

## Introduction

The western institutes appear to have announced the nation-conception as old-fashioned, paramount and essentialist whereas majority of the progressing and unprogressive territories in Asia and Africa are still committed in the proposal of “nation-making” which is adequately emulated in their scholarly works. It is interesting to know that majority of the contemporary treatises on postcolonial theory have invaded the nation and approved the global instead. But, for the third world countries like Asia and Africa, the significance of the term “nation” is absolutely important for social, financial and cultural reorganization and their contemplation in literary and scholarly works. The acceleration and growing reputation of English novel from the eighteenth century along is an index to the matter that novel more than any other genre adds the ultimate zone for narrating the nation. The authentic history of a “nation” does not exist in the feuds of monarchs and rise and fall of kingdoms but ordinary nature of common-folk’ life whose deep-rooted resilience, unaffected by the competition in the areas of political and legislative states, permits their survival. The writer or author as a social being is also positioned in a society within the framework of socio-cultural and historical background. So, writers located in the third world countries, striking by starvation, underdevelopment, bleeding, brutality, have to classify themselves with suffering and anguish common folks. If they are dedicated writers, their very situations or locations in the society make them conscious to the analytical transformation happening in their societies or nation. Their stories or narratives turn into the narratives of the nation by mirroring the actual realities of their respective communities. This section mainly deals with the nation i.e., its historical background, definition provided by various critics and thinkers in the eastern and the western world. Background of

writer and outline of concerned chapters would also be described in this section of research.

Nation: There is no exact definition that definitely delineates the notion of nation. As “nation” as a notion does not have common and mutual authorized definition so its definition lingers challenged by distinct strand of expertise. It is notoriously difficult to define what nation is. There is not even a parallel term for a concept called nationalism in any Indian language, let aside equivalent term for it. Basically, nation is derived from the French word *nacio* which states “birth”, “place of origin” which is originated from the Latin word *natio* which refers to “birth”. Generally, it can be defined as a large group of people with strong sense of belonging and identity, having common culture, history, territory, language, religion or ethnicity but not necessarily having same government and sovereignty. Nation is more an abstract and political term rather than a concrete and religious term. However, there is an unambiguous definition of the concept of ‘state’ defined by Article 1 of Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States (1933). It defines, “The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: a) a permanent population; b) a defined territory; c) government; and d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states” (Grotenhuis 25). All these descriptive features of states can completely be illustrated and confirmed. To provide cohesion to the frail states, it is essential to frame a state that fulfills the requirements and yearnings of its citizens. In order to build an idealistic state, it must fulfill the following affairs towards its citizens:

1. A state can guard its citizens from the foreign and inner attacks and convicts by providing surveillance.
2. A state can create legitimate financial life of its citizens by providing foundation to promote commercial life and accomplishing policies.

3. A state can become comprehensive and accessible for all civilians by creating scope for assistance in constitutional verdict accomplishing.
4. A state can empower civilians to give them opportunity to spend their lives with decency by providing fundamental public assistances.
5. A state can treat its citizens candid, unbiased and unprejudiced by providing authority of equal laws and rights.

According to the sociopolitical conception, the nation can be stated as it is “a political community containing a “national majority,” i.e., a group which is a majority on a given territory which also happens to be the majority of a group of individuals sharing the same language, culture, history around the world” (Seymour 425). Nation is basically a society, an exact society of masses. Such type of society is not ancestral nor is it ethnic. The modern Italian nation was derived from Romans, Teutons, Etruscans, Greeks, Arabs, and to onward. The French nation was derived from Gauls, Romans, Britons, Teutons, and so onward. The similar should be spoken of the British, the Germans, Indians, Chinese and others, who were derived into nation from the masses of varied ancestral and ethnics. Thus, a nation is not an ancestral or ethnic but an archivally comprised society of masses.

In another way, it is undeniable that the enormous realms of Alexander and Cyrus could not be labeled nations, despite the fact they occurred to be comprised archivally and were derived out of various ancestral and ethnics. They could not form the nations, as they were spontaneous and closely related amalgamation of society, which collapsed or united rely upon the achievements or killings of this or that winner. Thus, a nation is not an occasional or transitory amalgamation, but a definite society of masses.

But not each one definite society comprises a nation. Russia and Australia are also definite society, but these are not called as nations. What does determine a national society from a constitutional society. One of the characteristic aspects is that a national society is incredible beyond an ordinary language. At the same time, a state does not demand fundamentally an ordinary language. The Polish in Russia and the Czech nations in Australia would be insurmountable if each did not have an ordinary or a general language, although the probity of Austria and Russia is not afflicted by the evidence that there are a lot distinct languages within their outskirts. We are implying, definitely to the vernacular or common language of the masses and not to the legitimate executive language.

Thus, society of language is one of the distinctive aspects of a nation. Hence, it is defined that neither all who communicate common language automatically comprise one nation nor distinct nation invariably and throughout automatically communicate distinct languages. It is necessary to have an ordinary language for a nation but not automatically distinct languages for distinct nation. It is necessary for a nation to have one common language during a particular period but it is not suggested that there may not be two nations communicating the same language.

Americans and Englishmen communicate one language but they do not comprise one nation. The identical is authentic of the English and the Irish, the Norwegians and the Danes. But what is reason, despite having common language, English and Americans do not comprise one nation. Inherently, they occupy diverse region so do not reside well-organized. A nation is brought into existence only as the outcome of organized and extended intimacy, as a result of the fact that masses reside well- organized from breeding to breeding. But without having common territory, people cannot live in well- organized manner for an extended period. Basically,

Englishmen and Americans occupied the same territory, England and comprised one nation. Coming after, one portion of the English migrated to a new territory, America, and with the passage of time, it emerges as a new American nation. Disparity of territory drive the construction of distinct nation. So, society of territory is one of the distinct aspects of a nation. But the society of territory is not sufficient in creating a nation. There must be some economic bond among the various parts of a nation so that they can interact to one another and build the nation into single whole. As there is no economic connection between America and England, so they comprise two distinct nations. Thus, society of economic life, economic cohesion, is one of the distinct aspects of a nation.

But this is not enough. One must take care of the life style of people, their spiritual complexion of the people comprising a nation that is called national culture. America, England and Ireland comprise three different nations because of the specific psychological make – up which they created from breeding to breeding as the outcome of different situations of survival, however, one common language i.e., English is spoken by them. So, the psychological make- up that can be defined as “national character” cannot be ignored as it manifests different culture of a nation. However, “national character” is not a thing that can be called definite, it is developed with the changes in the situation of life. But as it survives at every prescribed moment, so it makes its imprint on the physiognomy of the nation. Thus, society of psychological make- up, which is included in society of culture, is one of distinct aspects of a nation.

Now there are lots of distinct aspects of a nation. A nation is an archivally or historically evolved, definite society of territory, language, economic life, and psychological make- up manifested in a society of culture. But nation like any other historical phenomenon, is bind by law of change, has its beginning and end and its

history. While taking this functioning definition of nation from the master plan and partisan and their devotees. This definition is an excellent and reasonably approved today, however liable group of population endeavoring to be adequate nations in this aspect, scarcity one or other of these qualities in minor or major extent. For instance, a group of population endeavoring to be adequate nations, but they may not have equal approach and movability in the accepted organization of education and economy and may be expelled from the complete act of common constitutional privileges. They may be treated as in some manner of cultural foreigner by the majority because of their different culture and history, however they may have all access to the facilities provided by the government. As Asian were felt to be aliens in East Africa after decolonization and Jews at the time of Dreyfus, both in France and farther.

A French historian, Ernest Renan defines nation in his lecture “what is nation” (1882) that a nation is “a daily referendum” and that nations are based as much on what the people jointly forget as what they remember. The main aim of writing this essay was to represent the nationalism which was originated due to French Revolution in 1789. He states that there is a continuous conflict between the concept of racial or linguistic and nationhood, that can cultivate “the gravest errors”. He rejects the concept that race is the source of unification of people. During the rule of Napoleon Bonaparte and the French Revolution, it is significantly to note that French was completely genetically manifold but in spite of that it handled to set the juncture for nationalism. He also asserts that neither religion nor language are the source of unanimity because language summons common mass to mingle, but does not drive them to do so and religion has tuned a personal affair. For example, England and the United States both speak English but do not have a single, integrated nation and do not force people to operate religious practices against each other. He states that forgetfulness and historical

errors are the fundamental facts in the developing of a nation. Unwelcome facts disclosed by historical research, can even imperil nationhood. All the nations are constructed on the acts of brutality and violence and after that these acts are forgotten. Unity is always retained by destruction and violence. Mingling of North of France to the centre is the outcome of an approximated a century of assassination and shock. People of the community feel as they have executed something significant if they are able to survive in adverse situations. He illustrates the example of Turkey and Bohemia where various societies are contracted against one another, and where the homogenization of various communities could not occur appearing in a breakdown of nationhood. He states that Geography only guides us wide and mountains don't perceive how to chisel out nations. Hence the concept of nation lies on the shared glories in the past, common will in the present to live together and wish to cultivate more for the nation in the future and tolerate all the suffering and enjoy happiness together. Ian Baucom in his review work *Narrating the Nation* states,

“Ernest Renan’s “What is a Nation?” the initial essay and the only piece that was not written by a contemporary critic, refers to the “spiritual principle” of the nation, to its “large-scale solidarity,” as a fusion enabled by the selective processes of memory and forgetting, by the reification of a shared glorious past and the deployment of this solidified memory in the present as an object of consent and communal, proleptic imagination: “We are what we were; we will be what you are.”” (Baucom 148)

There are three approaches a) constructive approach b) primordial approach c) materialist approach, through which nation is defined by the different scholars.

a) Constructive approach: Benedict Anderson’s definition of nation is finest echoed in constructive approach in which he defined nation as an imagined political

community and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. A nation is imagined because members of even the smallest nation will never know their fellow member, meet them, hear them yet in the minds of each live the image of their communion. He defines that nation emerges from industrial society though neither “economic interest, liberation, nor enlightenment could or did, create in themselves the kind, or shape, or imagined community” (Anderson 65). In contrast to Gellner, Anderson puts more prominence on the constructed nature of culture and on act of lithograph commercialism to the augmentation of a nation. Anderson places greater emphasis on the lithograph commercialism which is responsible for the augmentation of new national culture and originate the particular structures which the new nation will finally proceeds. Anderson debates that pre- national culture was sectarian culture. Nations reinstates this sectarian culture with their own exclusively constructed national culture.

b) Primordial approach: This type of approach is best reflected in Anthony D. Smith, who protects primordial position in order to define a nation. He defines nation as a titled human community having common historic province, shared myths, historical recollections, common economy, shared culture, a community and shared privilege and obligations of all members. The distinctiveness of the primordial and the constructive notions of nation lies in the ancient bases of collective subjectivity. For constructivist like Anderson, the nation is not entity palpable like a historical commodity, illustrated by paleontologist. He states that it is developed by masses who are passionately ambitious for a nation and are carrying well – organized the components to create it. Nation is not the outcome of movement of conserving existence from the prior into current and forthcoming but is the outcome of an invention and construction. It is necessary for the construction of nation to intentionally obliterate those issues in



history, culture and narratives that do not assist the creation of a common, national identity. The attempts to remain back the nation into history, to connect the current nation to its historical cores, are intentional conducts to construct a national identity of a substantial existing society with historical moments, people, anecdote and chronology.

c) Materialistic approach: This type of approach is finest echoed in Gellner and Hobsbawm while defining the nation. Through his typical deviation altercation, Gellner explains the derivation of nations. He contends that nations are derived from nationalism which is basically a political doctrine, which suggests that national and political entity should be identical. Nations are contemporary structure. Due to the demand of technical innovation, nations come into an existence. With the migration of people from villages to cities, it is essential to build some arrangement of shared identity for them. Due to the requirement of commercialism, it is necessary for workers to have a common language. All these requirements are experienced by the construction of shared culture (experienced by changing “low” folk cultures into “high” folk cultures), common history and demanding a common language. Workers can be inspired to be laborious, not only for their own benefits but for the welfare of their nations by these shared involvements. A shared history, culture and language helps in united the recently movable personnel.

It is amazing to bridge the definition of state in the Montevideo convention to the definition of nation by Smith and Anderson. By applying the words, a territory and a population, Smith concisely mentions the foremost two components of the Montevideo definition. The third concept, ‘government’ suggests to be implicated in the common constitutional duties and rights referred by Smith. Anderson mentions primitive three comprising concept of the Montevideo definition: nation is about a

population in a limited physical territory and there is some sovereign authority that governs the population in that territory by applying the words 'community', 'limited' and 'sovereign'. What wants in both the Smith's definition and Anderson's definition is the concept of international affiliation. Nation is primarily an intramural concept, attributing to the autonomous society existing in a convinced domain. Nation does not unquestionably have to get into affiliation with other nations is suggested by the definition of nation. As the antagonistic, it is distinguished that there is no innuendo of culture or identity to characterize the accomplishment of the state which is prescribed in the definition of state by Montevideo Convention. Even in the postmodern age, states are very circumspect about the international affiliation to intrude in the elements of culture and identity: these are regarded intramural affairs.

Thus, it can be concluded while talking to the relationship between nation and state, that identity and culture are supposed to be very intramural affairs and they are not described in the definition of states. Hence nation adds the characteristics of identity and culture in the definition of state given by Montevideo Convention. Characteristics of nation like identity, imagination and culture are suggested by Smith through the word 'historical memories', 'myths', 'historic' and 'culture', by Anderson with his characterization 'imagined'. Nation is likewise an accurate explanation of figure, squares, kilometers, organization and system. State is around structures, systems, organizations and institutions while nation is around identity, which we are in the impression of 'self-labeling'. State is around collective objectivity while nation is around collective subjectivity as it does not cast new concepts, but basically developing the concept of 'nation' correlated to the concept of 'state'. Materialistic approach of nation promoted by Gellner and Hobsbawm state that it does not create an impression to describe nation and state are different matters and in modernity, nation can be

referred in the relation of nation- state. However, nation and state are not the same and one matter. But after observing their definition, it is luminous that both nation and state are firmly intervolved. The nation, being a modern anomaly, can be understood within the structure of a modern humanity of nation- states. The concept of association of state and nation was established by the peace alliances of Westphalia in 1648 through determining the doctrinal integrity of this innovation it developed, the sovereign state. It is based on the peace of Augsburg of 1555 in which doctrine of 'whose realm, his religion' was accepted.

While talking about the relationship between nation and state, can it be assumed a state to survive without nation or the notion of nationhood and a nation to prevail without the state and its institutions? Two approaches are delineated to describe the statement i.e., does the state presume a nation? First, can state survive without nation or notion of nationhood? Second is to delineate the importance of the notion of nationhood for the state to construct its force over its people on substantial terrain.

In the modern world, where questioning of identity and culture, nationwide exodus and people's personal independence have been becoming constantly personal and less cumulative. One may even find nationhood as a notion of questionable inclined the diversification of people and cultures that discover themselves within the outskirts of one nation-state. Is it important to develop sense of belonging and nationhood? Faithfulness towards the state, sense of being responsible citizens like to pay their taxes and follows the rules can be developed if the state is adept to perform as an impartial constructor to its citizens, giving civil benefits, employment, surveillance and justice. But how it can be expected to the migrants to become the member of nation and embrace the national identity. Up to date, the approach has been that migrants must embrace the sociable and governmental schemes of modern nation- states. From the

notion of leading culture, it is emerged that immigrant must adopt culture and identity of the host society as subjugate one and their own culture and identity is destined subaltern.

Second approach is related to the importance of nationhood in establishing the state. Through nationhood, sense of belonging and attachment can be created by the state, it will be easy to develop sense of being responsible citizens towards nation-citizens can be easily convinced to pay those taxes and follow all the norms governed by state. Through the sense of nationhood, citizens can be inspired to die for their country. To cultivate a sense of belonging is required for the state for implying constitutional laws on its citizens otherwise without nationhood; the state is obligated to retreat to forcible and exploitative amplitude to cultivate its jurisdiction. This sense of belonging can be created by the notion of nationhood. So, the testimony of citizenship must not be based on the concept of historic adoption. Exodus and distinctiveness do not compose nationhood antiquated; they cause belonging mere demanding and complicated. Without the sense of belonging, societies flight the exposure of demoralization and of degenerating validity of the state.

Those who believe that nation as implanted in society and as bearing endured long before the modern state was constructed, they state that nation is an actuality and does not require a state to occur as validity of a nation happens in mutual identification of its masses, apparent from extra association. From this statement can nation be imagined to endure without the state and its organization? Ephraim Nimni apparently discriminates the two when he asserts that we account title nation as exchangeable with the title state. The British integrity is an actuality that advanced continuously from the twentieth century forth, lengthy before the state and its organizations derived entity as attributes by Adrian Hastings. For the academics who comply with a further primitive

viewpoint on the nation, the profound memorable origins of the national identity are the supporting structure of the plea that nation is an actuality aside from the presence of the state. This acceptance is positioned on an erratum however it is widespread all over the planet. As Nimni states a nation as a cultural society and a state is an instrument of administration. The UNPO (Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization) operates as the delineative of nations that desire for worldwide acknowledgment. In order to be able to live the identity to the adequate and without coercion, generally their aspiration involves an assertion to statehood. An uncoupling of nation and state would diminish the affiliation between the nation and the civilian to a sheer constitutional and administrative one. One could discuss, to some amount, this is the present actuality taking today's assertive analytical-commercial agency that explains approximately every expense or affiliation into commercial and monetary account. Nonetheless, in an entirely juridical and constitutional affiliation, the state would not adept to develop the faithfulness of dweller above the terms of obligation. As in the time of emergency and adversity, a dweller may purely deny to fulfill their responsibilities towards state, unless they measure that there is a profit in answering to the state's appeal. From the mindset of dwellers, an uncoupling between the nation and state would permit an individual without an impression of loyalty and affinity to an expanded society. For the dweller a sheer juridical affinity without added fidelity makes him or her open to attack. If the affinity between the nation and the state is dwindled to hardly a juridical then the basis of citizenship, that is the responsibility of a state to be solicitous and cultivate an affinity with anyone at all civilian even if s/he is an immoral or deplorable. One could argue that the execution of nation as imagined community is no protracted so valuable and essential in the eminently analyzed Western world. But the disintegration of community has its curb that is ratified by the jingoist evolution all

through Europe. It could be accomplished in a universe if a citizen does not accomplish s/he duties or responsibilities towards state then state has the power to close the juridical or constitutional affinity with that particular citizen. There is no emotional and genuine feelings and attachment betwixt the state and the citizen and the extended community of which s/he is member.

Previously it has explained that there are some components of nation defined by Smith and Anderson like people, a territory and sovereignty are also included in the state defined by Montevideo Convention. But this actuality of association betwixt the state as collective objectivity and nation as collective subjectivity has grown into even more complicated in the postmodern era. As state furnish surveillance, community services, and integrity to its citizens and lawfulness that supports to develop a sense of affinity that is an integral to nationhood. Some academicians argue that, nation can occur or prevail without state by following draconian relation of nationhood to identity. But in modernity, possessing national identity beyond a state is precarious. There are following significant bases for legality, in the affinity betwixt the nation-state and its citizens as nation and state are inseparably convoluted in the modern cosmos:

1. The citizens as an association of mandatory harmony for common backing;
2. As the verbalization of citizen's supremacy in exerting bureaucratic capability;
3. The citizen as society, integrated over a shared prospect and common culture;
4. The citizen as possessing identical before the legislation.

These legality bases are inter-twisted and cannot be disconnected.

There is an intrinsic relationship between war, violence and formation of nation-state. Nation-state is factually connected to the Westphalian peace alliances of 1648 that contrived a deadline to both Thirty Years' War in the Holy Roman Empire and the Eighty Years' War between Dutch and Spain, with Spain officially identifying the freedom of the Dutch Republic. The protracted controversies related to the spirituality and domains were clarified by the argumentative groups. The formation of nation-state was not an arranged system of agreement and construction but one of distinct formulated corrupt parties demanding to snatch strength. Charles Tilly's acclaimed declaration regarding the formation of nation-state that war generates states and states generate war. He confers through his research that state-formation occurs as the outcome of an operation of opposing clans competing for authority by applying brutality, when one of the groups arrange to set up its government and control in the challenged domains. Consequently, the action of constructing a state, organizing its association, academies and getting legality starts. The brutal cause of the nation-state is a frequent reality in past. The Independence war that drives to the making of United States, the Independence wars in French and English territories in the 1950s and 1960s, the liberation war in South Sudan, the wars that breach up the Spanish territorial force in Latin America into liberal States. Thus, it is necessary for the state to have a sense of belonging and notion of nationhood amongst the citizens and between the citizen and the state to provide the factual base so that state can play the its role with legitimately as the state and the nation are inextricably intertwined as defined by Hobsbawm and Gellner. It can be concluded about nation with the ideas of Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny in their work *The Origins of Nations*,

“The nation that emerges in the modern era must be regarded as both construct and real process, and that in a dual sense. For the analyst, a “nation” represents an ideal-type combining elements in accentuated form. But equally needs to be broken down into the constituent dimensions of process to which the construct refers. For the nationalists, too, the nation represents an ideal to be striven for and reconstructed, particularly in the case of demotic *ethnies* where educator-intellectuals’ visions assume great importance.” (124)

However, there are various Indian critics who describe various dimensions of nation but there is the two most affluent critics whose views are being delineated in this research. First is Mahatama Gandhi and other is Rabindranath Tagore who made great efforts to describe nation through their writings like *Young India*, *Hind Swaraj* written by Gandhi and *Nationalism*, *Ghare Baire* written by Tagore.

Gandhi’s Views Regarding Nation and Nationalism:

Gandhi brought the concept of internationalism inside the blend of nationalism so that developing its perspective and creating it more integrate and liberal. He states that it is not the nationalism that is immoral; it is the self-obsession, snobbery, intolerance and clannishness which are the curse of contemporary nations which is sinful. He delineates following characteristics of an Indian nation:

- Accommodating Capacity: For Gandhi, any country can be assigned as ‘nation’ if it has accommodating capacity which suggests people living in a nation should have desire to live together as a community besides having variations amidst them as personage. At this point, he appears to predict the extract of Benedict Anderson’s eminent speculation of nation as “an ‘Imagined Community’ – imagined as both inherently sovereign and limited” (Rai 3). He also uses the notion of *sama*, which means episodic convocation to highlight the assimilative temperament of Indian nation.



Ernest Renan states that ‘fusion of people’ is a fundamental requirement for the establishment of diverse nations in Europe. When Gandhi uses the term *sama*, he appears to be pretty near to Renan’s concept of ‘fusion’.

- Relationship between Religion and Nation: According to Gandhi, India can not suspend to be one nation due to folks living in belong to various doctrine or religion. He states, every religion has two components – central/ spiritual and circumference /superficial. Circumference of any religion identifies the societal establishment of the folks pursuing it, the central or core is embodied by the upright conviction of that structure. Different religions may vary in the societal organization or their peripheral presentation but at the core, all the religious beliefs are singular. Whenever folk realizes the essence of their religion, social disagreements will deteriorate thus developing the possibility of a nation possessing manifold religious community.

- Relationship between Language and Nation: On the relationship between language and nation, Gandhi acknowledges that each and every nation ought to have a ‘lingua franca’ determining correspondence amidst its multi- phonic or multi-vernacular community. While he regards the function of English language in the circumstance of India, he rejects its perpetuation as, it has become hegemonizing or enslaving apparatus in due passage of span. English has no prolonged persisted mere a language because multiple masses have launched applying their expertise of English to obtain executive position, other kind of assistance or donations etc. For Gandhi, one must never disgrace or derogate one’s mother tongue and one must always aspire to enhance one’s mother tongue. For this, he recommends the requirement of establishing a new ‘lingua franca’ of India liberate of enslaving notions of English Language.

- *Swaraj* (Self – Rule): Key to Health, Constructive Village Programmes and Advocacy of Panchayat System: For Gandhi, if *swaraj* would be executed with radical

methods then the English govern disappear but Englishness will predominate. It would lead to few vicious frames of nationalism and nation – state of which India had been targeted for previous two epochs (English nationalism). He longed to build an Indian type of nationalism which would be considerably more cooperative and more intrinsic in Indian conventions and civilization as opposed to biased from the West. Thus, the most elementary characteristic of a nation derives from the Gandhian notion of self-adequacy, an idea which he evolved in his succeeding compositions and schemes for example as *Key to Health* (to eliminate the role of contemporary type of physicians), constructive village programmes, patronage of Panchayat system (to eliminate the function of attorney, contemporary type of specialist legislators and executives), etc.

#### Rabindranath Tagore's Views Regarding Nation and Nationalism:

- Imperialism: Tagore believes imperialism as a superficial manifestation of nationalism and appreciated the notion of 'internationalism' by rising above the parochialism of the notion of nationalism.
- Nationalism: He debates that nationalism is only supplementary label of appropriation or funding, by savage power, if essential, of the prosperity, abundance and unprocessed substance of other nations and that nationalism will finally generate xenophobia and infringe the supreme standards of humanity and benevolence. At the same time, it is not only the forceful hostile frame of nationalism which he counters; rather he is equitably suspicious of non – violent nationalism portrayed by Gandhi's Non-Cooperation movement. He calls this non-violent type of nationalism as a 'parochial nationalism' intimidating a secluded opinion of the nation. In the current environment, nationalism is destined to bring a brutal twist so it is superior to renounce this notion entirely rather than aggravating and modify it. For Tagore, there is no benefit of producing so much enthusiasm for a notion (nationalism) for which there is

not even an equivalent title in India's own language. Here he probes to indicate forward the western-ness of the notion of nationalism.

- Nation: For Tagore, nation is not a natural self-actualisation of man as social being as majority of the folk consider; rather it is an administrative and mercantile alliance of a class of people, in which they assemble to magnify their benefit, advancement and authority. He points that geographical frontier, commercial involvement, a common province and inheritance usually ties people into a nation. In another expression, it is a manifestation of the classified self-interest of a people where it is less humane and less spiritual which suggests nation is phony and devoid humanity.
- *Swadeshi Samaj*: Tagore substitutes the artificial notion of nation and nationalism through his own concept of *Swadeshi Samaj* which is a personification of social connection. It is not artificial and neutral but established on collaboration and affection, and of a community where everybody is in harmony with everybody else in the world. The concept of internationalism which is so precious to Tagore is not the Marxist and socialist internationalism of the laborers of the world, but one of unearthly type founded on the concord of various religion and races.

Thus, after observing the definitions of various scholars and critics, they may belong to western and eastern world, it can be concluded that there are two types of definitions, where one is objective definitions and other one is subjective definitions. Subjective definition of nation can be described as empirical as facts can be provided in this definition. For example: Stalin definition of nation can be considered as subjective definition of nation as he states: "a nation is a historically constituted, stable community of community, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture" (Stalin 5).

Gandhi's definition of nation is another example of empirical definition of nation where he talks about almost all the notions which satisfy the condition of Indian nation with its diverse culture. Whereas definition of nation given by Ernest Renan, Benedict Anderson and Rabindranath Tagore are considered subjective definition as they talk about abstract notions as "a soul, a spiritual principle" (E. Renan), "imagined community" (Anderson) and "least human and least spiritual" (Tagore). All these notions are abstract notions as they cannot be measured. Hence definition of nation can be concluded as a nation is a group of people but it can be imagined society, franca – lingua can be established if there are more than one language, common territory and essence of religion can be understood if there are multi-religious people exist and all the cultural event can be celebrated if there are multi-cultural people live, they feel belonging to one another and want to live together and tolerate suffering and enjoy happiness together, it is constructed on the acts of violence and all these notions are forgotten if they don't assist in construction of shared, national identity and violence is the only cause of unanimity of any nation rather than race, language and religion. In the end, conclusion regarding nation can be best described in the idea of Katherine Verdery in her work *Whither "Nation" and "Nationalism"?* by stating, "Although the idea of nation with which we have been familiar may indeed be past its peak, being born into something as natural condition will remain fundamental to human existence and to scholarship, even if in new ways" (Verdery 45).

Ananthamurthy was one of India's best acknowledged thinkers and writer both in India and abroad. Creeping his approach into the consciousness and bare existence of his character is getting to be a habit with Ananthamurthy, witness his masterpiece work, *Samskara*. Due to this novel, he had to face lot of criticism and controversy as it is scathing attack on Brahmin orthodoxy. Most of his literary works are on backlash of

personals to situations that are counterfeit and astonishing. His works apparently evaluate facets varying from transformation and objections challenged by Brahmin communities of Karnataka to administrators dealing with bureaucratic instigating their works. His literary works depict the cognitive facets of common masses in various situations, opportunity and situations. Conflict and transformation on classical Hindu communities of India due to the outcome of instigations of economic and socio-political changes-the true affinity that discharges underneath all such conflicts are illustrated by Ananthamurthy in his works. He is not just adherent to illustrating only classical topics of Indian Literature of his era but he also depicts the conflicts and clashes faced by a bureaucrat at the time of calamity like drought in his novel *Bara*. He is known for his strong political views. As he did his Ph.D. in English Literature on 'Politics and Fiction in 1930's' at the University of Birmingham in England that is why he has great knowledge of politics. Ananthamurthy was highly motivated by the philosophy of the socialist luminary and intellectual Dr Ram Manohar Lohia, who was an ardent campaigner of parity between man and woman. Mostly of his works are an acute arraignment of Brahminical doctrine and furnish a spirit that is anxious for conversion.

In first chapter '*Samskara: Socio-Cultural Framework in Rural India*' talks about various facets of culture which include tradition, rites and rituals, myths, superstitions, flora and fauna, outcastes, taboos, philosophy etc. All these facets of culture are fully delineated. This chapter is relevant as it depicts culture of rural India spectacularly which are still being practicing in many parts of India and 65.97% (2018) population of India still reside in rural area. It depicts microcosmic world of rural India. It also delineates status of women who are considered half humanity. Their genuine situation and problems are described which are still relevant in some rural parts of India

even after 74 years of independence of India. Being a very controversial novel, *Samskara* describes two types of women—Brahmin women and low caste women. Brahmin women like Anasuya, Sitadevi, Lilawati, Naranappa's wife are described as sexless and have lack of vitality of life while the low caste female like Chandri, Belli, Chinni are described as full of flesh and life force. They can lure any ascetic through their physical charm. Their other needs like mentally, emotional and psychological satisfaction are completely ignored. All women are deprived from the right to education that is why (Anasuya and Sitadevi) are unable to put their views intellectually before their husbands. The untouchable women have to beg and wear few clothes due to poverty and caste system. Through the Lakshmidiamma, being a widow, it is delineated how all the widow women are considered ill-omen and how they have to live all alone and depend on the mercy of others. They have to follow many restrictions like shaven head and food restriction also. All the women have very few opportunities to come out of their houses and express their views publicly. Through the Chandri and Padmavati, profession of prostitution is described. Dowry system and child marriage are also delineated by the talk between Praneshacharya and a *Smarta* Brahmin during their meal in temple. So, this novel describes the position of women prevailing in 1930's and 1940's in Pre-Independence of India and suggests gender inequalities that need to be eradicated. In his novel *Samskara*, Ananthamurthy delineates various episodes where the concept of outcaste can be observed. This is described by the outcastes like Chandri, Pilla and his wife, Chowda, Putta and his wife, a prostitute Padmavati. How they are ill treated and used by the upper caste people for the satisfaction of their passions, lust and desires. Upper caste people cannot touch outcaste as they would be impured but they can have physical intimacy with low caste females.

This is the irony and hypocrisy of the upper caste people. Concept of untouchability is delineated fully in the second chapter.

The second chapter '*Bhartipura: Dalit Question in India*' defines various understanding of outcastes. It raises many questions related to dalit like who are dalits, why they are called untouchables outcastes or marginalised, what is the urgency to uplift their cultural and economic status so that they can be brought in the mainstream of the society, are they really progressing or socially accepted by the upper caste or being deviated from the dominant stream of society, what are the strategies being adopted through which they can be properly assimilated in society etc. In *Bhartipura*, untouchables especially holeyaru are not allowed to enter the temple, they have their different God that is *Bhoothararya* who is also considered inferior to the god of upper caste people that is *Manjunatha*. There are various ill practices are delineated through different characters. Holeyaru are represented as the objects to satisfy the desires of their landowners, they even cannot speak frequently before the upper caste people. Dalits who represent 16.6% (2011) population of India are also described through microcosmic world and they live every part of India through different names. In the end, what are the suggestions given by the Ananthamurthy for the development of untouchables are to be delineated.

The third chapter '*Awasthe: Power Dynamics in India*' is not merely the depiction of a senator, it is a replica. This chapter mainly deals with the power dynamics in India especially in formal and informal relationships. Formal relationships cover political, administrative, economic and cultural sphere whereas informal relationships cover society in which family institution plays an important role. This novel is originally a bureaucratic novel with sociological culture. It excoriates the power dynamics of economically developing nations and depicts an account of how the

country and its spokesperson act their authority over the ordinary proletariat by the assorted apparatus of brutality. Ananthamurthy describes the status of the nation - its collapsing communal framework, deteriorating values, its fraudulent campaigning and insidious senators, its offensive capitalism and caviling financial civilization. It is related to the metamorphosis of the combatant, Krishnappa, from a leftist undergraduate powerbroker to a revolutionary spokesperson who doesn't have any of the metropolitan affluence during living in an urban. Nonetheless, later, he extorts them by his prosperous bureaucratic acquaintance. Phony affliction in the nation has been sincerely and reasonably castigated. Writer describes that in the developing countries, an underprivileged person who has might, spins into a despot that some day he was also persecuted. Krishnappa, being an honest Dalit political leader, also accepts that politics is vermin that may assassinate its own custodian. Barbaric practice of police men, ailing berth of debilitated, unsound places incarceration, abduction and persecution committed by the nefarious officers in the police station are conferred in their coarse shape. It is explained that the arrangement of commercialism is positioned on dearth, paucity and profiteering. There are discussion of communism and why Gandhi ji accepts the democratic and equitable philosophy of communism but boycott its clique of bloodshed. In his third novel, the writer bands his combatant, Krishnappa Gowda, a political leader of the Left and an apprized demi-god figure in the Karnataka of Emergency days, right down to his disturbed soul. This dynamic novel opens with the 50 years old protagonist on his deathbed. It is not bare annihilation, he has to confronting with but the reality as all the flashback of things past which deathbeds essentially appeal to – is the fact that he has negotiated with his integrity, self- respect and honesty. Krishnappa, who was once utopian and charismatic, was recycled by the smooth shark entrepreneur and cagey spokesperson to farther their own rapacious



limits. He was just for them the advantageous Trojan horse to enter the fortification of power. The vermin of corruption and violence have over the years devoured into this innocent and poor man, not even his conscience has been granted. Those engaged vermin have also devoured into the draperies of dreams interlaced by the artisan of an Independent India, when impelling ahead means moving backward.

The fourth and last chapter '*Bhava: A Picture of Modern India*' delineates various facets of urban India especially elite class where individualism (self-introspection, personal space) play an important role. Through the various characters of novel, urban India is represented who are 31.6% (2011) population of India. There are mainly two metropolitan cities are referred in the chapter. One is Delhi which represents various metropolitan cities of northern India whereas other is Bangalore-cum-Bengaluru which represents metropolitan cities of southern India. A nation is structured on community and each personal is connected to nation deliberately as a personal being. It is important to suggest that nation is a community which provides the personal an excuse to be complimentary appreciate his/her privilege. The clash between privilege and essentiality is demonstrated by the individual aggravating to perform in the community. There is a link amid individual's destiny and nation's destiny. What is pleasant and atrocious for nation must be pleasant or atrocious for the individual. Globalization, localization, urbanization, gender conflict, caste conflict, class differences, alienation, dilemma, confusion, frustration, depression, displacement, self-indulgence, nihilism, identity crisis, health crisis, unemployment, lack of faith, uncontrolled population, pollution, unconventionality, capitalism, spiritual crisis etc. are the main characteristic of modern India. However, globalization and localization are two contrary terms but they have its own significance in modern India. According to the survey of Greenpeace, Gurugram is the most polluted city in the world. This novel

(*Bhava*) shows the environment friendly attitude of South Indians as they use banana and jackfruit leaves as disposals that can easily be decomposed as compared to the northern. Northern Indians are not aware towards environment and more materialistic. Mostly use plastic disposals that cause health crisis and environment hazards. In *Bhava*, Individual plays an important role in nation building. As individual makes relationship, family, society, state and nation so being a minor unit but cannot underestimate its significance. In *Bhava*, writer depicts true picture of modern India through the life of individual that refers to the modern man/woman. How an individual entangles with each other without having any calmness and peace. How modern man/woman has lost faith in every relation. How modern man/woman faces identity crisis, frustration, dilemma, illicit relationships, superstitions. How people have become morally uprooted and now want to seek transcendence. The writer explains actual picture of modern India through routine life of people, culture (traditional dresses, rangoli, food habits, food items), role of man and woman in patriarchal society, status of women and outcastes, influence of western world, hegemony. In prior works Ananthamurthy narrates nation through the conflict between past and present (*Samskara*), abolition of untouchability through temple entry that still relevant (*Bhartipura*), social and political reformation and how power dynamics works in formal or informal relationship (*Awaste*) but here he talks about individual's hypocrisy by explaining the differences between his outer and inner reality through stream-of-consciousness technique. Thus, psychoanalysis approach is used to describe various dimensions of modern man/woman residing in urban India.

Hence, all the chapters cover various dimensions of India, it may be rural or urban population within the framework of social, cultural, political, economic and

administrative by using textual analysis approach, inter- disciplinary approach and psychoanalysis approach.

## Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rawat Publications, 2015.
- Baucom, Ian. "Narrating the Nation." *Transition*, no. 55, 1992, pp. 144-153. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2934858](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2934858).
- Eley, Geoff and Ronald Grigor Suny. "The Origins of Nation." *Becoming National: A Reader*, Oxford UP, 1996, pp.106-130.
- Grotenhuis, René. "Nation and State." *Nation-Building as Necessary Effort in Fragile States*, Amsterdam U P, Amsterdam, 2016, pp. 25–44. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1gr7d8r.5](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1gr7d8r.5)
- Rai, Saurav Kumar. "Nation and Nationalism: Revisiting Gandhi and Tagore". Nation and Nationalism: Revisiting Gandhi and Tagore | Articles - On and By Gandhi (mkgandhi.org) <https://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/nation-and-nationalism-revisiting>, accessed 20 March 2021.
- Seymour, Michel. "On Redefining the Nation." *The Monist*, vol. 82, no. 3, 1999, pp. 411–445. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27903646](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27903646).
- Stalin, J. V. "What Is a Nation?" *Pakistan Forum*, vol. 2, no. 12, 1972, pp. 4–5. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2569097](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2569097).
- Verdery, Katherine. "Whither 'Nation' and 'Nationalism'?" *Daedalus*, vol. 122, no. 3, 1993, pp. 37–46. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/20027181](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027181).