 68.
108. Bebler, Abes. National Sovereignty in the Nuclear Age, (I.C.C.R. 1972), p. 6.
109. Parkinson, op.cit., p. 91.
110. Ibid., p. 92.
111. Kohane Robert and Josep S. Nye Jr. Transnational Relations and the World (Harvard, 1973), pp. 5,91.
112. Primakov, Y. M. The East After the Collapse of the Colonial System, (Nauka, 1983), pp. 4-6.

113. Lerche & Said. op.cit., p. 121.
114. Evan Luard. International Agencies : The Emerging Frame Work of Interdependence (Macmillan 1977), p. 3.
115. Burns, C.D. Political Ideals (Oxford), p. 5.
116. Falk, R.A. Global Approachop.cit., pp. 13-14.
117. Bebler. National Sovereignty op.cit., pp. 7-8.
118. Wright, O. 'A Study of War, op.cit., pp.99-100.
119. Godwin, G. International Institutions and International Order, (Ed. Alan James), (Oxford 1973), p. 158.
120. Forward, Nigel. The Field of Nations (Mac. 1971), p. 1.
121. Dutsch, K. W. 'The Future of World, Politics, The Political Quarterly (January - March 1966), p. 9.
122. Ibid., p. 10.
123. Ibid.
124. Columbius, A.T. Wolfe, J. H. Introduction to International Relations, (P.H.I., 1981), p. 10.
125. Johnson, Robert C. The National Interest and the Human Interest, (Prenceton 1980), p.
126. Hertz, J. H. The Nations and the Crisis of the World.
127. 'Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences' (Macmillan 1963), p. 246, Vol.
128. Chan, Steve. International Relations in Perspectives, (Mac. 1984), p. 359.
129. Baldwin, David A. "Power Analysis and World Politics"
'World Politics' Vol. XXXI, No.2, January 79, p. 163.

130. Columbius. op.cit., p. 19.
131. Ibid., p. 9.
132. Ibid., p. 22.
133. Ibid., p. 29.
134. Burton Marshal Charles, The Exercise of Sovereignty, (John Hopkins 1964), p. 2.
135. Eromkin David, The Independence of Nations, (Praeger 1981), p. 97.
136. Columbius, op.cit., p. 339-40.
137. Parkinson F. op.cit., pp. 91-95.
138. Ibid., p. 99.
139. Ibid.
140. Ibid., p. 103.
141. Ibid., p. 106.
142. Wright, Quincy. A Study of War, (Chicago 1974), pp. 99-100.
143. Pentland, Charles. International Theory and European Integration (Lond. 1973), p. 81.
144. Ibid., p. 108.
145. Falk, Richard A. A Global Approach to National Policy, (Harvard, 1975), p. 15.
146. Haas, Earnest. Beyond the Nation State : Functionalism and International Organisation (Standard Univ. 1964).
147. Pentland. op.cit., p. 169.
148. Columbius. op.cit., pp. 283-84.
149. Pentland. op.cit., p. 40.