# BLOCK: II
## NATION AND STATE

# UNIT: 1

# NATION AND STATE

**Unit Structure:**

## 1.1 Introduction

The ideas of nation and state have dominated the discussion of most of the social sciences and particularly political science due to its centrality in the human society since the dawn of organized living. Starting from pre modern (late medieval) period the grand imaginations of these idea began in some parts of the world. However scholars also draws the ancient past lineage of these ideas. Therefore in discussing the conceptual framework of these ideas from different perspectives, a historical approach is also necessary. The nation building process or origin of state reveals that both the phenomena

have not only followed a long trajectory of historical events but also that they have collided and coincided in several processes leading to concept called nation state.

## 1.2 Objective

After reading this unit one should be able to–

- *understand* the concept of Nation,
- *trace* the history of the term nation,
- *examine* preconditions needed to fulfil to become a nation, that may be defined as its basis features,
- *understand* the nation building process,
- *discuss* the Concept of State,
- *examine* different perspectives in understanding the state,
- *understand* the major theories on origin of the State,
- *trace* the historical evolution of the nation state system.

## 1.3 Understanding Nation

The conviction that a group of people are united by a common history, tradition, language and culture is through nationalism and hence they should establish a sovereign political community called the nation based on this conviction. Thus this idea refer to a close knit political community that consists of culturally, linguistically, ethnically and even racially homogenous population bound together by shared history of struggle or achievements. However no country today literally and totally satisfy this criteria, but this idea of nation has been powerful force in the history of most countries around the world.

It is interesting that in present times no country can claim itself to be a complete nation in its literal meaning. So it will be necessary to see how country like India with vast diversity is a nation or it will need further specific studies to explore the nature of Indian nation.

The distinction between the nation and nationality is a thin one. This is more so because both the terms are derived from the same word. Some even

consider them as interchangeable. But certainly there are differences between the two; Nationality is a cultural term. It is a psychological, which is generated in a group of people having geographical unity and who belong to a common race, common history, religion, customs and traditions, economic interests and common hopes and aspirations. The people of a nationality must feel that they have something in common which differentiates them from other people. But nation is a people organised; a people united. What unites people in a nation are feelings of oneness. Nation gives an idea of an organisation; nationality gives an idea of sentiment. Nationality is basically a cultural term; it is 'political' only incidentally. Nation is basically a political term, cultural only incidentally. This, however, does not mean that nationality is not political and nation is not cultural concepts.

According to Ramsay Muir, a nation may be defined as a body of people who feel themselves to be naturally linked together by certain affinities, which are so strong for them to live together, they are dissatisfied when disunited and cannot tolerate subjection to people who do not share the same ties. The development of nationality is definitely psychological phenomenon or as Hayes says, it is primarily cultural, conscious of unity.

The nation is thus seen as a birthmark. People with foreign origins are seen to be a harm national unity and purity and to a national culture which defines itself vis -a-vis "the other". The common ancestry is considered as the end of history and has to be protected. However in most cases governments and peoples cannot demonstrate a long, unbroken, historical continuity and ethnic homogeneity. In many cases, nations were created by romantic nationalistic historians.

The written language played an important role in creating a nation. The emerging national state created its national language inorder to legitimize itself. According to a classic definition, the difference between a language and a dialect is that a language has a government and an army. National conscription, compulsory education and the development of mass media were the channels used by the architects of nations in the 19th century in order to create contact between the centre and the periphery, and borders that appeared natural on the basis of geography, language, ethnicity or religion.

In particular, the emergence of national education systems and the mass media contributed to communicating a sense of affinity to a national collective; to extending the cultural horizons and getting away from provincial narrow mindedness. The creation of national symbols and myths and re-writing of history were also part of the process of nation-building.

Nations were thus constructed and invented. Eric Hobsbawn spoke of a mass production of nations in the 19th century, when cultural hallmarks were created for later presentation as authentic and ancient. The "real" aspects needed the "fake" and "foreign" in order to define themselves. Thus, nations are not eternally defined entities, but they are in fact created. They are "imagined communities", in the words of the American anthropologist, Benedict Anderson. Nationalism is a two-faced, Janus-like creature. It is synonymous with self-determination for those who have the good fortune to live in a society which has its own history, language, culture and religion, but it can also be xenophobic, intolerant, aggressive, hegemonic and authoritarian, lacking the will and ability to allow others what the nation claims for itself.

Many social scientists believe that, in order to make the concept of nation more humane and natural, there is a need that the adherence to a nation must be an act of choice, and not a birthmark. Instead of "ethnos", in which a sense of affinity is based on mythical racial ties of blood, our perception of the national must be a question of "demos" – an open, universalist concept of the nation which focuses on the individual level, in which the nation is based on acceptance by citizens and their belief in a political order which protects their freedoms and rights. The individual can choose to join, but he can also leave the nation. The nation may be ethnically homogenous, but it can also consist of several different peoples, as in the case of Switzerland. National culture is not static or laid down by history, instead it is a dynamic creation based on free and independent citizens. As a result, the starting point in the fight against racism and xenophobia must be the concept of nationality which was defined by Ernest Renan in his classic address at the Sorbonne on 11 March 1882, entitled "What is a nation?" As far as Renan was concerned, national affinity was not a question of race, religion or place of birth, but was instead a matter of "a daily referendum".

**Stop to Consider**

A group of people are united by a common history, tradition, language and culture, establish a sovereign political community called the nation. However one should keep in mind that though it is considered as a birthmark, many a times nations were constructed and invented. Many social scientists believe that, in order to make the concept of nation more humane and natural, there is a need that the adherence to a nation must be an act of choice, and not a birthmark.

## 1.4 History of the Idea

The word nation has its origin in Latin. The Latin word 'natio' has the same stem as the word 'natus'. Both have the common origin in 'nascor' meaning I am born. The nation for the Romans thus meant as something born. In Cicero, one finds nation personified as the goddess of birth. In ordinary understanding nation was referred to as a group of men who belonged together in some way because of similarity of birth. This similarity of condition was seen mostly due to the fact that the members of a nation were born in the same city or same tract of land. However the size of this group was limited; it was larger than family but smaller than a clan and people (gens). It was regarded as a native community of foreigners something that is outside the Roman society and even below. Romans never introduced themselves as nation and the original connotation of the term had a derogatory connotation. Cicero ones spoke of the Jews and the Syrians as *nationesnataeservi-tuti*, that is, people born to servitude.

The word is used in English in a broad sense, "a race of people an aggregation of persons of the same ethnic family and speaking the same language" and in the narrower sense "a political society composed of a government and subjects or citizens and constituting a political unit; an organized community inhabiting a defined territory within which its sovereignty is exercised." The narrower sense of the term started dominating from the pre modern times when application of the tern nation was done to signify the native North American people (1640); nation building i.e. Creation of new nation is

attested by 1907 and nation state meaning sovereign country whose inhabitants are united by language, culture and common descent came to be used from 1918.

The use of the word in its origin had some comical connotation as its members had different ways of lifestyle, food habit, language etcetera that was used by the *foreigners*, something alien and 'funny' for the native. Another interesting use of the term is associated with the university students. The foreign countries of the Roman world had direct link with the universities in the middle ages where students from far of lands came for higher learnings. On the strange soil of the university cities, the students were foreigners, just like their ancient predecessor of immigrants, had the need for union to use their dialect, food and customs. They formed groups of their own country and termed as 'nation'. Since 12th century, within the student unions there were formed, as the result of the customary vigorous disputes, certain common opinions which derived from the commonly accepted views in the common homeland; the word now signified more; it designated a community of origin, a union of purpose, and a *community of opinion*. The first external change in value of the coin "nation" was complete.

However this community of opinion had no slightest resemblance with modern nationalism due to Christian unity that bound all states and their people; it was the Christian language, Christian culture and Christian way of life that prevented any division. However gradually that clutch of religion became weak when there arose internal conflict within Christianity.

In the 18th century "nation" became a word of fashion. Fashionable words always become-like a much-used coin-very much worn down and flat. As in our time everything is democratic or totalitarian. In the 18th century everything was "national." At the beginning of the French Revolution, there developed a tendency to set up a clear boundary between people and nation, is shown by the deliberations instituted in June, 1789, as to whether the new House of Representatives should be called *assembleenationale* or *representants de peupleFrangais*. The French Revolutionary Parliament called itself *assemblienationale*, and the citizenry then sat sat in the seats of the distinguished and of the aristocrats, distinguished from people. The nation in the modern sense arose in 19th century with a more mass character.

(85)

**Stop to Consider:**

There was a change in the meaning of the term nation in its history of origin and growth. First it was used in derogatory sense to identify the alien lifestyle, food habits etc.; later in the modern period that shifted to only an identity of unity amongst the elite class. The mass character of the term is a very recent phenomena.

## 1.5 Precondition or features of Nation

In the modern era nothing so clearly marks out our attitudes and sentiments as national consciousness and nationalist ideology. Not only in everyday political and social life, but also in our underlying assumptions, the nation and its nationalism provide a stable structure, for good or ill, and define the objectives and ideals of most collective activity.

Nation is not a once-for-all, all-or nothing, concept; and that historical nations are ongoing processes, sometimes slow in their formation, at other times faster, some features emerge or are created, while others lag. Modern nations are therefore are linked to older ethnies and in most cases indirectly, that provide them with distinct symbolism, mythologies and culture. Or if it does not have them then it should be appropriate or risk for dissolution (Smith 1986)., the nation that emerges in the modern era must be regarded as both construct and real process. In Europe, nations have been forming, from the medieval period; in several other parts of the world, this process, or processes, have been more recent. Both objective factors outside human control, and human will and action, go into the creation of nations. Geographical environment, and the political accidents of warfare, may provide a setting for a group to form into a nation; but, whether it will subsequently do so, may depend on how far the group, or its ruling classes, become conscious of their identity, and reinforce it through education, legal codes and administrative centralization (Tilly 1975).

There must be, at least, some elements in the chosen population and its social environment who favour the aspirations and activities of the nationalist visionaries. Also different types of ethnic base largely determine the forms

and mechanisms through which the nation is subsequently formed, in so far as this is achieved Not only do they influence the role of the state, they also differentiate the social groups - aristocrats, bureaucrats, bourgeoisies, intelligentsia, lower clergy - that are likely to play leading roles in the movement towards nationhood

Besides, not all nations are the product of nationalist political endeavour. Many nations owed more to state centralization, warfare and cultural homogeneity than to any nationalist movement. The people in the communities of history who possessed specific cultural attributes often formed a social network or series of networks, which over the generations became what we today designate 'ethnic communities'. These communities of history and culture generally display a syndrome of characteristics, by which they are usually recognized. These include:

1. Common name for the unit of population included;

2. Set of myths of common origins and descent for that population;

3. Some common historical memories of things experienced together;

4. Common 'historic territory' or 'homeland', or an association with one;

5. One or more elements of common culture - language, customs, or religion;

6. A sense of solidarity among most members of the community.

The legacy of great nations attributed to their possession of military and economic power at the relevant period, the period of burgeoning nationalism and nations. As the great powers of the period, they inevitably became models of the nation, the apparently successful format of population unit, for everyone else. Yet in such case like England and France, this was not accidental. It was the result of the early development of a particular kind of 'rational' bureaucratic administration, aided by the development of merchant capital, wealthy urban centres and professional military forces and technology.

Some would say that the state actually 'created' the nation, that royal administration, taxation and mobilization endowed the subjects within its jurisdiction with a sense of corporate loyalty and identity. Even in the West, this overstates the case. The state was certainly a necessary condition for the formation of the national loyalties we recognize today. However, its operations in turn owed much to earlier assumptions about kingdoms and peoples, and to the presence of core ethnic communities around which these states were built up.

---

### Stop to Consider

Nation is not a once-for-all, all-or nothing, concept; and that historical nations are ongoing processes. There are many pre conditional characteristics that helps the nation to sustain and grow. Common name of the population living in a historical homeland with some unified language, culture, history and some myths of such unity leads to a sense of solidarity in order to build the nation.

---

## 1.6 Nation building Process

Nation Building refers to a process of inculcating the minds of people to be committed to and allegiance to one overriding loyalty to the nation, the motherland and to the authority of the state. The word 'nation-building' originated into craze among traditionally oriented political scientists in the 1950s and 1960s. Its main protagonists Karl Deutsch, Charles Tilly, and Reinhard Bendix. Ernest Renan's famous question 'what is a nation?' in his lecture at Sorbonne in 1887, marks the beginning of the academic debate on nations and nationalism, which continues to this day. Nation-building philosophy was predominantly used to describe the processes of national integration and consolidation that ultimately resulted in successful establishment of the modern nation state as distinct from various form of traditional states, such as feudal and dynastic states, church states, empires, etc.

In the traditional society and pre-modern state the communities that existed wereinsulated and they hadinsular cultures at the 'bottom' of society; state structure at 'the top' was rather content with collecting taxes and maintaining some sort of law and order. Through nation-building these two spheres were brought into contact with each other. Members of the local communities were drawn upwards into the larger structure through education and political participation. The state authorities, in turn, expanded their demands and obligations towards the members of society by offering a wide array of services and integrative social networks.

Stein Rokkan's model saw nation-building as comprising of four methodically distinct aspects. The first phase resulted in economic and cultural unification at the elitist level. The second phase brought the masses into the system through recruitment into the army, enrolment in compulsory schools, etc. The mass media created channels for direct contact between the central elites and periphery populations and generated widespread feelings of identity with the political system at large. In the third phase, the subject masses were brought into active participation in the workings of the territorial political system. Finally, the administrative apparatus of the state expanded. Public welfare services were established and nation-wide policies for the equalization of socio-economic conditions were designed.

Walker Connor noted that the nation-building literature was engrossed with elites and masses cleavage and totally ignored ethnic diversity factor in the process. He further held that the efficiency of engineering in nation-building had generally been exaggerated. This artificial production very often was counter-productive and in most cases led to ethnic revivalism. Complete assimilation of ethnic minorities had largely failed all over the world, Connor maintained. Neither common language, common religion, nor any other, shared cultural reservoir within a group qualified as a genuine sign of nation hood. He further asserted that the true nature of the ethnos was in all and every case the sense of common ancestry shared by its members. The nation is the ultimate extended family.

Later on some theoreticians developed Connor's understanding in two different directions. Scholars like Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner and

(89)

Eric Hobsbawm strongly underlined the myth aspect of the nation. In his book title, Benedict Anderson coined the expression "imagined communities" to describe modern nations. The nation is a product of imagination in the sense that the members of the community do not know each other personally and can only imagine themselves to be in communion with each other. Later, Anderson distanced himself from Gellner and Hobsbawm however as they took the "imagination" in a different meaning, interpreting it as "invention" and "fabrication." Smith insisted that nation though is a modern concept it has a long prehistory, evolving out of ethnic cores. It is a convergence of felicitous circumstances but it may also be due to the active efforts of determined nationalists, the Nation-builders.

Even for the most recently created states after decolonisation, ethnic homogeneity and cultural unity are paramount considerations. Even where their societies are genuinely "plural" and there is an ideological commitment to pluralism, the elites of the new states are compelled, to forge new myths and symbols of their emergent nations and a new "political culture" of anti-colonialism and the post-colonialism i.e. African or Asian state.

---

**SAQ:**

How does plural and non-homogenous States create nation? Does that leads to coercion?

......................................................................................................

......................................................................................................

......................................................................................................

---

After all discussions there can be highlight of few essential aspects for a successful nation-building process:

(a)   Democracy is the powerful force behind all successful nations and most successful nations are defined as democratically constituted ones. Though in terms of theory, nationalism does not require a particular form of government, there is a strong element of belief and examples of popular sovereignty involved in any nationbuilding

process. It could, therefore, be argued that nationalism and democracy depend on each other.

(b) The elite and their consent are the motivating force behind the nation building. Any elite adopting a national identity may have had their own interests in mind but it would have been impossible to advance those interests without referring to a larger collective body, the nation, at the same time. References to the nation served a double purpose: to legitimize their own involvement and their desire for political power.

(c) The most crucial responsibilities of nation builders is to incorporate existing institutions and traditions in the institutional make-up of the nation according to what importance they might have in the new national narrative. It is important to keep in mind that in a national context, all public institutions take on an additional, symbolic meaning: not only are they supposed to perform certain political, social or economic functions but they also form the visible surface of the nation.

---

**Check Your Progress:**

1. What is nation?

2. Mention the most important factors in the process of nation building.

3. Nations are 'imagined community'. Explain.

---

## 1.7 State: Conceptual Framework

A state is a form of political association or polity that is distinguished by the fact that it is not itself incorporated into any other political associations, though it may incorporate other such associations into it. The state is thus a supreme corporate entity because it is not incorporated into any other entity, even though it might be subordinate to other powers (such as another state or an empire). One state is distinguished from another by its having its own independent structure of political authority, and an attachment to separate

physical territories. It is a corporation because it is, in effect and in fact, a legal person. As a legal person a corporation not only has the capacity to act but also a liability to be held responsible. Furthermore, as a corporation it is able to hold property.

The crucial innovation that made for development of the state was the idea of the state as a legal person. In enabled the emergence of a political entity whose existence was not tied to the existence of particular persons – such as chiefs, lords and kings – or particular groups – such as clans, tribes, and dynasties. The state asa living entity is more durable, then any such living being.

Liberal theorizing on the State, as a concept, contends that the State is a political organization of human society that comprises organized attributes of contemporary institutions like the legislature, executive and judiciary, with respective roles. These are governmental institutions that make and enforce laws that are binding upon the people within a defined geographical territory. Machiavelli who expressed the idea as "the Power which has authority over men". Marx Webber captures the State, further, as "that authority which gives order to all but receive from none". It is the State, therefore, that provides the structures through which people and resources in a society are organized and policy and priorities established.

One is often paused with the query whether the best way to describe the state is as a sovereign power. The answer depends on how one understands sovereignty. If sovereignty means 'supreme authority within a territory', it is not clear that sovereignty captures the nature of all states. One aspect of being a state that is sometimes considered best identified by the concept of sovereignty is its territoriality. People belong to a state by virtue of their residence within borders, and states, it is argued, exercise authority over those within its geographical bounds.

Max Weber's well-known definition of the state as a body having a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force in a given territory is also inadequate. The extent of a state's control, including its control of the means of using violence, varies considerably with the state, not only legally but also in fact. Though they are supreme corporate entities, states do not always exist in

isolation, and usually stand in some relation to other forms of political association beyond their territorial borders. States may belong to international organisations such as the United Nations or alliances such as NATO. They may be a part of supranational associations that are loosely integrated defence and trading blocs (such as ASEAN) or more substantially integrated governmental associations (such as the EU). They might be members of international regimes, such as the International Refugee Convention, as a result of agreements they have entered into. States might also be parts of empires, or operate under the sphere of influence of another more powerful state. The state is, in the end, only one form of political association. Indeed, the range of different forms of political association and government even in recent history is astonishing.

---

**Stop to Consider**

State is constituted of population, territory, government and sovereignty. These characteristics of state vary in every peculiar existence of any state and accordingly the nature of the state also changes.

---

## 1.8 Perspectives on State

The origin and existence of State has different facets as analysed by different ideological groundings. Starting from the Westphalian State, that resulted from the demise of the Church as a power centre along with State and feudal lords, the imagination and analysis of State has been routed through diverse understandings. While State of Nature and the situation of chaos and mistrust there made the contractual theorist to imagine a contract agreed upon by the willing people to create a state and sovereign; utilitarian saw the justification of state from an utilitarian perspective where State serve for greatest happiness of the greatest number. Sometimes in doing so, the individual rights and interest may be sacrificed in order to achieve the principle of greatest happiness of greatest number.

Liberalism however is against this as it would base its claim in State showing equal respect to every individual and her rights. Liberals believe that State

is a neutral arbiter between competing interests and stands to realize what common good of the society is. Hence state is committed to believe in moral equality of individuals and it is concerned with rules that enable individuals to pursue their idea of 'good life', till that does not infringe others freedom and rights. Liberal equality however can have two implications, as put by Ronald Dworkin, first, it could be equal distribution of certain goods and opportunities; second, it may be opposed to identical distribution to all. Liberals are also divided on the extent of State obligation; if state be only concerned with law and order or it should be also involved in welfare activities through redistribution of resources.

However, individual remains the centre of universe in this perspective. Being the rational being to judge what is good; one should be given freedom and inalienable rights. State acts only as a mean to this end. It is considered as a necessary evil. The liberal individualistic perspective of the state overestimates the individual. Its enthusiasm to protect and promote individual in his rights, liberties and autonomy, leads to a capitalistic system where the state is reduced to a minimal state. In the present times in post-world war period the liberals like F.A. Hayek, Robert Nozick and John Rawls stands with the view that political life, like the economic life, is ought to be a matter of individual freedom and initiative and that there is a market society with a minimal state. Going a little left Poulantzas opines that poor should be taken care of by the state and there should be open information system. Again communitarians within liberal tradition like Michael Sandal believed that citizens as a members of community can obtain higher level of citizenship only in the State.

This whole standing on state by liberals is challenged by Marxists. Karl Marx and his successors bring in the theory of materialistic interpretation of history and dialectic in developing their argument on the evolution of State system. Marx's ideas of State were developed as a critique of Hegel and for the later the state is an ethical ideal and the highest expression of human freedom, which was realized for human beings acted in accordance with their reason. So for Hegel State is the community that secures freedom and

integration for the individual that is somewhere suspended in 'universal egoism' of civil society.

Marx departs from the argument that State had a universal character that can harmonize the dissenting element in civil society. He maintains that so long as society is divided into classes on the basis of the ownership of the means of production, there will be dominant and exploited class and the State will be acting in accordance with the interest of the dominant class. This has got its finest expression in his writing *Communist Manifesto (1848).* In fact the point of departure from the Liberal theorizing on the State occurred when Marx and Engels jointly expressed in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" that "the executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie", mostly at the expense of the poor. Classical Marxist View of the State therefore shows that it is an institution with established apparatuses purposely and directly meant to defend and maintain a class domination and class exploitation. For Milibrand and Saville (1965), both the economic and political powers of the State are merely the organized power of one class for the oppression of another. Lenin (1945:29) further views the State as the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. According to Alavi (1979), because of the absence of a fully developed indigenous class, the State (mostly in under-developed economies) has largely remained an instrument of the ruling class in the promotion of capitalist accumulation under the pretext of national development.

However in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louise Bonaparte* (1852), Marx talks about 'relative autonomy of the State' through precise balance of the class forces in society. Marx however maintained that while appearing to mediate between competing classes, the state keeps the class structure intact. The question, however, is as to how autonomous or free is the State in choosing its policies in a class-divided society with already established vested economic, political, ethnic, religious and social interests which are completely interrelated and interconnected? Apart from these two grand perspectives on states there are few other important approaches of looking at state.

The Feminist again have different attitude towards state power. While the liberal feminists believe in state's basic neutrality since it is the agent of removing the legal and political inequalities between the sexes. However the radical feminist strongly view that the power of the state is reflection of the patriarchal nature of society and it is an instrument of male domination over women.

Initiating post-modern thinking in understanding the State, Michel Foucault brought in the concept of 'governmentality', where he try to convince that state is the result of the practices of the government. Foucault's interest of government of human conduct in modern times led to his understanding that state is the result of this tendency towards government of conduct. So rather than saying governmental system flows from state, he turned around saying that state flows from the modern practice of the tendency of 'ordering life'.

Mahatma Gandhi has an interesting perspective on state and can be labelled as Gandhian perspective on state. Gandhi had a distrust upon all sorts of power, including political power as by its very nature it is coercive and compulsive.Accordingly Gandhi condemned the state as he found in the west and outlines a desire for *ramrajya* or an idea of ideal state.

---

**SAQ:**

How liberals and Marxists are different in their understanding of State?

...................................................................................................

...................................................................................................

...................................................................................................

---

## 1.9 Theories on Origin of State

The political philosophers are having a divergent view regarding origin and evolutionary process of State. Accordingly different theories evolved in this regard. This section will be to look into the diverse theoretical analysis regarding evolution of State.

### 1.9.1 Divine origin of State

The theory of divine origin of the State outlines the fact that the State has been established by an ordinance of God and so its rulers are divinely ordained and are accountable to no other authority but God (Anifowose, 1999:95). It is taken as the oldest theory on origin of State that tries to establish that God rules State directly or indirectly through some super human powers. The Greek and Romans regarded the State as indirectly divine. This notion of the divine origin of the State strongly prevailed in the oriental Empires where rulers regarded themselves as the descendants of God. God select, appoints, dismisses and slays a ruler according to some religious scriptures. The theory was used to support the theory of divine rights of the king. This theory of divine origin of leaders was used to support the absolutism of James I of England who, like others of his era, governed absolutely without any accountability to his people. In his book 'the law of free monarchies', James I wrote that kings were kings because God has made them kings and consequently they are responsible to god alone and nobody else. Therefore they were not to be held for any mistakes done as that will mean questioning the ultimate power, God.

The theory of divine origin remained popular for a very long time; but later it declined due to many factors. The religion began to fad its significance and people gradually began to assert that everything done by the king could not be attributed to god alone. This was mainly due to the separation of state from the church. Again the coming of the theory of social contract and evolutionary theory were other reasons for this decline. With the establishment of democratic ideals the fall of divine origin of state was inevitable.

---

**Check Your Progress:**

1. How did divine origin theory lost its significance?

2. Identify few new perspectives on State.

## 1.9.2 Social Contract Theory

The social contract theory is propounded by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and J.J. Rousseau. All the three philosophers rest their thought on the hypothesis regarding the existence of state of nature prior to the creation of civil state. However they differ in their approach to the process of state building from the state of nature.

In _Leviathan_, Hobbes wrote that the in state of nature humans were in a state of war. There was no condition for industry, culture, no society and worst of all people lived in continual fear and danger of violent death and the life of man were solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and selfish. Hobbes maintained that people should willingly give up their freedom to authority for security and protection. The state and sovereign so made are absolute and very powerful.

John Locke while giving his theory of 'Tabula Rasa' in _Second Treatise_ maintained that men are naturally free, equal and independent, no one can be deprived of this freedom and subjected to political power without his own consent. Government only governs with the consent of the people. Therefore can be overthrown and role of the government is to protect right to life, liberty and property. So for Locke State was limited in its power.

Rousseau known for the famous saying man is born free, but everywhere he is in chain has a slightly different theorisation regarding state formation. His take on social contract to form state is that people make laws directly and surrender their individualism to the general will of the community. Rousseau talked about democratic state based on his theory of general will that can be also termed as popular sovereignty.

The importance of the social contract theory lies, at least on two grounds: (1) it served as the basis for modern democracy by declaring the state as the product of people's consent (2) it condemned the divine origin theory as obsolete and provided an alternative theory of the origin of the state.

**SAQ:**

Can you differentiate between the understandings of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau regarding State?

.................................................................................

.................................................................................

.................................................................................

### 1.9.3 The Evolutionary Theory

This theory explains that the State is the product of a process of growth, a slow and steady evolution extending over a long period of time and ultimately shaping itself into the complex structure of a modem State. The State is, as Garner said, "neither the handiwork of God, nor the result of superior physical force, nor the creation of resolution or convention, nor a mere expansion of the family." It is an institution of natural growth which originated in the bare needs of the life of man and continues in existence for the sake of good life. Main supporters of the theory are J. W. Burgess, MacIver, Garner and Gettell.

According to the proponents of this theory, apart from the influence of physical environment and geographical conditions, there are five other important factors including kinship, religion, property, force and political consciousness that operates together in various combination to form the unity and organisation called state.

The factors responsible for gradual formation of state include: 1. Kinship or blood relation. Family constituted the first link in the process of the evolution of the state. With the expansion of the family arose new families and the multiplication of families led to the formation of clans and tribes. The name of the common ancestor was the symbol of kinship. Kinship created society and society at length created the state. 2. Religion not only helped the unification of political communities, it was also responsible for subordinating barbaric anarchy and for teaching reverence and obedience. The sanction of law in primitive society was religion and the breaking of law was followed by terrible punishment. 3. Property:"The basic factor in any given society,"

(99)

says Laski, "is the way it earns its living. All social relations are built upon provision for those primary material appetites without satisfying which life cannot endure." Among primitive peoples there were successive economic stages that marked the growing importance of property and that brought about corresponding changes in social organisation as well as corresponding intensification of social control.4. Force might not have been the sole factor in the making of a state, but it cannot be denied that it must have contributed its worth in making and expanding the state as one factor. Force translates weakness into subjugation; subjugation into unity, and unity into strength.5. Political consciousness arising from the fundamental needs of life for protection and order. When the people settle down on a definite territory in pursuit of their subsistence and a desire to secure it from encroachment by others, the need for regulating things and persons is felt imminently and this is the essence of political consciousness.

All these factors grow and evolve with time; the political organisation, the states roots gaining strength and ultimately the shaping and reshaping of it into the complex creation of the state. This has been adequately sufficed by Gettell, when he says 'like every other social institution the state arose from many sources and under various and it emerged almost imperceptibly'.

---

**Stop to Consider**

Evolutionary theory is accepted as the most logical and well-articulated theory on origin of state. The five factors- kinship, force, political consciousness, property and religion work together to strengthen the institutions and mechanisms of state.

---

**1.9.4 Marxist Theory on origin of state:**

The best explanation of the origin of the state is given by Frederick Engels in his book 'Origin of the Family, Private Property and State'. For Marxists it is a product of society at a certain stage of social development; Marx maintained that the forces of production in any given society constitute the basis of all social relationships while the State rests (or is founded) upon

economic conditions. State is the admission that in the society when it has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction. It has not existed from all eternity and there have been societies that did without it. The state became a necessity at a certain stage of social development that was a consequence of the cleavage of society into two contending classes. Accordingly, the state is the product of antagonistic classes. In each stage of economic system or mode of production in human history contained within it a contradiction that eventually led to its demise and replacement by another, more advanced stage of economic and social life. This contradiction also necessitates the state that appears because the antagonistic classes appear and that functions as a class institution, is of the economically dominant class, of the slave-owners, or of the feudal lords and at present is of the capitalists.

This State then turns to be an instrument in the hands of a powerful dominant class for accumulation and exploitation of the dominated members of the society. Marx maintains that the State's creation is not for the interest of all, but it originates in conflict and operates as a form of instrument of domination.

---

**Check Your Progress**

1.  The Divine origin theory of the state is about unquestionable State where it acts as the representative of the God. True/False.

2.  Marxist theory of materialistic interpretation of history is associated with Theory of origin of State. How?

---

### 1.10 On the Idea: Nation-State

The terms 'nation' and 'state' are sometimes used synonymously and most of the time they are used together. The muddle has been the result of one of the fundamental beliefs of nationalism that every community of people who are conscious of them being nation should also have a state of their own. Thus the birth of the hyphenated term 'nation-state' evolved. Even a historical study of nation and nationalism clarifies its relationship with State.

Modern states, nations and nationalism are all territorial in the sense that they claim or are based on specific geographical areas. In the 19th century,

the idea got a new boost when it got the claim that geography is the spot where the state and the nation coincides. It has already been discussed earlier that the modern state is often called the "territorial state" since it has a clearly demarcated territory in which it claims sovereign rights over all its citizens. Nationalism is a territorial ideology which is internally unifying and externally divisive. As an ideology nationalism discourages conflicts based on social class or status within a nation but enhances differences between different peoples and nations outside the territory.

Authorities as different as Max Weber and V.I. Lenin have argued that nations and nationalism have to be seen" primarily in political terms in relation to statehood". Three ways in which nationalism has shaped the modern state have been identified. In the older states like England and France the rise of nationalism was linked to the development of more democratic relationships between the state and civil society. Secondly, nationalism furthers the internal unification of culturally and economically diverse regions into a more homogenous state territory. Finally, nationalism divides one political community or nation from another and even determines the geographical boundaries of the nation in many cases.

Nationalism as has been regarded by most historians to be originated in Western Europe that spread to other parts of the world. While the idea in modern sense arose in 18$^{th}$ and 19$^{th}$ centuries, certain military and political events (decline of Holy Roman Empire and hundred years war between English and French Kingdoms) were occurring in Europe that were creating preconditions for rise of nations as early as 14$^{th}$ century. However the rise of centralized modern state in Europe around 16$^{th}$ and 17$^{th}$ century created fertile grounds for rise of nationalism. Unlike the pre modern political formations, the modern states are centralized, sovereign, undivided political power. Before that the political power was shard horizontally with the 'Church' and vertically with the feudal governors or the 'vassals'. Europe in those time had two overlapping zones of authority between catholic church and the individual rulers of kingdoms; this uneasy alliance of political and religious authority in the State meant that neither could emerge as omnipotent.

Again the feudal system of social stratification based on hierarchy, functioned at both political and economic level, was based on relationship with land. It is a complex power sharing structure vertically downward from the monarch, which kept a check on each other.

Thus these factors along with others prevented formation of centralized political community with fixed territory and population. Again marriage alliances between royal families, accompanied by dowries and gifts of land, territory and consequently people were normal practices. Therefore local diversity and peculiarity remained throughout Europe.

---

**Check Your Progress:**

1. Territory or geography is the spot where nation and state coincide. True/false.

2. Can there be nation without state?

3. Why in pre modern times the formation of centralized state was impossible?

---

However there was gradual weakening and collapse of the feudal and the religious power centres in Europe and the most important factors linked to it were the rise of absolutist monarchy and the merchant capitalist class. Trade and commerce became a rich source of wealth then and the rulers' dependency of taxation from feudal agrarian production reduced to a considerable level leading to their reduced dependency on vassals; thus resulted in loss of political influence of the feudal governors and this in turn gave rise to absolute power of the monarchs.

This was the same time in early modern period, when due to religious reforms, there was a heavy blow to Catholic Church. So there was the collapse of both horizontal and vertical power sharing centres leading to direct, effective and comprehensive rule over entire population by the monarch. They strictly enforced territorial boundaries, strict rule of residence and mobility were introduced and also standardization of the population took place to ensure

certain kinds of homogeneity; these were done in order to ensure a sense of loyalty to respective rulers. However in long term these developments also laid the objective foundation of nations.

Subsequently nationalism became the philosophy of the emerging elite (emerging as mercantile capitalist then industrial capitalists) in west Europe, who were important political ally of the absolute kings in their rise to power. Soon they became restless to have share in the political power and this led to their capture of the newly introduced representative assemblies across Europe. In subsequent period there were tussle between the king and the parliament (Glorious Revolution is a prime example). Interestingly the capitalist bourgeoisie used 'nation' as a sense of identity and 'nationalism' united diverse section of that class. They used nation to refer to homogenous, ancient, close knit political community, which needs to be revived through greater political power within the respective State systems.

In the following period, when the absolutist monarch was devoid of support from the capitalists, in desperation of maintaining power, they resorted to increased despotic forms of rule. In response the masses protested in leadership of the elite sections. Thus these revolts and uprisings of the 18th-19th centuries in Europe had 'nationalistic' expressions. These ultimately resulted in the creation of limited and constitutional monarchy and then democracy in many parts of Europe.

However this whole experience of Europe regarding rise of nation state was totally alien to other parts of the world. At the time when in Europe, nationalism had spread from the elites to the masses by the end of the 19th century, this also started to spread to other parts of the world. Trade relations and colonialism in particular was responsible for this spread. Benedict Anderson's famous doctrine that nationalism in Asia, Africa and Latin American countries is an 'export' from Europe holds strong here. Colonialism exposed the natives of these continents to outside world that was pregnant with the new ideas of nation, nationalism, democracy, liberation etcetera, ultimately fuelled the national liberation struggle in the colonies. However in these indigenous struggles, there was a rise of new form that is called anti-

colonial nationalism or non-European nationalism. These resulted into modern nation states in most of Asian, African and Latin American countries in mid-20th century.

## 1.11 Summing Up

After reading this unit you definitely have understood the concept of nation. You have learnt that a group of people having a common origin, language and tradition constituting a political entity is called a nation. A nation is generally more overtly political than an ethnic group. You have also learnt that the word 'nation' has its origin in Latin. This chapter has familiarised you with the features of nation as well. A population with a sense of ethnic, historical and cultural oneness is one of the most important features of a nation. The feeling of community and unity also are important features of a nation. You have also learnt that constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of a state is called the process of nation building. The economic and social factors play a vital role in the process of nation building. Nation building also includes the process of constructing national identity. After reading this unit you have also learnt the concept of state. The state is a supreme corporate entity having its own independent structure of political authority. This unit has also dealt with different perspectives on state. While the liberals believes in minimal and neutral state, Marxist are of the view that state is an instrument of class oppression. The feminist explain the patriarchal nature of state. The post modern view defines that a state is the result of the practices of government. In this unit you have also learnt about different theories about the origin of the state. The divine origin theory says that the god has created state and the rulers of a state are appointed by the god himself. The social contract theory of state argues that state is the creation of a contract. The evolution theory of state explains that the state is a product

of growth and composed evotuin over a long period of time. The Marxist theory believe that state is the result of class struggle. This unit has enlightened you on the concept of nation state. Nation state is a form of political organisation under which a relatively homogenous people inhabits a sovereign state.

## 1.12 References/Suggested Readings

1.  Alavi, H. (1979). "The State in Post-colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh", in Politics and State in the Third World. Macmillan Ltd.

2.  Anifowose, R. (1999), "State, Society and Nation", in Anifowose, R &Enemuo, F.C. (eds), Elements of Politics. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.

3.  Anthony D. Smith (1989), The origins of nations, Ethnic and racial Studies, 12:3, 240-267, retrieved on 4th August from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1989.9993639

4.  Benedict Anderson (1983), Imagined Community: Reflection on the Origin and spread of Nationalism, Verso publication

5.  Benyamin Neuberger (2001) National self-determination: A theoretical discussion, Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity, 29:3, 391-418, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00905990120073672

6.  Chandran Kukathas (2014), A definition of the state, .University of Queensland Law Journal, 33 (2), 357-366. Retrieved on 27th July from https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research/2917

7.  Charles Tilly (1975), The formation of National states in western Europe, Princeton University Press.

8.  Dr. Jayanta Kumar das and Dr.Ratnaprava Barik, Indian Government and Politics, retrieved on 25th July 2021 from https://ddceutkal.ac.in/Syllabus/MA_Pol_Science/Paper-5.pdf

9.  Earnest Gellner (1983), Nation and Nationalism, Wiley Blackwell publication

10. Elie Kedourie (1960), Nationalism, New York: Collier, reprinted 4th edition by Wiley Blackwell in 1993

11. Eric J. Hobsbawm (1992), Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth and reality, Published by Cambridge University Press in 2012.

12. Ernest Renan (1882), What is a nation, Paris, Presses-Pocket, 1992 (translated by Ethan Rundell, retrieved on 24th July 2021from http://ucparis.fr/files/9313/6549/9943/What_is_a_Nation.pdf

13. F.A. Hayek (1944), The Road to Serfdom, reprinted by University of Chicago Press in 2008pp;

14. Guido Zernatto and Alfonso G. Mistretta (1944), Nation: The History of a Word, The Review of Politics , Vol. 6, No. 3 (Jul., 1944), pp. 351-366, Cambridge University Press, retrieved on 12th July 2021 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1404386

15. IGNOU, Self-Learning Material, Unit 16: Nationalism and the nation State, retrieved on 25th July 2021 from http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/20507

16. IGNOU, Self-Learning Material, Unit 4: Theories of state, retrieved on 25th July 2021 from http://egyankosh.ac.in//handle/123456789/43921

17. Johann KasparBluntschli (2000), The Theory of the State, Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books, first published in 1895

18. Karl Marx (1952), The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, retrieved on 2nd November 2006 from https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/

19. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1948), The Communist Manifesto, republished in 2017 by fingerprint publishing

20. Lenin, V.I. (1918). The State and Revolution. Moscow: Progress Publishers, retrieved on 24th July 2021 from https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/staterev/

21. Miliband, R. & Saville, J. (eds) (1965). "Marx and the State", in The Socialist register, retrieved on 25th July 2021 from https://www.marxists.org/archive/miliband/1965/xx/state.htm

*Space for Learner*

22. Robert Nozick (1974), Anarchy, State and Utopia, 2nd edition 2013, Basic Books Publisher

23. Stein Rokkan (1971), Nation Building: A review of Models and Approaches, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001139217101900302

24. Walker Connor (1978), a nation is a nation, is a state, is an ethnic group is a…, Ethnic and Racial Studies, Vol. 1, No. 4, October 1978, published online in 13th September 2010, retrieved on 23rd July 2021 from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870.1978.9993240

× × ×

# UNIT: 2

# SOVEREIGNTY

## 2.1 Introduction

It is known to all of us that state is the most powerful institution. Every cititizen has to obey and respect the state and follow the rules of the state. Hence it becomes necessary to know why state enjoys such privilege and predominant position in society. Here comes the importance of the concept

*Space for Learner*

of sovereignty. It is the element possessed by state for which it is regarded as the most powerful institution. Sovereignty is not a simple term but one of the most complex notions of Political Science. Hence study of political theory certainly requires study of sovereignty. And form the very beginning, political scientists have tried to analyse it in their own way. This chapter is an attempt to discuss the concept of sovereignty, its nature, forms and various theories. Along with these an attempt has been made to analyse the contemporary challenges to sovereignty found in the form of imperialism and globalization.

## 2.2 Objective

After going through this unit you will be able to—

- *understand* the concept of Sovereignty and its evolution,

- *understand* various characteristics of sovereignty,

- *understand* existing theories of Sovereignty,

- *examine* challenges to sovereignty and status of state sovereignty under the age of Globalization.

## 2.3 Concept of Sovereignty

Sovereignty is a key concept of traditional political theory and one of the important elements of modern states. Without Sovereignty statehood will remain incomplete. The word sovereignty has been derived from the Latin word *Superanus*. *Superanus* in Latin means supreme power. The Romans considered it as fullness of power. Sovereignty is one of the four elements of modern state. The state exercises its supreme power internally over its individual and other organizations and in external aspect it refers to its absolute freedom in its relation with other states. This means in simple term that no other state can compel or force a sovereign state to act or not to act on any issue that it does not want to. This is known as internal and external sovereignty of a state. These are two aspects of sovereignty. Earlier sovereignty was considered to be a power of the rulers. But in present time when the division between state and government has become clear and

accepted, it no longer remains with the ruler and has become an important element of state.

Sovereignty is primarily a legal concept. All the traditional definitions of sovereignty have defined it in legal terms. And it refers to the supremacy of state in legal sphere. The basic idea behind sovereignty is that it is able to declare law, issue commands and take political decisions that are binding on all the citizens and associations of the state. The sovereign can do these on his own will or he does not require approval of any one to issue laws and commands. A sovereign power is authorized to use physical force to punish those who disobey his laws and commands.

As the concept of sovereignty attributes supreme power to the will of the sovereign, hence it is by nature absolute, unlimited and undivided. But there exists difference between arbitrary power and sovereign power. Absolute power of sovereignty does not mean that it can be used without any reason and against customs and traditions. It has to go in tune with the prevalent customs, social values and public interest. If this is not done then legitimacy of the sovereign power will be in danger.

### 2.3.1 Definitions of Sovereignty

Many theorists have defined Sovereignty in their own way. Some important among those are-

According to Garner, "sovereignty is that characteristic of the state in virtue of which it cannot be legally bound except by its own will or limited by any other power than itself."

Bodin defines sovereignty as, "the supreme power of the state over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law."

Grotius defied sovereignty as, "thesupreme political power vested in him whose acts are not subject to any other and whose will cannot be overridden."

According to Willoughby,"Sovereignty is the supreme will of the state."

Jellinek defined sovereignty as,"that characteristic of state in virtue of which it cannot be legally bound except by its own will or limited by any other power than itself."

According to Laski, "the sovereign is legally supreme over any individual or group. It possesses supreme coercive power."

Burgess defined sovereignty as "original, absolute, unlimited power over the individual subject and over all associations of subjects."

In a nutshell, Sovereignty is-

i. an attribute of the state

ii. the supreme power of the state

iii. the source of the laws of the state

## 2.4 Evolution of the Concept of Sovereignty

It is true that sovereignty is a modern concept and came into existence with the emergence of nation states in Europe but at the same time it is also true that it was there in ancient period also. Indeed the idea of sovereignty can be traced back to ancient Greek city states. Ancient Greek thinker and father of Political Science Aristotle also accepted sovereignty as the supreme power of the state although he did not give any illustration about the nature of the notion or did not analysed sovereignty because he believed that power of the ruler was limited by the law which existed above him. Regarding the evolution of sovereignty in medieval times it is seen that conditions in the middle ages were not favourable for the development of sovereignty as the ruler's powers were limited by both feudal lords and religious heads. Further the laws of God were supposed to be superior to human laws at that period. This also hampered the evolution of sovereignty during middle ages. By the end of the middle age, the king started increasing power and thus Sovereignty got a new height in modern age. Accordingly the ground for evolution of sovereignty got prepared. The modern concept of sovereignty was first propounded by Jean Bodin and he defined sovereignty "as supreme power over citizens, unrestrained by law". Thus, Bodin placed sovereign above law. According to Bodin the power of sovereignty cannot be delegated, and it is perpetual and unlimited. He also made the sovereign the ultimate authority to make, interpret and execute laws. Hugo Grotius, a Dutch jurist made an important contribution to the concept of sovereignty. He is mainly

associated with the aspect of external sovereignty of the state, that is, the state is independence of the sovereign state from foreign control. Thomas Hobbes, the European contractualist thinker discussed about the concept of sovereignty in seventeenth century. He made the sovereign, who is the outcome of social contract an all powerful figure and identified the sovereign as the source of law, interpreter of law and above the law of the land. His sovereign power was absolute and unlimited.

Hobbes's main contribution to the theory of sovereignty lies in adding legitimacy to the authority of the sovereign because according to him sovereign is the product of the will of the people. Further, the sovereign enjoys his supreme authority for its functional value that is because he is the provider of peace and security in place of anarchy of state of nature that existed before the origin of the sovereign authority.

Another contractualist and French thinker Rousseau also contributed significantly in the development of sovereignty and he put forwarded the notion of popular sovereignty through his idea of General will. This concept of popular sovereignty of Rousseau is one of the most important contributions to the field of political thought. Unlike Hobbes and Rousseau, John Locke propounded a theory of limited and constitution government. He was not in favour of giving absolute power to the sovereign authority and thus established himself as a pioneer of limited and constitutional government.

Jeremy Bentham, the English utilitarian also discussed about sovereignty in a different way. For him sovereignty was not limited by law but was subject to moral limitations. Hence he suggested that the sovereign should try to justify his authority by adopting useful legislation with the aim of promoting greatest happiness of the greatest numbers. And in the nineteenth century John Austin emerged as the most important exponent of legal sovereignty. By giving a single source of all positive law, Austin put forward a monistic view of law, state and sovereignty. Austin's theory of sovereignty will be discussed in the later part of this chapter. Along with these thinkers, historical events like French Revolution, Industrial revolution also contributed to the evolution of the notion of sovereignty. The historic French revolution helped in establishing people's sovereignty. Similarly, the Industrial Revolution also

expanded the activities of the government and thus led to the increasing of authority of state.

---

**Stop to Consider**

**Some important points:**

- Supreme power of the state is called sovereignty and it is one of the important elements of modern state.

- The modern concept of sovereignty was first propounded by Jean Bodin.

- Sovereignty has two aspects-internal and external.

---

## 2.5 Basic characteristics of Sovereignty

Analysis of the concept of sovereignty brings out a few characteristics. These are discussed below-

**Absoluteness:** Sovereignty refers to absoluteness. It has two sides-internal and external. Internally it means that all persons, groups and organizations existing within the state are subject to the total control of sovereignty and externally it means that the state is not in control of any other state. Sovereignty is regarded as absolute because it cannot be limited by any superior power or authority. The sovereign may on his own will can give importance to social norms and customs and moral principles but he is not bound to follow those. This absoluteness of sovereignty is the logical outcome of legal nature of it.

**Indivisibility**: As sovereignty is absolute; it cannot be divided among person or among various organs of state. Sovereignty rests with the state as a whole. According to Jellinek, notion of a divided, fragmented, diminished, relative sovereignty is the negation of sovereignty. Gettel says, "if sovereignty is not absolute, no state exist ;if sovereignty is divided, more than one state exists. So it can be said that sovereignty is an entire thing. Hence to divide it is to destroy it.

**Universal:** Since sovereignty extends to all individual and associations and organizations within the jurisdiction of the state, hence it is universal in nature. There may exist different international and multinational organization in a state but these are also subject to the sovereignty of the state in which they exist.

**Exclusive**: Sovereignty is exclusive. Only state possesses this power and exercises control over individual and organizations. There may be some kind of delegation of some power but that does not mean that they are sovereign. Sovereignty exclusively belongs to state.

**Inalienability**: Sovereign power is non transferable. No sovereign can Transfer its

authority to another one. Once it gets transferred, the original possessor ceases to be sovereign. But delegation of some powers is possible.

**Permanent**: Sovereignty is permanent. Any change in the government does not affect sovereignty. Bodin says, "if power be held only for a certain time (it does not matter how long a time), it is not sovereign power, and he who holds it for that time is not a sovereign." One needs to understand the distinction between state and government to understand the permanence of the concept of sovereignty. Sovereignty belongs to state, not to government. Hence, change in government does not lead to change of sovereignty. Sovereignty of the state continues till the existence of its independence.

## 2.6  Kinds of Sovereignty

Sovereignty may take different forms in different conditions. Some of these forms are discussed below-

### 2.6.1 Titular Sovereignty and Actual Sovereignty:

When supreme power is vested in the name of one person and it is enjoyed by some other then it's called titular sovereignty. The person in whose name power is vested does not enjoy or use the power. In other words a titular sovereign is one who is sovereign or supreme only in name but not in fact. In constitutional monarchy like England, the queen is officially referred to as the sovereign where real powers are vested on cabinet .And an actual sovereign is one who is powerful both in name and fact. He is all powerful.

(115)

### 2.6.2 De Facto and De Jure Sovereignty:

De facto means something which does not exist in the eye of law or law of the land does not recognizes its power and authority. On the other hand a de jure sovereign is one whose power and authority is recognized by law of the land. However in many incidents it has been observed that the defac to sovereign become de jure in long run. The authority exercised by Napoleon in France, the Bolshevist groups in Russia after 1917, the military dictatorship in present day world etc are some of the examples of de facto sovereign. These types of de facto sovereign can become de jure by adopting measures to legitimize their authority.

### 2.6.3 Legal and Political Sovereignty:

According to Prof. Gilchrist, "The political sovereign in the state is the influence in the state which formulated in a legal way and passed by the legal law making body, ultimately becomes the law of the state." The political sovereign manifests itself by voting by the press, by speeches and in many other ways, not easy to describe or define. It is however not organized and it can only become effective when organized. The organization of political sovereignty leads to legal sovereignty. The two are aspects of the one sovereignty of the state. They constantly react on each other."

Legal sovereignty is organized, definite and recognized by law. The political sovereignty is the sum total of the influences in a state which lie behind the law. For example in England it is the electorate which is politically sovereign, which in long run can always enforce its will. According to Garner, "Legal sovereignty is the determinate authority which is able to express in a legal formula the highest command of the state, the power which can override the prescription of the divine law, the principles of morality and the mandates of public opinion."One of the most important advocates of legal sovereignty is John Austin.

### 2.6.4 Popular Sovereignty:

Popular sovereignty refers to people's sovereignty. When the supreme power of the state lies with the people of the state then it is called popular

sovereignty. In a democratic form of government this kind of sovereignty is found. According to this notion of sovereignty, the organs of state which exercise supreme power in terms of enactment and execution of law draw their legitimacy from the will of the people. Writers and thinkers like Marsiglio of podua, George Buchanan, Francis Hotman and others advocated this notion of sovereignty by opposing exercise of unlimited power by kings. Jean Jacques Rousseau is regarded as the chief exponent of this notion of popular sovereignty. For him sovereignty lies with the people whom he called as General Will. According to Lord Bryce, "the idea of popular sovereignty is the basis and watchword of democracy." Modern democracies of the world are based on this concept of popular sovereignty. Marsiglio described the supreme authority of the people as Republicanism. In the later part of medieval period, by challenging the supreme authority of the pope, he argued that the powers of the pope should be confined to the administration of the sacraments and teaching of divine laws.

## 2.7 Austin's theory of Sovereignty

John Austin was an English Jurist and he put forwarded the legal view of sovereignty in his famous work 'Lectures on Jurisprudence' (1832). According to him, "if a determinate human superior not in the habit of obedience to a like superior receives habitual obedience from the bulk of a given society, that determinate superior is sovereign in that society and that society is a society political and independent."Thus according to Austin sovereignty must be a determinate authority and in every sovereign state this determinate authority is found. He also believed that this determinate sovereign authority can do anything and everything. Austin believed that sovereignty is indivisible and all powers of it should be centered in one hand or one person. Austin's theory of sovereignty is also known as legal theory of sovereignty. This is because he discussed sovereignty from a legal point of view. Austin's theory of sovereignty was influenced by the then prevailing conditions in England. He wanted to eliminate the anomalies of common law by subordinating it to a superior law.

Austin, the eminent jurist tried to make a clear distinction between law and morality and also between laws of the court and laws based on usage. He believed that there can exist only one sovereign authority in a state. Since he supported the existence of only one sovereign authority in a state, hence this theory is known as monistic theory of sovereignty. Austin received support from other thinkers like Hobbes, Grotius etc.

Austin said that law is the command of the sovereign and sovereign is the source of law. Indeed according to him the sovereign holds a right to legitimate use of physical force to enforce its laws. He also believed that the authority of the sovereign is unlimited and absolute. He is above law and he is the source of law as has been mentioned above. He also identified a few characteristics of law. These are-i.e.it must originate from a determinate source, that is the sovereign, ii. It must be the expression of the command of the sovereign, iii. It must be backed by sanctions. That means disobedience to law must be punishable.

**Principles of Austin's theory of Sovereignty:**

   i.  Sovereign is a determinate authority that is the source of all authorities of a state.

   ii. Sovereignty is the supreme power of the state. It is the source of all authority. This authority is absolute and unlimited.

   iii. Law is the will and command of the sovereign. Sovereign authority is the source of all laws of the state. It is he who can punish other for not obeying the laws. The sovereign is above customs and traditions.

   iv. People habitually obey the sovereign. According to Austin if a large portion of the population refuses to render obedience to the sovereign then he is not sovereign in the true sense.

   V.  Sovereignty is indivisible. It is a unit in itself. If it is divided then it will cease to be sovereign.

   vi. Sovereignty has legitimate physical force to execute its commands and laws.

(118)

**Criticisms:**

According to critics, Austin's idea of indivisibility of sovereignty is not acceptable. The pluralist opposes this by saying that various associations formed in society share and compete with the sovereignty of the state. For many, sovereign authority of a state is divided among the legislature, executive and judiciary. Bluntchli said that sovereignty of a state is limited by both internal and external factors.

Austin's idea of absolute sovereignty is challenged on the ground that in modern times, no state can violate international laws made on various issues. In the internal aspect also it has to respect rights of the citizens, its social norms and customs etc.

Non recognition of the importance of the popular sovereignty is another drawback of Austin's theory of sovereignty. He only emphasized on the legal sovereignty for which this concept of sovereignty is regarded as anti democratic.

Austin's credit lies in making a clear distinction between legal and political sovereignty. It is true that he is criticized for giving too much importance on legal sovereignty, but it is natural for a jurist like him.

---

**Stop to Consider**

**Austin's theory of Sovereignty:**

It represents all the basic characteristics of sovereignty. It was he who identified and discussed sovereignty from a legal point of view. According to him Sovereign is a determinate authority and he is the source of all authorities of a state. Austin believed that sovereignty is indivisible and all powers of it should be centered in one hand or one person. Austin's theory of sovereignty is also known as legal theory of sovereignty. This is because he discussed sovereignty from a legal point of view. For him sovereign authority is the source of all laws. It is he who can punish other for not obeying the laws.

---

## 2.8 Pluralist Theory of Sovereignty

The pluralist theory of sovereignty is a reaction to the monistic theory of sovereignty propounded by John Austin. We have already come to know that monists like Hobbes, Austin attributed absolute, unlimited, indivisible and inalienable powers to the state. But the pluralists consider it as undemocratic and harmful to the society. F.W. Maitland, G.D.H.Cole, Maciver, Laski, Earnest Barker etc. were the main proponent of this theory of pluralism.

The pluralist does not believe that the sovereign is determinate. They are of the view that determination was possible in old days when the king used to rule with absolute powers. In modern times when there is democracy based on popular sovereignty, this concept of supreme authority of only one institution i.e. state can never be accepted.

Pluralists are of the view that man's social nature is expressed through various associations and institutions. Such institutions are very old and these are equally powerful with the state in their respective areas. Hence, according to the pluralists, it is unjust to consider state as only sovereign or supreme power or institution. Laski says," The state is only one among the various forms of associations and, as compared with them, has no superior claims to the individual allegiance." In a nutshell the pluralists believe that the state and other associations occupy the same status in society and deny to the state a more important place.

The pluralists are in favour of giving importance to the sociological character of state. They, hence recognize the role of associations in society formed by men for fulfillment of their various needs. For instance, religious institutions, trade unions, social institutions in a society play very important role in individual's life. It is true that the state enjoys a privileged position in the sense that its jurisdiction is over all individuals and associations and unlike other associations it enjoys coercive powers. But that does not necessarily establish the superior authority of the state. Rather this imposes a higher moral responsibility on the state. Again, the pluralist put forward the role of customs and traditions in society in support of their criticisms to legal monistic theory of sovereignty. They say that the customs and traditions of the society

are neither created by the state, nor the state has any control over them. Rather, the state has to bow before it. Indeed history reveals that the most dictatorial rulers had to bow before these.

The pluralists are of the view that the state must justify its claim to allegiance on moral grounds. Thus the pluralist stands for the decentralization of authority so that all authority is not centralized in the hands of the state. In short, the pluralists are of the view of redefining the nature of the state as one of the several associations operating in society. It wanted to give a new role to the state in the form of coordinator of different associations. It also repudiated the exclusive and absolute claim of the state to individual's allegiance and wanted to that the state should compete with other human associations to establish its claim to superior authority.

The pluralists are of the view that state's claim to superior authority cannot be taken for granted. It is true that the state's jurisdiction is compulsory over all individuals and associations and it is also equipped with coercive powers to punish those who violate its commands but this does not mean automatically that the state is the superior authority.

**Principles of Pluralism:**

  i. **The pluralist nature of society:** It emphasis on the sociological nature of the society which is mainly plural. It also accepts that there are some social institutions which are very old and formed by men to fulfill their various interests. Hence importance of these groups can never be ignored.

 ii. **Role of the state as coordinator**: According to the pluralists, the state does not exist above the social institutions. It plays the role of coordinator of the various associations. This role of the state as coordinator is essential for maintaining order in society, they believe.

iii. **Decentralization of authority:** The pluralists believe that expansion of authority of state leads to undermine of democracy and it may be dangerous for individual liberty. Again the complex problems of modern state can not be handled by only one authority. Hence to keep democratic norms and individual liberty safe and also for administrative convenience decentralization of authority is a necessary condition.

(121)

**Characteristics:**

i.      Pluralist theory does not accept state as the only authority or the supreme power. It believes that state does not possess unlimited and absolute powers. Its powers are limited by both external and internal factors. Internally its power is limited by social and rights related issues and externally it is limited by international norms and laws.

ii.     It considers various social institutions as equally powerful with the state in their respective sphere.

iii.    It in sharp contrast to the monistic theory believes that sovereignty is divisible. It can be divided between state and other associations that exist within the state.

iv.     The pluralists are in favour of giving importance to the sociological character of state. They, hence recognize the role of associations in society formed by men for fulfillment of their various needs.

v.      It believes that not only the state but other institutions also receive allegiance from the people. Thus it believes in plurality of sovereign institutions.

**Criticism:**

Pluralism has been criticized on various grounds. The critics are of the view that there exists contradiction within pluralism itself. It on the one hand tries to decentralize the sovereign authority of the state to establish importance of the associations of society and on the other hand entrusts the state with higher moral responsibility of coordination.

Significance of pluralism lies in bringing out the importance of group life in modern societies and establishment of role of various associations. It also attempted to contribute towards the development of decentralization and democracy. But at the same time it is also true that if authority of the state is declined there may emerge various problems in society. Having a final authority definitely helps in establishing a peaceful society.

Importance of pluralism lies in discussing the problem of sovereignty in political sphere. It also emphasized on the importance of group life. Its argument for democracy and decentralization can never be ignored.

---

**Stop to Consider**

**Pluralist theory of Sovereignty:**

It is a reaction to the monistic theory of sovereignty. F.W. Maitland, G.D.H.Cole, MacIver, Laski, Earnest Barker etc. were the main proponent of this theory of pluralism. They are of the view that man's social nature is expressed through various associations and institutions. Various such institutions are very old and these are equally powerful with the state in their respective areas. Hence, according to the pluralists, it is unjust to consider state as only sovereign or supreme power or institution. Main principles of the pluralists theory are-the pluralist nature of society, role of the state as coordinator and decentralization of authority.

---

## 2.9 Challenges to Sovereignty:

Sovereignty refers to the supreme power of the state. A sovereign state is supreme both in external and internal sphere. All the conventional legal theories of sovereignty accept this supremacy of the state. But there are some challenges to this supreme authority. These challenges are both external and internal in nature. Internally it is challenged by various associations or organizations as has been discussed under the pluralist theory and externally it is challenged by imperialism and colonialism, neo colonialism, globalization etc. Indeed it can be said that the process of globalization aggravated the situation and posed a grave challenge towards sovereignty of the state. In present world state sovereignty is also affected and challenged by human rights issues, environmental issues etc.

### 2.9.1 Imperialism and Colonialism:

Imperialism that means formation of an empire by bringing several countries under the control of one supreme authority found expression in modern times as colonialism. Yet there exists some differences between the two.

Colonialism expanded with the search of market by the emperor like France, Britain, Spain, Portugal etc. These emperors colonized various countries of Asia Africa and America in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Accordingly exploitation of resources started to strengthen the economy of colonial powers. But gradually the colonies started protesting against this exploitation and the process of decolonization started after the World War II. And accordingly many countries of Asia and Africa became sovereign. So, imperialism and colonialism represents a major challenge to sovereignty.

Colonialism has emerged after the World War II in a new incarnation i.e. neo-colonialism. The imperialist powers started exploiting the earlier colonies with a new and indirect technique which is known as neo colonialism. 'Neo colonialism denotes the strategy of a colonial power which does not maintain its political domination in a foreign territory, but continues its economic exploitation by using it as a source of cheap labour and raw materials as well as a big market for its industrial products.' Through puppet government, economic measures and cultural measures the colonial powers exercise their control. Due to problems like poor economic development, low level of technology, financial crisis etc. The new countries are bound to get close to the colonial powers. Taking advantages from this the colonial powers started adopting new techniques both for exploitation of resources of the colonies and for selling their products in the markets of the colonies. This process of neo colonialism is more dangerous than colonialism according to many analysts since it is difficult to detect and challenge. Thus the legacy of colonialism remains and sovereignty of various countries are in great danger.

**2.9.2 Neo-colonialism:**

The term neo colonialism was first coined by Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of independent Ghana in his work Neo Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism(1965). He was of the view that countries which were earlier colonies, had technically achieved independence but they are still under control of some powerful nations through various measures and institutions.

### 2.9.3 Formation of Power Blocs:

Emergence of power blocs after the World War II also posed a serious challenge to the sovereignty of various nations. During cold war period two power blocks under the leadership of United States and Soviet Union emerged. Various countries of the world joined the two super power and formed power blocs. For instance America formed the military alliance called NATO in 1949 with England, France Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemberg, Italy etc. Similarly USSR formed WARSAW in 1955 with Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia etc. This kind of formation of power blocs posed a new kind of challenge to sovereignty of the nation states. The aligned states had to follow instructions of the leaders of their respective bloc leaders and had to lose both internal and external sovereignty. During that time also, there were some nations who maintained independence and sovereignty by not joining both the blocs. India represents one of them. India along with Egypt, Yugoslavia, started a new movement and decided not to join any power blocs. This is known as Non Alignment movement in world politics. It gradually emerged as a movement against colonialism and imperialism.

---

**Stop to Consider**

**Non Alignment:**

Non alignment movement is a policy developed by the states that gained independence after the World War II. The movement was initiated by countries like India Egypt, Indonesia, Ghana, Yugoslavia to remain away from both the power blocs led by United States and Soviet Union during cold war. Main aim of this was to maintain independence of the newly emerged nations. It opposes colonialism, imperialism, neo colonialism ,racism etc.

---

### 2.9.4 Sovereignty of state in the age of Globalisation

Globalisation can be seen as the process of integrating the national economy, culture, technology and even governance into a global system. In

(125)

contemporary time globalization is identified as a great challenge to the sovereignty of state although there exists criticism against this. Many people see globalization as a process that has not only eroded the boundary of state but also destroyed the authority of state. Globalisation has made movement of goods and services free thereby leading to the decline of authority or control of national government in economic field. Again dependency of the developing countries over institutions like World Bank and IMF has further increased the interference of these in the economic fields of the countries. Measures like Structural Adjustment Programme appear as a great threat to the internal sovereignty of state. These measures ask the states who take loan from IMF to reduce public expenditure, withdraw from public welfare programmes, liberalization and privatization of economy etc. All these do diminish the sovereignty of a state. Along with liberalization, privatization of services has led to the decline of role and functions of government. Thus under globalization and liberalisation, where almost all the nation states have become interconnected and interdependent in their economic relations, how can a particular nation claim absolute sovereignty in its external relations? With globalization, various international institutions have come up and a basis for global governance has already been laid. This has created a situation where the rights and obligations, powers and capacities of states have been redefined. In recent times various international laws, organizations and issues have posed challenge to the internal sovereignty of nation states. For instances issues of democracy, human rights, environment has compelled states to work carefully by following international norms. Nation states have to follow Universal declaration of Human Rights and such other international norms while taking individual decisions. It certainly affects state sovereignty. If a state does not follow international norms in these issues then the state may face problems.

There are some other views that oppose this. According to Steven D. Krasner," those who proclaim the death of sovereignty misread the history. The nation state has a keen instinct for survival and has so far adopted to new challenges even the challenges of globalization." For him, globalization is not a new challenge to the sovereignty of the state. He believed that decline of autonomy of state is true to a great extent but it does not mean that globalization has affected the sovereign power of the state.

David Held viewed that the causes for the decline of sovereignty of nation states are-changes in economic field or world trade, power bloc, International organization and international laws etc.

In spite of all the challenges sovereignty of state continues, but the sovereign structure of the state is heavily influenced by globalization and its related measures.

---

**Stop to Consider**

In modern times sovereignty has experienced various challenges. Most important challenges to sovereignty are Imperialism and Colonialism, Neo Colonialism, Creation of power blocs during cold war, Globalisation etc. Along with these, environmental, human rights issues are also leaving impact on the sovereign authority of state.

---

**Check Your Progress**

1. Write the meaning of Sovereignty. Discuss in brief about its development.

2. Define sovereignty. Explain its features.

3. What are the various kinds of sovereignty? Explain.

4. Critically analyze the Austin's theory of sovereignty.

5. Make an analysis of the Pluralist notion of sovereignty.

6. What are the contemporary challenges to sovereignty? Explain in brief.

---

**SAQ:**

Discuss the impact of globalization on state sovereignty.

..............................................................................................

..............................................................................................

..............................................................................................

## 2.10 Summing Up

After reading this unit you have learnt that sovereignty is the supreme power of the state and legally there cannot be any restrictions to this supremacy of the state. It is absolute, undivided, permanent, universal and inalienable. This nature of sovereignty gets reflected in the monistic theory of sovereignty that was popularized by English jurist John Austin. This theory received severe criticisms from the pluralists who emphasized on the plural nature of the state and accepted the important role of various associations of the society. In contemporary world sovereignty has been challenged by incidents like colonialism, neo colonialism, power blocs, globalization etc. Along with these human rights, environmental, economic issues are also putting challenges to sovereignty. However, sovereignty continues to be one of the most important elements of state.

## 2.11 References/Suggested Readings

1.   Arora N.D.,Awasthy S.S. Political theory, Har Anand Publication,2004

2.   Ball. A.R. Modern Politics and Government, Macmillan Press, 1975

3.   Das, P.G, Modern Political Theory, NCBA, 1996

4.   Gauba, O. P. An Introduction to Political theory, Macmillan, 2010.

5.   Heywood, A. Political Theory: An Introduction, Macmillan international,2015.

6.   Held, David. Political Theory and Modern State, Polity Press Cambridge,1989.

7.   Mahajan, V.D. Political Theory, S Chand & Company LTD, 2001

8.   Https://egyankosh.ac.in

× × ×

UNIT: 3

# NATION AND NATIONHOOD

**Unit Structure:**

## 3.1 Introduction

Often nation, nationhood and nationalism are used synonymously. But in political science there are a few differences between these concepts. The confusion arises due to the origin of the two words. Both the words have been derived from a Latin word '*natio'. 'Natio'* implies birth or descent.

In the seventeenth century the term nation was used to describe the population of a state in respect of its racial unity. During the French revolution the term nation gained popularity and was used to mean patriotism. And nationality was at this period considered as collective sentiment. Since the nineteenth century the terms nation and nationality have assumed quite definite meanings. The term nation conveys the ideals of political independence or sovereignty and nationality is largely a non political concept and can exist even under foreign domination. It is a psychological quality although it is often used to convey an ethical and cultural conception as well. Thus nation and nationality are not identical concept. A nation which means the population of a self governing state may very well include several nationalities. For instance, Great Britain, which is a single nation includes four distinct nationalities such as the English, the Scots, the Welsh and the north Irish. As soon as nationality acquires political unity and sovereign independence it becomes a nation.

This chapter aims to have an understanding about nation and nationhood and also about nationality.

## 3.2 Objective

After Reading this unit you will be able to:

- *explain* the meaning of Nation and Nationhood,

- *establish* relationship between Nation, Nationhood and nationality.

## 3.3 Nation, Nationhood and Nationality

Many people try to analyse nation in a racial sense and put emphasis on the community of birth, race and language etc. They, therefore, regard the nation as people of same stock. Burgess defines nation as a "population of an ethnic unity inhabiting a territory of a geographical unit." This means that when some people of the same stock live together in a geographical area they form a nation. Leacock also said about the racial significance of a nation. But many a times this concept of nationhood is not found to be applicable because purity of race is difficult to find in modern times for the reason like migration which has emerged as a major issue for the states.

In modern period, it is accepted that not the race, language and religion but the sentiment of common consciousness is regarded as the basis of a nation. It is true that race, religion, language etc. help in generating unity among people but at the same time it is also true that without such common factors a nation can grow. In fact religion has ceased to occupy a very important place as a nation building force in modern world. Psychological and spiritual factors play an important part in wielding people into a nation. Such feeling of nationhood develops from a common history of struggle against foreigners and the desire to live together. People with such psychological and spiritual ideas form a nation. Hence Garner said "a nation is a culturally homogeneous social group which is at once conscious and tenacious of its unity of psychic life and expression."

There are many nations in the world who do not have a common language and religion. Canada, India represents such nation. In Canada, there is both English speaking and French speaking people. Again in India, there exist multiple religious and linguistic groups. But still they have been existing as nation. Then what constitutes a nation. Benedict Anderson viewed nation is to a great extent an 'imagined political community' held together by the collective beliefs, aspirations and imaginations of its members. It is based on certain assumptions which people make about the collective whole with which they identify.

Nations are cultural entities, collections of people bound together shared values and traditions, in particular a common language, religion and history, and usually occupying the same geographical area. There are a few particular cultural features which are associated with nationhood such as language, religion, ethnicity, history and tradition.

Language is often considered as the clearest symbol of nationhood. Language embodies distinctive attitudes, values and forms of expression that produce a sense of familiarity and belonging. For example, the German nationalism has traditionally been founded on a sense of cultural unity, reflected in the purity and survival of the German language. But at the same time there are people who share same language but do not belong to the same nation. For Example, Switzerland represents a nation with more than one language.

Religion is another important component of nationhood. Religion expresses common moral values and spiritual beliefs. For instance, Islam has been a major factor in forming national consciousness in much of North Africa and Middle East. However, there are exceptions too; countries such as Poland, Italy, Brazil etc. share a common Catholic faith but do not feel that they belong to a common Catholic nation.

Nations are also based on ethnic or racial identity and also on cultural unity.

Thus the nation is a psycho political entity, a group of people who regard themselves as a natural political community and are distinguished by shared loyalty or affection in the form of patriotism. Factors such as absence of definite territory or land, small population are of little significance if a group

(131)

of people insist on demanding what it sees as national rights. For instance, Kurdish people of the middle east have nationalist aspiration even though the kurds have never enjoyed formal political unity and are at present spread over parts of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria.

**Definitions of Nation:**

According to Burgess, "Nation is a population of an ethnic unity, inhabiting a territory of a geographical unity."

According to Lord Bryce, "Nation is a nationality which has organized itself into a political body independent or desiring to be independent."

According to Dr. Garner, "A nation is a culturally homogeneous social group which is at once conscious and tenacious of its unity of psychic life and expression."

According to Gilchrist, "Nation is the state plus something else: the state looked at from a certain point of view, viz. that of the unity of the people organized in one state."

Thus, a nation is a geographical area and its contiguity, it is a population having racial religious and cultural unity, a political organization and a common consciousness and oneness. In a nutshell the characteristics of a nation are-

    i.    A nation is a geographical area and its contiguity.

    ii.    It is a population having racial religious and cultural unity.

    iii.    A political organization.

    iv.    A common consciousness and oneness.

● **Nationality:**

Nationality refers to a people having common spiritual and psychological sentiments. When a group of people feel themselves united because of certain factors and also feel that they are different and distinct from other similar groups they form a nationality. A nationality transforms into a nation when it aspires to political self determination or actually organizes itself into a state.

(132)

According to Lord Bryce, "A nationality is a population held together by certain ties, as for example language and literature, ideas, customs and traditions in such a way so as to feel itself a coherent unity distinct from other population similarly held together by like ties of their own."

According to Gilchrist, "Nationality is a spiritual sentiment or principle arising a number of people usually of the same race, resident on the same territory, sharing a common language, the same religion, similar history and tradition, common interests with common political associations and common ideals of political unity."

According to Burgess, "Nationality is a distinct socio ethnic group within the state and ordinarily constituting minority of the total population."

Thus it appears from the above definitions that nationality is a sentiment of people who belong to the same race and same country, whose history and culture are same, who speak same language and who practice same religion and whose political associations and ideas are same. At the same time it is also true that presence of all these are not necessary for nationality; existence of a few from these also leads towards the development of nationality. Most communities in history had been based on familiarity. But in modern times it has been found that the new national communities are based on unfamiliarity and anonymity. They are not brought together by common factors like religion, language, culture etc. but by a certain kind of imagined sentiments. And for this Benedict Anderson, one of the important theorists of nationalism referred to nation as 'imagined community'.

● **Elements of Nationality:**

The factors that help in bringing unity necessary for binding people together as a nation are termed as the elements of nationality. Some of these are common race, common language, common religion etc. presence of all of these are not necessary at a time. Let's have a look at these-

**(a) Sense of belongingness:**

Sense of belongingness to a particular group helps in developing nationality among the people. It is the most important element for nationality because without it in modern times where there is diversity of religion, language and

(133)

culture no other factor can help in creating unity among the people except the feeling of belongingness.

**(b) State:**

People living in a particular state are bound together by law and administration. It again helps in bringing the sense of unity among the people of the state and thus the bond for nationality gets developed. The common order separates them from the people belonging to other states. Hence, state is also considered as an important factor of nationality.

**(c) Race:**

Racial unity is one of the strongest bond of cohesion. Community of race means a belief in a common origin that may be fictitious or legendary. Whenever a body of people believes that they belong to one race they become a group of common consciousness and interest.

**(d) Common Culture:**

Common culture means existence of common historical traditions, common literature, and common way of living etc. Culture plays a very important role in bringing unity among the people

**(e) Common Language:**

A common language creates a cohesive and united society. Lack of common language may create problems towards developing the feeling of unity and thereby towards nationality. The general view is that diversity in language greatly weakens national sentiments. The revolt of Bengali speaking people of East Pakistan and formation of Bangladesh in 1971 on linguistic nationalism speaks a lot about the importance of language towards nationality. But there are exceptions too. For example reference can be made to India where national unity has suffered a lot due to lack of common language. But at the same time it is also true that India has been able to overcome these challenges and has proved it a unified force.

**(f) Common Subjugation:**

Many analysts believe that this has been a major factor for developing nationalism in most of the third world countries which have experienced

colonial rule. Reference can be made to India where common subjection to the British led to the development of Indian nationality. Common exploitative policies of the colonial power helped in developing a feeling of oneness in India.

**(g) Common Historical Tradition:**

According to Ramsay Muir 'it is an indispensible factor in cementing the bond of nationality'. It includes a memory of sufferings endured and victories won in common expressed in song and legend.

**(h) Geographical Unity:**

Naturally defined territory or geographical unity often described by the name 'homeland' is a powerful tie in the formation and continuance of nationality. But there are several exceptions to this. But at the same time it is also true that where there is no national home or no hope of securing it, it is difficult to acquire or develop the spirit of nationality.

There are many who does not accept these factors as necessary for nationality and consider it totally a psychological aspect.

### 3.3.1 Nation and State

People in general do not make any difference between state and nation. But actually both are two different concepts. The principle of one nation one state of President Woodrow Wilson and the application of the principle extensively after the First World War has made the state and nation almost similar. But the theoretical distinction does exist and these cannot be ignored.

A state is a combination of four elements such as population, territory, government and sovereignty. There can be no state without these. But the mere combination of these elements can not make a nation. The feeling of oneness among the people is very important for a nation. Lack of this oneness, Austria and Hungary before first world war was a state but not a nation. The Austrians and Hungarians were not united by sentiment of love and they had nothing except the political bond common among them. They

were neither similar and nor they wanted to live together. Actually a nation becomes a state when it acquires sovereignty. Sometimes even a single state may combine several nationalities to create a nation. The difference between the nation and state becomes clear when a nation either fails to have a state or is deprived of its statehood. For example Japan and Germany lost their statehood after the World War II, but continued to be nation. They ceased to be states because they lost their sovereignty and continued to be nations because the people in each country aspired to live unitedly in the future and remain united emotionally. Ultimately they were again able to attain statehood.

Again statehood is objective and nationhood is a subjective concept. Psychological unity based on commonness of religion, language etc is essential for being a nation. It is true that sometimes even without these factors or in spite of having heterogeneity a feeling of oneness may be generated among people who may constitute a nation. But statehood implies four elements such as population, territory, government and sovereignty.

State is a concrete political organization whereas the nation is abstract.

The state consists of four elements such as population, territory, government and sovereignty. But a nation is constituted of many cultural elements.

The nation is ethnic and hence it is not limited to one state alone. It may include more than one state.

The state can exist in the absence of national feelings but a nation cannot.

The state must be sovereign. Sovereignty is the most important element of a state but a nation may not be politically independent.

Nation has no force to coerce its members. It has the power of sentimental attachments. But the state has coercive power. It can compel its members to obey laws.

A state must have fixed territory but a nation can exist without it.

Thus, there are vast differences between nation and state although many a times both are used synonymously.

### 3.3.2 Nation and Nationality:

The main and only difference between nation and nationality is that a nation is politically organized and is an independent state but nationality is not. Nationality possesses cultural unity but it is neither politically organized as a nation nor it is an independent state as a nation is.

A nationality comprises of people bound together by a common religion, race, culture, ideology etc but it becomes a nation by getting a political organization with the power of self determination. For example, the Jews formed a nationality because they belonged to the same stock, they had a common religion and culture created through common sufferings and happiness. But they developed into a nation when they got the right to self determination and established a state of their own in Palestine.

---

**Stop to Consider:**

**Right to Self Determination:**

Right to Self Determination is considered as the most important right of every nationality. Unlike other social groups nation seeks the right to govern themselves and determine their future development. Thus they desire for the right to self determination. After the first world war this right was applied to a considerable extent in Europe and after the second world war this right has been asserted by national movements of Asia and Africa to make an end of the colonial rule.

---

**Check Your Progress**

1. Analyse the concept of Nation and Nationhood.
2. Analyse the concept of Nationality and its elements.
3. What are the distinctions between Nation and State and Nation and Nationality? Discuss.

| SAQ: |
|---|
| Relate the concept of Nationality with that of Nationalism. |
| ................................................................................. |
| ................................................................................. |
| ................................................................................. |

## 3.4 Summing Up

After reading this unit you are now in a position to understand the concepts of nation and nationhood. From this unit you have learnt that Nation and nationhood and also nationality constitute two important concepts of political theory that often creates confusion for using synonymously. Hence it is very important to understand the basic differences between these to have a proper understanding of the concepts.

## 3.5 References/Suggested Readings

1.    Arora, N. D., Awasthi, S. S.  (2005) Political Theory, Haranand publication pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

2.    Asirvatham, Eddy., Misra, K. K. (2008) Political Theory, S. Chand, New Delhi.

3.    Anderson, Benedict. (1995) Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of Nationalism, verso.london.

4.    Heywood, Andrew. ( 2014) Political Ideologies, Palgrav Macmillan, new York.

5.    www.egyankosh.com

× × ×

# UNIT: 4

## NATIONAL SELF DETERMINATION

## 4.1 Introduction

National Self-Determination is a process by which a group of people, usually with some level of national identity, choose their own government and thereby form a state. National self-determination has no universal meaning and can differ from country to country. National Self-determination is typically defined as a person's decision to do something or to make an ideology or dream a reality and it is essential for democratic set up. Men have attempted to reconcile the country and the state on the basis of the concept of national self-determination. The concept is often being confused with the total

independence, self government and autonomy. We will discuss and analyse all these issues involving with the concept of National Self Determination.

## 4.2 Objectives

The basic objective of the unit is to understand and analyse the concept of National Self Determination, how it has developed, the various theories of the National Self determination, provisions under the United Nations and National self Determination in Indian context. After going through this unit you will be able to –

- *explain* the concept of national self determination.
- *trace* the development of the concept of National Self Determination.
- *explain* its differences from other related concept like self government, secessionism.
- *discuss* provisions for National Self Determination under the United Nations.
- *analyse* the concept of Self Determination in Indian context.

## 4.3 Meaning of National Self Determination

National self-determination has no universal meaning and conceptually it may differ from countries to countries. People have attempted to reconcile the state on the basis of the concept of national self-determination. The concept is frequently used as the 'Right' of people to define their own political, economic, and cultural fate. The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences defines National Self Determination as, "all people of one nationality have the right to live together in order to rule themselves in their own state." Woodrow Wilson viewed National Self Determination as "Self-determination is not a mere slogan... peoples and provinces are not to be bartered around from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game." Alfred Corban views National self determination is a form of popular sovereignty.

The right to national self-determination is granted to a certain group of people having certain unique character like ethnicity, language, religion, culture and geographical location. Self determination can provide some advantages to those individuals or groups having certain unique character. The idea has the ability to foster emotional togetherness among varied peoples while simultaneously rationalising their desire for self-sufficiency. However, the concept of self-determination in multi-cultural societies is complicated as people or groups desires may differ. Nationalism has played a crucial role in the globalisation of world politics, legitimising the fundamental principle of national self-determination. The concept of nationalism and national self-determination played crucial role in the process of decolonization and in establishing new sovereign state after the World War II. The formation of the sovereign state reigning over defined territory was justified by national self-determination.

The concept of National Self Determination is linked to the concept of self-government. Self-government is primarily concerned with issues of political independence, but it differs from the National Self Determination as it tries to establish a standard for resolving boundary disputes. The concept is essentially seen as the cornerstone of International peace and order. National Self Determination value the surrendering of political power to the group or its members. However, the socio-economic, political and other developmental activities and the fortunes of their members depends on those powers are entrusted and their activities. The right to decide dominates whether a territory should remain an independent or not.

Moreover, the major powers has undermined national self determination as the process of defining a new territorial boundary deemed necessary for the development of international peace based on national self-determination. Several countries in the early twentieth century which were under the western colonial power, i.e. Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, and others, successfully launched nationalist campaigns under the banner of national self-determination and gained independence. Using the same principle, old European empires such as the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian became independent countries.

## 4.4 Characteristics of National Self Determination

There are certain characteristics that are associated with the concept of national self determination. Some of them are the following: -

- A group of people with a common cultural character defining their particular activity, i.e. cuisines, common language, common literature, customs, music, ceremonies, attire, and so on, can join to demand the right to self-determination.

- People who grew up in the same cultural environment can be grouped for self-determination.

- Mutual acknowledgment of the above-mentioned cultural set-up by other relevant groups could be the cause for this.

- Belonging to a group is more important than achievement or accomplishment. To become a member, no proof of belonging is required; the group simply requires acknowledgement, not accomplishment or achievement.

## 4.5 Development of National Self Determination

In politics, the concept of national self-determination has a long history. Self-determination can be traced back to Greek city-states, where self-government was commonplace. National self-determination, on the other hand, may be traced back to the American Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen in 1789, both of which recognised people's rights as a method of gaining popular sovereignty. Since the French Revolution, the concept has grown in popularity, especially after World War I. The French revolution confirmed the idea that "the root of all sovereignty is ultimately in the nation." The French organised a plebiscite and justified the annexation of Avignon, Savoy, and Nice in the 1790s by adopting the same slogan. In the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, French Emperor Napoleon III embraced the notion of "nationalist awakening" as part of his ideological mission and used the plebiscite as a political corollary.

Furthermore, during 1848, the concept of national self-determination received attention in Central and Central Western Europe as a foundation for international law and democratic rights. Mancini, a distinguished nineteenth-century Italian jurist who was inspired by Locke, Rousseau, and Kant's theories, as well as the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, advocated for National Self-Determination. He openly stated, with terms aimed at Austria, in a famous lecture delivered in Turin in 1851, that a state in which several ethnicities were coerced into a union was not a political entity but a monster incapable of life.

The term "national self-determination" was coined by colonial powers throughout the process of decolonizing countries. The fundamental motivation for breaking away from colonial masters was the national movement carried out by colonised countries on the principle of self-determination. Prior to World War I, Woodrow Wilson was the world's sole major intellectual capable of conceiving of the concept of national self-determination. In his writings and speeches prior to 1914, Wilson, on the other hand, makes no reference of National Self-Determination. His renowned fourteen ideas, on the other hand, had a considerable impact on the formation of the concept of national self-determination. He argued that two specific ideas should be included in the concept: nationalism and self-determination. Wilson's proposal was essentially a blend of Christian, self-government, democracy, nationality, and organic state concepts. He avoided militant nationalism, militaristic patriotism, and aggressive imperialism, and argued that the United States had a moral commitment to help countries break free from totalitarian oppression. He looked at nationality through the lens of language, arguing that the most significant criterion for nationality was language. Wilson described self-determination as the right of communities to rule them, and he asserted that the right to self-determination was grounded in the Anglo-American history of civic nationalism. He also believed it had little to do with the history of collective or ethnic nationalism.

The rights of nationality and national self-determination were one of the important causes for which the allies avowedly fought as World War I. Despite violating Lenin's own ideological and organizational principles, he

(143)

adopted and declared the principle of national self determination on the eve of the October revolution. The main idea behind declaring the principle before the revolution was to gain and control confidence over the non-Russian ethnic groups within the Russian empire and also people beyond the empire as he wanted to rebuild Russia on a new foundation. Moreover, Lenin used national self-determination as a tactical instrument. However, self-determination, whether for people or groups, was not recognised in Communist practice.

## 4.6 Theories of National Self Determination

There are six competing theories of national self-determination ideal in nature based on liberal democratic norms. These theories are useful because they clarify both the overlapping consensus among liberal democratic thinkers as well as the differences between them. The following are the theories:–

### 4.6.1 Liberal Theories

The liberal philosophy is fundamentally based on individual rights and freedoms, with the state playing a minimal role and the state committed to safeguarding those rights and freedoms. Individuals have the right to withdraw or question the existence of a state if it fails to protect their rights, freedom, and interests. In liberal ideology, self-determination must be subjugated to the state's commitment to protect the individual's rights and liberties. The most fundamental concept of national self-determination is the remedial theory, which defends individual rights and liberties. According to the theory, a group's right to self-determination is recognised only when serious and persistent human rights violations occur. Victims' desire for self-determination is justified as long as it improves possible human rights problems.

Beran advocated a liberal perspective, rejecting the remedial notion of self-determination. Beran, a proponent of the voluntarist view, contends that a voluntary member of a community has certain rights, including the ability to quit a political society. A majority of the people in a certain area comes from a distinct cultural and linguistic heritage, and they have the right to

secede from the state. The voluntarist theory stipulates a set of requirements for achieving self-determination. Only until the groups respect the human rights of all persons living in the newly established state will self-determination be recognised.

On the same principle, the newly formed state must recognise the right to self-determination of majority populations within the same territorial border. Thus, the voluntarist view varies from the remedial theory in that it denies that human rights abuses are required for self-determination, but that self-determination rights can be granted provided certain criteria are met. Buchanan, adopting a different view of national self-determination, rules out any economic discrimination, and if such discrimination does exist, the people who are subjected to it have the right to self-determination. Second, it promotes cultural preservation and believes that liberals should respect a culturally plural state and self-determination because cultural differences can lead to social conflict and human rights violations.

### 4.6.2 Democratic Theory

Liberal democracy and liberalism are often confused, but they are not the same concept. Individual liberty and human rights are valued by liberalism, while democracy adheres to the notion that power should be concentrated in the hands of the people rather than the elite. Liberalism prioritises individual liberty, whereas democracy prioritises majority will. Though a democratic system prioritises majority will, it inevitably disregards individual rights and freedoms. The goal of liberal democratic theory is to explain why either liberal premises about human values or democratic political outcomes necessitate liberal premises. The two approaches can produce different results because liberal democrats prioritise constitutional protection of individual rights over popular majority decisions. Democratic liberals, on the other hand, prefer democratic solutions to rights issues. On the other hand, contemporary self-determination theories are more democratic than liberal. Others have confused democracy with national self-determination; however, Philpot emphasises that democratic ideals must be respected in order for self-determination to take place. The right to democratic government has been interpreted as national self-determination.

### 4.6.3 Communitarian Theory

Communitarian thinkers argue that nations are formed on communities, and that the concept of national self-determination recognises community rights. According to Margalit and Raz, the right to self-determination essentially refers to a group's transfer and handing over of political rights to another group. Members of a group with a shared cultural background can be granted self-determination because they shape and establish people's identities. Individuals with a shared cultural history have the right to decide whether the areas in which they live require autonomous states to preserve the group's culture, and it is critical to retain this cultural identity within the communities. According to this theory, there is no need for persecution or repression in order to achieve fulfillment or demand self-governance. They placed a higher value on self-government than independence, fearing that independence would cause greater problems for those seeking self-determination.

### 4.6.4 Realist Theory

Shehadi has advocated for the most promising self-determination theory of the Realist school. Realists believe that the international community has failed to put self-determination criteria to the test because secessionist violence has raged around the world since World War II. Realists believe that self-determination must find a balance between territorial integrity and state-facing self-determination movements, and that an international institution should be established to resolve self-determination issues through the rule of law rather than force. Both liberal idealism and realism believe that the right of people to self-determination should be recognised, and that the state should accommodate people's multi-cultural identities while also recognising self-determination without jeopardising territorial integrity.

### 4.6.5 Cosmopolitan Theory

Miller established the cosmopolitan notion of national self-determination. Miller's take on the nationalist concept of self-determination is cosmopolitan, and the theory considers the right to self-determination to be a human right. Realism and classical liberalism are considered cosmopolitan when it comes to international order and inter-country interactions. The Universal

Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) serves as the foundation for cosmopolitanism, and cosmopolitan ethics is based on the idea stated in Article 1 of the UDHR: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." The moral idea of cosmopolitanism does not oppose national integration or state self-determination. Others oppose the cosmopolitan conception of self-determination. It takes into account both the interests of those seeking self-determination and those seeking independence from them.

---

**Stop to Consider:**

**Cosmopolitan Realism:**

Cosmopolitan realism of self-determination prioritises human well-being over institutions and does not adhere to any universal moral code. It considers nations, states, and a wide spectrum of cultural diversity. According to the preceding explanation, realism can be cosmopolitan and cosmopolitanism can be realistic. Though it supports the right to self-determination, cosmopolitanism does not recognise general rights unless in rare circumstances since it supports the idea of a world of nation-states that the right to national self-determination implies.

---

## 4.7  United Nations and National Self Determination

As previously stated the concept of national self-determination predates the United Nations (UN) and can be traced back to the American and French revolutions. Prior to the establishment of the UN, the League of Nations played a vital role in recognising people's aspirations for national self-determination. National self-determination was enshrined in a number of globally recognised laws, including the 1919 peace accords and the League of Nations Covenant. The League of Nations covenant emphasised national self-determination and provided protection for national minorities inside member nations based on international legal principles and standards.

In 1919, the League of Nations backed the principle of self-determination through plebiscites, which was overwhelmingly approved by Eastern and Central European nations. The League of Nations, on the other hand, was

(147)

unable to deal with the challenges that were presented at it because it assumed that the existing power order, which was centred on Europe, would suffice. The United Nations, on the other hand, differs from the League of Nations in that it prioritises national self-determination. However, the UN's significance was recognised until after World War I. Since the organization's inception, the UN has recognised national self-determination as a fundamental political value, and it has become a worldwide phenomenon.

The United Kingdom and the United States paved the way for a systematic and gradual spread of national self-determination and political theory across the world's politically and economically dependent peoples. Both the United Nations and the League of Nations advocate the principle of openness to all nations at varying stages of development that subscribe to and accept the covenant and charter's norms and laws. Regarding the concept of national self-determination, the international community has understood it in a limited manner, associating it with emancipation from colonial masters. When it comes to the value of self-determination, Lord Avebury believes it is the most important of all human rights.

Recognizing the significance of self-determination, Gros-Espiell believed that the effective exercise of one's right to self-determination is a necessary condition for the actual presence of all other human rights and freedoms. However, the UN Secretary General, U Thant, dismissed such a notion, claiming that the concept is misunderstood in many regions of the world. The right to self-determination of people should not be understood as the right to self-determination of all people, according to the UN's elite members. The UN charter, on the other hand, recognises the importance of national self-determination and includes provisions for it.

The importance of national self-determination is highlighted in the UN Charter I "To develop cordial relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and peoples' self-determination." The United Nations concept has pushed states to voice against the colonialism and racism around the world. Furthermore, the two Human Rights Conventions of 1966 gave the right to self-determination a prominent place and demonstrated that UN member nations recognised its value. Most crucially, the Soviet Union

and Yugoslavia disintegrated as a result of claims to self-determination and ethno-nationalist violence. In the case of Yugoslavia, however, the international community's strategy of self-determination failed to fulfil its goals.

Furthermore, when it came to recognising self-determination movements, states were extremely careful, attempting to retain territorial integrity while maintaining international peace and stability. In August 1941, Roosevelt and Churchill signed the Atlantic Charter, which reaffirmed national self-determination as one of the goals of Anglo-American policy. Western leaders' policies, on the other hand, were less effective in fostering the Asian and African self-determination movements.

National self-determination was not mentioned in the League of Nations' covenant. The United Nations, on the other hand, prioritised national self-determination by including three particular parts in its charter. Chapter XI of the UN Charter contains a declaration on non-self-governing territories. According to the Article, member nations must "promote self-government, taking adequate account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and supporting them in the progressive development of their free political institutions." Similarly, the UN Charter's Chapter XII addresses the international trusteeship system, with the main goal of "promoting progressive development toward self-government or independence, as appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples, as well as the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

Despite the UN Charter's inclusion of such articles, the UN does not encourage independence and instead advocates for self-government, as independence would contradict the UN's mission. The United Nations has campaigned for federation rather than sovereignty, as well as a government based on the consent of the governed, which recognises the importance of people's equality in a democratic culture. National self-determination was endorsed by both the United Nations and the United States, despite the fact that it could not be completely implemented.

"The United States government and the American people wholeheartedly believe in the principle of peoples' and nations' self-determination, and they

believe that the right of self-determination should be exercised by the peoples of all territories, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," Roosevelt stated in the General Assembly on December 16, 1952. As a result, if individuals with distinctive traits who live in a region are granted full self-government under UN Chapter XI of the Charter, the UN will not create any obstacles. The United Nations defines national self-determination as the achievement of a state of self-government with free expression of people's preferences, rather than independence in the limited sense.

## 4.8 South Asia and National Self Determination

South Asia is a melting pot of people with many ethnicities, customs, faiths, and languages. Separatist movements and attempts to establish independent states have occurred throughout the region. Furthermore, the region's people have faced a number of challenges, including acute poverty, socio-political upheaval, and cultural and traditional inequality. Furthermore, interstate wars and tensions increased, as did religious and linguistic divides inside nations, resulting in polarised and intolerant civil society and authoritarian states throughout the region. South Asia has seen the formation of a number of separatist movements, some seeking autonomy and others outright secession. The majority of separatist movements were armed insurgencies that were crushed by the government's repressive measures. Most crucially, the Indian subcontinent was under British colonial rule, and a successful self-determination movement led to India's independence from the colonial power. The Indian subcontinent was one of the best examples of national self-determination-based decolonization. In 1947, the subcontinent was further divided, resulting in the independence of Pakistan and India, respectively. Another example occurred in 1971, when Bangladesh was established, freeing East Pakistan's Bengali-speaking community from Pakistan's discriminatory policies.

The inability of the state infrastructure to deliver and defend numerous constitutional rights and obligations is at the basis of the South Asian region's growing separatist movement. The rights to life, liberty, equality, and justice

are all regarded fundamental. The right to life encompasses both the right to live and the right to be free of torture or killing. Similarly, the right to equality encompasses the freedom from discrimination based on religion, ethnicity, or language, as well as the right to be treated equally by the country's highest laws. Equality is a term used to describe equal access to opportunities. The rights of people from various walks of life are protected when the state appears to be just, and a strong nation can be built when the state also accepts plurality. These deep-seated tensions have resulted in armed warfare between diverse factions in pursuit of a state that best serves their own interests, resulting in increased state repression. All of the aforementioned scenarios, however, may lead to a self-determination, separatist, or secessionist movement if individuals face institutionalised discrimination and deliberate violation of their basic rights. Even after these rights were formalised, the region never stayed peaceful. Being disregarded by the state frequently resulted in social unrest and conflict.

The Sri Lankan Tamils' struggle for self-determination began in the mid-1950s, when the government began to discriminate against them. The first instance of discrimination against Tamils occurred in 1956, when the government implemented a "Sinhala Only" policy. Similarly, in order to undermine Tamil religion, the government designated Buddhism as the state religion in the 1972 constitution. Despite the fact that Sinhala and Tamil were designated as official languages in the 1997 draught constitution, Sinhala was retained as the sole language for keeping public documents in any district where Tamil speakers make up less than one-eighth of the population. Furthermore, the government has made knowledge of the Sinhala language a requirement for employment.

In the 1970s, Tamils began demanding self-determination in response to a discriminatory language policy and similar treatment in terms of employment and education. The Tamils' desire for self-determination was for the creation of a federal structure in which they could protect their rights. The movement began peacefully, but became violent after security forces were deployed to repress the protests in Tamil-populated districts. Sri Lanka's new constitution, adopted in 1972, explicitly rejected the aspiration for self-determination. Later, in the mid-1970s, the underprivileged Tamils created

(151)

guerrilla groups, including the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), and waged a violent armed struggle to achieve their goal in the Tamil-speaking majority districts.

Furthermore, the movement sparked demands for independence, and the LTTE armed group employed violence against anyone who disagreed, putting the entire country at risk through assassinations and deaths of civilians, security officers, and others. Even the LTTE's talks with the Sri Lankan government ended in failure, leading to all-out operations and the state's suppression of the Tamil movement, resulting in widespread human rights violations and the end of the Tamil movement.

India is the epicentre of a number of self-determination and separatist movements. While rejecting the desire for secession, the government was able to resolve such issues within the framework of the constitution. The abuse of civil liberties and the lapse of political pacts are key preconditions for the desire for secessionism in India. The issue of Jammu and Kashmir began with the timing of signing the instrument of accession, which was done under duress because the Indian administration refused to convene a plebiscite. As a result, under Article 370 of the Indian constitution, the state was admitted into the Indian Union with specific provisions, granting them special status.

The provision was made specific in order to respect the political accord and honour the document of accession treaty. Because of the state's geopolitical importance, a large deployment of security forces resulted in human rights violations, as well as the stagnation of democracy and citizens' fundamental rights. These factors aided the state of Jammu and Kashmir in its quest for independence from India. The Indian government, on the other hand, effectively thwarted all such attempts by separatists and mercenaries from across the border, referring to the states' demand for separation as a freedom struggle by Pakistan. However, in 2019, India's government repealed Article 370 and abolished the special status provision for Jammu and Kashmir, making it a fully integrated part of the country.

The Indian government also dealt successfully with separatist and separate statehood movements in India's north-eastern region, where the

organisations generally claimed to be self-determination movements. Hundreds of different cultural and ethnic groups have claimed and sought secession as well as separate states. Furthermore, when dealing with successive secessionist movements in the North Eastern region, the Indian government adopted two unique ways to address their objectives. First, the security forces engage in a repressive engagement and operation to weaken separatist groups; second, once the separatist parties are weakened militarily, a forced negotiated settlement within the framework of India's constitution is offered. The government has done an excellent job of reconciling the demands of different groups. Some are resolved, while others are in the process, such as Mizoram's creation, Nagaland's problem, and various groups' aspirations from Meghalaya, Manipur, and Assam. In Assam, for example, the government has developed sub-federal structures to grant autonomy for self-rule, such as the Bodoland Territorial Region and various district councils. The United Liberation Front of Assam's (ULFA) demand for a separate independent state has also gone through various operation carried out by the security forces for which the group has shown willingness to come forward for a negotiated settlement.

---

**SAQ:**

Evaluate the role of UN to the concept of National Self Determination and its application.

..............................................................................................

..............................................................................................

..............................................................................................

---

Bangladesh's independence is one of the strongest examples of self-determination. The oppression and injustice meted out to the people of East Pakistan by the dominant Urdu-speaking west Pakistani political establishment in the 1970 election sparked a massive revolt and the demand for a separate state based on linguistic grounds. The main reason for the demand for a separate, independent Bangladesh was political discrimination, in which Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was denied the opportunity to establish a

government by the majority of West Pakistan's dominant Urdu-speaking politicians, despite winning the majority.

Furthermore, Bangladesh experienced a similar type of self-determination movement in the Chittagong Hills Tract (CHT) area long after the country was founded. Because the CHT has a distinct tribal culture, the government of Bangladesh's intention to relocate Bengali-speaking people from the plains to the CHT resulted in clashes between the indigenous Jumma population and the Bengali settlers. In that area, the state carried out a huge repression, resulting in serious human rights violations, including the genocide of the Jumma people. The indigenous Jumma populace, on the other hand, pursued armed conflict alongside peaceful techniques of dialogue and negotiation in order to assert their right to self-determination. However, the Bangladeshi government was hesitant to take steps to recognise their right to self-determination. The Jummas signed a CHT peace pact in 1997, putting an end to their long struggle for self-determination by lowering their demand for "autonomy" to "regional autonomy."

The Madhesi people of Nepal's Terai area, which borders India, are also engaged in a self-determination movement. The Madheshi are people who live in the Terai region and have a distinct cultural set up. Rather than Nepalis, their culture, language, and traditions are more like those of Northern Indians. These people speak Maithili, Bajjika, Bhojpuri, and Awadhi and account for the majority of the population in the region. Cross-border marriage is common due to the region's proximity to India, and many Nepali women lose their citizenship as a result. Furthermore, the Nepali constitution does not grant full citizenship to children born to a Nepali mother and a foreign father, and as a result of the citizenship issue, many Madhesi people are unable to progress in the Nepali administration and security services, resulting in deprivation. Despite accounting for 50% of Nepal's overall population, the Madhesi communities remain underrepresented in the country's parliament. Two factors contribute to this underrepresentation: first, constraints on citizenship rights, and second, the existing political map of Nepal, which was built up in such a way as to dilute the Madhesi vote. Due to legal and constitutional limits, discrimination on the basis of equal participation in the political process has occurred. Furthermore, the Nepalese

government is waging a campaign to curtail the Madhesi people's right to self-determination. Three Madhesi political groups created a single front called the United Madhesi Democratic Front (UMDF) to carry out their agitation and pressurise the Nepalese government to satisfy their demands in order to rationalise their demand for self-determination. However, the demands are yet to be met by the government of Nepal.

Similarly, a self-determination movement has erupted in Pakistan, particularly in the Balochistan province. Balochistan is Pakistan's largest province, home to a diverse ethnic population that includes Africans, Arabs, Persians, Turks, Kurds, Dravidians, and Sewais. Balochi is spoken by the majority of the population, while Pashto is spoken by the rest. With 71 percent of the population living below the poverty line and only 41% of the population having access to literacy, the province is considered Pakistan's poorest. Despite this, the province has a lot of natural resources like gold, coal, copper, uranium, and a lot of natural gas. Balochistan's quest for self-determination is motivated by a variety of factors.

The province has a long history of marginalisation, which began with Pakistan's independence in 1947. The problem began in 1948, when Kalat, which is now part of Balochistan, declared independence, with the primary claim that Balochistan had never been a part of British India. Balochistan was given the status of a princely state under British administration during British rule. Separatists and politicians claim that Balochistan, notably the Khanate of Kalat, was never under British administration and hence cannot be a part of Pakistan. When Pakistan attained independence in 1947, the Khan of Kalat faced greater pressure to admit the Kalat state to Pakistan.

Balochistan's parliament, on the other hand, unanimously passed a resolution proclaiming that relations with Pakistan should be created as between two sovereign states rather than through accession. As a result, when Pakistan gained independence in August 1947, the khan of Kalat announced Balochistan's independence as well. The newly created Pakistani government, on the other hand, forced Balochistan's entrance to Pakistan. The Khan eventually signed the document of accession in March 1948, less than a year after Balochistan declared independence, under pressure from Pakistani authorities. This forcible incorporation of Balochistan into Pakistan, on the

(155)

other hand, exacerbated the seeds of anti-Pakistan agitation. This was the start of a long battle that would last decades. The Pakistani government continued to overlook ethnic communities' desires and identities.

Certain accomplishments were made during the autonomy granted to the Baloch in the 1970s, but it was also quashed by the Pakistani government. Meanwhile, the administration of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto in Islamabad overthrew the powerful National Awami League, a coalition of Baloch parties, which began to make substantial structural changes in the promotion of the Baloch people, following the 1970 election. The Pakistani government's interference provoked a fresh revolt in Balochistan, which resulted in killings, atrocities, state persecution, and human rights violations. Furthermore, the military coup that installed Parvez Musharraf in office in 1999 exacerbated the Baluchis' sense of isolation.

The divide was accentuated by the absence of Baluch representation in the army and the Punjabis' overwhelming influence. However, while Pakistan's transition from a military to a civilian government reduced the degree of violence in Balochistan, the assaults of 2009 and 2010 intensified it. As a result, the struggle in Balochistan has been ongoing for a long time and is exceedingly complicated, with historical, political, and social issues such as race and religion serving as underlying causes. The region's spiralling conflict was compounded by discrimination based on Baloch political rights, which were neglected by the Pakistani government, as well as low level representation in the national government.

---

**Check Your Progress**

1. What is National Self-Determination? How it differs from secessionist movement?
2. What are the problems faced by the Indigenous groups with respect to the question of right to self determination?
3. Discuss the various theories of National Self Determination?
4. Analyse the concept of national self determination in its historical setting?

## 4.9  Summing Up

After reading this unit you have learnt that the right to self-determination cannot be used as a justification for secession. On the basis of national self-determination, an ethnic group, whether religious or linguistic, can constitute a state, but it must adhere to all democratic rules. Statehood is meant to be non-discriminatory and impartial amongst groups, and if a state is regarded to belong solely to one group, other residents who do not belong to that group are denied full citizenship. The most damning criticism of the nationalist thesis is that it tends to exclude non-members. And if minorities have no place in the state, it will be difficult for the state to meet the basic needs of justice for all and non-discrimination. The ideal kind of political community is one in which members of certain minority groups have a good amount of control over their fate thanks to institutionalised power and resource decentralisation. This is the only way for groups to gain self-determination. Self-determination does not need the formation of a separate state by a community. To suit the objectives of minority groups within states, self-determination must be reinterpreted. The realisation of the idea does not have to include violent renegotiation of territorial boundaries, unless the current state denies the people their right to self-determination. In other words, a group's right to secede is valid only if the current state has denied the group's right to secede.

## 4.10   References/Suggested Reading

1.  Chandhoke, N. (2008), "Exploring the Right to Secession: The South Asian Context", *South Asia Research*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 1-22.

2.  Freeman, M. (1999), "The Right to Self-Determination in International Politics: Six Theories in Search of a Policy", *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 25, No. 3, July, pp. 355-370

3.  Heywood, Andrew (2011), *Global Politics*, Palgave, Macmillan, New York.

4.  Kohn, H. (1958), "The United Nations and National Self-Determination", *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 20, No. 4, October, pp. 526-545

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **_Space for Learner_** | 5. | Lynch, A. (2002), "Woodrow Wilson and the Principle of 'national self-determination': A Reconsideration", _Review of International Studies_, Vol. 28, pp. 419-436 |
| | 6. | Margalit, A. & Raz, J. (1990), "National Self-Determination", _The Journal of Philosophy_, Vol. 87, No. 9, Sept., pp. 439-461 |
| | 7. | Meyer, E. W. (1946), "National Self-Determination: Forgotten and Remembered", _The American Journal of Economics and Sociology_, Vol. 5, No. 4, July, pp. 449-467 |
| | 8. | Tamir, Y. (1991), "The Right to Self-Determination", _Social Research_, Vol. 58, No. 3, Fall, pp. 565-590 |
| | 9. | Throntveit, T. (2011), "The Fable of the Fourteen Points: Woodrow Wilson and National Self-Determination", _Diplomatic History_, Vol. 35, No. 2, June, pp. 445-481 |

× × ×

# UNIT: 5

# STATE AND GLOBALIZATION

**Unit Structure:**

## 5.1 Introduction

The State has always been playing a prime focus in the discipline of Political Science as a central theme of traditional political theory. Again, Globalization has become a key concern for the world community as an important current political debate. The modern state is undergoing tremendous transformation in the age of globalization. Many forces released by the global processes have affected the state as the centre of popular thoughts. The nation-state has come to redefine its relationship with its people at different levels. Though the sovereignty of state still remains important, it is severely limited by disintegration at the local level and integration at the global level. The transformation of the nation-state in different regions of the world assumes different forms depending upon the distinctiveness of regional formations. This unit explains the multiple meanings of globalisation along with its implications on the nation-state.

## 5.2 Objectives

After going through this unit you will be able to—

- *understand* the concept of state,

- *analyse* concepts like nation state, sovereignty, globalisation etc.,

- *discuss* the impact of globalisation on state,

- *understand* the relation between state and the process of globalisation.

## 5.3 Meaning of State

A **state** is a centralized political organization that imposes and enforces rules over a population within a territory. Though some sort of political organizations exist since ancient times in the name of Greek city-states and in the Roman Empire, yet the concept of the 'state' is comparatively modern that owes its origin to Machiavelli who expressed this idea in early sixteenth century in his famous work *The Prince* (1513), as 'the power which has authority over men'. It refers to the territorial and constitutional community that make up the federation which can be distinguished from a government. It is difficult to come to a consensus regarding the definition of state. But a composite definition of state includes its three elements. First, the state is a set of institutions and these are operated by the state's own personnel. It is a coercive institution as well as it provides certain amenities and protection to its members. Second, the institutions of state are at the centre of a geographically- bounded territory, usually referred to as a society; vitally, the state looks inside to its national society and towards the outside to larger societies in which it must make its way; its behaviour in one area can often only be explained by its activities in the other. Third, the state monopolises rule making within its territory; what we call as sovereignty. This tends towards the creation of a common political culture shared by all citizens.

The evolution of state has taken place through various evolutionary stages. Sociological explanation about historical evolution of state identifies the tribal organisation, in the name of tribal state to be its earliest form. With the

changing nature and necessity of the people and society, state has passed through the Oriental empire, the Greek city-state, the Roman world empire, the feudal state and finally, the modern nation-state has evolved. The term **nation-state** simply means an organized structure of a group of unified people. It is a political unit where the state and nation are corresponding to each other having a predominant group on the basis of some similar elements, like- common descent, ethnicity, religion, region, language, shared history, traditions, customs etc.

### 5.3.1 Nation-State

The modern state is relatively new to human history, emerged after the Renaissance. The idea of a nation-state is basically associated with the rise of the modern system of states; dated back to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). These modern system of states were characterized by balance of power that depended for its effectiveness on clearly-defined, centrally controlled, independent powers, whether empires or nation-states. It was given impetus by the throwing off of kings and the rise of efficient state bureaucracies that could govern large groups of people impersonally by efficient application of the law. Frederick the Great (Frederick II of Prussia 1740 - 1786) is frequently cited as one of the originators of modern state bureaucracy. Some modern nation-states in Europe or North America prospered in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and were promoted as a model form of governance. The increasing emphasis on the ethnic and racial origins of the nation, during the nineteenth century, led to a redefinition of the nation-state in ethnic and racial terms.

Nation-state is a combination of two words- **'state'** and **'nation'**. A state is specifically a political and geopolitical entity, while a nation is a cultural and ethnic one. The term "nation state" implies that the two coincide, in that a state has chosen to adopt and endorse a specific cultural group as associated with it. A nation-state refers to a country with well-defined delineated boundaries, resided by people having similar element and supposed to have a government of its choice with unity, strength and cooperation. It is a form of political organization under which a relatively

(161)

homogeneous people inhabits in a sovereign state, especially: a state containing one as opposed to several nationalities. Thus, nation-state is a territorially bounded sovereign polity that is ruled in the name of a community of citizens who identify themselves as a nation. This indicates that modern nation-state is a combination of four basic elements: **sovereignty, land, population,** and **government**.

### 5.3.2 Sovereignty

Sovereignty is one of the four essential elements of the state without which there is no state. It refers to the supreme power of the state through which the state exercises power over all persons, organisations and groups within its territory. The term sovereignty has been derived from the Latin word 'Superanus' which means supreme. It refers to the independence of the state from internal and external forces. Internally, sovereignty means that no individual or group within the state can claim protection from sovereignty; everybody is subject to its control. The state exercises legitimate physical compulsions upon the people and institutions within its territory to obey its commands. Non- compliance of the laws enforced by the state invites punishment. While, external sovereignty is concerned with the relationship between a sovereign power and other states. It refers to a situation where the states interact on the basis of respect for each other. Each state, big or small, by virtue of its sovereign power is equal to every other state. According to Gettel, "What is called External Sovereignty is in reality the totality of rights by which sovereignty manifests itself in dealing with other states." Therefore, in short, external sovereignty implies equality with all other states and freedom of action at the international level for securing its national interests.

Sovereign equality did not become fully global until after World War II during decolonization. There were very few geographic territories in which a single ethnic, religious, or other culturally homogeneous group resided. National conflicts within states resulted to the spreading of people of countless national cultures all over the world displaced as refugees. The attempt to impose cultural homogeneity on all minority groups within a country had not

only been created one of the greatest menaces on human society, but also a particularly monotonous quality in an increasingly pluralistic world. Genocides, civil wars, ethnic cleansing, and religious persecutions were rooted in the concept of creating a unified nation-state by force-a state in which a specific set of cultural norms were imposed either by the ruling elite, or by the majority.

The state's exclusive claim to have rule-making power and to make laws is often referred to as sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty has been a key idea in the evolution of the modern world and the all-powerful nation-state. Initially, it was purely the state's authority to exercise legal violence in order to maintain order. But gradually, the sovereign nation-states assumed more legitimate claims over the exclusive authority within its territorial boundaries by adding concepts like social justice. Thus, citizens have developed expectations from their nation-states' ability to resolve their problems. Fairness in the exercise of authority imparts legitimacy to the acts of the nation-state, carrying a universal image in a given national society with its autonomous and sovereign actions.

But, the nation-state entered into a crisis in the late twentieth century with the advent of **globalization**. The ability of nation-state to act independently in resolving the problems and fulfilling the expectations of its citizens had been pressurized by the external forces at the global level and internal forces at the local level. It questioned the validity of the meta-narratives of their existence as the nation-states and nation-states were pushed in between the forces of global integration and local fragmentation.

Relationship of individual with nation-state is important in a structured organization. Emergence of globalization had changed the existing relationship between these two as the states were neither able to negotiate with global forces on their own, nor capable of building a sense of unity among their citizens who choose to live through exclusive identities. It was more intense in case of the third world countries because of their lack of ability on both the fronts. Citizens were seeking new forms of organisation that would be able to assert their identities in different ways. As a result of this, sometimes local communities saw their interests supporting nation-states, at other times

in undermining them seeking a greater share of resources and having trans-border entities. International organisations sponsored those third world countries for greater legitimacy. The phenomenon of world summits mobilised local communities across nations on the lines of ethnic, caste, gender, ecological issues. They raise questions of social justice beyond the preview of nation-states and connect them with global processes. Thus, the nation-states were coming under pressure from both the domestic and the global forces.

To realize the changing nature of nation-state in a globalized era, understanding of globalization as a concept is very important. Here, an analysis of globalization with its different aspects has been made along with its impact on the modern nation-state.

### 5.3.3 Globalization

Globalization is a buzzword of the 21$^{st}$ century acquired considerable force during the 1990s as a process of growing interdependence between people of all nations. The term 'Globalization' can be considered as an integrating process of the economic, social and cultural relations of each country across borders by which ideas, knowledge and information, movement of goods and services marked by free trade, technology and people, spread throughout the world. It is a trend where national boundaries are becoming less relevant and sovereign entities are cooperating with each other across national borders. In other words, the concept Globalization is a fast increasing consciousness encompassing each and every individual of the globe.

The hyper globalists argue that globalisation has brought about the demise of the sovereign nation-state as global forces undermine the ability of governments to control their own economies and societies. Globalization is evident in the growing extensity, force, rapidity, and deepening impact of world-wide interconnectedness. It denotes a shift in the scale of social organization, the emergence of the world as a shared social space, the changing nature of social, economic, and political activity, and the relative denationalization of power. Globalization can be conceptualised as a fundamental shift or transformation in the conceptual shape of human social

organisation that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across the regions and continents.

Explanations of globalization tend to focus on three inter-related factors: **techniques**, **economics** and **politics**. Techniques, i.e. technological change and social organisation is central to any account of globalization since it is a maxim that without modern communications infrastructures, a global system or worldwide economy would not be possible. Economics, deals with markets and capitalism is as crucial as technology. Capitalist requirement for new markets and profits lead inevitably to the globalization of economic activity. Politics for ideas, power, interests and institutions constitutes the third logic of globalization. If technology provides the physical infrastructure of globalization, politics provides its normative infrastructure.

---

**Stop to Consider:**

**Michael Porter on Globalization:**

The forces that lend momentum to the process of globalization have been identified by Michael Porter to include the following:

a) Growing similarity of countries in terms of available infrastructure, distribution channels and marketing approaches

b) National capital markets are growing into global capital markets because of the large flow of funds between countries

c) The reshaping of competition globally as a result of technological revolutions

d) The impact of integrating role of technology which have reduced cost and increased impact of products have made them accessible to more global consumers

e) New global competitors- a shift in competitors from traditional country competitors to emerging global competitors.

---

The process of globalization has enabled businesses in one nation to access another nation's resources. With fewer restrictions on trade, globalization creates opportunities to expand. Increase in trade promotes international competition. As a result, people from one country are coming to other nations

(165)

to do business and work brings with them their own cultures, exchange of ideas and knowledge which influence and mix with other cultures.

Understanding of these **three forces** of globalization helps us to find out its different **dimensions**. Globalization is evident in all the principal sectors of social activity. It can be discussed as follows:

1.  **Economic:** Economic globalization is mainly characterized by the rapid expansion of international trade, foreign direct investment and capital market flows. It is the process of integration of international financial markets and the coordination of financial markets between the countries of the world. It involves production, distribution, management, trade and finance and it upgrades the efficiency of global economy and plays a significant role in accelerating the demand of the national economies development. Some of the examples of Free Trade Agreements under the pretext of Economic Globalization are **North American Free Trade Agreement** (NAFTA) consists of United States, Mexico and Canada, **Trans- Pacific Partnership** (TPP) consists of Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile and New Zealand, **European Free Trade Association** (EFTA) consists of Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Liechtenstein, **South Asian Free Trade Area** (SAFTA) comprising India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Bhutan.

2.  **Political:** Political Globalization can be referred to the process of political cooperation and national policies that exists between different countries and brings them together politically, economically and culturally. The process of political globalization has helped the countries to make frequent contact in times of concern or crisis. In contemporary times, the concept of political globalization is the need of hour as some of the issues are to be solved internationally. Problems like international terrorism, global warming, environmental degradation, human security, pandemic, etc. cannot be solved by one single country. Political cooperation between national boundaries is required to solve the international problems. The formation of League of Nations, United Nations Organization, and European Nations are some of the classic examples of political globalization.

3.  **Legal:** The legal aspects of globalization necessarily focus on achieving uniform corporate standards in an increasingly diverse world. International human rights law has become a kind of "common denominator" of understanding for judges interpreting national or regional human rights documents such that national judges in a certain jurisdiction turn to the interpretation of human rights norms in another jurisdiction as persuasive authority. The expansion of transnational and international law from trade to human rights alongside the creation of new world legal institutions such as the International Criminal Court is indicative of an emerging global legal order.

4.  **Social:** The social dimension of globalization refers to the impact of globalization on the life and work of people, on their families, and their societies. Concerns and issues are often raised about the impact of globalization on employment, working conditions, income and social protection. Beyond the world of work, the social dimension encompasses security, culture and identity, inclusion or exclusion and the cohesiveness of families and communities. Shifting patterns of migration from South to North and East to West have turned migration into a major global issue as movements come close to the record levels of the great nineteenth-century movements of people.

5.  **Cultural:** The aspect of cultural globalization refers to the rapid movement of ideas, attitudes, meanings, values and cultural products between the countries. It also focuses in a large part on the technological and societal factors that are causing cultures to be in touch. Music, food, sports, art, literature, cinemas are some of the aspects where cultural globalization is visible. The process of migration helps in globalization of culture with an assimilation of homogeneity with the heterogeneity of the society in other parts of the world through exchanges of languages, religious beliefs, art, music, missionary work and trade and also values spread by military conquest. Food consumption is also an important example of cultural globalization and most countries all over the globe have diets that are unique to them, however the cultural globalization of food has been promoted by fast food giants such as McDonald's , Coca –Cola, Noodles and

Starbucks. The Globalization of sport is another significant aspect of cultural globalization. The sporting events like the Football World Cup, Cricket World Cup and the Olympics bind millions together in a shared.

6. **Military:** Military globalization, as sub-domain of political globalization, is defined as the escalation and extension of military power and cooperation across the globe through the use of various means of military power, like- arms trade, nuclear military weapons, weapons of mass destruction, growth of transnational terrorism etc. This form of globalization occurs across offensive and defensive uses of power and survival in international field that creates global insecurity. Beyond states, global organizations such as the United Nations also extend military means globally through support given by both Global North and South countries.

7. **Ecological:** Ecological globalization include population growth, access to food, worldwide reduction in biodiversity, the gap between rich and poor as well as between the global North and global South, human-induced climate change, and global environmental degradation. This dimension involves a shared ecology that leads to shared environmental problems, from global warming to species protection, alongside the creation of multilateral responses and regimes of global environmental governance.

The analysis on dimensions of globalization gives a clear picture of the status of statehood in a globalized world. Globalization has changed the functions and role of the state and in the life of the individual. It's economic, social, demographic and technological forces have dramatically altered the relationships among nations as well as the nature of politics, public policy, administration, institutional relations within the nation-states.

## 5.4 Impact of Globalization on State

Globalization has changed the role of the state in many ways: politically through interdependence and independence of states, socially through the problems and threats of terrorism and deadly diseases, technologically

(168)

through the media and internet and economically through the change from national to global economies. In the era of globalisation, with the increasing disinvestment of public sector, privatisation was encouraged. Public sector was made to compete with the private sector, and as a whole open competition, free trade, market economy and globalisation were practiced. State ownership of industries came to be rejected. The state has moved from a controlling to a protecting role internally in facing the problems that globalization has caused, but also from an authoritative to a dependent figure externally between the sovereign state ages to current unfailing interdependence. Globalization is often seen to have lowered the importance of the state.

In this era of Globalisation, several changes have been taking place in the functions of the State:

a) **Decreased Economic activities of State:** The process of liberalisation- privatisation has acted as a source of limitation on the role of the state in the economic sphere. Public sector and enterprises are getting privatized and state presence in economic domain is shrinking.

b) **Decrease in the role of the State in International Economy:** The emergence of free trade, market competition, multinational corporations and international economic organisations and trading blocs like European Union, NAFTA, APEC, ASEAN and others, have limited the scope of the role of state in the sphere of international economy.

c) **Decline of State Sovereignty:** Increasing international inter-dependence has been compelling each state to accept limitations on its external sovereignty. Each state now finds it essential to accept the rules of international economic system, the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF. The role of MNC/TNC has also been growing in national and local politics as they play a significant role in shaping the state decisions and policies. Their key objective behind influencing the state decision and policy-making is to promote their vested interests.

**d)** **Rising People's Opposition to their Respective States:** Globalisation has encouraged and expanded people-to-people socio-economic-cultural relations and cooperation in the word. As IT revolution and development of fast means of transport and communication have been together making the world a real Global Community. The people of each state now deal with people of other states as members of the World Community. The loyalty towards their respective states continues, but now the people do not hesitate to oppose those state policies which are held to be not in tune with the demands of globalization.

**e)** **Reduced Importance of Military Power of the State:** The state continues to maintain its military power as an important dimension of its national power. However, the strength being gained by movement for international peace and peaceful coexistence as the way of life has tended to reduce the importance of military power of the state.

**f)** **Increasing Role of International Conventions and Treaties:** Several international conventions and treaties have placed some limitations upon all the states. All the states are now finding it essential to follow the rules and norms laid down by such conventions. The need to fight the menace of terrorism and rogue nuclear proliferation as well as the shared responsibility for protecting the environment and human rights, have compelled all the states to accept such rules and regulations as are considered essential for the securing of these objectives. Thus, Globalisation and several other factors have been together responsible for influencing a change in the role of State in contemporary times.

**g)** **Decline in Public Expenditure on Public Welfare Policies**: Most advanced western states appear committed to reducing social expenditure on public welfare programs, and to introducing measures such as labour market deregulation and lowered tax rates which facilitate greater economic competitiveness, but impact adversely on rates of poverty and inequality. These economic and political

initiatives have coincided with a period of intense economic globalisation. The growing significance of international trade, investment, production and financial flows appears to be curtailing the autonomy of individual nation states. In particular, globalisation appears to be encouraging, if not demanding, a decline in social spending on public welfare programs and policies.

While some view globalization as a process that is beneficial to world community, others believe that it increases inequality within and among nations, threatens employment and living standards, increases dependency, expands neo-colonialism and prevents social progress. To turn the negative aspects of globalization to positivity, state can play a major role which can be discussed as follows:

● **Redefining the Role of State in Globalized Era:**

In the globalized era, the responsibility of the state has changed and this has introduced important modifications both in the policy arena and in the State's requirements for high-level skills, qualitatively and quantitatively. The focus of state has shifted from direct management and the direct production of services and goods to the establishment and maintenance, refinement and reform of an enabling framework for private enterprise and individual initiative through strategic planning. . Decentralization, de-bureaucratization and deregulation, caused by globalization, are adding to the importance not only of local government, but also of non-state actors on whom significant functions are entrusted. At the same time, a range of tasks and policy decisions, traditionally handled by national bureaucracies in their respective capitals, is being increasingly altered to an inter-governmental or world-wide level as a result of increased flows between countries of goods, capital, labour and information. Globalization made the state the hub of activities related to planning, consultation, negotiation and decision-making connecting multiple partners and stakeholders from diverse fields, regions, cultures, occupations, professions and interests involving both state and non-state actors.

With the progress of globalization, the state has an important role to play in the establishment and preservation of an equal space and a supporting environment for private enterprise, individual creativity and social action. It can also contribute to the establishment and maintenance of social safety nets; promote as well as facilitate social dialogue at the sub-national, national, and international levels; establish and maintain mechanisms for mediation of disputes, mitigation of conflicts and reconciliation of rival cultures or interests in the increasingly diversified contemporary societies. Apart from these, strong democratic states are necessary to protect the vulnerable groups of the society including- women, children, sick, elderly and other to fight against the social exclusion of minority groups, and ensure a more equitable distribution of the benefits of globalization.

Thus, the state has an important role to play in providing affordable social services. Economic growth alone is not sufficient to sustain equitable human development. Providing health care and education, public infrastructure, safety nets for the unemployed, equal opportunities for all and the respect of basic human rights is a fundamental responsibility of the state, which is related to social development, complements the goal of economic prosperity for all and to the enhancement of people's freedoms and quality of life. For this, state has a larger redistributive role to play in order to minimize the negative effects of globalization.

## 5.5 State and Globalization- An Appraisal

The problem in understanding globalisation lies in its dualism that governs the present world order. If globalisation refers to a unified world, it is also equally true that the world is increasingly divided into two unequal parts- the rich and the poor nations, in which the more advanced western nations are taking advantage of the so called free trade and the openness advocated by the new global order. This free flow of information, goods and services in globalized epoch has further shrunk the world into a *Global Village* as termed by Marshall McLuhan, where national boundaries become disappeared in political and cultural terms. This flexibility of traditional territorial boundaries brings more anxieties and real worries about political and cultural onslaughts by the West on the more vulnerable third world nations. The global economic order combined with the New Information

Order is likely to strengthen the nation-state in advanced countries and weaken the state in the third world. Thus, the unfair world order has different implications for different nations that leads to inequality and injustice become the most important concerns of the emerging global order.

The emerging global order has changed the traditional European notion of homogenous nation-state based on common identity and their functions. As there is no substitute structures that can perform all the traditionally associated functions of the nation-state, neither the nation nor the state is about to go away as a result of global processes. At the same time, people are not prepared to give up a state-centred nationalism altogether, because nationalism is historically embedded and culturally experienced. Even if they are prepared to give up, it is only to divide their loyalties increasingly on the lines of multiple identities and the disintegration of the state for identities cannot be a substitute for the nation-state. Globalization has changed the patterns of adherence, replacing it with multiple loyalties. Though the nation-state does not disappear, it may not remain the way it has been as the forms and lines of the citizens' loyalty to it changes.

**Check Your Progress**

1.  Define state. Briefly discuss the elements of state.

2.  What is nation-state? Discuss the evolution of state.

3.  What do you understand by sovereignty? How does globalization threat state sovereignty?

4.  Define globalization. Point out its features.

5.  Discuss the three forces of globalization.

6.  Explain different dimensions of globalization.

7.  Examine the impact of globalization in the functioning of modern nation-state.

8.  Examine globalization from the perspective of the developing ad developed nations.

9.  Comment on the present and future of globalization.

| |
|---|
| **SAQ:** |
| Briefly discuss the role of state in the age of globalization. |
| ................................................................................................ |
| ................................................................................................ |

## 5.6 Summing Up:

After reading this unit you have learnt that though globalization has its positive and negative impact both, the future of globalization looks bright. With the increasing innovation, development, and transferability of technology, the global economy will witness more integration and interconnectedness. For enhancing this kind of a relationship, a high mobility of the current and upcoming generation is the utmost necessity; the national governments will continue to be relevant; national policies and decisions will be greatly influenced by external factors related to the impacts of globalization. Developing and emerging markets will be mostly affected due to their development needs and consequent demand for technology and development skills to address their development and growth challenges.

## 5.7 References/Suggested Readings:

1.    Baylis, J & Smith, S. (2001), the globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations, Oxford.

2.    Bhargava, R. & Acharya, A.(Ed.) (2009), Political Theory- An Introduction, Dorling Kindersley.

3.    Bertucci, G and Alberti, A. Globalization and the Role of the State: Challenges and Perspectives (https://www.sbsc.in/pdf/resources/1588661028_Globalization_and_the_Role_of_the_State__Challenges_and_Perspectives.pdf)

4.    Buchanan, S. (November 24, 2012). Has Globalisation Altered the Role of the State? (https://www.e-ir.info/2012/11/24/has-globalisation-altered-the-role-of-states/)

5.    Gauba, O.P. (2003). An Introduction to Political Theory, Fourth Edition, Macmillan India.

× × ×