Saikat Majumdar, Dr. Sandip Sarkar

Research Article

The emergence of Nation and Nationalism: an ontic study

Saikat Majumdar[1], Dr. Sandip Sarkar[2]

Abstract:

After turning on, the word 'nation' got a multi-layered shape and multifocal interpretations by streaming into and streaming through the ripples like anthropology, political science, history, and ethnicity. Even before involving in the discourse of nationalism, it is necessary to get acquainted with the concept nation as words like race, nationalism and nation are deeply intertwined historically, politically, and culturally. 'Nation', the concept has gained importance in the age of political consciousness worldwide, especially after democratic revolutions in the eighteenth century generally refer to a united community living in a particular territory and creating a process or 'apparatus' for the sovereign homogenized national sentiment. This apparatus or tool is nationalism that sensitizes human history and existence, sometimes generous and often to achieve indomitable dominion supremacy. This paper seeks to intersect and tries to undermine the motley of theoretical postulation of nation and nationalism, which remain as the subject of critical discourse in various disciplines.

Keywords: *Nation, nationalism, ethnicity, territory, culture.*

---

[1]Ph.D. Scholar, National Institute of Technology, Raipur

[2]Assistant Professor, National Institute of Technology, Raipur

Nations are not all alike. They weren't alike in poverty, and they are not alike in luxury.

(J.F.Revel)

Though it has a similar dominion, economy, mass education system, and common civil rights as a prominent community of race, history, civilization, and culture, nation is a relatively

modern phenomenon. It can find its appearance back to the pre-modern ethnic nations. These so-called nations emerge in ancient and medieval places, with ancestral lineage, common memory, culture and solidarity, and the myth of connecting with one country to another. Two types are important for the origin and origination of nation-building. The region has evolved from civilian nations, the aristocracy's 'pro-ethnicity' to the outside world. History often turns the religiously defined and passive human community into an active political country. Intellectuals have replaced this state as an agent of widespread solidarity by creating a new 'map' and 'morality' through a newly discovered and reconstructed communal past of landscape and golden ages like Finland, Ireland, and Switzerland. Modern countries today draw more to their strength and stability through these ancient bonds and feelings by creating nations.

A nation, when it gets politically recognized it becomes the bearer of nationalism. National consciousness, a consciousness of integrity, is transmitted to people living in a particular territory only if they are the bearers of their ancient history and traditions and are identical in language and religion. They remain attached to fundamental unity in their diversity. Nationalism is born out of the national consciousness that exists in the minds of the masses. However, not all of the above conditions may be present in all cases. However, it is essential to unite on some other issues. Otherwise, nationalism cannot develop.

Traditionalists such as Anthony Smith and Gottfried Hard consider nationalism as temporary and universal. However, many people did not consider their idea. Anthony Smith prefers a mixed approach to investigate and analyse race, nation, and nationalism. He regarded that the roots of nationalism were relating to phenomena of ethnic and that nationalism was modern and conventional (Smith, 1972, p. 20). He endeavored to put together contemporary and pre-modern sentiments concerning race and ethnocentricity (Smith, 1991, p. 45). To Smith, nationalism as an approach is a modern facet having apparent roots.

According to Smith, some of the features of modern nations are: Having a 'clearly demarcated area', alongside a center and 'recognized boundaries within a legal-political community', with an individual standard 'legal system' and 'broad participation', including the 'civil and political rights' of all civilians or citizens spreading the culture to entire citizens over a standard, mass education system as well as an international system of sovereign nation-states.

Smith, however, firmly believed that nationalism emerged as political conformity in the eighteenth century, but elements of nationalism had emerged earlier. Thus, in Smith's view, the

modernist narratives of nationalism are needed to be revised further by others. Ethno Symbolism is a 'middle way' effort to the study of nationalism. This method is not a taboo juice in the modern era. It originated from the intricate societal and national structure of the previous era and the diverse ethnic groups [ethnic communities] that transformed modern power but never abolished it. In this case, the modern age is similar to 'palimpsest'. They recorded various identities and experiences of multiple eras and different ethnic formations, influenced the past, and subsequently revised to create the cohesive cultural unit we call.

A nation controls legitimacy and power. Nation, in Renan's view, is a spiritual and cultural borderland. Renan explains two ethnic situations. He emphasized the indigenous peoples of the state and their traditions and the unwavering desire for unity to survive more potent than the neighboring peoples. Some mental qualities enable people to be united in a single nation. These qualities are the bonds of homosexuality, empathy, and unity in diversity.

Johann Gottfried Harder (1744-1803) possessed a historical overview of nation and nationalism. Though the general elements of humankind framed his motivation, his firm belief lay in that tradition, customs, and especially languages being the root of nationalism. Johann Gottlieb Fiche (1622 - 1814) succeeded Herder's view that language being the highest reasonable ground for nationalism. He accepted that different languages were the reason for different nations. But Hegel (1770–1831), Fiche's immediate successor observed that nation is a construct of politics; it is a political institution rather than a state for a culture cluster. He also believed that a state could develop humankind which included expanding human liberty. According to him, the state is a moral institution that can improve the nation. The state as a divine concept exists on this earth. Freedom achieves objectivity in a state, so Hegel admitted that complying with the law was how humankind could be free and independent. "When the state or our country forms a community of existence; when man's subjective will submits to the law - the conflict between liberty and necessity disappears "(Cohen, 1965, p.111). That the Napoleonic Empire could have been transformed by another as a further stage in human progress and perhaps turned into a more advanced stage "(Birch, 1989, pp. 2-22).

Italian nationalist and patriot Mazzini (1805-1722) tried to inspire the Italians to create an undivided Italy. He emphasized the historical and geographical heritage and the legation of the Italian nation to have a single and common country. He praised the history of ancient Italy and concluded the study by concluding:

Italy will be one. Its geographical location, language, and literature; The need for defense and political power; The aspirations of the people, the democratic instincts inherent in our people, the presence of progress where all the powers and faculties of the country must agree, the awareness of an enterprise in Europe and still achieve great things for the world by Italy; All of these goals. There is no obstacle that cannot be easily overcome; there is no objection that cannot be historically and philosophically united and disputed (Cohen, 1965, pp. 112-111).

One can trace the rise of the nationalism with real historical and political significance back to the French Revolution. The free nationalist ideas of the reform movement overshadowed the social contradictions of counter-reform. Though nationalism, according to Hobsbawm: "is simply no longer the historical force it was in the era between the French Revolution and the end of imperialist colonialism after World War II." (Hobsbawm. P.169)

J.J. Rousseau (1712-1778) was the first political theorist to draw a theory that could be called nationalist. In the Projet de constitution pour la Corse (1765) he stated: "Every people has, or ought to have, a national character, and if it is lacking, one must begin by providing it to them." He suggested that political societies should have their own government institutions. After the old dynasty and authority collapse, Rousseau saw a new focal point and source of support for society and social order in the state. He also believed that the invention of a perfect political society wasn't a matter of natural evolution or spontaneous fusion; rather, it should combine some general ties of origin and interest. Rousseau combined the concept of nation with the idea of social with his concept of nation. The social contract, when he envisioned it, transferred political authority from the monarchy to the people. This process disturbs a person's solidarity. The idea of the strong nation was the vibrating solidarity. The people now had to unite as a 'nation', not as subjects of a king. Their elected representatives consolidated around those who gave political rehearsals. It was God's will, not the will of the people, that the authorities should act as a "nation". He understood the nation as an ordinary political place that all people their birth; including wealth and religion. The nation became a source of political legitimacy for national governments, which worked for the people.

For Durkheim (1858-1917) - a French sociologist – the existence of a nation is possible only where state and nationality are the same and in the togetherness of cultural as well as political oneness. He was in the belief that humankind is moral for living in an adequately founded society and nationalism is the whole idea and feeling that binds a person to a particular state. He also saw no conflict between loyalty towards the nation and to humanity. Furthermore,

Durkheim noticed a direct relationship between nation and religion. He indicated a similarity between conventional religious performance and the union of citizens in remembrance of a new ethical or legitimate system or some remarkable occasion in national life.

Marxist doctrine: Karl Marx and Engels did not believe in nationalism in the general sense in the early stages. They emphasized class struggle. Ethnicity doesn't matter to them. However, they must indeed have understood that the national environment and tradition are an undeniable part of the class and class conflict development. Marx and Engels often used the term race and nation in the sense of civil society. According to Marx, the beginning of the class struggle for the interests of capitalism began in civil society. In that case, a state acts as a political organization of the influential class. It conducts foreign policy in the interest of that significant class. Despite rising concern over national character in Marx and Engels's work, they concentrated on social class relations rather than nationalism. According to them, many nations gradually became extinct. It is due to rapid industrialization. But the main goal of the Marxist proletarian movement is to unite all civilized countries economically. One can mention the famous lines from Communist Manifesto. Working people have no country, no working class; they belong to the working class as a whole - that is their main identity. It is the slogan of the workers of the world. They believed in the establishment of proletarian dictatorship and internationalism. However, many Marxist thinkers later changed their views on the nation-state.

Joseph Stalin (1878-1953) was the premiere of the Soviet Union, with some characteristics for a nation. He did not agree with those who defined the nation as an authentic nation and tribe on the one hand and the emperor's government on the other. He firmly believed that a nation could not exist without combining economic life, language, and region.

Max Weber (1864-1920), a German social scientist and political economist, investigated the country as a success of a dignified community through a kind of cultural commission. He claimed that a standard definition could not outline a nation, but he connected the nation to common ancestors, myths, and ethnic communities. Weber believed that these issues identified nations as separate, adopting a political agenda.

From the point of view of **Karl Wolfgang Deutsch** (1912-1992) - Czech political and social scientist - the definition of a nation may be a helpful approach where a nation is an assortment of shared history, common expertise, and communication facilities. He claims that the goal of

national organizations is to implement and promote network communities that can guarantee citizen's loyalty to national standards and signs.

Clifford James Geertz (1926-2006) has ethnographic methods for investigating nations. He admitted that post-colonial states had two divisions: ethnic and civic. Racial perspectives were primitive loyalty that gave people a distinct identity, and civic citizenship was a key feature of the modern state.

There are two main ideas about race and the origin of nationality. The first method is called Primordialist / perennialists, and the second is called modernist/instrumentalist. The first group (primordialist / perennialists) believes in the origin of ethnicity and racial relations as the first condition of humanity. According to this notion, government, party, bureaucracy, and politics are signs of the gap between ethnic and cultural identities. Primordialism, in general, points to the repetitive nature of nationalism throughout human history. Nations do not claim to be natural; perennials claim to find excellent continuity in ancient and modern ideas of nations throughout different historical periods and very different places. The second group (modernists/instruments) argues for nationalism and nationalism as a modern phenomenon created by the political elites. The idea of modernists, race, and nationalism is the product of the recent state, school of thought, secularism, and market economy.

The paradigms of primordialism emphasize the importance of the eternal nature of the nation. An important argument derived from primordialism is the inevitable "pressure on cultural given" Social Existence. " However, modernist theories magnify a nation's purely simulated nature through political, ideological, socio-economic, socio-cultural, or constructionist approaches.

For example, Edward Schills (1910-1995) believed that kinship was the nation's foundation. According to Clifford Geertz (1926-2006), the creation of most nations based on blood, language, caste, and habitat turn borders into self and others. These national relations form the basis of state power control. According to this theory, the building of a nation stands on ethnicity. Walker Connor (1926) believed that nationalism was allegiance to the state to the nation. He thought the nation was a group that consciously had ethnic roots. Van den Berge (1933) firmly believed that ethnicity comes from genetics and kinship relationships. Another example of this method is contemporary. Franjo Tudjiman's monograph on nationalism in Europe:

> Nations…grow up in natural manner, in the objective and complex historical process, as a result of the development of all those material and spiritual forces Which in a given area shape the national being of individual nations on the basis of blood, linguistic and cultural kinship, and the common vital interests and links of fate between the ethnic community and the common homeland and the common historical traditions and aims… Nations are the irreplaceable cells of the human community or of the whole of mankind's being. This fact cannot be disputed in any way (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p.27).

Modernists such as Anthony Giddens, Eric Hobsbawm, Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, all agreed that Western capitalism, the Industrial Revolution in Britain, and the French Revolution were significant events in the national consciousness of the eighteenth century. Anthony Giddens (1936) presents an official definition of a nation where he describes the nation as a "power holder of the frontier." In the formation of Giddens, what emerged next was the 'border power-holder' which we know as the modern nation-state that exists in a complex part of other nation-states. It collects the institutional style of maintaining an executive or governing monopoly in an area, including boundaries. It approves its rules by law and direct management of internal and external violence. He conjointly acknowledges that there is no correlation between nationalism and the philosophy of sovereignty. The history of the literary, cultural, and historical memory connected with the right of a single region, somewhere religion; somewhere language was especially associated with the formation of this nation-state. For example, from reform to enlightenment, religion played a major role in transmitting state consciousness and nationalism in pre-French Europe.

Eric Hobsbawm is one of the leading modern thinkers on nation and nationality. He wrote his famous book Nationalism and Nationalism since 1780, emphasizing the modernity and nationalism of the nation. According to Hobsbawm:

> The basic features of the modern nation and everything connected with it are modernity ... Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy does not use the terms state, race and language in a modern way before the 1888 edition (Hobsbawm, 1990, p.14).

He interprets this phenomenon as a "discovery of tradition". In his view, these ideas were built in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, not in ancient times. According to Hobsbawm:

Invented traditions are relevant in relation to historical innovations in relation to events related to race, nationalism, country-state, national symbol, history and others. All these details on the exercises of social engineering which are intentional and always innovative, only if historical innovation refers to innovation (E. Hobsbawm, 1983, p. 133).

In his view, nation and nationalism are not ancient phenomena. In other words, the basis of the nation is not biological but cultural. Hobsbawm would say the main difference between this nationalist movement of the late twentieth century and their predecessors. The first in the middle of the twentieth century gathered around revolution, imperialism, and decolonization. He is right to draw attention to the reactionary and hostile forms of nationalism prevalent throughout the country today. Hobsbawm writes: "In short, the appeal of most such 'nation and 'national movements' was the opposite of the nationalism which seeks to bond together those to have deemed to common ethnicity, language, culture, historical past, and the rest". (P.179). He writes further:

The nation today is visibly in the process of losing an important part of its old function, namely that is constituting a territorially bounded 'national economy' which formed a building blockin the larger world economy, at least in the developed regions of the world" (Habsbawm.p.181).

The basic meaning of the nation as per Habsbawm is political. According to him,a nation is the 'body of citizens whose collective sovereignty constituted them a state which was their political expression' (Habsbawm. p.18-19). He postulates nation and nationalism will remain in history as a diminutive form, unlike national history and culture. Nationalism, as it is historically less significant, it is no longer a global political project or program as it used to have been in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its function either to complicate factors or as a catalyst to develop other issues.

Ernest Gellner's Nations and Nationalism (1983) provides one of all the most original and powerful interpretations of the recent concept of nationalism. Drawing upon a huge extent of disciplines, including sociology, philosophy, anthropology, history, and politics Gellner argues nationalism as an inevitable consequence of modernity. To define a nation, Gellner gives the example of Chassimo, an émigré Frenchman in Germany during the Napoleonic period who wrote a powerful proto-Kafkaesque novel about a man who lost his shadow. It indicates that

the man without a Shadow was the man without a Nation ; 'A man without nation defies the recognized categories and provokes revulsion.'(Gellner, 1983, p.6) Gellner also writes: 'having a nation is not an inherent attribute of humanity, but it has now come to appear as such.'(Gellner. p.6) He defines: "1.Two men are of the same nation if and only if they share the same culture, where culture, in turn, means a system of ideas and signs and association and ways of behaving and communicating. 2. Two men are of the same nation if and only if they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation. In other words, nations maketh man; nations are the artifacts of men's convictions and loyalties and solidarities"(Gellner. p.7). In his work Thought and Change, Gellner defines: 'Nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent'. Gellner was stimulated by Kedourie's argument: 'The idea of nationalism was a product, not producer, of modernity'. In his Nations and Nationalism (1983) he writes:

> It is nationalism that endangers nations, and not the other way round. Admittedly, nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively, and it most often transforms them radically. They can revive dead languages, traditions invented, entirely fictitious pristine purities restored. The artificial, contingent and ideological aspects of nationalist fervor must not misinterpret the meaning that nationalism was created de novo by non-existing European thinkers for their benefit and convenience.

Thus, nationalism is the overall impose of high culture in society, where antecedent lower culture held the lives of the majority of the common masses and, in few cases, the people of the total demography.

There is an appeal to the theorists of decolonization to suppress the concept of 'national' culture. Timothy Brennan wholeheartedly draws attention to the aesthetic instincts of the nationalist movement when he writes that for these decolonization theorists, 'culture itself is meaningless if not considered in its "national" direction. Although the inherent characteristics of those different movements, and even the words that these 'third world' nationalisms are pronouncing, may differ, the underlying similarity is that they are identity constants that may identify their functions with a spread of tools established by colonialism. Thus, to understand why nationalism is widespread as negative or authoritarian today, we must first realize that the idea of a nation in the 'Third World' has grown through a resilient, anti-colonial nationalist movement. As the struggle created new states and new frontiers for independence, it also

produced relatively few homeless tours, voyages, vignettes. The emerging structures of institutional power, rejected by the establishment of order, exist between the old and the new.

Frantz Fanon, one of the earliest decolonization theorists in the article on 'On National Culture,' strongly asserts restoring natural past cultures. According to him, it prompts indigenous intellectuals to decolonize regional nationalism. In this case, the notion of 'nation' as an imaginary basis for building dependence on culture and identity became an integral part of nationalism's rhetoric. A stable, united one for humans, he tried to create a national culture.

Benedict Anderson starts Imagined Communities (1983) by writing nation, nationality, nationalism — all have ascertained notoriously troublesome defining and analyzing. In contrast to the colossal impact that nationalism has exerted on the modern world, authentic theorization about it is conspicuously pitiful. In his ongoing praise of nationalism, Benedict Anderson called nations "'joinable in time'" because they were "conceived in language, not in blood." Anderson, for example, knows the origins of nation-building within the "imagined community." Its creation through the destruction of religious states, new methods of communication, and the beginning of "printed capitalism" around the world. Anderson argued that nation and nationalism 'were imagined' because: "Even members of the smallest nation will never know most of their peers, meet them or listen to them, yet the image of their communication in every man's mind". He goes on to write: "The nation 'is imagined' as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind. The most messianic nationalists do not dream of a day when all the members of the human race will join their nation in the way that it was possible, in certain epochs, for, say, Christians to dream of a wholly Christian planet." According to him, It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an era destroying the legitimacy of enlightenment and revolution—the kingdom of the divinely controlled, hierarchical realm. At a stage in human history when even the most devout followers of a universal religion came to maturity, the living plurals of these religions, and the ontological demands of each faith, spread invisibly between the territories. Nations dream of being independent and, if under God, directly.

It is notional or imagined as a community, irrespective of the particular imparity and exploitation in every case. The nation always exists imagined as a deep, horizontal comradeship. In the end, it is the brotherhood that has made this possible in the last two centuries that is not so much about killing off millions of people as it is about dying voluntarily for limited

imagination. Anderson believes in the formation of nations on the American continent according to nationalism. Because of the power of the media, American colonial states invented nationalism. According to Anderson's concept, the media played a vital role in how were the nations formed historically. Nationalism developed from the revolution enabled by the written and printed word, which utterly remodeled the Middle Ages' geography by identifying with fellow citizens.

Eli Kedouri, a professor of politics at the University of London, believes that nationalism is a matter of Enlightenment Thought, the French Revolution, and the central state's birth in France. Thus, in Kedouri's view, nationalism is an elliptical concept related to Kant and the Enlightenment. However, like some thinkers like Lord Acton (1834) believed that the central theme of nationalism was romantic nationalism. Kedouri believed that nationalism derived from German philosophy, especially from Fichte and a sub-branch of Ideas on Kant's independence. Moreover, he emphasized the built character of national identity; and claims that it's often correct to mention that national identity is the creation of nationalist ideology instead of nationalist ideology, the emergence or manifestation of national identity. However, some modernists, like John Breuilly (1975), provided a framework for nationalism, where he studied nationalism as a type of political power. Like other statements about nationalism normally, it's rather more sweeping. It obscures the fact that nations are imagined in several ways and will be connected individually. Different nations imagine indifferently, but the identical nation also imagines different times at different times - after all, often at the identical time, different people.

 In some settings, 'nation' is visualized as an ethnocultural community separate from state citizenship. When 'nation' 'is imagined' during this way, nationalism is completely internal and external because it can define some cohabitants, even colleagues and even enemies of the country as external. There are, of course, several ugly examples in American history of this kind of internal exclusion, of this narrow Americanism, or racism. Overall, the American nation is envisioned - by existing and potential members - to be comparatively open and accessible. Certainly more simply accessible than other countries, only if the 'nation' is supposed to connect in a highly timely manner; nationalism can perform as a valued provision for the unification of immigrants.

John D. Caputo in his The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion Without Religion, (1997), has reflected the celebrated words of Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), a renowned philosopher, anti-realist, and deconstructionist, on his idea of national identity:

The idea behind deconstruction is to deconstruct the workings of strong nation-states with powerful immigration policies, to deconstruct the rhetoric of nationalism, the politics of place, the metaphysics of native land and native tongue... the idea is to disarm the bombs… of identity that nation-states build to defend themselves against the stranger, against Jews and Arabs and immigrants.

The discourse of nation, nationalism and their significance in ethnographic, cartographic, and demographic levels remained unacknowledged till it touches the Asian soil and particularly acquaints with the tone of Indian philosophies.

Swami Vivekananda was concerned with Indian nationalism for five years but left his impetus on almost half a century. He "thundered from Cape Comorin on the southern tip of India to the Himalayas" (Gokhale) delivering his great massage of nationalism that "came as a tonic to the depressed and demoralized Hindu mind" (Nehru). For five years he performed the role of "an itinerant prophet of a renascent India" that had re-discovered its decayed soul and was preparing to recapture its lost glories and to save the world as well. Vivekananda redefines nation in terms of its "syntagmatical interconnectedness" (Singh, 17) with other nations. His pronounced words reflect his intrinsic philosophy:

I am thoroughly convinced that no individual or nation can live by holding itself apart from the community of others, and whenever such an attempt has been made under false ideas of greatness, policy, or holiness – the result has always been disastrous to the secluding one. (Vivekananda 147)

"Nationalism has not been crushed. Nationalism is not going to be crushed. Nationalism survives in the strength of God and it is not possible to crush it, whatever weapons are brought against it. Nationalism is immortal" (Aurobindo, 1908) is echoed in the voice of mystic poet, true nationalist, and celebrated philosopher Sri Aurobindo. With a universal outlook and spiritual foundation, Aurobindo's nationalism is considered as a comprehensive and broader one.

In contrast to the western construct of nationalism that just implies a common and standard political sentiment he advocated nationalism as a spiritual 'Sadhana.' In a public meeting in Bombay in 1908, Aurobindo said "Nationalism is not a mere political programme; nationalism

is a religion that has come from God. Nationalism is a creed which you shall have to live." For Sri Aurobindo nationalism is much loftier and more inherently profound than mere patriotism. Together with his construct of the nation as a divine subsistence, he considered nationalism as a spiritual and imperious requisite and potential religious observation essential for the freedom of motherland and the spiritual upliftment of the devotee. For him rendering service towards the nation was highest level of religion.

Father of nation, Mahatma Gandhi ushered a radiant sunshine in Indian national movement. An unprecedented upsurge came nationwide under his leadership. His ideology brings resurrection in the caste-ridden society; his consciousness helps transform the entire nation and find fertile soil of humanity and non-violence. Different Indian novels represent Gandhi's omnipresence. Novels of Anand shows him as crusader of curse of untouchability, in Khwaja Abbas' his revolutionary spirit and R.K. Narayan represents his humanity. To quote his own words: "Our nationalism can be no peril to other nations, inasmuch as we will exploit none just as we will allow none to exploit us. Through Swaraj we would serve the whole world." (Young India, , p. 79)

Rabindranath Tagore, the Noble Laureate and world poet, welcomed the dawn of humanism vividly felt the achieved unity in Europe through the state. Thus, political unity is the most crucial element of European ethnicity. On the other hand, India writes differently. The existence of a state depends on power, not on cooperation. The state empowers the nation and society leads the people to perfection. According to Rabindranath, people are good people who want to build kinship with everyone. This social perception of humanity embodies the essence of the world in humanity, where all nations can be bound in one humanity. The states of the countries are not able to meet this demand. European life, where nation-states are centered, is socially centered. Opposition to this society-based India did not seem unreasonable, but the enemy did not. The multifaceted path and different perspectives have integrated the society, giving priority to society and recognizing all. Nation-states are against Indian ideology and the arrogance of power, and their despair is no more a place of love than unceasing coercion. The wave of nationalism that has erupted across Europe, especially in the nation-state consciousness, deeply rooted in the spirit of nationalism, especially in Europe, is a wave of Asian states.

For a society of irrational addiction to nationalism, the European nation has fallen in love with the cruel game of the nation's best proof. Western thought has always tried to establish this nationalism in the seat of production. At the same time, Rabindranath, who considered the

central state of Indian society, has tried to break away from the Western notion of caste and nationalism and review the Indian traditional consciousness and the concept of caste and nationalism in the light of the world. Rabindranath thinks that caste is an entirely new concept to Indians. Many powers like Mughal, Pathan came to India before the British, but they all went as a nation, not as a nation. But the British imposed the idea of nation-state or nation-state on us. According to him, the Western nation is a special economic and political organization of people formed to meet mechanical goals.

Contemporary European state philosophers see nationalism as a great model. However, in European history and civilization, Rabindranath found the theory of national self-determination and ethnic domination in Western nationalism. Rabindranath believes that a nation is a specific people who are politically and economically united to achieve particular mechanical means at any time. According to him, intoxication is an organized and narrow form of consciousness for the benefit of the whole people. In the poet's view, the unifying influence of the monarchy is not the root cause of the rise of the caste of religion or the linguistic unity of economic and material interests. Again, one can notice different languages, religions, etc., in the same nation in European states. Thus, he believes that although the above elements influence the formation of the nation, its main source is spiritual and sensorial. He said the deeply historically entrenched nation is a mental, emotional element. In the past, the nation gave a united expression to the people leaving the country, acknowledging their grief and being ready to unite again for it.

Rabindranath Tagore called the nation a ghost of exploitation under Western imperialist rule. These ruthless monsters leave the weak and poor behind in the face of violence. The Western powers have expressed their aggressive attitude towards the nation, and they are eager to name the nation because of their intense desire to enjoy the world. Rabindranath hated this shameless aspiration of European power. He warned the world that it was a disgusting form of heinous form; it was also contagious. He condemned the mentality of building one's nation by making other nations smaller. He said that liars should have misled themselves to prove them tremendous and that the ceremony needs curtailment to the nation's religion. We still do not see the signs of a civilization that can raise a child from injustice and all kinds of lies. No matter how much the country dislikes religious literature in the name of religion, the nation cannot hide its power, wealth, and flag. The rest of the world swells at the opportunity of weakness.

In his famous book Imaginary Community, Benedict Anderson argued that the modern nation emerged as an imaginary nation through the institutionalized form of printed capitalism. Anderson proposes that the arrival of the printing press brought about the formation of nations and fictional communities. His concern lies with the rise of nationalism with the growth of print books and the technological development of printing. He says that the promotion of books, magazines, etc., published in specific languages created an understanding among the readers and a simple idea between them. Anderson showed that their national printed language formed their European nation-state. Jurgen Habermas believes that the press has a role to play in creating the public. Publications in a country's language form a conscious language group, and the same speakers gradually reach common ground by exchanging views among themselves. Partha Chatterjee showed that the ideal of modern nationalism got restructured in the field of language and literature. It was flexible and rich in new ideas and ideals. On p.106 of the Legacy of History, Partha Chatterjee also states that the history of the last century's history explains the context of all the myths that are a significant element of today's Hindu propaganda. Looking down on the matter will reveal a startling truth. It is one of the most visible forms, shapes, reflects in the mirror of Indian nationalism.

Thus nation has several essential characteristics, including integral territory, linguistic unity, literary, traditional features, generally social, religious, and economic institutions, the sovereignty of the state, confidence in ancient history and traditions, public loyalty to the same state, common values, national interests, hostile attitude towards foreign enemies, etc. However, these elements need not exist in totality. It is possible to fulfill the condition of ethnicity only if it is partial. After considering the history of different countries, it is clear that despite differences in language, religion, and borders, national consciousness or nationalism emerged among many countries during the independence movement. An example of this is British India. During the colonial rule, amid religious and linguistic diversity, unified Indian consciousness of nationalism developed in India's minds.

The relationship between nationalism and nation is complex and is not disappearing as part of an obsolete and traditional matter. Both are part of a modern concept. Elite described a set of distinct identities and other participants in the political arena of social struggle. These different identities also shape everyday life, provide tools for integration and understanding of differences, build specific versions of national identity. It is quite impossible to completely separate nationalism from nation innumerable dimensions like modern discourse of culture,

nation-building, inter-Nationalism, trans-national identity, and so on both nation and nationalism paramount. Gellner's remarkable lines may worthily conclude the discussion:

... nationalism is not the awakening and assertion of these mythical, supposedly natural and given units. It is, on the contrary, the crystallization of new units, suitable for the conditions now prevailing, though admittedly using as their raw material the cultural, historical and other inheritances from the pre-nationalist world. (Gellner, 1992, p. 49).

Select Bibliography

Ahmad, A. (1992): rpt. In theory: Classes, nations. Literatures. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, B. (1991). Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Print. London: Verso.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Helen, T. (1995). The post Colonial studies reader. London: Routledge.

Barnard, F. M. (1983). National culture and political legitimacy: Herder and Rousseau. Journal of the History of Ideas, 44(2), 231–253. doi:10.2307/2709138

Barrington, L. W. (December 1997). 'Nation' and "nationalism": The misuse of key concepts in political science. PS: Political Science and Politics, 30(4), 712–716. doi:10.1017/S1049096500047314

Breuilly, J. (1993). Nationalism and the state. Manchester: Manchester University Press.Chatterjee, Partha. Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World : A Derivative Discourse? (Delhi : Oxford University Press, 1986).

Chin, C. (2021). Multiculturalism and Nationalism: Models of belonging of diverse political community. Nations and Nationalism, 27(1), 112–129. doi:10.1111/nana.12657

Dawisha, A. (2002). Nation and nationalism: Historical antecedents to contemporary debates. International Studies Review, 4(1), 3–22. doi:10.1111/1521-9488.00250. Wiley on behalf of The International Studies Association.(Spring, 2002)

Deshpande, A. (June 21–27, 1997). Nationalism and nation-state as discourse in India. Economic and Political Weekly, 32, No. 25.

Devy, G. N. (1992). After amnesia: Tradition and change in Indian literary criticism. Bombay: Orient Longman.Gellner, Ernest. Nations and Nationalism. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.1992.

Giddens, A. (1992). Nationalism: Five roads to modernity. The nation-state and violence. Cambridge: Polity Press. Greenfield, L. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Greenfield, L. (1992). Nationalism: Five roads to modernity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guia, A. (2016). The concept of nativism and anti-immigrant sentiments in Europe. European University Institute.

Haas, E. B. (1986). What is nationalism and why should we study it? International Organization, 40(3), 707–744. doi:10.1017/S0020818300027326

Hobsbawm, E. Nations and nationalism since 1780 [Program]. Myth, Reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1990).

Mellor, R. (1989). Nation, state, and territory: A political geography. London: Routledge.

Nandy, A. (2000). The illegitimacy of nationalism: Rabindranath Tagore and the politics of self 1994. Delhi: Oxford. University Review.

Richmond, A. (1987). 'Ethnic Nationalism: Social Science Paradigms.' interna- tional. Social Science Journal.

Said, E. (1994). Culture and imperialism. London: Vintage Book Company.

Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. London: Routledge.

Smith, A. (1991). National identity. London: Penguin Press.

Tagore, R. (1917). Nationalism in India NATIONALISM (1917 ed). New York: Macmillan.

Tamir, Y. (1995). The enigma of nationalism. World Politics, 47(3), 418–440. doi:10.1017/S0043887100016440

Trivedi, & Harish. (1994). Theorizing the nation: Construction of "India" and "Indian literature", 37(2) (pp. 31–45).

Uberoi, V. (2008). Do policies of multiculturalism undermine national identities? Political Quarterly, 79(3), 404–417. doi:10.1111/j.1467-923X.2008.00942.x

Uberoi, V. (2015). The Parekh Report- National identities without nations and nationalism. Ethnicities, 15(4), 509–526. doi:10.1177/1468796815577706

Uberoi, V. (2016). Legislating multiculturalism and nationhood: The 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 49(2), 267–287. doi:10.1017/S0008423916000366

Uberoi, V. (2018). National identity- A multiculturalist approach. Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy, 21(1), 46–64. doi:10.1080/13698230.2017.1398475

Viroli, M. (1995). For love of country: An essay on patriotism and nationalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vivekananda, S. (1989). Complete works of Swami Vivekananda, 4. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.

Wimmer, A. (2002). Nationalist exclusion and ethnic conflict: Shadows of modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolpert, S. (2006). Shameful flight: The last years of the British Empire in India p. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zimmer, O. (2003). Nationalism in Europe 1890–1940. Houndmills, NY, Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Zimmer, O. (2003). Boundary mechanisms and symbolic resources: Towards a process oriented approach to national identity. Nations and Nationalism, 9(2), 173–193. doi:10.1111/1469-8219.00081