

THE CONCEPT OF NATION-BUILDING

by

EDWARD J. JASAITIS

B.S., United States Military Academy, 1958

5248

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

Approved by:

Michael W. Sullivan
Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1971
D32
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. NATION-STATE	5
III. CONCEPTS OF NATION-BUILDING	14
IV. PROCESS OF NATION-BUILDING	23
V. CONCLUSION	36
FOOTNOTES	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

I. Introduction

Compared to the other peoples of the world, we have the greatest population and our civilization is four thousand years old; we should therefore be advancing in the front rank with the nations of Europe and America. But the Chinese people have only family and clan solidarity; they do not have national spirit. Therefore even though we have four hundred million people gathered together in one China, in reality they are just a heap of loose sand.¹

Sun Yat-sen (1924)

The emergence into statehood of a multitude of nations in Africa and Asia since World War II has greatly altered the map of the world and has presented the political scientists with a new challenge in tracing patterns of change and their political ramifications in the emerging nations. Virtually all of the several dozen states which have acquired independence since 1945 have experienced disruptive and disintegrative forces which threatened their sovereignty. Existing racial, linguistic, religious and culture differences, tribal, regional and caste loyalties, and vast economic and educational disparities generate tensions which have to be resolved if these nations are to survive. The countering of these divisive and disruptive forces has become a major concern of the new national leaders and an important aspect of the study of non-Western politics.

As European empires crumbled, nations rose to take their place. In the process, which took several centuries,

civic loyalties came to be refocused within the new political boundaries.² Modernization, started by the Renaissance and the Reformation, unleashed forces, which further changed man's relations to the nation and the society. The present conditions in the Western nations took years to evolve and to be molded by the people of these nations. While the Western People gradually adjusted to a series of alterations and became identified with the history, territory, myths and the political and social environment of their state, the people of the new states must assimilate much more rapidly the changes that nationhood has brought to them.³ The time span for them has been greatly compressed, and as Kwame Nkrumah exclaimed, "What other countries have taken three hundred years or more to achieve, a once dependent territory must try to accomplish in a generation if it is to survive."⁴ In Western states, development was relatively natural, for political change had a close interrelation with socio-economic advance. In the emerging nations, however, the change is uneven, discontinuous, and marked by lags, leads, and uncertainties.

The development of a new nation and its ability to survive depends on its ability to meet and solve the many problems or challenges that stand in its path. Almond and Powell suggest four main challenges to a political system (nation-state) which must be overcome if a nation is to survive and develop.

1. State Building - The problem of penetration and integration.

2. Nation-Building - The problem of loyalty and commitment.

3. Participation - The problem of pressure from groups in the society for a part in decision making.

4. Distribution - The problem of pressure from domestic society to employ the coercive power of the political system to redistribute income, wealth, opportunity and honor.⁵

The problems that are being faced by the new nations can be seen in the order in which they are presented since it suggests that "state building" precedes "nation building" which in turn precedes "participation" and "distribution." The dilemma that faces an emerging nation is that it must attack all the problems at once without the luxury of being able and having time to solve them singly in turn.

Mankind existed long before nations. The era of nations and nationalism is a short span in recorded history. However, today the world is in the age of nations succeeding the age of villages, tribes, and empires. Today the making and breaking of nations is a process that is occurring in most parts of the world.⁶ This process seems to have been started by purely practical considerations, although for some it had begun at different times. Where England was clearly a nation-state in the

fifteenth century, the emerging nations of the twentieth century are just trying to assemble such a model. The practical considerations for a nation state were the peoples' desire for more and better government, better administration of justice and desire for security which the nation-state in the modern era seems best to be suited in providing.⁷

The purpose of this paper is to determine the concept of "nation-building" as held by some of the Western scholars, to examine several of the proposed models, to arrive at a synthesis of what scholars had to say about the concept, and in conclusion state the main factors and variables of the process.

In arriving at this synthesis I propose to examine the nature of the nation-state, the processes of nation and value building and consider several theories of "nation-building." The term "nation-state" will be considered as connoting two different aspects. "Nation" will be considered as "the body of inhabitants of a country united under a single independent government; a state;"⁸ and the "state" as "a political body, or body politic; any body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government, especially one that is not subject to external control."⁹ The question of how a state came into being will not be considered in this paper.

II. Nation-State

We live in an age of nationalism. Like all historical movements, nationalism is deeply rooted in the past. The product of political, economic, social, intellectual, and psychological factors, it emerged over the course of centuries, gradually taking on common characteristics. The simple term "nationalism" is used to describe what is, in reality, a complex historical phenomenon. Despite the labors of several generations of scholars in attempting to define the meaning of nationalism the term has escaped a clear and unanimous definition. The fault lies partly in the varied implications of nationalism itself. Another complicating factor is that the meaning of nationalism changes with the course of history and that it means different things to different people. Historically it has been used as a force for liberation and freedom; as a means for aggression; and as a means to denounce other ideologies.¹⁰

Louis Snyder, after devoting a book to the study of the meaning of nationalism concluded that nationalism cannot be clarified by definition but only by description. In the process, for those who insist on a definition, he proposed what he considered the least objectionable one:

Nationalism, a product of political, economic, social, and intellectual factors at a certain stage in history, is a condition of mind, feeling, or sentiment of a group of people living in a well-defined geographical area, speaking a common language, possessing a literature in which the aspirations of the nation

have been expressed, attached to common traditions and common customs, venerating its own heros, and, in some cases, having a common religion.¹¹

To this definition he immediately added that there are exceptions more or less pertinent, to nearly all the terms used in it.

Hans Kohn writes that nationalism is a political creed "that underlines the cohesion of modern societies and legitimizes their claim to authority. [It] centers the supreme loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the people upon the nation-state, either existing or desired. The nation-state is regarded not only as the ideal, 'natural,' or 'normal' form of political organization but also as the indispensable framework for all social, cultural, and economic activities."¹²

Historically, nationalism has undergone several transformations and has expressed itself in varied and opposite ideologies. Commencing as an elitist movement, it later became the "bourgeois" movement and then changed to a mass movement in which people at large demanded an ever-widening participation in the political, social, and cultural life of the nation. Regardless of the transformation it has retained several constant factors: demand of the people for government of the same ethnic complexion as the majority; demand to be separate, distinct and independent from other nations; and demand for cultural self-determination.¹³

Nationalism, therefore, emerges as one of the basic ingredients of the "nation-building" process and will be considered as the state of mind in a population living in a certain geographical location which favors the idea of nation-state as the panacea for the problems of political order and economic betterment over any other system.

In the analysis of the "nation-building" process a distinction must be made between the "nation" and the "state" for the purpose of determining who the "nation-builder" is. Is it the "nation" or is it the "state"? The most widely accepted definition of a nation is that "it is a group whose members place loyalty to the group as a whole over any conflicting loyalties"¹⁴ and of a state as "a territory in which a single authority exercises sovereign power, both de jure and de facto."¹⁵ "Nation", therefore, denotes the people and is associated with the political, social, economical and cultural aspects of the nation-state and the "state", an organization, associated with legal authority and power. The state through the possession of legal authority and power, therefore, becomes the nation-builder which must employ the means at its disposal to gain compliance of the populace to the ideals of the nation-state. This compliance may be attained through coercion, remuneration and persuasion or normative power or a combination of all three. Coercion implies the application of threats and the infliction of some degree of punishment; remuneration, the allocation of some type

of rewards; and the normative power or persuasion, the allocation and the manipulation of values and symbols.

In order to discuss the Western concept of nation-building it is of paramount importance that one understand what constitutes a modern nation state. There is a consensus of opinion among scholars that we do not know with any certainty what nation-states are and how they are shaped and that there is no real agreement as to what a nation-state is. No one has succeeded in devising a definition which is watertight in the sense that, without opening up a number of leaky "ifs" and "buts," it enumerates the constituent elements of nation-states in such a fashion as to distinguish them satisfactorily from other types of communities in which men have lived their lives through the ages.

"By rule of thumb we can usually count on knowing a nation [-state] when we see one, but if we face up to the limitations of our knowledge it must be recognized that all too frequently the determination that a nation [-state] exists can effectively be made only after the fact when the nation [-state] has emerged full-blown and leaves little reasonable doubt that it is there and must be reckoned with."¹⁶

At this point let us consider some of the concepts as held by different scholars on the nature of the nation-state.

Stoessinger's concept of the nation-state isolates two aspects inherent in its make up: the attribute of sovereignty and the phenomenon of nationalism. Man endows the nation-state with an attribute of sovereignty which

is shared with no other human association. The nation-state through this endowment becomes the final arbiter over men's lives and leaves them recourse to no higher law. The sovereign state has the right to send its citizens to their death and, through its sanctions, to transform even the most brutal forms of killing into acts of patriotic heroism. Sovereignty is considered to apply both in internal affairs of the state for maintenance of political order and stability and in international relations which often lead to wars and anarchy in the world arena. Nationalism, the other aspect of nation-state, is defined as providing the people a sense of collective destiny through a common past and the vision of a common future.¹⁷

D. Rustow describes the nation-state as a favored political vehicle in today's world for modernization employed by a group of individuals who rule themselves on the basis of a sense of ultimate mutual loyalty. He also prescribes three specific political requirements which must be fulfilled in order to have success in modern self-government:

"they must know what territory and what persons are included in their national community; they must be willing to accept a large measure of authority for the performance of public services; and they must participate in their common affairs on a basis of appropriate equality."¹⁸

Almond and Powell discard the word nation-state altogether and substitute political system in its place.

They argue that "nation-state" is too limited by legal and institutional meanings which apply mainly to the Western societies. The concept of "political system" to them directs attention to the entire scope of political activities within a society, regardless of where in the society such activities may be located and therefore expand the analysis into wider scope than is allowed by the examination only of nation-state.¹⁹

There are additional "objective" ingredients that go into describing a nation state; but, there is almost a consensus by the scholars on what they are.

Clearly the very first requirement of a nation is that it possesses a geographical base, a territory of its own. However, it does not necessarily follow that the attachment to a piece of ground explains the fact of national unity. A person might be attached to a specific location such as his birth place or the countryside where he was raised, and yet have no emotional ties to an unfamiliar locale in his own country. Moreover, powerful emotional ties to specific locales may even divide a nation. When this is the case, the nation in question tends to be vulnerable to serious disunity and frequently, civil strife. Yet even when strong local attachments are not present, a really active attachment to the national territory as a whole usually results only from powerful nationalistic propaganda.

Economic pattern is another major factor that contributes to the existence and unity of a nation. Modern

technology and mass production require vast national markets and thus economically reinforce the national ties. Conversely, economics have also tended to undermine the nation-state system. For why limit production and distribution to nationally protected markets?

Common language also plays an important part in the making of a nation. In many countries, as for example in the United States, a common tongue is an important integrative factor; however, there are many nations where the fact that the same common language may be spoken in many different versions does constitute a divisive influence. Lack of a common language may also be a divisive force. The multiplicity of minor languages in a developing nation is not nearly so important as the existence of a few major ones. "Language diversity creates a problem of communications which can be overcome, but greater political problems are created when smaller numbers of languages exist, each with its own literary heritage, around which political mobilization can take place."²⁰

One of the most perplexing concepts in nation-building is that of "national character." Few social scientists would deny that certain cultural patterns occur more frequently and are more highly valued in one nation than in the other. But it is almost impossible to find agreement among scholars on precisely what these common patterns are. "National character" seems to be an indisputable factor but no one knows exactly what it is. "National

character," however, plays a part in supporting national unity and varies from nation to nation while remaining a paradox.

Finally, religion represents a unifying or detracting factor in the unity of a nation. In the United States, religion has neither substantially contributed to, nor detracted from, national unity. In other countries, as in Israel for example, religion has proved a very significant factor in making for unity in national terms. Yet in other cases such as India religion can bring on civil strife and prevent unity.

One aspect of a nation not covered in the preceding pages is one proposed by Carl J. Friedrich. Friedrich submits that "a nation, in light of present realities, is any cohesive group possessing 'independence' within the confines of the international order as provided by the United Nations, which provide a constituency for a government effectively ruling such a group the acclamation which legitimizes the government as part of the world order."²¹ Through this definition he introduces the possibility of a future world system to which the age of nations might evolve.

K. Deutsch in summarizing C. Friedrich's concept of "Nation-Building" presents us with a definition which incorporates many of the aspects of the meaning of nation-state as expressed by the scholars quoted previously:

"A nation is any sizeable population or group of persons which can be called:

independent, in the sense that it is not ruled from outside.

cohesive, by virtue of its markedly more effective habits of easy and varied social communication and cooperation, compared with their corresponding capabilities and motivation for communication and cooperation with outsiders.

politically organized, in the sense that it accords to their government such acclaim, consent, compliance, and support as to make its rule effective.

internally legitimate, in the sense that its habits of compliance with and support of the government, or, at least, toward mutual political cooperation and membership in the nation, are connected with broader beliefs about the universe and about their own nature, personalities, and culture so that their support for the nation, even in times of adversity, is likely and thus ensures its endurance. This internal legitimacy, anchored in the beliefs of its own population, may be largely independent of the opinions of other populations or of other foreign governments."²²

In summary, then, what constitutes a nation-state in our time may be characterized as follows. It is a sovereign political unit. It is a population committed to a particular collective identity through a common image of past and future which shares some degree of nationalism and is devoted to the achievement of some particular goal(s). And finally, it is a population inhabiting a definite territory, acknowledging a common government, and usually exhibiting common linguistic and cultural patterns.

III. Concepts of Nation-Building

There are three main different perceptions of nationalism and of the rise and fall of nations: "National Growth"; "Nation-Building"; and "National Development."

"National Growth" is the historians view. It proposes that a nation-state must pass through certain fixed qualitative stages toward a maturity. It compares the nation-state's growth to an organismic process which can not be dissected without injuring or killing it. "Nation-Building" is the view of policy-oriented political scientists, many statesmen and some historians. This view suggests that a nation-state can be built according to different plans, various materials and by different sequences of steps. It proposes an architectural or mechanical model which is partially independent from its environment which is developed based on the choice, will and power of its builders. The "national development" concept, which is preferred by many social scientists, seeks to unite the above views. It acknowledges limits to the speed and scope of "nation-building" but agrees that there are significant opportunities and choices for intervention and partial control.²³

The intention of this paper is not to argue any of the above viewpoints or concepts, but to consider them in turn and to arrive at conclusions, which one of them seems to best describe the "nation-building" process.

Deutsch proposes a sequence or steps for the amalgamation of a nation state which illustrates the "national-growth" approach. His model suggests a state composed of several groups or tribes developing through stages into a nation. Initial amalgamation of the nation begins with tribes or groups within the confines of a state being hostile and refusing obedience to the state to the point of warfare or hostility of a lesser degree. The government's demands are complied with only as long as they are supervised. In either case, the state must garrison national troops to insure their unwilling membership in the nation. In both cases they provide a source of taxes and manpower as long as troops of the state are there to extract them.

As tribes or groups become more reconciled to their inclusion in the state they no longer require national garrisons to insure compliance with the state's directives. However, they do not possess any sense of loyalty and would not come to the aid of the state in its hour of need, i.e., they passively "accept" the state as the political integration progresses beyond this minimum and does not require military force, further integration brings the stage of "good citizenship." This is the stage of unsupervised compliance in most situations and active support in case of need. However, the tribe or group still retains its ethnic, cultural, or linguistic distinctness and is reluctant to engage in close social relations across its own boundaries.

As further integration into the nation-state continues the cultures of the tribes become sufficiently similar to let them communicate and act together as one people; however, their ethnic, linguistic, or other group diversity still persists and is preserved. Finally, these diverse groups within the same state become wholly assimilated to the majority of their countrymen in language, culture, probabilities of intermarriage and close personal relations until they become indistinguishable as a group.²⁴

The above concepts when applied to Western Europe can explain in whole or part its development, but when it is applied to other parts of the world such as Latin America the ingredients of time and history appear to have produced different results. Time and history fail to account for the lack of development of the countries in that region.²⁵

There are many other variable factors which prohibit nation-building and in the case of Latin America the two main ones are the problems of identity and congruity which must be overcome before an effective nation-building process can proceed. The main problem in these nations is not the amalgamation of the populace but its transformation from subjects to participants. The lack of modern colonial experience and the absence of dangerous foreign enemies at the borders of some countries seem to have been the cause of the manifestation of these factors

standing in the way of nation-building.²⁶ The same set of circumstances might be applied to Liberia in the analysis of its national growth and which in part has been admitted by President Tubman as one factor contributing to the slow amalgamation of the populace in that country.

D. A. Rustow brings in the size of a nation as a requirement for nation-building.²⁷ He proposes that a population of three to four million is a minimum for a modern state without which a division of labor, a requirement for modern development, may not take place. This quantitative criterion must be then taken into account when considering the process of nation-building without which it might be impossible for nations to progress and survive.²⁸ Rustow also develops the theory that modernization is an essential element in nation-building and that without it a nation cannot retain its identity and develop in today's world. Modernization, to him, is the key in meeting the aspirations of the populace which in turn bind or destroy the populace identity with the nation-state.

In their functional analysis approach to nation-building, Almond and Powell refer to the process of a transfer of people's commitment and loyalty from smaller units to the larger central political system. In their analysis they break down the population into three categories -- parochials, subjects and participants. Parochials are those people who manifest little or no

awareness of the national political system and derive very little or no benefit from it. Subjects are those individuals who are oriented to the political system and derive certain benefits from it. The participants are those individuals who are oriented to the input structures and processes, and engage in, or view themselves as potentially engaging in, the articulation of demands and the making of decisions.²⁹ The shaping or evolvement of the populace from one category to the others, therefore, is the process of nation-building and as suggested by Almond and Powell is accomplished through political socialization and cultural secularization.

From the preceding discussion of various theoretical models of nation-building it can be concluded that it is a dynamic process based on many variables and various factors. National environment, history, modernity, size, economics and cultural heritage are but a few aspects that play an important part in a nation's development which must be considered by a scholar in analyzing the nation-building process.

In an emerging nation the majority of the populace can be classified as parochials. Their social and cultural orientations are traditional and in most cases primordial. The changing of these traditional or primordial orientations from tribe or group to the nation-state therefore is necessary for national development. The key elements in nation-building appear to be cohesion and group loyalty for internal representation and domestic planning to the nation-state which transcends tribal and regional interest.

As a new state emerges the integration of smaller units, such as tribes, castes or local states into the political body of the nation-state becomes an immediate concern of the leaders once independence is achieved in order to avoid the possibility of these units demanding self-determination and nationhood. To succeed in creating a nation-state the nation-builders, therefore, must often compete with the primordial attachments of the nation's populace to race, religion, language, and regional and cultural heritage. Nation-building therefore becomes the process of creating a sense of identity, loyalty, and commitment to the nation-state in the populace living within its boundaries, and implies the creation of a nation by a state rather than the creation of a state by a nation.

Before new values can be implanted or evolve in society, the old ones must either erode or be rooted out through some process. The erosion or implantation of values does not necessarily have to be intentionally manipulated by the state or an institution. Modernization, technology, and economic life act as value changers of which a state, at times, may not be aware. The meaning of values as used here relates to the developed commitments individuals feel which cause them to act in certain ways in a given situation.

Values are acquired over a period of time; they are neither inborn nor developed in an instant. They are a

composite set of behavioral controls assembled after long periods of experience. Because values take so long to form, they are something very difficult to change.

From values emerge patterns of attitudes and behavior. The establishment of values within a society is a complex and time-consuming process. The values held by an adult are primarily those generated during his childhood and school years. Once values are formed they are extremely difficult to change.

The life of a child is influenced by his membership in a family, his community, his school, and other sociological groups. Since his values will be influenced by all these groups, any program for value establishment must consider the role of each. The school is particularly influential and also more susceptible to regulation by government than most groups. The curriculum, the teachers, and the physical plant can be carefully selected to support a given value objective. For example, school courses can be designed to support development of values such as achievement, universalism, collectivism, nationhood and many others. Communities are more difficult than schools to control; however, they can be controlled to some extent by higher government. For example, if nationhood is to be a value, public display of flags, community celebrations of national holidays, and publicity of national significance can be emphasized.³⁰

The family unit is the first socialization structure

encountered by the individual and among the many latent influences, perhaps, the most important in shaping the attitudes toward authority. The family decisions are collective and for the child authoritative. It is in the family, however, that the government's ability to control value formulation is most difficult because the home is controlled by adults whose values are already formed and whose behavior is difficult to monitor.

Besides the school and family other agencies are also influential in value formation. Social organizations, for example, play important parts in shaping values and attitudes. Where family ties are loosened in an industrial society, or where family training seems incongruous with the youth's social environment, formal or informal associations have considerable impact on individual views of politics. Since association with others in a society mold one's views of politics the influence of these organizations has a bearing on future political behavior of the individual. Such relationships may build or break down attitudes of hostility and aggression. They may develop skills in human interaction and participation in group decision-making. Organizations within a nation play a major part in the development of a nation. They unite people, stimulate shared values, and promote patterns of behavior favorable to the national interest.³¹

A controlled or a friendly system of mass media can

also be a powerful force in shaping political beliefs and can provide bases of support for the national government. In addition to providing information about specific and immediate political events, over the long run it can shape the public opinion and thus instill desired values in a large portion of the population.³²

Conscript armed forces of a nation is another instrument that can aid the nation in shaping values of its citizens and contribute to national integration. The military is almost unique in this aspect. It has one language, one set of rules, one uniform, and other features of unifying character that apply to the total membership. This standardization promotes the equalization of values among the membership. Ethnic, religious, and other sociological differences tend to be erased within the armed forces. The military can be the base for social change within a nation. Educational and training programs for armed forces personnel can cause or force changes in thinking and patterns of behavior. Regardless of the positive contribution the army can make to the nation, it is a very expensive organization which can divert capital needed in more vital areas if the national security is not threatened.³³

The national elites, national parties and charismatic leaders are other possible sources for value formulation in the society: however, since they are found mainly associated with the authority of the nation they fall in

the category of the state. The limit on time and scope of this paper prohibits further discussion of the above.

The above list is not all inclusive and, perhaps, many more institutions for value changing can be identified; however, the ones mentioned are considered the most common ones which are found in all societies. Religion, caste, race, economic and social status play a great part in value and attitude formations that are part of these institutions and if they are to be changed or molded must be attacked within the framework of the family and society and not as separate entities.

Islam in the Middle East, for example, can be used as a force for national unity but where it is in conflict with modernization it cannot be attacked by the state without creating internal strife. Similarly, land reform can be used to weaken the political strength of the landlord class in a country through legislative process; but an attack on the class as a whole will result in class struggle and bloodshed.³⁴

IV. Process of Nation-Building

It is very difficult to separate the problems of state building, nation-building, participation and distribution, since all of them have the common elements of values and attitudes. In order to amalgamate disparate groups into a nation it is necessary for the populace to have a sense

of identity and loyalty; similarly in order to participate in the political process of a nation the sense of loyalty and identity must also be present in the participants. The problem therefore arises, where does one process stop and the other begin. The four challenges appear to be omnipresent and never-ending.

A nation-state containing populations with divided values and desires which cannot be molded into a common consensus have a slim chance of surviving and developing. Only a nation with a populace or society which share values, institutions, and culture has a full potential for social, economic, and political growth, development and stability. The question, therefore, arises of how does this amalgamation of populace is achieved.

The method by which this is to be accomplished is discussed by many scholars and is given many names. Social mobilization, political integration, political unification, political socialization are but a few explanations for the process. These suggested methods differ in some respects; however, they all possess several common elements -- change in values and the need for the destruction of some of the old values held by the people.

Deutsch in his theory of communications and control in the study of nationalism and social mobilization focuses upon transactions and other forms of social communications in his analysis of the integration of political communities. His theory looks upon nations and governments as communication

systems which influence the populace's norms and activity for gaining some insight into the process that develops allegiance and identity of a populace to the nation-state. Deutsch proposes that "nationalism and national development [are] processes of social learning and control" and suggests that nationality is the result of a process of social learning and habit forming.³⁵ Deutsch rejects the conventional definition of nationality as a term that may be applied to people

"among whom there exists a significant movement toward political, economic, or cultural autonomy....political organization, or a market area, or an area of literary or cultural exchange, within which the personnel and the characteristics of this people will predominate."³⁶

since some of these frequently cited factors seem not to be essential to the unity of a nation -- language, common territory, common experience and common values, etc. Instead, he proposes a functional definition of nationality in which the presence of sufficient communications facilities with enough complementarity, and not any single factor, act to produce the overall result. Deutsch regards membership in a nation-state as consisting essentially in the ability of people to communicate more effectively, and over a wider range of subjects, with members of one large group than with outsiders. His definition differs from others in the respect that he makes no attempt to specify nationality in terms of some particular ingredient. Deutsch defines nationality, in the present world, as

"an alignment of large numbers of individuals from the middle and lower classes linked to regional centers and leading social groups by channels of social communications and economic intercourse, both indirectly from link to link and with the center."³⁷

Members of a society form social, economic, and political alignment around a center and a leading group. Membership of social classes become united by intensive social communications and alignments based on the probability of social rise and economic betterment.

"The primary basis of this alignment is the complementarity of communication habits. Its secondary basis is the complementarity of acquired social and economic preferences which involve the mobility of goods or persons....in such matters as buying and selling, work, food and recreation, courtship and marriage. A third factor [which] has made all such alignments more important: [is] the rise of industrialism and the modern market economy which offer economic and psychological rewards for successful group alignments."³⁸

As alignments grow stronger they begin to press for some measures of effective control over the behavior of its members which requires power and means for enforcement. The goals always remain the same: the strengthening and elaboration of social channels of communication; the preferences of behavior, and political alignments which, all together make up the social fabric of the nationality. Power once acquired by a group leads to want for greater power. Dissenters are brought into line and a significant part of its members begin to demand control of the state. The power to compel is added to its earlier cohesiveness

and attachment to a group and once the control of state organization is achieved a nation-state comes into being.³⁹

Deutsch's theory goes a long way in explaining the historical development of the Western nation but it seems to explain only in part the nation-building process of the emerging nations. The problem of these states is not the formation of a government or its immediate stability but the amalgamation of the various units or tribes within its borders. National assimilation and differentiation, he says, are related to social learning. But as discussed previously, it is a long drawn out process. It requires long periods of time and the ability of the state to improve social communications. However, when Deutsch's theory of social communication is combined with his theory of social mobilization, defined

"as the process in which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behavior,"⁴⁰

they become very relevant and applicable in explaining the nation-building process of today's emerging nations.

Social mobilization is something that happens to large numbers of people in areas undergoing modernization. It brings about changes which tend to transform the range of human needs and the quality of the political process in the nation-state. Changes in residence, occupation, social setting, face to face association, institutions, roles, ways of acting, experiences and expectations, and

finally of personal memories, habits and needs, including the need for new patterns of group affiliation and new images of personal identity induced by modernization generate strong pressures upon the government. They increase the volume and the range of demands upon the government for administration and services and widen the scope of politics and the membership of the politically relevant strata.⁴¹

Modernization brings about in the society an increase in urbanization, literacy and exposure to modernity and in the process raises its expectations for betterment of its lot in the form of demands on the state. They increase the frequency and the critical importance of direct communication between the society and the government. If the government proves capable and responsive to the demands of its subjects, psychological identification with the state in the greater part of the populace occurs which in turn creates values and attitudes necessary for the amalgamation of the nation-state. Conversely, if the state

"proves persistently incapable or unresponsive, some or many of its subjects will cease to identify themselves with it psychologically; it will be reduced to ruling by force where it can no longer rule by display, example and persuasion; and if political alternatives to it appear, it will be replaced eventually by other political units, larger or smaller in extent, which at least promise to respond more effectively to the needs and expectations of their peoples."⁴²

Social mobilization in fact then becomes a counter-

force to nation-building and instead of creating values and attitudes necessary for the amalgamation of the nation can act as its destroyer.

Social communication and the process of social mobilization combine to bring about the change of individuals within a society from parochials to subjects and finally to participants. The process of social mobilization erodes the traditional and primordial commitments which are replaced by new patterns of socialization and behavior in a populace through the process of social communication and control.

D. Rustow in his work, A World of Nations, posits that only modern nations are capable of retaining their identity in today's world.⁴³ Loyalty to a nation-state, the one indispensable ingredient within the political sphere, is only given to a government "capable of a wider division of labor and, where necessary, of defense against attacks from other modernizing societies."⁴⁴ A nation-state exists, according to Rustow, by virtue of a network of mutual loyalties based on cultural setting. As modernization advances, it affects this cultural setting and transfers society's loyalty to a group which can provide the best means for the achievement of its needs. Social communications, "which [are nothing more than] the social aspects of modernization"⁴⁵ (that is, of trade, travel, correspondence and the like) bring about changes in the societal patterns and give rise to higher expectations.

Rustow's "dual revolution" of modernity and nationalism, therefore, explains the nation-building process basically the same as Deutsch. His three essential political requirements (authority, identity and equality) for success in the "grand venture of modernization"⁴⁶ do not detract from Deutsch's theories but seem to reinforce them. Rustow's theory is based on the same aspects that are developed by Deutsch's theories of social communication and social mobilization.

Almond and Powell suggest that national development results when the existing structural and cultural patterns of a political system are unable to cope with problems which confront them without changes in their political and cultural make-up.⁴⁷ Nation-building, to them, is a part of the national development process whereby people transfer their commitments and loyalty from traditional attachments to the nation-state.⁴⁸ They suggest that this is accomplished through the process of political socialization -- a process which maintains and changes political culture. It is the "process whereby political attitudes and values are inculcated as children become adults and as adults are recruited into roles."⁴⁹ The family, schools, peer groups, organizations, mass media, and contacts with the political system are the agents of political socialization which inculcate attitudes and values in the populace. Political socialization is a continuous process throughout the life of an individual which may

take the form of either manifest or latent transmission. It is manifest when it is articulated in a political action and latent when it influences individual behavior in a society.

Often cited in works concerned with national development and coordinated collective action is the concept of political integration. Political integration is a concept that is neither very well defined nor clearly understood. It is defined by Jacob and Toscano as "a state of mind or disposition to be cohesive, to act together, to be committed to mutual programs in more than several aspects."⁵⁰ Political integration generally implies a relationship of community among people within the same political entity. The population is held together by mutual ties of one kind or another which give the group a feeling of identity and self-awareness. It shapes and develops the values and attitudes of the populace in such a way that they become identified with the nation-state. Political integration engineers large-scale social change, brings political stability, develops political culture and induces commitment to the nation-state. It brings about cohesion for collective action to promote mutual interests arrived at by compromise without violence. It implies a society acting through its governing organs arriving at a public policy that commits the resources of the community to common purposes.⁵¹

In essence the problem of political integration is

one of developing a political culture and of inducing commitment to it in order to allow for "orderly exercise of a nationwide, public authority" and to create a shared understanding between the rulers (state) and the ruled (nation) which is based in some measure of agreement.⁵²

Political integration must be considered to be relative. The extent of integration needed for a social group to be judged a community is less than it is necessary for a unit to be judged a nation. At the lowest level of political organization, the local community, integration involves relationships among people. At higher levels integration concerns the relationship among communities, and the problem becomes one of integrating the already integrated. However it appears that the differences between relationships within communities and those among communities are not so great as to indicate that political integration is a different phenomenon in the two types of situation.⁵³

A primary prerequisite for a high degree of integration is a mature political culture and for its emergence in the new states is the broadening and intensifying of "social communication." To improve its communicative facilities a new state must undertake social mobilization which is disruptive to the political order in a short run and threatens political stability of the new nation. This raises the question of what type of political system can survive the disruptive forces of social mobilization.

Claude Ake with his theory of political integration, appears to provide the best model. He describes a political system that is most capable of undertaking social mobilization and surviving its destructive forces.

Ake's theory is "that the political system undertaking social mobilization maximizes its capacity for carrying out the process and remaining stable despite the potentially disruptive short-run effects of social mobilization if it is authoritarian, paternal, 'identific,' and consensual."⁵⁴ Authoritarian -- if the government's power is large, concentrated, and easily mobilized, and if the government manifests a determination and ability to use this power to carry out its policies. Paternal -- if it is dominated by a political class that is willing and able to lead. Identific -- there is a free flow of communications between the political class and the governed. The "political formula" of the political class is acceptable to the governed. The civic body considers that it has interest in the continued existence of the government. Consensual -- if the political class is solidary and if the hegemony of the political class is not threatened by a counter-elite.⁵⁵

According to Ake's theory a system is integrated when individuals accept the established norms regarding political behavior and act along the legitimate guidelines established by these norms. Conversely, in a malintegrated political system, political activity is not conducted along accepted norms and the emphasis is on effective rather

than on legitimate means for pursuing political goals. In this theory, coercion is an accepted form of political and social behavior as a method for political integration.⁵⁶

At this point the question may be raised if there is a way to measure the nation-building process or must it be considered only at the level of theoretical abstraction. Can we measure how far has any nation progressed towards the goal of being a nation-state? Since all of the theories discussed consider cohesion as a main variable of the process and since cohesion is relative, it appears that the degree of nationhood of a nation-state can be measured in degrees of integration.⁵⁷

Ake's empirical indicators for measuring the degree of political integration give operational meaning to the nation-building process and are especially adaptable to the measurement of nation-building. At the same time, they encompass most of the aspects that must be considered to determine the degree a nation-state has progressed in achieving national unity, loyalty and political culture.

1. Legitimacy Score, i.e. the extent to which the citizens of the state identify with the state as an embodiment of their interest, and therefore concede that it deserves their loyalty and the authority to exercise certain powers over them. This can be measured by attitude survey research methods.

2. Extraconstitutional Behavior Score, i.e. the degree of compliance to the rules of the political game

and compliance to legitimate means for pursuing political goals. Arbitrary arrests of opponents, assassinations and the use of terror are some of the indicators of extraconstitutional behavior and reveal a system as malintegrated.

3. Political Violence Score, i.e. the frequent resort to political violence indicates that either the development of a normative culture is still in a low form of development or that the individual's commitment to the existing normative culture is ambivalent or both.

4. Secessionist Demand Score, i.e. the number of secessionist groups and the numerical strength of their following.

5. Alignment Pattern Score, i.e. ascertaining the extent to which the major groups (political parties) competing for control of the apparatus of government draw their support from a diversity of geographical areas and of ethnic, religious, and social and economic groups within a country. If the major competing parties draw their support from a diversity of socio-cultural and regional groups, the political system is likely to be highly integrated.

6. Bureaucratic Ethos Score, i.e. if a political system is highly integrated, there will be a tendency for its members to give their loyalty to the state and the constitutionally elected holders of its high offices in spite of their personal feelings about the holders of these offices. Bureaucratic ethos, here, signifies the commitment of loyalty of members of the political system

on the office rather than on the charismatic appeal of the holder of the office. Loyalty from charismatic appeal of the office holder is unstable as long as the charismatic authority from which it derives is not routinized.

7. Authority Score, i.e. the authority of the state is a function of its legitimacy score and its effectiveness for carrying out its constitutionally prescribed duties. One essential condition for carrying out its duties is the availability of coercive resources. A state incapable of carrying out its legitimate function loses the respect for its authority which leads to disrespect for its authority and subsequently to a general withdrawal of the populace's commitment to the political culture.⁵⁸

IV. Conclusion

At the outset an attempt was made to avoid the normal classification of systems into categories such as traditional, transitional and modern or in any other similar way. The process of nation-building was to be considered only one stage of several that a nation must pass through on its way in becoming a modern political system. However, nation-building emerged as a process that cannot be separated from modernity. It became clear that a nation-state must modernize and concurrently consider other factors besides nation-building as it develops. If it stagnates or lags behind in modernity populace support will be lost by the governing institutions.

Furthermore, nation-building is a process that must be considered differently for some countries. As each nation has to evolve its own political system, it must also evolve its own approach to the process of nation-building. The process of nation-building used by the West is not applicable to the emerging nations because of the Western difference in culture, traditional values and history from Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Nation-building is an exceedingly difficult and long task since it is a psychological and sociological process by which loyalty, identity and commitment are created in a populace to a nation-state.

Nation-building is a dynamic process based on many variables. All individuals, all organizations, and all systems are simultaneously a part of it. The role and ability of each to contribute to the process is the function of its respective value base and capabilities. If a nation-state contains populations with divided values and desires which cannot be molded into a common consensus its chances of surviving and developing are slim. Only a nation with a populace or society whose members share values, institutions, and culture will have the full potential for social, economic, and political growth, development and stability.

There is no fixed objective in nation-building. It is constantly moving. As a nation modernizes so must its values and institutions modernize to support the changes.

These changes should be evolutionary and slow, not abrupt and radical, but they must be made; the mechanism providing for orderly change available to the state must be integrated and work in unison. Tradition, economics, military religion, mass media, educational system, national symbols, nationalism, propaganda and any other available means must be integrated and geared to induce the identity and loyalty of individuals in a society to the state in an emerging nation to insure its survival.

Nation-building is variously seen as a process of creating a source of identity, loyalty or commitment in a populace living within the boundaries of an independent sovereign state and as a combination of several processes such as social communications, social mobilization, political socialization and political integration.

The objectives of nation-building are: to build a coherent political society from a multiplicity of "traditional societies; to increase cultural homogeneity and value consensus; and to elicit from the individual deference and devotion to the nation-state."⁵⁹

Environment, history, modernity, size, economics, religion, language, and culture are but a few aspects that are considered by scholars in their attempt to define the process of nation-building. However, under close analysis these aspects seem not to be essential to the unity of a nation. Deutsch's theory of social communication and control offers the best explanation of the national

development process since it is based on functional definition of nationality in which social communications within a geographical base combine to produce a nation-state.

All authors cited in this paper agree in part with Deutsch's theory and use it as a basis for expanding their own theories.

Social communication theory combined with the theory of social mobilization, appears to provide the best explanation of the nation-building process. The theory of political socialization -- the process of conversion of parochials into subjects -- further refines the process of nation-building and the theory of political integration concludes the creation of a nation-state.

Nation-building, therefore, is the process whereby a population living within a geographical base over a period of time initially becomes aligned and united by forming a common behavior pattern and habits through associations, interactions, transactions and communications within the same geographical base. These alignments and unity are brought about by the needs of the populace and center around a smaller group which demonstrates the best capability in achieving these needs. As technology and economical development takes place a disruption, in the process of social mobilization, occurs. This process in turn changes the character, needs and demands of the populace to which the state must adjust in order to survive.

Deprived of historical development, the emerging

states must undertake social mobilization to improve their communicative facilities. Social mobilization "entails the breaking down of physical barriers between people and facilitating a greater flow of goods and services between the different parts of the country, educating the masses, developing urban centers and the mass media, etc."⁶⁰ It must transform the old ways of life which generate tensions and resistance in the society. In achieving this transformation the process of political socialization and integration must be instituted by the state, which instills political attitudes and values in the populace and unites people for collective action and commit them to mutual goals.

In conclusion, since all the evidence in this paper points towards the view of "national development" and since it clearly appears that through political and social manipulation "national growth" can be hastened or changed by interference of the state, the concept of "national development" best describes the theory of the nation-building process.

FOOTNOTES

1. Elia Kedouri, Nationalism in Asia and Africa (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1970), p. 65.
2. Dankwart A. Rustow, A World of Nations (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967), p. 238.
3. Claude E. Welch, Political Modernization (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967), p. 15.
4. Ibid.
5. Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Comparative Politics (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966), p. 35.
6. Karl W. Deutsch, "Nation-Building", in Nation-Building, edited by K. W. Deutsch and William J. Foltz (New York: Atherton Press, 1963), p. 7.
7. Joseph R. Strayer, "The Historical Experience of Nation Building in Europe," ibid., p. 19.
8. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 2nd edition, 1960.
9. Ibid.
10. Louis L. Snyder, The Meaning of Nationalism (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 4.
11. Ibid., p. 196.
12. Hans Kohn, "Nationalism," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1968th edition, XI, 64.
13. Ibid., pp. 63-69.
14. Dankwart A. Rustow, "Nations," ibid., XI, 8.
15. Morton H. Fried, "State", ibid., XV, 151.
16. Rupert Emerson, From Empire to Nations (Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 90.
17. John G. Stoessinger, "The Anatomy of the Nation State," in Strategic Subjects Handbook (Ft. Leavenworth, Ks.: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1970), pp. 8-21.
18. Rustow, A World of Nations, p. 35.

19. Almond and Powell, Comparative Politics, p. 16.
20. William L. Richter, "The Politics of Language in India" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968), p. 5.
21. Carl J. Friedrich, "Nation-Building," in Nation-Building, p. 31.
22. Deutsch, "Nation-Building," ibid., pp. 11-12.
23. Ibid., p. 3.
24. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
25. Strayer, "Nation-Building in Europe," in Nation-Building, pp. 17-26.
26. Robert E. Scott, "Nation-Building in Latin America," ibid., pp. 76-83.
27. Rustow, A World of Nations, p. 247.
28. Ibid., p. 31.
29. Almond and Powell, Comparative Politics, pp. 34-72.
30. Ibid., p. 67.
31. Ibid., p. 69.
32. Ibid.
33. Lucian W. Pye, "Armies in the Process of Political Modernization," in Political Modernization, edited by Claude E. Welch (California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967), p.301.
34. John H. Kautsky, Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967), p. 50.
35. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communications (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1953), p. 163.
36. Ibid., p. 3.
37. Ibid., p. 35.
38. Ibid., p. 75.
39. Ibid., p. 37.
40. Deutsch, "Political Development," 2nd edition, p. 155.
41. Ibid., p. 153.

42. Ibid., p. 168.
43. Rustow, Nations, p. 31.
44. Ibid., p. 30.
45. Ibid., p. 61.
46. Ibid., p. 35.
47. Almond and Powell, Comparative Politics, p. 34.
48. Ibid., p. 36.
49. Ibid., p. 24.
50. Philip E. Jacob and Henry Tuene, "The Integrative Process," in The Integration of Political Communities, edited by P. E. Jacob and James Toscano (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1964), p. 4.
51. Ibid., pp. 4-10.
52. Reinhard Bendix, Nation-Building and Citizenship, (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969), pp. 22-23.
53. Jacob and Tuene, "The Integrative Process," pp. 17-45.
54. Claude Ake, A Theory of Political Integration (Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967), p. 101.
55. Ibid., pp. 103-113.
56. Ibid., p. 7.
57. Ibid., p. 8.
58. Ibid., pp. 8-11.
59. Ibid., p. 96.
60. Ibid., p. 97.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Ake, Claude. A Theory of Political Integration. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Almond, Gabriel A. and Powell, G. Bingham. Comparative Politics. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- Almond, Gabriel A. and Verba, Sidney. Civic Culture. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.
- Bendix, Reinhard. Nation-Building and Citizenship. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.
- Blondel, J. (ed.). Comparative Government. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.
- Coleman, James S. "Modernization: Political Aspects." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1968 edition, Vol. X.
- Dawson, Richard E. and Prewitt, Kenneth. Political Socialization. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Deutsch, Karl W. Nationalism and Social Communication. New York: John Wiley and Sons., Inc., 1953.
- _____. The Nerves of Government. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- _____. Politics and Government. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Deutsch, Karl W. and Foltz, William J. (eds.). Nation-Building. New York: Atherton Press, 1963.
- Eckstein, Harry and Apter, David E. (eds.). Comparative Politics. New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1964.
- Emerson, Rupert. From Empire to Nation. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1950.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Political Unification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

- Fried, Morton H. "State." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1968 edition, Vol. XV.
- Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Jacob, Philip E. and Toscano, James V. (eds.). The Integration of Political Communities. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964.
- Hayes, Carlton J. Nationalism: A Religion. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960.
- Kautsky, John H. Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.
- Kedourie, Elie. Nationalism. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1961.
- _____. Nationalism in Asia and Africa. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1970.
- Kohn, Hans. The Idea of Nationalism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.
- _____. "Nationalism." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1968 edition, Vol. XI.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. "Without Consensus There is No Consent." Center, IV, (July-August, 1971). Pp. 2-9.
- Richter, William L. "The Politics of Language in India." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968.
- Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Susanne H. The Modernity of Tradition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Rustow, Dankwart A. A World of Nations. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967.
- _____. "Nation." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1968 edition, Vol. XI.
- Snyder, Louis L. The Meaning of Nationalism. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Stoessinger, John G. A composite of excerpts from The Might of Nations. Random House Inc., 1965. (Reproduced in Strategic Subjects Handbook. Ft. Leavenworth, Ks.: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1970).
- Welch, Claude E. (ed.). Political Modernization. California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1967. Second edition: 1971.

THE CONCEPT OF NATION-BUILDING

by

EDWARD J. JASAITIS

B.S., UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, 1958

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Science

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

The purpose of this paper is to examine the concept of "nation-building" as held by various Western scholars and to arrive at a synthesis of this concept. The main factors and variables of the process are analyzed and in conclusion a definition of the "nation-building" process is formulated. The following questions are examined and answered: (1) What is a nation? (2) How is a nation to be distinguished from a state? (3) What is nation-building? (4) How is this distinguished from national growth, national development, national integration, and political integration? (5) How do political socialization, social mobilization, national communication and authority contribute to or facilitate nation-building?

There are several diverse views on the process of "nation-building" and a lack of general agreement by scholars on an operational definition for the process. Chapter II examines the various definitions of the nation-state and presents various theories of how nation-states were formed. A nation-state is defined as a sovereign political unit consisting of a population: which inhabits a definite territory, acknowledges a common government and usually exhibits common linguistic and cultural patterns; is committed to a particular collective identity through a common image of past and future; shares some degree of nationalism; and is devoted to the achievement

of some particular goal(s). In the analysis a distinction is made between "nation" and "state". "Nation" is associated with political, social, economic, and cultural aspects of the nation-state and the "state" with legal authority and power. "National growth", "nation-building" and "national development" theories are examined and are found to contain quantitative variables such as territory, economy, language, religion and national culture along with ideological variables such as identity, loyalty and commitment. On closer examination the quantitative variables, although contributing greatly to a unity of a nation state, do not appear to be the essential ingredients. The essential elements in the building of a nation-state appear to be the values and the attitudes of its population which call for unity, stimulate shared values and promote patterns of behavior favorable to the national interest. Nation-building, therefore, is defined as a process of creating a source of identity, loyalty and commitment in a populace to a particular nation-state.

Chapter III expands on the theories of how nation-states were formed by examining the theories that explain the processes by which attitudes and values necessary for national unity (contained in the definition of nation-state) are inculcated in the populace living within the territory of the nation-state. Deutsch's theory of

communications and control provides a starting point for the nation-building process. Then the concepts of social mobilization and political socialization are examined to assess their effect on the process of nation-building.

Nation-building emerges as an exceedingly difficult and long task since it is a psychological and sociological process by which loyalty, identity and commitment are created in a populace to a nation-state. It is a dynamic process based on many variables and is a combination of several processes -- social communication, social mobilization, political socialization and political integration. It is best described by the concept of "national-development" since it clearly appears that by political and social manipulation "national growth" can be hastened or changed by interference of the state.