

Nationalism as a Constructive Force

by

Joseph Kagedan-Kage

Thesis submitted
to the
Department of History
University of Ottawa
in
partial fulfillment
of the
requirements
for the
Degree, Master of Arts.

Montreal, April 1946.



UMI Number: EC56113

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform EC56113
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction. The Problem of Nationalism	1
2. Race and Racism	7
3. Race and Nation	23
4. The Origin of Nationality	35
5. Geography, Homeland, and Nationality	45
6. State and Nationality	53
7. Language and Nationality	60
8. Tradition and Nationality	68
9. National Consciousness and National Honour	76
10. A Nation Defined	81
11. The Individual and Nationality	85
12. Nationalism as a Constructive Force; Should Nationality Survive?	92
13. Unity of Mankind: Nationalism and Internationalism	107
Bibliography	

CHAPTER 1

The Problem of Nationalism

The perplexed problem of nationalism is a modern one for which history has not yet found a solution. In ancient times, as well as in the Middle Ages, the problem of nationalism did not seem to puzzle mankind, even though then there existed certain forms of nationalism.

The sense of tribal solidarity with its peculiar religion, its symbolic King of God, was a raw form of nationalism. However, the tribe could not be considered as a nation because it was not large enough, not sufficiently developed, and it did not have a national self-consciousness which only centuries of common tradition can give. In the ancient world, only two groups of people were conscious of their nationality, the Jews and the Greeks. The Jews considered themselves as a chosen people. The Greeks too, were conscious of their national power, naming all other nations barbarians. The Romans were conscious of their political power. "I am a Roman Citizen" was the expression of their superiority and national consciousness.

During the Middle Ages nationalism tended to be submerged. The people were local in their experiences and their patriotism was directed towards their village, town, or petty feudal province, where they lived and laboured. The boundaries of nations were determined not by their own interests but by the ruling dynasties. The state and its inha-

bitants were the property of the King, who could do as he willed.

The problem of nationalism arose at the close of the eighteenth century with the formation of the modern state. The state assumed the character of a centralized economic unit with separate economic interests and aims.

The partition of Poland in 1772 awoke in many minds the problem of the rights of the weaker peoples. The question arose whether peoples were to be bought and sold at the bidding of irresponsible monarchs, or had they the right of self-determination. Another important cause of the newly arisen tide of nationalism was the French Revolution. According to Lord Acton, the national sentiment was not developed directly out of the revolution in which it was involved, but was exhibited first in resistance to it, when the attempt to emancipate had been absorbed in the desire to subjugate and the republic had been succeeded by the empire.

Napoleon called a new power into existence by attacking nationality in Russia, by delivering it in Italy, and by governing in defiance of it in Germany and in Spain. From Russia to Mexico, everywhere, subjugated nations began to experience the dream of national emancipation. Dormant national feelings were awakened and the national wills became dynamic forces. The Romantic Movement gave additional stimulus to the national revival.

By the study of the past, by the discovery of early legends, and by the study of European nations in the stage of primitive societies, a national historical consciousness was brought to birth. The Napoleonic Wars and the despotism of K. Metternich (1) generated a new feeling of nationalism as a reaction to despotism. Every country was producing national historians who painted the past virtues of their race.

There followed a series of national uprisings and wars. The Greek war for independence from Turkey took place in the 20's of the last century. In America, the year 1826 marked the end of the Spanish rule. The Monroe Doctrine in 1825 was a great step forward in the direction of national autonomy on the American continent. In 1830 there took place a national uprising in Poland. Under the leadership of Kossuth, the Hungarian people revolted against Austria. The national independence of Belgium, the unification of Italy and Germany, the independence of Norway, Roumania, etc., -- all were achieved during the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The fallacious theories of false liberalism, humanism, and economic determinism, contributed to the fact that nationalism became a secular religion. Men forgot God and found an idol. It became a faith as complex and as compelling as any religious creed. The sentiment of

1. Prince Klemens Lothar Wengel. Metternich - Austrian statesman.

nationalism began to be exploited for evil purposes. It became chauvinistic in character and was used as a tool by the vested economic interests in their struggle for markets and production. States competed with one another for markets in order to sell their goods, and for raw material with which to make their goods. The states used the spirit of nationalism to whip up enthusiasm for competition and for eventual war.

For the chauvinistic nationalist, the state-nation became the realization of an ethical ideal, the march of God through the world. The state was raised to a supernatural level, and individual liberty and rights were denied. For the chauvinist, nationalism meant the suppression and negation of foreign nations, inflation of their own value, stagnation and petrification of national culture and sanctification of tradition. The chauvinist considered his own nation as the highest and absolute. He considered all other nations as a means of self-aggrandisement.

Growing atheism; loss of faith; the ascendancy of economic liberalism, which placed prime importance on economic gain; were exploited by interested groups in making nationalism a divine concept. It became, and was accepted by many as a transcendental absolute.

Nationalism became a powerful appeal and has become the basis of life in the modern state. Social and economic dislocation of the nineteenthth and early twentieth century

has by some been interpreted as originating from an incompatibility of racial elements in the populations involved.

Nationalism became a cloak for selfish economic and political aims. Nations claimed absolute sovereign rights, forgetting about the Brotherhood of Men and the Fatherhood of God. Nations forgot St. Paul's assertion that, "He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth".(1) The racial myth, on which extreme nationalism thrives, has brought the world to its present catastrophe. Elevating the nation to a mysterious supernatural being and forgetting God, the chauvinistic nationalism was bound to lead to hatred and to wars, for the love of God is inseparable from the love of our fellow men.

It may appear, therefore, that nationalism was a destructive force in our society, and should be rejected as having no good in it at all. However, this is not so. The purpose of the treatise is to prove that there is no reason why nationalism should be rejected as undesirable and without any good in it. By examining the concept of nationalism and the nature of the national unit, we shall endeavour to prove that nations are a highly desirable and necessary social structure, which is of great service to man and humanity.

1. Acts 17:26

Nationalism is a highly constructive force, provided it derives its strength from a universal norm of morality, a standard of morality that has reference to human nature, and that is applicable at all times and places, and not one which is grounded on particular interests.

CHAPTER 11

Race and Racism

In discussing the question of racial differences, O. Kleinberg (1), states that the problem of psychological differences between national and racial groups has always been of interest, and in recent years it has received a practical application and a political significance which has made it far more than an academic question.

P. Moon (2) writes that there exists an ill-defined, but widespread popular belief that a nation is, or should be, a racial unit. That is, it is a group descended from common ancestors, and, therefore, is united in kinship, language, and racial characteristics; a belief that expresses itself popularly in such phrases as: "our forefathers", "Irish wit", "Irish blood", "Anglo-Saxon", "French temperament", "English common sense", "German thoroughness", and the like. Moon reminds us that it is well to remember that common sense is not an exclusive possession of Englishmen; wit is lacking, in at least, a few Irishmen; "Slavic melancholy" is not characteristic of all Russians; "love of the almighty dollar" is not a peculiarly American trait; and Frenchmen are not invariably polite.

However, since race theories have been justified in the

-
1. O. Kleinberg Social Psychology p. 282
 2. P. Moon Syllabus of International Relations p. 14

to employ head shape as a criterion of race and speaks of two main species or races: the Eurasiatic, or roundheaded, found in Asia and Central Europe; and the E¹african, or longheaded, originating in Africa but also found in Northern and Southern Europe. This classification unites in one category the blondest Scandinavian and the darkest Negro, because both are longheaded, and it ignores all the differences between them.

An attempt to use a number of criteria in combination was made by Deniker (1), who arrived at seventeen main races and twenty-nine subraces. In other words, it appears that racial classifications are artificial and arbitrary, since there is no way of deciding whether skin color or head shape is the more significant criterion. The fact that there are many transitional forms and that there is a marked degree of overlapping between one group and another, appears to justify the conclusion that human races, in any strict sense of the term, exist only in the mind of the classifier. Thus Father Lafarge (2) cites Reuter (3), Garth (4), Schmidt (5), and others as authorities, claiming that modern anthropological and ethnological science overwhelmingly rejects the theory of race.

-
- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Deniker | cited by O. Kleinberg, <i>ibid.</i> |
| 2. Father Lafarge | <i>Interracial Justice</i> p. 11 |
| 3. Reuter, E.B. | <i>The Race Problem</i> |
| 4. Garth, T.R. | <i>Race Psychology</i> |
| 5. Schmidt | <i>Rasse und Volk</i> |

Used even in the purely physical sense the term race presents great difficulties. Those primary races, or subspecies - the Caucasad, the Mongloid, and the Negroid - are generalized racial types; hypothetical stocks, rather than living races.

The modern racist theory, which found its most ardent followers among the German National Socialists, owes its philosophy to H.S. Chamberlain (1), who glorified the Teutons, and who developed a passionate and arbitrary Pan-Germanic philosophy of history which stemmed from the previous doctrines of Gobineau who spoke of the superiority of the Aryan race. Chamberlain denied all evidence of a universal fraternity of human species and insisted on the necessity of recognizing a hierarchy of distinct and unequal races, physically and spiritually dissimilar, and incapable of being considered a simple humanity, but rather divided into nations coextensive with the distinct races. Chamberlain attempts to identify the oneness of race and nation, and thus, he laid the foundation for the racism of Hitler Germany. He writes that humanity, about which men have philosophized to such an extent, suffers from the serious defect that it does not exist at all. Nature and history reveal a great number of various human beings but no such thing as humanity. Even the hypothesis that all these beings, as the offshoots

1. Chamberlain, H.S. The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century.

of one original stem, are physically related to each other, has scarcely so much value as Ptolomaeus' theory of the heavenly spheres.

The Teachings of racism construct a hierarchy of races among which no sociability exists; the difference among which are true differences in blood, and the degrees of greatness achieved by them, are to be attributed to forces of blood and physique. In other words, it is a purely zoological concept of race and nationality.

Forst de Battaglia (1) reduces this teaching to the following essential propositions: (a) men who descend from a single blood form a natural community, the race, from which no man can escape and into which no one can enter by a mere act of the will; (b) this primitive unity is the most important and the most sacred which exists among men; (c) the physical constitution of a man classifies him infallibly in one of these racial communities; (d) the soul and all the intellectual manifestations of a man bear the impress of his race; (e) there is an inevitable and intrinsic connection between physical and moral qualities; (f) this double heritage fixes in advance the personality of each individual; (g) we are the products of our own heredity; (h) there is a hierarchy among the races not only in physical beauty, but also in all the spiritual endowments and in moral value; (i) history, all the culture,

1. Forst de Battaglia La Mysterie du Sang pp. 54-55

and all the civilization of humanity, depend on the evolution of races; (j) the better race has the right and the duty to maintain its purity and to protect itself against the influences of the inferior race.

In the special, physical, pseudo-scientific sense, race is defined by one of the theorists, Hans F.K. Gunther (1), as follows: "A race shows itself in a human group which is marked off from every other group through its own approximate combination of bodily and mental characteristics, and in turn only produces its like". Dr. Gunther finds five basic European races: the Nordic race, tall, long head, narrow face, blue or grey eyes, fair hair, white and rosy skin; the Mediterranean race, like Nordic in head and face but short in stature, soft, smooth or curly brown or black hair, brownish skin, deep-sunk brown eyes; the Dinaric, tall stature, broad head, narrow face, prominent nose, curly brown or black hair, brown, deep-sunk eyes, brownish skin; the Alpine race, short stature, broad head, broad face, flat short nose, stiff hair, brown or black, yellowish brown skin, standing out brown eyes; and the East Baltic race, short stature, short head, broad face, flat broad nose, light stiff hair, light grey or whitish eyes standing out; light skin with grey undertone. According to Dr. Gunther, 55 to 60 per cent of the population of the British Isles is Nordic, 30 per cent is

1. Gunther, Hans F.K. cited by H. Sommerville in
 "A Course in Social Science for Catholic Clubs"

Mediterranean and 10 per cent is Alpine. The population of Germany is from 50 to 55 per cent Nordic. That of France, he says, is 25 per cent Nordic.

Thus the racist claim, that there are anthropological, biological, cultural, and psychological arguments for racial superiority. Let us examine these contentions in the light of the findings of scholars who have worked and studied in this field.

G. Retzius (1) points out that even the Swedes, who are regarded as unmixed representatives of the Nordic or North European racial type, show such marked divergencies among themselves that only a minority actually possesses the combination of physical features usually regarded as Nordic. This is, of course, more marked in other European nations.

The Jews, for example, show physical variations almost as great as those found in all Europeans taken together.

Huxley and Haddon point out that in the Caucasus the large majority of Jews are roundheaded or brachycephalic, whereas among the Yemenite Jews dolichocephaly is the rule. In parts of Poland and Lithuania the average stature of Jews is 5'4", in western European and American countries it is 5'8". Similar variations have been reported for colour of skin, eyes, and hair. F. Müller (2) maintains that an

-
1. Retzius, G. *Anthropologia Suesica*
cited by O. Kleinberg, *ibid.*
 2. Müller, F. *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Aryan*, cited by O. Kleinberg, *ibid.*

ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes or hair, is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dilochocephalic dictionary or brachycephalic grammar.

Dr. Hertz (1) states that even the primal Aryan race is a purely hypothetical conception, just as Indo-European is a mere linguistic conception. It is evident that a fair-haired, blue-eyed Finn, whose speech is non-Aryan, is more akin to a Swede or North German of like racial characteristics than the latter are to a South Aryan, let us say to a Sicilian, to a Greek, or to a Portuguese, who in many respects will bear more likeness to a Semite or to a North African.

Let us now turn our attention to the arguments for racial superiority. One type of argument heard is to the effect that races differ in their degree of primitiveness. More specifically, the Negro, for example, may have developed earlier from the ancestral anthropoid stock and represents, therefore, a species inferior to the later evolved Caucasian or Mongolian. It is claimed that in certain physical characteristics, like the wide flat nose, the long arms, etc., the Negro resembles the anthropoid more than do either of the other two racial stocks. This argument has been examined in detail by Boas, Kroeber, and others. As they have pointed out, this hierarchy of races depends on the nature of the criteria used. There are many characteristics in

1. Dr. Hertz Race and Civilization p. 77

which the Negro resembles the anthropoid less than do either of the other races. In hairiness of body, for example, the Caucasian is most like the anthropoid. The thick lips of the Mongolian represent much less a departure from the anthropoid type than the thick everted lips of the Negro, which are most "human". There is, approximately, an equal number of ape-like characteristics in the three races, and no decision is possible as to which is the most primitive.

It is frequently argued that the physical differences between races create a presumption in favour of psychological differences. There have been studies of the possible psychological significance of various physiognomic features, including skin colour, shape of head, size of nose, height of forehead, convexity and concavity of facial profile, glandular makeup and general bodily constitution. A series of careful investigations have thrown considerable doubt on the connection between constitution and normal personality. A careful examination of the research data by Patterson justifies the conclusion that not a single one of them has proved any positive relationship between physique and mentality.

Some significance has been attached to the fact that on the average, the size and shape of the Negro brain is smaller than that of the White. Studies in this field, however, revealed the fact that the overlapping is very

great and that there are a great many Negro brains larger than that of the average White. In general, the brains of Negroes and Whites appear to be approximately equal in size and appear to have the same conformation. It is also a fact that studies of brain size within the White group have failed to show any close correspondence with level of mentality.

O. Kleinberg (1) describes an interesting experiment by R. Bean, conducted in connection with the qualitative characteristics of the brain. R. Bean (2) has focused attention upon possible Negro-White differences. In a series of studies Bean arrived at the conclusion that the frontal area of the brain was less well-developed in the Negro than in the White, and that the posterior area was better developed. He believed that this difference paralleled the "well known fact" that the Negro is inferior in the higher intellectual functions and superior in those concerned with rhythm and sense perception. Another important difference was in the depth of the convolutions of the cortex, those of the Negro being much shallower and more childlike than those of the White.

It happened that these studies were carried out at John Hopkins University under the direction of Professor F. Mall (3), head of the Department of Anatomy. Mall was

-
- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| 1. O. Kleinberg | Ibid |
| 2. R. Bean | Some Racial Peculiarities of the Negro Brain, cited by O. Kleinberg, <i>ibid.</i> |
| 3. F. Mall | On Several Anatomical Characters of the Human Brain, cited by O. Kleinberg, <i>ibid.</i> |

for some reason uncertain of Bean's results and he repeated the whole study on the same collection of brains on which Bean had worked. He took the precaution, however, of comparing the brains without knowing in advance which were Negro and which were White. When he and his associates placed in one group those brains which had rich convolutions, and in another group those with shallow convolutions, they found exactly the same proportions of Negro and White brains in the two groups. When they measured the size of the frontal and posterior lobes in the two groups of brains, they found no difference in their relative extent in the two races.

Mall came to the conclusion that Bean's findings had no basis in fact, and that it had not been demonstrated that Negro brains differed in any essential manner from those of White brains. Thus, it can be said that there has been no demonstration that psychological differences of any significance are associated with the physical features used in race classification. The cultural argument for racial superiority is unsatisfactory because of the great variations in the cultural levels of the same racial groups at different times in history. There is also no acceptable criterion which may be used in judging cultures.

In recent years the racial superiority of the Nordics has been greatly emphasized. However, the first important

consideration in connection with this type of racial evaluation is the need to place it in proper historical perspective. Even if one were willing to grant that at the present time certain of the North European nations appear to stand in a position of political, military, and possibly artistic superiority over those in other parts of the world, and this is a large assumption, it is necessary to keep in mind that we have no right to argue from a temporary to a biological and permanent superiority.

In the time of the Greeks, for example, the North Europeans were regarded as barbarians incapable of creative culture. Besides, there is no doubt, that our western civilization is a composite, containing contributions from all peoples of the world. It must also be kept in mind that other groups may legitimately protest against our judging them in terms of our own criteria. We tend to think of the Chinese or the Africans as inferior because they have failed to develop our type of civilization. There is, however, no universal criterion which enables us to determine the superiority of one culture or of one civilization over another.

Marco Polo may have ridiculed the Chinese for wasting their discovery of gunpowder on firecrackers, but they, with at least equal right, might have questioned the intelligence of using it for the destruction of human beings. There is also a great amount of variability found within any one race in respect to culture. The most cultivated

Chinese and the simplest tribes of Siberia are of the same race or physical type. The same is true of many other racial groups. These wide divergencies within a single race make it impossible to assume that race is in any direct way the cause of culture. They indicate rather that we must take into account a whole host of geographical and historical factors which are relatively independent of race, and which make it possible for one community to reach the height of complexity in its cultural and social life, and which keep another at a relatively simple level.

The same lack of evidence of discrepancy between races applies also to experiments conducted with intelligence tests. The present consensus of opinion is that so many environmental factors enter in the comparisons that no conclusions as to innate ability is justified. The discovery of individual Negro children with intelligence quotients at the extreme upper end of the distribution, as well as the excellent showing made by American Indian children adopted into superior White homes, also testify to the absence of innate racial differences of intelligence.

As far as nations within the White race are concerned, there is almost complete unanimity among psychologists that biologically determined differences between them has never been proven. O. Kleinberg also reports that an attempt to compare groups of Nordic, Alpine and Med-

iterranean children, selected in Europe according to the most rigid anthropological criteria, failed to reveal any significant differences between them. In other words, there has as yet appeared no adequate proof of inherent racial differences in ability.

Thus, anthropologists in general, tend to repudiate the entire system of race. Father J. Lafarge (1) cites a number of authorities stating that modern anthropological and ethnological science overwhelmingly reject the theory that even purely physical traits are permanently or fixedly inherited by any large determinable group of human beings. It is an analogy falsely transferred from an animal race, an analogy not unlikely, when human beings are treated as animals. Used even in the purely physical sense, the term race presents great difficulties. Those primary races or sub-species, - the Caucasoid, the Mongloid, and the Negroid, - are generalized racial types, hypothetical stocks rather than living races.

J.J. Wright (2) discussing the Catholic view on the subject of race, informs us that racist contentions that human racial stocks differ from one another in their original and permanent nature, as radically, as do men from beasts, is described as absurd by the congregation of Seminaries in its syllabus of pernicious propositions

-
1. J. Lafarge Ibid pp. 16-17
 2. J.J. Wright National Patriotism in Papal Teachings.

bruited about and bolstered with false show of science. In a letter of April 13, 1938, entitled "Falsi nominis scientia fucatas" it is stated: "Stirpes humanae indole sua, nativa et immutabili, adeo inter se differunt ut infima ipsarum magis distet a suprema hominum stirpe quam a suprema specie brutorum". Against any effort to divide the human family anthropologically, Pope Pius XI declares simply and categorically that there is no longer any serious disagreement with regard to the essential unity of the human race - "De generis humani unitate iam nulli dissentiunt", - Encyclical Mortalium Animos, A A S XX (1928) p. 5. The Holy Father explains that we do not speak of races describing the families of mankind that constitute human society, and that the failure to perceive the existence and necessity of universalism, a failure productive of the disorders of the international world, is the result of the fact, that men forget that human species is one great human race in which there is no room for special races. (Discourse to members of Confederation Francaise des Syndicats Chretiens. Observatore Romano 19-20 September 1938, p. 1).

Thus, religion and reputable science are at one in their contention that the human society cannot be subdivided into races. Races have become mixed and there is no such thing as a purely physical order of race. On the basis of all this, it can be safely said, that the whole theory

of racism was false and presented a deliberate attempt to create disunity in mankind and to subjugate one group of people to another group.

CHAPTER 111

Race and Nation.

"The Romans first, with Julius Caesar came,
 Including all the nations of that name,
 Gauls, Greeks and Lombards, and by computation
 Auxiliaries of Slaves, of every nation.
 With Hengist, Saxons, Danes and Suenos came,
 In search of plunder, not in search of fame.
 And conquering William brought the Norman o'er.
 Scots, Picts, and Irish from the Hibernian shore;
 All these, their barbarous offspring left behind;
 The dregs of armies, they, of all mankind,
 Blended with Bretons who before were here,
 Of whom the Welsh have blest the character.
 From this amphibious, ill-born mob began
 That vain, ill-natured thing, an Englishman".

Daniel Defoe - "The True-Born Englishman".

As long ago as 1700 Daniel Defoe laughed at the chauvinistic nationalists who preened themselves as "true-born Englishmen". The quotation at the head of this chapter referred only to the racial mixtures affected in England up to the time of William the Conqueror. During the nine hundred years that have passed since then England continued to receive immigrants from abroad, and thus, has added further variety to her national blood.

The concepts of race and nation are frequently confused.

Some maintain, and at certain periods the contention was quite pronounced, that unity of race is to be considered an essential element of nationality. If race is to be regarded as a physical thing, or as defined in general anthropology, a large subdivision of mankind the members of which are distinguished by possession of similar combinations of anatomical features due to common heredity, we certainly cannot consider the English nation as originating from one racial stock, but we must admit profound influences due to history, to culture, to environment, and to blending.

The fallacy of the race doctrine has been examined and discussed somewhere else in this thesis. However, because of the frequent confusion of the concepts of race and nation, it is important to analyze and to throw light on the relationship, if any, between these two concepts.

Professor Von Engeln (1) takes the view that there can be no question but that the most firmly established division of human beings into separate classes is that based on race, as determined by the colour of the skin. There is a natural antipathy between white, yellow, brown, red, and black races. This intolerance apparently is based on a psychological realization of unlikeness; and this unlikeness had its origin in the long prehistoric development of each race in geographical isolation. In view of

1. O.D. von Engeln Inheriting the Earth pp. 8-14

this very ancient origin of racial antipathies, one would also expect to find that national groups have been, and are, quite universally based primarily on kinship of race. In a large measure this is true, but there are exceptions.

Thus the Japanese, perhaps as homogeneous a national group as any that could be cited, include in their number a remnant of Ainus, a people of Caucasian type, and perhaps the aboriginal race of the main island of Hondo. On the other hand, in the south of Japan there is found a Malay admixture, a relatively recent addition to the prevailing Mongolian stock.

A more recent amalgamation than that of the Japanese, of distinctly different races into a well-defined national unit, is encountered in the Brazilian people. The Portuguese planters in Brazil seem to have had sexual intercourse from the first with the African female slaves whom they imported. In consequence of this racial admixture, a large population of Metis, or half-breeds, developed in Brazil at a very early date.

Perhaps the most striking, if not the most significant, transgression of racial lines by nationality is presented by the Jews. There are none other than this people who so characteristically preserve the mask of nationality, if not anthropologically, at least by facial expression. Hence it is of great interest to note that the Jews, though mainly a white people, have a colour fringe --

black, brown, and yellow. There are the Beni-Israel of India, the Falashas of Abyssinia, the disappearing Chinese colony of Kai-Fung-Foo, the Judeos of Ioango, the black Jews of Cochin, the negro Jews of Fernando Po, Jamaica and Surinam.

But colour of skin is not the only criterion of race. Ethnologists have fixed their attention on head form as the most permanent and distinct, and at the same time, characteristic racial difference. Using this as a basis, three separate racial types may be identified in European populations: the Mediterranean race, the Alpine race, and the Nordic race.

It is immediately evident that there is no correspondence between the distribution of these three racial types and the various developments of nationality in Europe. Lack of coincidence between nationality and racial unity, racial character, might, perhaps, be expected, but the fact that practically every one of the nationalities of Europe present a different combination of racial make-up is quite significant as an indication that division between long-heads and broad-heads is not the basis of national consciousness in Europe.

A nation consists of individuals who share certain national sentiments. J.S. Mill (1) contends that a feeling of

1. Mill, J.S. Representative Government chapter XVI

nationality may generate from various causes. Sometimes it is the effect of identity of race and descent. Community of language and community of religion greatly contribute towards it. Geographical limits are one of its causes. But the strongest of all is the identity of political antecedents; the possession of a national history and consequently community of recollection; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past. None of the circumstances, however, are either indispensable or necessarily sufficient by themselves.

Father Schmidt speaking as a Catholic anthropologist, finds that cultural factors give rise to differentiations within the human family, but he sees in these differentiations secondary and superficial factors of division in a single human race. J.J. Wright (1) bringing the opinion of Father Schmidt, whose book "Rasse und Volk" is the principal Catholic work on the biological and ethnological postulates of racism from a scientific point of view, states that such anthropologists as Eugene Pittard, who is devoid of theological preoccupations, supports the contention of Father Schmidt in his book "Les Races de l'Histoire". He bears witness that the concept of race is a zoological concept unlike, for example, that of language or nationality, both of which are social concepts peculiarly human. Or as E. Barker (2) puts it: "race is a

-
1. J.J. Wright National Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp.11-12
 2. E. Barker National Character and Factors in its Formation p. 23

physical classification and a nation is a spiritual fact".

W. Sulzbach (1) writes that if the race concepts of the anthropologists, as applied for example to Europe, should be taken seriously by politicians, civil wars would immediately destroy all the existing nations because Homo-Europeans, Homo Mediterraneans and Homo Alpinus are all to be found in almost every country of Europe. If sympathies coincided with what the anthropologists call races, a great part of the inhabitants of Northern Germany would feel closer affiliation with the people of Northern France than with those of Southern Germany; and many Northern Italians would feel more intimately identified with the Swiss than with the natives of Naples or Palermo.

German nationalists are in the habit of saying, "Blut will zu Blutt", men of the same blood long for each other. It is very doubtful whether this applies even to close relatives, who are often quarrelsome. It is certainly far more unlikely in the case of several million different persons. Whatever races may be, they are not identical with nations. If the Germans could actually define races by listening "to the voice of their blood" as Hitler asserts, it would not be necessary to require every inhabitant of Germany to prove whether his descent is "Aryan", "Partly Aryan", or Jewish. Every German Aryan

would be aware of his ancestry and of the Jewish blood in others by instinct.

Father de la Briere cited in Lafarge (1), calls attention to the solidarity with which leaders among anthropologists have repudiated, as an illusion and superstition, the idea that any people, including the Jews, known to political geography, possess a homogeneity of anthropological origin, even if they may be distinguishable by certain ethnological characteristics. He states that it is pure abuse of language to confuse by the current employment of the word race, an actually discernible community, resulting from a thousand historical causes, social and psychological in their nature, with an anthropological family constituted by the physical and immemorial continuity of a distinctive descent. The social community is a visible reality; for every differentiated group, unity of anthropological origin is a fiction without relation to the authentic and verifiable reality.

B. Joseph (2) analysing the question of the inter-relationship of race and nationality on the basis of various sources, declares that the contention that race and nationality are not co-terminous can best be demonstrated by a survey of the existing nationalities of Europe. The French Walloons, who form part of the Belgian nationality,

-
- | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------|
| 1. Lafarge, J. | Interracial Justice | pp. 16-19 |
| 2. Joseph B. | Nationality | pp. 40-41 |

are of a different race ~~than~~ the Flemings. Russia, as it existed prior to the Great War, was said to have comprised people of over forty different races. Whilst it is true that there were several nationalities included within the Russian State, even on that basis, it contained, on the average, four or five races to each nationality. Similarly, it can be observed that the Flemings, North Frenchmen, and North West Germans belong to the same race, whilst they differ from the Central and Southern Germans and Frenchmen. Nor is there any noticeable distinction of race between a Norman and a Hanoverian, between a Lyonnais and a Bavarian, nor between a Provencal and a Calabrian. The English nationality, as we have seen above, is also an illustration, consisting as it does, of Normans, Saxons, Danes, and Flemings, not to mention a considerable admixture of Scotch, Irish, Italian, Spanish, and other European blood.

The confusion and contradiction that exists with regard to the importance of the racial element in nationality becomes patent when it is realized that, although the French are popularly believed to be of Celtic descent and the Germans of Teutonic origin, there are scientists, like M. Jean Finst, who in his book "Race Prejudice", maintains that if it is absolutely necessary to attribute Celtic descent to any European people, that people must not be the French but the Germans; while the French, on the other hand, are more Teutonic in blood than the

Germans. This seemingly startling view will cease to surprise when it is remembered that France was the abode of the Franks, the Burgundians, the Visigoths, and the Normans, all of whom were of Germanic origin.

Speaking absolutely, it is probably correct to say that no entire single race has ever formed one nationality. It is certainly the case that there has been constant intermingling of races ever since society emerged from the primitive stages. The development of nationalities is frequently the history of the voluntary or compulsory rapprochement of different nations. As I. Zangwill (1) aptly remarked: "Turn Time's Cinematograph back far enough, and the Germans are found to be French and the French Germans".

Pope Leo XIII, as cited by J.J. Wright (2), conceded that apart from the unhappy sense which the word "Americanism" may have when applied to separatist opinion in the religious sphere, there exists an unimpeachable sense which the word may have as the description of those "*morum aliarumque dotum Americanis peculiarium*", those usages and distinctive traits of the American people by which they are set apart from the rest of men and which form the core of the fact of an American nation, always understanding nation in a sociological sense. When Leo XIII

-
- | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------|
| 1. Zangwill, I. | The Principle of Nationalities | p. 47 |
| 2. Wright, J.J. | Nationalism and Patriotism in Papal Teachings. | |

described the rise of a new nation with a new fatherland, a *genus americanum*, composed of peoples from all corners of the old world, yet sharing now a common national character and a common national spirit, he implicitly excluded, as an intrinsic determinant of the fact of fatherland, any theory of racial purity.

The impossibility of conceiving a patriotism based on racial homogeneity in the United States, or in any part of it, is immediately evident. Sinclair Lewis' description of Martin Arrowsmith^{who} "was, like most inhabitants of El Mills before the Slavo-Italian immigration, a typical purebred Anglo-Saxon American, which means that he was a union of German, French, Scotch, Irish, and perhaps a little of Spanish, conceivably a little of the strains lumped together as Jewish, and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Britain, Celt Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane and Swede..."

Thus it can be clearly seen that no nation, and as a matter of fact, no individual, is of pure, unmixed, racial stock. Race and nationality are not co-terminous. Each nation contains streams of blood from various sources. There is no nation in the world that is not of a mixed race. The Germans contain considerable Slavic blood combined with that of other nations. The English nationality consists of a mixture of Normans, Saxons, Danes, Scotch, Irish, etc. The Russians contain considerable

proportions of the Tartars and Finnish peoples. The same applies to other nations, as we have seen from the numerous examples cited above. There has never been a race, Teutonic, Slavonic, Celtic, or the like, which has succeeded in including all its members within a single national entity. The present Greek, Italian, Roumanian, and American nations are mixed peoples, just as are the new nations in South America. In many instances, where nationality is most diverse, race may be quite uniform. Nationality and race may coincide, but race seems to be prejudiced to the evolution of national solidarity. Nationality is not based essentially on race, and in fact it develops from an indiscriminate mixture of races as indicated somewhere else in this chapter.

Apart from the fact that there is not an entire single race that has ever formed one nationality, and that there is no nation that is not of a mixed race; the theory of race, as it was discussed somewhere else, fails to stand up to any adequate test. The racial theory assumes purity of race where it demonstrably does not exist. H. Somerville (1) writes that only a few scholars take these physical race theories seriously. In history we cannot trace these physical races except in the most shadowy way. It is states and nations, political nor physical groups, that have mattered most in history. The peoples

1. Somerville, H. A Course in Social Science for
Catholic Clubs pp. 52-53

that have walked in the highroads of history and civilization have been inextricably mixed in their breeding. G. Partridge (1), synthesizing the objections of scientific authorities against the possibility of making race the criterion of national groupings, states that all races have become mixed and kinship in a group has ceased to exist in fact. Race, even in its widest sense, cannot be the determinant of the visible realities which are nations.

Thus, unity of race and a common origin cannot serve as an absolute basis for nationality, and national unity, and the two concepts of race and nation should be kept distinct.

1. Partridge, G. The Psychology of Nations p. 226

CHAPTER IV

The Origin of Nationality

How does a nation come into being? How does it develop its national consciousness?

J.J. Wright (1) states that by eliminating the racist theory which determines nationality in the biological order and the statist theory by which it would be determined in the judicial order, it becomes apparent that the nation does not come into being by the operation of any blind and deterministic necessity beyond the control of men and imposing itself upon the action of their wills in such wise as to claim of them instinctive patriotism.

Herein lies the fundamental point of difference between the Catholic concept of society in all its forms, the national society among them, and any materialistic concept of the same. The latter is bound always to resolve itself into a deterministic interpretation of society; the former, starting as it does in all social theory from the primacy of spiritual personality, must see in the rise of human societies no mere blind involuntary forces at work, but rather, as Pope Leo XIII expressed it, the operation of those historic and national circumstances, always human, which give rise within a nation to its traditional, and indeed, its fundamental laws.

Inasmuch as it is a form of society, the nation represents the operation of human forces. As a particular form of society, however, the nation is brought even closer to the human form as its norm and cause;

1. Wright, J.J. Nationality and Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp.52-55

for the very forms which society takes in order to achieve this end and, therefore, the national society as one of these forms, are themselves determined by human nature and the needs of human personality. A nation comes into existence in response to some particular human, i.e. personal - exigencies. The fundamental exigency by which society and any form of it comes into existence arises from the fact that it is not good for man to be alone. Human nature bears constant witness to its recognition of the truth of the cry *Vae Soli!*

Let us now substantiate the above statement by tracing the approximate path by which a nation came into being.

No individual is sufficient unto himself. No one, however gifted, can maintain his existence or perfect his mind and heart, save, in that society in which he is called to live. Man has a personal destiny; society is for him the necessary means that helps him to attain his proper end. His rights flow from his nature but they are subject, on the part of society, to certain limitations which community life imposes. The above statement is taken from "A Code of Social Principles", issued by the Catholic Social Guild.

H. Sommerville (1) contends that man has, by his nature, physical, intellectual, and moral needs and faculties. These can be satisfied and exercised only in association with other human beings. Man owes his birth and rearing to the association of his parents. He could not develop his mind beyond the most rudimentary state except by contact with other minds. The knowledge he acquires is almost entirely gained

1. Sommerville, H. A Course of Social Science for Catholic Clubs
pp. 7-8

through other human beings with whom he has conscious intercourse, that is to say, in social relations. Man's intellectual dependence on society is even more complete than his physical dependence. The development of man's moral nature in a non-social state could rise no higher than his mental development. In the true sense of morality only a rational act is a moral act; the non-social man, being scarcely rational, could scarcely be moral. Society, therefore, is necessary to man.

What is a society? Sommerville gives the following explanation: a society is a group of human beings united for the purpose of obtaining a common good. The term society is limited to human groupings. There are, it is true, extraordinarily interesting animal groupings, such as a hive of bees, where the power of instinct results in marvellous organization, but this is a non-rational society. Human societies alone are rational and this makes them as different from animal groups as man is different from animal. A society is a group united for a purpose; unity for a purpose means cooperation in means as well as community of aim. Society is for common not separate goods.

From this point of view it is clear that a nation is a society and that the origin of the institution of nationality may be traced to the primitive society of the distant past. In the earliest stages of human progress and human organization, the bond of union between human beings was very slight. E. Jenks (1) states that at the primitive stage the form of human organization appears to be mainly a group of people engaged in hunting together, a cooperative or communal society for the acquisition of food supply. It would really be better to call it

1. Jenks, E. A History of Politics pp. 8-9

the "pack", for it far more resembles a hunting rather than a social organization. All its members are entitled to a share in the proceeds of the day's chase, and, quite naturally, they camp and live together. But they are not sharply divided for other purposes from other "packs" living in the neighbourhood. On the contrary, they frequently mingle with them and a social relationship extends over vast areas of the (Australian) continent. In other words, man is definitely of a gregarious nature for the practical advantages growing out of a larger range of social activities. The survival of man in earliest times could be assured only through the development of human communities.

The most logical theory as to the beginning of the origin of nations seems to be given in the Bible. In the beginning there were two people, Adam and Eve; they multiplied, and in the course of time, a race, let us presume the Aryan, was established. "And the whole earth was one language and one kind of words". The rigors, however, of the struggle with nature for a livelihood tended to limit the numbers of the group; it encouraged the formation of fresh groups when pressure upon the means of subsistence and the need for different cultural expression became acute.

Thus a group would detach itself from its racial tribe and settle in some other country. "Now the Lord hath said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country and out of thy birthplace and from thy father's house unto the land that I will show thee. And I will make you a great nation". Thus, a group of people detached itself from its original stock and moved into a new land and new environmental conditions. At this point we find the beginnings of nationality. For while a group

lived together, they were subject to the same cultural and environmental conditions which made them united into one cohesive unit. There could be no question of nationality or national differences because the group was one, bound by the same cultural and material bonds and solving its cultural and material problems in one specific way.

At the moment of detachment, however, the binding forces of the old group were severed. The detached group, instead of being an integral part of a larger, social, economic, and cultural unit, became a unit unto itself. Becoming independent it was forced to search for its own specific solution of its cultural and material problems. Under the influence of a new environment, the detached group was bound to develop new forms of industry, new ways of life, and new cultural concepts. This is clear. The Eskimos, living in the region of the North Pole, cannot possibly solve their material and cultural needs in the same manner as the French living in Middle Europe. The geographical environment, the natural resources, the climate, and the conditions of life, influenced and were responsible for different modes of life, different cultures, different beliefs, etc.

H.T. Buckle (1) drawing a forceful comparison between the religion of ancient Greece and of India, pointed out that the Gods of India were terrible Gods, hideous to view, and monstrous creations of a terrified fancy. This was because the works of nature in India are on a colossal and intimidating scale. Noble mountains and mighty rivers, impassable forests, jungles, dreary and boundless deserts, - all speak to

1. Buckle, H.T.

man of his feebleness and inspire him with awe, with superstitious dread. But the gods of Greece were friendly beings. Men conceived them in their own image, with human forms, with face, with characters, and with passions. This is because the surrounding phenomena in Greece were such as to give confidence: the climate was healthful, the streams were small, and none of the mountains wore the eternal diadem of snow. Thus we can see that people, though originating from one stock, can, because of unequal conditions of life, develop two cultures and become two nations.

From anthropology we learn that at the beginning stage of social and cultural life there was a mutual adherence to a common cult or religion. As E. Jenks (1) points out at the beginning stage of social development the differentiating force was that of the totem. The totem group is primarily a body of persons, distinguished by the sign of some natural object, such as an animal or tree, who may not intermarry with one another. Thus a binding force of this kind at once differentiated groups from each other, giving them a peculiar individuality; elements of competition, which were bound to grow up between different groups in search of sustenance, contributed to their segregation; thus a consciousness of kind took shape; also a belief of physical kinship. This feeling of kinship took a more pronounced form in the tribe. The members of the tribe believed themselves to be blood relations, descended from a common ancestor. There was also a mutual attraction by reason of family relationship or intermarriage. The fact of a geographical proximity,

1. Jenks, E.

Ibid pp. 20-21

mutual economic interest, and a constant social intercourse, tended to fortify the sense of kinship and gave the [†]tribe a feeling of oneness. One of the very strongest factors in tribal unity was the religious belief of the tribe.

The substitution of agriculture for the keeping of flocks and herds created a new social relationship among the tribes. A process took place whereby, at some period or other, the realization came to several independent tribes that they were characterized by certain similar attributes. Because of the new agricultural stage in their economic life, they felt a natural desire to live a united group life. In other words, a process took place whereby the tribal society was changed to a territorial society. Out of this realization of oneness between various tribes, and because of a permanent occupation of a certain territory, came the idea of nationality.

As traditions took root and customs became more fixed, the consciousness of kind among former diverse tribal groups became more pronounced. There is no doubt that the new forms of government, which were evolved as a result of territorial cooperation between tribes, contributed to the growth of nationality. There was a welding together by conquest and subsequent administration of a number of small independent communities into a state or empire.

The common allegiance to the head of the state, the general sentiment of solidarity, the promotion of a uniform mode of life, and of a common language, seemed to promote ever stronger the concept of nationality. B. Joseph (1) states that in antiquity nationality meant the existence

1. Joseph, B. Nationality p. 165

of common observances, habits and beliefs among members of the group, and adherence to these common factors constituted membership in the nationality. Thus a member of the group, though continuing to live within it, ceased to be counted as a member if he abandoned the national observances and beliefs, and adopted those of another folk. He would, however, remain a member of the group although he took up his residence away from it, so long as he faithfully adhered to its habits, customs, and beliefs. The argument of Jephthah, justifying the retention by the Israelites of the territory claimed by the Ammonites (Judges XI. 24), illustrates this well. Evidently neither party could have conceived of the nationalization of an Israelite in Ammon without his recognition of Chemosh as his god; nor of an Ammonite being adopted into the Israelites' nationality without his embracing the cult of Jehovah.

It becomes quite clear from this that nationality was primarily based upon culture as expressed in its highest form; religion, rather than based on political allegiance. This also becomes clear from the history of the four great ancient empires. S. Herbert (1) writes that neither Egypt nor Babylonia, neither Syria nor Persia, developed the ideal of nationality in our sense of the word. All four were essentially great military and theocratic states held together by dynastic and religious bond, and pursuing careers of conquest and exploration by which masses of servile and alien populations were brought under control. Yet it is within the epoch covered by the rise and fall of these empires, and in the communities closely associated with them: Judea and Greece, that we find the first evidence, not perhaps of a fully developed nationality, but at least of its clear foreshadowings.

1. Herbert, S. Nationality and its Problems pp. 58-64

Taking for example the Jewish people, we see them beginning as a tribal federation, then passing to a typical oriental monarchy, which finally divides into two portions: one of which is overwhelmed and absorbed by a conqueror, and the other continues the work of consolidation, where social life is made to center around Jerusalem and its temple. With the political revolution, a religious transformation takes place. The old local cults and holy places are ruthlessly destroyed, and along with them the last remnants of racial tribalism. The traditional literature is revised and a fresh code of legislation is enforced.

The result is a unitary society, intensely theocratic in spirit and organization, finding its binding force in religion and the territorial associations connected with that religion. Both these elements of unity are strengthened by a long exile from, and subsequently, restoration to, the ancestral home. We can see thus, that the consciousness of kind among the Jews was a cultural consciousness predominantly religious in form. In the references to the Holy City, to Jerusalem, in post-exile literature, the blending of the religious and national elements is obvious. If the homeland is the subject of profound emotion, it is because the homeland is also the Holy Land, Zion. The very customs and habits of life, which, in Hebrew society, formed so powerful a bond of union, derived their strength very largely from religious sanctions.

To summarize, we can say that a nation came into existence by a slow and gradual process of social development. At first a number of individuals were held together by common social tendencies of mankind, such as gregariousness, common needs, etc.; at a later stage common ideals developed for all its members. The possession of ideals and willingness

to act to maintain them, constitute national consciousness. It is the existence of the common group of ideals that determines the differences between groups. National feeling arises and becomes intensified as a result of a twofold process of isolation and contrast to the outside world, and cohesion and drawing together within, states M. Boehm(1). The result is not only the demarcation of one nation from another, but also, as regards the individual, a struggle between the group consciousness of the nation and that of other social groups. In this struggle the national ideal asserts itself as the bearer of a principle of solidarity against all other forms of group consciousness.

The longer a nationality exists the longer its peculiar social rules and regulations leave an imprint upon the human mind, upon the psychic life and usages of the members of the nation. These culturally conditioned psychic imprints are transmitted from generation to generation, forming the national character and national consciousness. It is the consciousness of kind, coupled with the obscure but very real aspiration for cultural and spiritual self-realization, that gradually developed distinct nationalities.

CHAPTER V

Geography, Homeland, and Nationality

R. Muir (1) discussing the ties of affinity which are necessary to constitute a nation, indicates that the occupation of a defined geographical area with a character of its own is often assumed to be one; and undoubtedly, the most clearly marked nations have commonly enjoyed a geographical unity, and have often owed their nationhood in part to this fact, and to the loss of the soil on which they have been bred, and to the love of its characteristic landscapes. But geographical unity is by no means essential to nationhood. It is possible to imagine a nation widely scattered, like the Greeks, over areas of very different characters, and yet retaining a strong sense of its unity. And in actual fact the limits of some of the most clearly marked nationalities are by no means plainly indicated by natural features of the soil.

The Poles, for example, one of the most persistent and passionate of European nationalities, occupy an area which has no clearly defined geographical limits on any side. The line of geographical divisions between French and German lands, seems for the most part purely accidental. On the other hand, the real geographical unity which belongs to the Hungarian plain, with its ring of encircling mountains and its single great river system, has not availed to create national unity.

The theory of "territorial" or "natural frontiers" as a necessary determinant of nationality is no longer seriously advanced. The main thesis of the theory is that national character is the direct result

1. Muir, R. Nationalism and Internationalism pp. 38-39

of geographical and climatic conditions. J. Oakesmith (1) discussing this theory as exposed by Von Ihring in his work on the "Evolution of the Aryan" describes his main thesis as that the various colonizing offshoots of the original Aryan stock, whose habitat he places in Central Asia, were all marked when they left home by the same national Aryan character, the product of the geographical and climatic situation of the original fatherland.

The differences which were subsequently developed between the Celtic, Teutonic, Slavonic, Greek, Roman, Iranian, and Hindu national characters, were entirely due to the different physical environment in which these various peoples settled. "The soil is the nation", - that was the pregnant phrase in which Von Ihring summarized his conclusions.

Criticising this contention, J. Oakesmith writes that as soon as Von Ihring's array of facts and arguments convinces the reader that here is a writer who has found the truth, he perplexes and disturbs beyond expression, by asserting that the first formation of the national character under the influence of the environment is final, decisive, and unchangeable, and is henceforth transmitted by racial heredity; a theory exemplified by his statement that the character of the Celts and the character of the Teutons, as described by Caesar and Tacitus, are fundamentally the same as those of their respective descendants today. If this view be correct, states Oakesmith, we must believe that the Teutons, for example, when they left Central Asia, with the fully formed national Aryan character which they had obtained under the geographical conditions prevailing there, had this fully formed national character profoundly

1. Oakesmith, J. Race and Nationality pp. 25 - 27

modified by the new geographical conditions of their European habitat; and that at some time before the end of the first Christian century, when Tacitus wrote his account of Germany, they had acquired a new national character, which has since been transmitted unchanged from generation to generation.

But if the character of the Germans was due to their geographical position, and if that character has remained fundamentally unaltered for at least 2000 years, to what cause are we to assign the failure of the soil to continue its developing influence? At what point are we to fix the cessation of its power? At what particular moment in the history of a people does its geographical position cease to affect the character which it has produced? We had extensive shiftings and interminglings of populations during the first millenium of our era, and if it is true that the national character depends upon the geographical situation, there can be no such thing as the crystallization of the national character.

P.T. Moon (1) suggests that geographic isolation will admittedly continue to be an important factor in the formation of nations, such as England and America. He notes the obvious effect on American nationalism of the existence of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans as the bounds of the continent, also the function of the Pyrenees as a wall between France and Spain, or the Danube between Bulgaria and Rumania.

Geography will inevitably play an important role in the determination of national boundaries, and especially, in influencing the nature and the rapidity of the development of national civilizations, in the light

1. Moon, P.T. Syllabus on International Relations pp. 9-11

of the resources and the of the climate of a land. J.J. Wright (1) states that in comparison with other facts contributing to form a people's nationality and patriotism, geographical factors will always be relatively unimportant, because, even in its own sphere as a material element, geography provides no clear and constant explanation of national divisions.

International boundaries are often purely artificial. Consider the boundaries between Canada and the United States of America; between Belgium and France; between Spain and Portugal; etc. Clarifying the Catholic point of view on the subject, J.J. Wright points out the subordination of mere territory to other determinants of the fact of nationality in papal teaching is indicated by the fact that in disputes between recognized nations concerning the boundaries of their territories, the equitable solution is declared to lie in the just aspirations of the peoples concerned, rather than in the land itself, while the mutability of merely territorial factors is implied in Pope Pius XI's (2) declaration, setting this norm, that the "Church...admits without any difficulty, legitimate political and territorial changes of peoples".

Thus, geographical unity may help to make a nation, but it is not indispensable, nor is it the main source of nationhood.

C. Hayes (3) holds that when we consider that some four nationalities: Portuguese, Castilian, Catalan, and Basque, coexist on the geographical unit known as the Iberian Peninsula; that the Polish and Magyar nation-

-
1. Wright, J.J. National Patriotism in Papal Teachings p. 31
 2. Letter Dopo gli ultimi A A S, X (198) p. 479
 3. Hayes, C. Essays on Nation p. 7

alities occupy parts, and only parts of great plains; that the Greek nationality inhabits rocky crests and islands; that the Norwegian geography is similar in many significant aspects to Swedish; Yugoslav to Bulgarian; and even the German to French; we must conclude that the idea of natural frontiers between nationalities is a myth.

On the other hand, should we regard native soil as associated with the human and social experiences which, as we shall see later, are the dominant elements of nationality and patriotism, then a geographical area assumes a new importance. It becomes a *terre commune* around which a nation weaves its history, traditions, and reminiscences.

Human history decidedly points to the fact, that every nation, at one time or another in its period of existence, enjoyed a continuous period of national life within the boundaries of a definite territory. There is no doubt that the most clearly defined nations have always had the benefit of a stable territory, which greatly enhanced their feeling of nationhood and national unity. A homeland always seemed to play a vital role in the life of a nation.

J. Mazzini (1) expressed the idea that the sentiment of nationality is given greatest expression by the enduring passion of the members of a nationality for their national homeland. A national territory provides fertile ground for all aspects of culture such as tradition, historical associations, language, literature. All these elements, nurtured in a homeland, contribute to a greater individuality and distinction of the nation.

1. Mazzini, J. Collected Works

H. Laski (1) points out that the sentiment of nationality cannot gather around an idea or a memory or a programme. Without the element of environment, the actual physical territory and what man has made of it, to form the framework and receptacle, as it were, of the national ideal, the sentiment of nationality would wither, lose its warmth and concreteness, which constitute so large a part of its appeal. It would have disappeared into the clouds which have swallowed up so many unattached idealisms in the past.

The individuality of a nation is best expressed in its everyday life, in a homeland of its own. The character of a nation is molded in the homeland because national culture, which is the mother of national consciousness, can flourish and grow fully only in a national atmosphere created by a homeland.

A homeland acts also as a unifying and preserving factor in nationality. People are usually attached to the place of their birth. The affection for a homeland, for the land where the ancestors lived, and around which they left the aura of their historical and cultural history and the halo of their religious traditions, unifies and solidifies the sentiment of nationality. J. Mazzini (1), the most ardent leader of the National revival of the nineteenth century, when addressing the Italians, implored them to love their country. "Our country is our home", he said, "the house that God has given us, placing therein a numerous family that loves us and whom we love; a family with whom we sympathize more readily, and whom we understand more quickly than

-
1. Laski, H. Grammar of Politics pp. 121-124
 2. Mazzini, J. Collected Works

we do others; and which forms its being centered round a given spot; and from the homogeneous nature of its elements, is adapted to a special branch of activity. Our country is our common workshop whence the product of our activity is sent forth for the benefit of the whole world, wherein the implements and tools of labour we can most usefully employ are gathered together".

Perhaps the most passionate devotion and undying sentiment of a people to its lost homeland can be seen in the case of the Jewish nation. Twenty-five hundred years ago, when the First Jewish Commonwealth was destroyed and thousands of Jews were driven as captives to Babylon, the famous psalm "By the Waters of Babylon", which expresses the yearning of the Jews for their homeland was composed:

"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,
 Let my right hand forget its cunning;
 Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth
 If I remember thee not,
 If I recall not Jerusalem
 On the day of my chiefest joy".

These passionate words the Jews repeated throughout the ages, thus fostering a strong sentimental persuasion towards its lost homeland.

A homeland appears very often also as a symbol of nationality. All national anthems and patriotic songs symbolize nationality in terms of the national homeland.

Thus, there can be no doubt that a homeland, a clearly defined geographical area, is an important fostering element in the concept of nationality, though it cannot be considered as an indispensable factor of it.

CHAPTER XI

State and Nationality

M.H. Boehm (1) analysing the concepts: nation and nationality, states that the two concepts have been subject to two interpretations. According to one interpretation, the tendency in national development has been to efface the boundaries between nation and state, so that at a certain stage, states automatically become transformed into nations. Nationality thus implies the formal adherence of an individual to the state. The Polish nationality, in this sense, includes all the subjects or citizens of the Polish state, irrespective of the language they speak or the ethnic group to which they belong. In contrast to this political concept of a nation and nationality, there is the view of the nation as a more ethnic and cultural phenomenon. Differences in language and culture, as well as variations in religion, race and customs, result in the formation of social groups, which, independent of political boundaries, constitute fundamental national units. Nationality thus signifies adherence to a people rather than to a state. In this sense, nationality refers to a people or a group, which independent of its political aims, forms a totality relatively wider and more comprehensive in character. Thus the Polish nationality in Europe includes all the Poles in Europe. It follows that not every modern state is to be identified with a nation.

From the above it is clear that there is a tendency to confuse nationality and state, and that there is a lack of clarity of the relationship

1. Boehm, M.H. Nationalism, Encyc. of Social Sciences pp. 231-251

between nationality and state. In order to clarify the subject, we shall discuss the nature of the state and decide, on the basis of this discussion, whether or not the state is a necessary determinant of the fact of nationality.

Human beings function through a certain number of societies. There are societies formed for many different purposes. A society which is organized for purposes of government, for law and order, for keeping the peace and maintaining justice, is called a state. A state is, thus, a political society which provides for the common good of its members within a given territory, and whom this common territory has made mutually interdependent. The state is usually an independent society, its membership is all embracing and it is not subject to some other society.

There is no doubt that the functions of the state were recognized and understood long before the idea of nationality became a potent force. It appears, however, that the embryo of nationality existed as long as human civilization exists, though the national group did not have the same cohesive elements as it possesses at present. Thus, C.H. Hayes(1) points out that from anthropological studies it is obvious that the tribalism which exists among primitive peoples today, and which presumably flourished generally before the dawn of human history, is a kind of nationalism. Each tribe has a normally distinctive speech or dialect, a peculiar pattern of social organization and cultural and religious observances.

From historical studies, however, it is equally obvious that through-

1. Hayes C.H. Historical Development of Nationality pp. 43-44

out most of the period of recorded history, say from 5000 B.C. to 1700 A.D., and wherever civilization was most advanced, the earlier and primitive tribal nationalism tended to be submerged. What submerged it and long kept it submerged, was a combination of several historical developments which substituted new types of human groupings and new objects of human patriotism. One was the advance and domestication of animals and plants and the expanding use of copper, iron, and boats, which emphasized the interdependence of tribes. Another was the conquest and consolidation of tribes by military empires, such as the Egyptian, the Assyrian, the Chinese, the Persian, the Roman, and the Arabian. A third was the spread of intertribal religions, such as Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. A fourth was the development of literary languages, such as Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Chinese, and their use by intellectuals of many different tribes in preference to the several tribal dialects of the illiterate.

It should not be assumed, however, that there was no consciousness of nationality among civilized peoples in ancient or mediæval times. The fusion of tribes in an empire or a theocracy often served to create a fairly large community which can properly be termed a nationality, with kindred language, customs, and traditions, whose members were quite aware that they were alike among themselves and different from foreigners, and on occasion they could evince a real nationalism. There were such occasions in the history of the ancient Egyptians, Jews, and Greeks. It seems therefore that nationality was antecedent to the existence of the state and that nationality is older than the modern state.

The modern progress of nationalism witnessed, however, the development

of the modern nation-state. The fact remains, however, that the two concepts cannot be confused. Thus, Monsignor Pasquazi (1), Dean of the Civil Law Faculty in the Pontifical Roman Athenaeum, writes that the notion of state is distinguished from the notion of nation; for while the notion of nation is psychological and ethnographical, the notion of state is rather juridicial and political. The state comprises all those who have, somehow, the same national characteristics, that is: origin, historical tradition, language, character, culture, etc. Wherefore there can be had states which include many nations or subjects of many nationalities, as for example, Belgium and Switzerland; nations comprising many states, as Italy before its political unity or Poland which was once a part of three states; or a single nation and a single state, that is, a state having all its subjects and only subjects of a single nationality.

B. Joseph (2) states that it must be conceded that the union of a group of persons in a single state would not of itself have sufficed to form them into a single nationality. On the contrary, it would have been quite feasible for several distinct national groups to be welded into a single state without becoming one nationality. This, indeed, so happened in the case of Great Britain. There is further consideration that frequently a single nationality is not united in political allegiance to one sovereign. Thus political unity can by no means be said to characterize the Armenians or the Jews. He quotes H. Laski as saying

1. Monsignor Pasquazi *Ius Internationale Publicum*, quoted by J.J. Wright in *Patriotism in Papal Teachings* pp. 43-44
 2. Joseph *Nationality* pp. 140-141

that political allegiance does not explain anything, because the history of the nineteenth century is largely the history of changes of allegiance effected in nationalist terms.

J.J. Wright (1), discussing the papal pronouncements upon the subject, contends that the whole reason for the state's existence, in the doctrine of the Holy See, is the superintendence and juridical ordering of the good of individuals and the community. The community being evidently considered as enjoying an existence and ends of its own antecedent, logically at least, to the existence of the state, so that it, too, is part of that order of nature which the "Ordo politicus recipit, non facit". He quotes Pope Pius XI as declaring that the genuine and chief function of public and civil authority consists precisely in the efficacious furthering of the harmony and coordination of all social forces. The function of the state will be most easily discharged with respect to the social force which is the nation, if the form the state takes be in conformity with the national character of the fatherland, and so the patriot may prefer any form of state he chooses and seek to change the existing civil order by any legitimate means at his disposition. He is not, however, equally free to withdraw his support from the fatherland itself, whatever its civil organization. But in all changes of civil organization through which the fatherland may pass in its varying relations with the state, he remains constantly attached to it.

During the years of the political division of Poland, the Popes, while exhorting the Polish people to fulfill their obligation in legal justice towards the states in which they were subject, never failed to remind

1. Wright, J.J. Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp. 48-51

them that they continued to remain a true nation with a patriotism of its own.

From this point of view a state is not an essential determinant of nationality, the state being a juridical institution, while nationality is a psychological, ethnic, and cultural institution.

The same idea, with some pointed illustration, is given by S. Herbert (1). He asks the question whether or not state and nation are identical and his reply is in the negative. The link which binds the citizens of a state together is that of political allegiance, of submission to a common law. This clearly need not be the case with the human beings who make up a nation.

England and Scotland are united under one crown, one parliament makes laws for them both, but Scotsmen do not, therefore, feel themselves to be Englishmen. All the natives of British India are governed by the King-Emperor; he gives them their laws, and controls through his ministers, the administration which carries those laws into effect. But does that fact make an Indian nation? Certain is the fact that the idea of a common nationality has arisen in India, and is daily making conquests of men's hearts and minds. But the wild Bhil who lives in the jungle, and who, not long since, was wont to offer up human sacrifices to his tribal gods, has nothing, or but very little, in common with the Bengals who have received a European education, and are devout theists after the manner of the Brahmo-Samaj. An even better example is that of the Hebrew nation. The Jewish people are scattered all over the face of the earth.

1. Herbert, S. Nationality and Its Problems pp. 18-66

There is no state at present which is definitely Jewish, but does that reflect, and who will deny, the existence of a Jewish nationality?

CHAPTER VII

Language and Nationality

A nation is a social reality. Since the manner of conceiving social reality is largely verbal, since communication through spoken and written language is so vital to the continuance of social reality, the significance of a language to the development and growth of nationality and of a national consciousness becomes immediately apparent. K. Young (1) reflecting upon the role of language in communication and culture states that language is the carrier of a vast amount of what we call culture. Knowledge of the past, techniques of science and food getting, taboos and social rituals - all are carried in language, or at least have language counterparts. Language carries for the individual the social definitions of the situations, the world of discourse, and the whole range of culture content which impinges upon him. It is the medium of interaction without which social life could not develop, without which the individual could not become intelligent.

The relation of language to thought is a difficult and elusive problem. However, as O. Kleinberg (2) states, whether or not language is to be identified with thought, there can be no doubt that thinking in the large majority of cases does require the use of language, and that the nature of language has an important influence on the nature of thought. As one has aptly remarked: "If language is ultimately a creation of intellect, yet hardly less fundamentally is intellect a creation of language". Language and thought are intimately related and mutually in-

-
1. Young, Kimbel
 2. Kleinberg, O.

Social Psychology
Social Psychology

p. 203
p. 42

fluence each other. Language and forms of thought furnish the atmosphere of social behaviour. It serves as a cohesive force uniting human groups and setting them apart from others.

E. Sapir (1) points out that language, a common speech, is an index of the social solidarity of a group. Much of the opposition between the in-group and the out-group reported for the most primitive, as well as for the most complex societies may probably be explained by the fact that the groups cannot understand each other. From the point of view of social relationships language appeared to be one of the fundamental facts of human social life, serving as an instrument of thought and communication, as a means of controlling the actions of others, and as a cohesive force uniting the members of a particular community.

One of the most obvious elements of nationality is language. Though it has been recognized that language is not a necessary determinant of nationality and that a separate, native language is not an absolutely essential attribute of a nation, R. Muir (2) writes that unity of language is unquestionably a binding force of the utmost importance, more especially the color and quality of a language largely determine the color and quality of the thought of those who use it. A common language means a common literature, a common inspiration of great ideal, a common heritage of songs and folk tales embodying and impressing upon each generation, the national point of view.

S. de Madiagara (1) observes that languages are the most direct expression of national character. They are the first impress of the mind of

-
- | | | |
|---------------------|--|-------------|
| 1. Sapir, E | Language and Encyc. of Social Sciences | pp. 155-169 |
| 2. Muir, R | Nationalism and Internationalism | pp. 41-44 |
| 3. Madiagara, S. de | Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniard | pp. 182-183 |

Men on the outer world. The words he coins in order to describe objects and emotions closely correspond to his idea of them: the system he contrives in order to use such words is a direct image of his way of thinking. H. Rose (1) indicates that a people cannot attain its full powers until its thoughts are wedded to a mother tongue, until that mother tongue ceases to stammer and learns to sing.

Father Fessard (2) observes, that language provides the primal medium by which the individual becomes aware of "self" and "others-than-self"; the knowledge he possesses of the latter comes to him by languages - and by language he is rendering his knowledge to his own self-objective, becomes enabled to share with others the treasures of his own self-consciousness.

Writing about language as one of the social goods uniting men into nations J.J. Wright (3) states that language is an apt symbol of man's social nature and of the necessity by which society comes into being. He quotes Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Diuturnum, Acta Leonis, 11, p.274, indicating that language is an efficient cause of society and that "indeed, that men should live in society is commanded by nature, or rather by God, the Author of Nature. This is clearly demonstrated by the faculty of speech, the principia concilliating force in society (maxima societatis conciliatrix), by a great many innate appetites of the mind, etc". He proceeds to explain that if language, inasmuch as it is a mere medium of bare communication between men, constitutes a general social bond amongst them, particular languages,

-
1. Rose, H. Nationality in Modern History p. 13
 2. Father Fessard Pax Nostra pp. 194-196, cited by J.J.Wright ibid
 3. J.J. Wright Nationalism and Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp.56-57

"qui tient sa langue tient la clef qui le delivre de ses chaines". Mourret brings this statement in commentary on Pope Leo XIII's appeal to the patriotic devotion of the Slavs to Saints Cyril and Methodius, pointing out that the basis of the patriotic devotion of these people to their great saints was not only the fact that from them they received other national religious traditions, but also the fact that by them was purified and systematized the writing of the Slavic language, and by them was obtained from Rome the privilege of employing the national tongue in their liturgy.

B. Joseph (1) contends that persons who think alike and have similar interests gradually develop a group consciousness which is the basis of the formation of nationalities. Language is the most visible and tangible of that like-mindedness which is indispensable to a fully developed nationality. M. Muir (2), emphasizing this contention states that there is indeed nothing that will so readily give unity to divergent races as the use of a common tongue, and in very many cases unity of language and the community of ideas which it brings, have proven the main binding force of a nation. As an illustration of the indispensability of language in the formation of nationalities, he cites the fact that there was scarcely any racial affinity between the people of northern Italy and those of the extreme south. However, they spoke a common language, which had been standardized by a great literature. But for this, how could Mazzini's young associates have appealed to all the Italians?

On the other hand, it should be indicated, as we have done so in the

-
- | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-------|
| 1. Joseph, B. | Nationality | p. 55 |
| 2. Muir, M. | Ibid | p. 43 |

beginning of our discussion on the importance of language to nationality, that a separate language is not an absolutely essential attribute of a nation, and that disunity of language does not necessarily prevent national unity. J.J. Wright (1) emphasizes that the claims of language as a scientific and necessary determinant of nationality are likewise contradicted by experience.

True, the possession of a national language constitutes the chief and most effective argument of subject nationalities when these are bent on securing political independence. But such linguistic considerations are rarely more than convenient and ready evidences of the existence of a national society already constituted by other factors. It is true that language too continues to be invoked in campaigns in the name of irredentism as it was in Italy before the Great War, and as it was in the case of the Greek demand for the Union of all Greek-speaking populations with Greece, and in the German desire for the Anschluss with Austria. None will the fact that language was used by the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 as the chief basis for redrawing the map of Europe convince the realist that the linguistic norm provides a clear-cut and infallible means of determining the extent of a nation, or that language suffices as the object of national loyalty in predominance over economic interests, historical considerations, or cultural traditions.

There are many nations which include several linguistic groups. There are also different nations employing the same identical tongues. The Spanish language dominates Central and South America, though these

1. Wright, J.J.

Ibid

p. 32

lands have no affinity and do not feel any sense of belonging to Spain. In a few instances, writes W. Sulzbach (1), people speaking different languages share the same government. The majority of the Swiss people speak German, and a minority speak French or Italian, without losing an intense Swiss national consciousness. Belgium has two language groups, one speaking French and the other Flemish. The English-speaking and the French-speaking Canadians manage fairly well together. It is interesting to note, that with regard to Canada, Pope Benedict XV (2) recognizes that within the single Canadian fatherland there exists more than one linguistic group, but only one patriotism, and only one national group in the sense of one gens recognizable as Canadians.

Most nations that comprise several language groups are in danger of being undermined through the quarrels of their language groups. Conversely, people who speak the same language, but are divided into several nations, generally wish to remain separate. The French-Canadian is not eager to join France. The Irish have hated the English for centuries in spite of common use of the English language. The Jews, in addition to their own Hebrew and Yiddish, employ the languages of the nations among whom they reside. But this has not prevented anti-semitism. Negroes in the United States of America, though they speak the language of their country, are not regarded by all white Americans as their equals. The Brazilians speak Portuguese, but they have a strong Brazilian national consciousness. The Spanish-speaking people of South America do not wish to come under Spanish domination, and they

-
1. Sulzbach, W. National Consciousness pp. 45-47
 2. Pope Benedict XV Letteris Apostolicis A A S X (1918)
pp. 440-441 as cited by J.J.Wright ibid

are themselves divided into national groups despite their common language. England and the United States, though bound together by language ties, do not, of course, have the same national consciousness.

However, though language provides no infallible means of differentiating nations, it is to be considered of great potency as a nation-building force. Unity of language, though of great potency as a nation-building force, is neither indispensable to the growth of nationality, nor sufficient of itself to create it. However, by and large, language has been, and still remains one of the prime factors in the formation of nationalities and in promoting and fostering their continued existence.

B. Joseph (1) emphasizes that it cannot be stressed too often that language is the expression of a common spirit and the sole instrument of intellectual intercourse. It is handed down and prized as a national heirloom. It keeps the sense of national solidarity constantly alive by its use on the part of members of the nationality. A national culture has its roots in the speech that is peculiar to that nationality. A language cannot flourish except when it is the peculiar possession of a particular people who cherish and respect it. It can be discarded and cast aside only at the risk of grave disturbance to the national life.

National life is capable of greater fullness of expression through a common language. It is a powerful factor in holding together men who are subject to other unifying influences. Other things being equal,

1. Joseph, B. Ibid pp. 67-69

a nation is more united in proportion to the importance given in actual use to its national language, and from this point of view language is to be considered an important factor in nationality.

CHAPTER VIII

Tradition and Nationality

M. Radin (1) defining the term tradition states that a tradition is not a mere observed fact like an existing custom, but it is an idea which expresses a value judgment. A certain way of acting is regarded as right; a certain order or arrangement is held desirable. The maintenance of this tradition is the assertion of this judgment.

Nationalism can scarcely be understood except as based in some fashion on a common tradition. The effort to create a national unity in Germany during the nineteenth century entailed a struggle to find a common tradition for all Germans in spite of the contrary tradition of separatism. The fact of a common language, since it was a mere fact and not an idea or a value judgment, was far from enough. The members of the young Ireland group, who in the nineteenth century sought to form an Irish nation, avowedly set themselves to create an Irish tradition which was to continue the intellectual standards of an older aristocracy and to apply their methods to distinctively Irish subject matter.

Tradition has a social significance only when the old or the long established idea becomes something of value in the estimation of some or all of the members of a community. Its age or its origin is referred to only as an assurance of value. Tradition produces in a nation or in a group an exalted group consciousness and is therefore most effective in creating groups or in reestablishing them.

1. Radin, M. Tradition - Encyc. of Social Science pp. 63-67

R. Muir (1) asserts that it is probable that the most potent of all nation-moulding factors, the one indispensable factor which must be present whatever else be lacking, is the possession of a common tradition, a memory of sufferings endured and victories won in common, expressed in song and legend, in the dear names of great personalities that seem to embody in themselves the character and ideals of the nation, also in the names of sacred places wherein the national memory is enshrined.

J.J. Wright (2) discussing the subject of cultural, historical and religious traditions as national bonds states that out of legend and lore transmitted in a people's national tongue flow the subjects providing the typically national cultural manifestations of their genius. He emphasizes the importance of tradition by quoting Pope Leo XIII who eulogizes the patriotic bond which unites St. Francis of Assisi and the Italians, since Il Poverello's skillful use of the new born Italian tongue gave rise to the poetry and canticles by him and about him which became the lore of the Italian people.

J.J. Mill (3) states that of the causes that generate the feeling of nationality, the strongest of all is identity of political antecedents, the possession of a national history and consequent community of recollection; collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past.

The outstanding national traditions center around wars and victories.

-
- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Muir, R. | Nationalism and Internationalism | p. 48 |
| 2. Wright, J.J. | Patriotism in Papal Teachings | pp. 58-59 |
| 3. Mill, J.J. | Representative Government | Chapter XVI |

I. Zangwill (1) says that death was the seal of nationality that stamped it as sacred. If men would henceforth die for it, it was because men had died to give it birth. More binding than common blood in the veins is the blood that is shed in common. War seems to be of great importance in the formation of national consciousness.

R. Muir (1) relates that the indestructible nationality of the rude mountaineers of Serbia is not due so much to race or language, or religion, though all these have contributed to form it, as to the proud memory of Stephen Drishan; the tragic memory of Kossova and the four bitter centuries of slavery that followed it; it is deepened by the memory of the long obscure struggle against the Turks from 1804 to 1829, and enriched by the triumphs of 1912 and 1913; it is made imperishable by the heroic sufferings of the men of 1914 and 1915, by their agony of defeat quite as much as by their victories.

Here is the source of that paradox of nationality, that it is intensified by suffering, and, like the giant Anateus in the Greek fable, rises with redoubled strength every time it is beaten into the bosom of its mother earth. Agonies heroically endured, heroic achievements, these are the sublime food by which the spirit of nationhood is nourished. From these are born the imperishable traditions that make the soul of nations. In contrast with them, mere wealth, numbers, or territory seem but vulgar things. When a nation is rich in such memories, the people outside its borders who have with it any affinities of race, language, or religion, will become eager to share in its pride. It is

1. Zangwill, I.	Principles of Nationality	p. 56
2. Muir, R.	Ibid	pp. 48-49

tradition, and above all, the tradition of valiancy in the defense of freedom, that has always been the great maker of nations.

Why are the Dutch a nation? In race, in language, in religion, they have the closest affinity with the Germans, and in the Middle Ages were included in the German Kingdom. They made their nationhood amidst the blood and suffering of the desperate fight for freedom against Spain. These are memories too precious to be willingly sacrificed even for the sake of commercial benefits that might result from incorporation in a great empire.

The Swiss, though made up of detached fragments of three great neighbouring people, are made a nation by memory of their long common defense of freedom among their mountains.

Ernest Renan(1) declares that to have common glories in the past, a common will at present, to have achieved great things together, to intend to achieve them more in the future, is essential for a nation. It must be remembered that there must also be a will for national unity. It is the will for national unity that comes first; tradition, recollection, history, blood shed in common, are consequences of the national will. Group consciousness as it were, is the first essential thing which brings about the other aspects of national glory and makes them blossom.

No one contributes so much to light the flames of national patriotism as the conqueror, who, by attempting to destroy a nation, gives it

1. Renan, E. Qu'est-ce qui une nation? p. 304
cited by Sulzbach in National Consciousness

the approximity of showing that it is inspired by an unconquerable spirit of national liberty, whose appeal finds response in every member of the nation.

Pope Pius XI (1) prays France may cherish in thought action and love under the patronage of Joan d'Arc.

L. Madelin (2) interpreting the enthusiasm of the French troops when faced at Valmy in 1792, tells us that though the French volunteers were raw as opposed to the mechanical discipline of the Prussians, yet they had life and energy and faith. In the straits in which the nation found itself at that time, patriotism became a burning force.

H. Rose (3) discussing the newly aroused national spirit says that the spirit which nerved France and which called upon the French to rise in defense of their fatherland against a foreign conqueror, expressed itself in the appeal of the young poet, Andre Chenier, who wrote: "All ye who have a fatherland and know what it means; ye who the words to live free or die means something; ye who have wives, children, parents, friends for whom you would conquer or die...come forth. Let the nation appear!" And the nation appeared. With the mighty shout "Vive la Nation" the outnumbered French dismayed the invaders.

B. Joseph (4) writes that a national tradition is a prevalent view or recollection or a custom or a practice, of immemorial age, which has become time-honoured and accepted by a particular people. It is the

-
- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. Pope Pius XI | Appostolic letter Galliam AAS XLV p. 187
cited by J.J. Wright ibid p. 60 |
| 2. Madelin, L. | The French Revolution pp. 286-296 |
| 3. Rose, H. | Nationality as a Factor in Modern History |
| 4. Joseph, B. | Nationality p. (cor - 111) |

crystallization of the continued process of thought and life as formed by heredity and environment. It is inevitable that traditions which are the sum total of accumulated habits and learning, affect and influence nationality to a very great extent. Each generation guides its life, in the first instance by the social, political, religious, and philosophical traditions of its ancestors and added to them, making changes only very gradually and never discarding the substance of its inherited traditions.

There is, thus, a continuity of national tradition which moulds the national character and forms the groundwork of the national sentiment. It creates a distinctive attitude towards life and a code of behaviour and reaction peculiar to the nationality. The development of a nationality is characterized by a spiritual evolution, that is to say, by the growth of the body of national traditions. These are the expression of the soul and spirit of nationality. Just as an individual has been formed mainly by his past experiences, so a nationality is essentially a product of its history, glory, and suffering in the past. A living memory of its past enables a nationality to visualize a future of its own. Without tradition to unite its members, a so-called nationality would be nothing more than a grouping of people, and not a nationality in the proper sense of the term.

The customs and traditions by which a nation is welded contain linguistic and literary elements as well as traditional, political, and social institutions. There is no single infallible test of what constitutes a nation. No single factor, neither geographical unity, nor race, nor religious unity, nor a common body of customs, nor community of econo-

mic interests, not even the possession of a common tradition, can be considered as a test of nationality. None of these ties are essential or can be used as a certain criterion. Yet, there is no doubt that the cultural, historical, religious, and traditional factors are the most powerful binding forces. It appears that the true foundation of a nation is spiritual and cultural. A social group which has perfected in the course of generations a certain equality and unity in its spiritual life, in its thoughts and feelings, and possesses a historical fate of which it is conscious, and has a desire for further historical continuity - such a group is a nation.

J. Oakesmith (1) furnished the following explanation for the existence of the phenomenon of nationality. He states that a nation arises when for a considerable time, allied by kin or not, people have been subjected to the same general environment. This identity of environment operates upon the natural capacity of the people so as to produce results in which they have a common interest. A general tradition is formed and gathers strength; the nation grows and strengthens and the process of traditional consolidation begins and continues.

The common environment, in cooperation with the common intellectual and moral capacity, creates a community of interest. In proportion to the strength of this common interest in the common tradition, the national life is vividly felt and strongly expressed. The use which the national genius makes of the national tradition stamps the character of the national life of the period. It may accept the tradition in an entirely acquiescent spirit; it may combine it and re-combine

1. Oakesmith, J. Race and Nationality pp. 88-89

it in forms of startling novelty; it may repudiate and neglect this part or ^esize with great eagerness upon another part; it may approve the wisdom or expose the folly of this or that constituent element. To one part it may apply daring courage, to another part cautious prudence. Here it will be conservative, there revolutionary. But all its actions and attitudes will be stamped by broad similarity due to the fact that all are members of the community, all have been cradled in the common tradition, all have been steeped in it from their birth, all have learnt their earliest and most lasting lessons from it.

Thus, once memories of national tradition have been branded into the soul of a people, their nationhood becomes almost indestructible. A nation is a cultural, psychological phenomenon. From this point of view, tradition, as a cultural, religious and historical concept, seems to be the most vital and essential element of nationality.

CHAPTER LX

National Consciousness and National Honour

Father Delos (1) speaks of nationality as a mentality and he says:

"Une nationalite est une mentalite. Il y a une mentalite anglaise, une mentalite espagnole, une mentalite Italienne, et c'est directement de cette mentalite commune que decoule l'unite morale nationale... Un etranger est assimile, non pas quand il a les memes idees qu'un national, car les idees sont differentes meme entre nationaux, mais quand il a acquis la meme mentalite, c'est-a-dire la meme tournure d'esprit, la meme facon d'envisager toutes les idees".

J.J. Wright (2) states that the use of common means and the pursuit of common ends, especially in proportion as these are formative and cultural, and the struggle with common problems against a common geographical background, all inevitably leave a common mark on the characters of individuals thus united. They shape along particular lines their bodies and even more their minds, so as to produce such modifications in universal human nature that men may be distinguished by themselves and by others as members of their national societies. The result of these accidental modifications is not to destroy the universal elements of human nature, nor to alienate any group from the reductively single ends of human society. Rather, it makes possible the preparation of particular peoples to do, in harmony with others, the single tasks in the several sections of the world which are neces-

1. Father Delos "L'Internationalisme, synthese de la culture et de la civilization". Revue de Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques October 1928, pp.659-679, as quoted by J.J. Wright in 'Patriotism in Papal Teachings'.
2. Wright, J.J. National Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp. 64-66

sary for the harmony of the whole. .

He quotes Pope Pius XI (1) as saying that there is a place and home for all peoples and all tongues, and there can be developed all the qualities, aptitudes, tasks, and vocations with which God, the Creator and Redeemer, has endowed individuals and societies. True mother love of the Church is wide enough to see in the divinely planned development of such special gifts and callings rather the richness of variety than the danger of divisions.

Thus, in a nation the individual ceases to consider himself merely ego, and becomes conscious of being one of a group, nos. He possesses not merely a good which is meum, but is conscious of one which is nostrum. Yet again because society is ultimately subordinate to individual personality, the nostrum and even the nos is ultimately seum, and it is in the last analysis as his that the patriot loves his fatherland and his nation.

B. Joseph (2) discussing the problem of national consciousness and the will to be a nation writes that it is a moot point whether nationality is entirely a natural consequence of the existence of certain circumstances and the possession by a given group of people of certain attributes, or whether it can be considered to be in a degree a deliberate creation of that group wrought by their resolve to constitute themselves as a nationality.

National consciousness must at some time or other exist in every na-

-
1. Pope Pius XI Encyclical Mit brennender Sorge, quoted by J.J. Wright ibid.
 2. Joseph, B. Nationality pp. 125-136

tionality. The elements requisite to make up a nationality could hardly be sufficient for the purpose if they were not positive and apparent enough to imbue the people possessing them with consciousness of their own nationality. A suggestion is even made that such factors as race, religion, language, are not factors in nationality according to whether or not they enter into the collective consciousness of the national group. The first indication that a national group has matured into a nationality is the development of the national consciousness to such a point that the great majority of them recognize in common that they are a nationality.

National consciousness owes its emergence to the existence of the other concrete elements of nationality. Such as a common language, traditions, homeland, etc. On the other hand, the diverse elements by themselves are of no value, from the point of view of nationality, until the members of the national group appreciate their existence sufficiently to have acquired a national consciousness. Thus, the consciousness of nationality and the diverse concrete attributes thereof are complementary.

National consciousness is without any doubt one of the most vital and powerful forces in the individual. The determination and readiness of the individual to make sacrifices for his nationality, the joy and sense of satisfaction that one feels when one's nationality is praised, the pain and chagrin that one feels when one's nationality is hurt or disparaged or when any reflection is cast upon it, is the result and is an expression of national consciousness.

National consciousness is by far the most important force today.

W. Sulzbach (1) writes that national consciousness has shown steady growth from the beginning of the nineteenth century. The wars for the unification of Italy and Germany were fought for national aims. The movements and revolutions which brought about the downfall of the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire were national in character. The peace treaties after the first world war were designed to establish a better international order by drawing the boundaries of European states in conformity with the principle of nationality

One of the important attributes of national consciousness is national honour. The honour of a nation is a very vague concept, which is difficult to define, yet, once abused by another nation it produces a warlike reaction. All nationalities treat national honour as an exceedingly delicate thing which must in no circumstances be offended by outsiders. Thus, for example, the Second Hague Conference assumed questions of national honour to be of such importance that it decided that it could not investigate or pass judgment on disputes of an international nature involving honour or vital national interests.

L. Perla (2) holds that national honour has been the cause of almost every war in history. As an ideal to be maintained, writes B. Joseph (3), national honour, like individual honour, is much to be desired. The danger lies in the development of an over-sensitiveness regarding it. National honour reflects national consciousness and could be considered as the quintessence of national consciousness.

-
- | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------|
| 1. Sulzbach, W. | National Consciousness | |
| 2. Perla, L. | What is National Honour | p. 121 |
| 3. Joseph, B. | Ibid | p. 348 |

National consciousness and national honour, in whatever form they may manifest themselves and in whatever form they may express themselves, are psychological concepts, man-made. National consciousness and national honour are not instinctive things. W. Sulzbach (1) asks the question where does the individual's knowledge of his country and its history, his political opinions, and concepts of patriotic duties come from? The answer is chiefly from parents, teachers, newspapers, books, and propaganda. Some add their own ideas to what they have learned from others, but the majority follow the beaten track. Man is to a great extent the product of his environment, so that education and agitation can achieve much. The dictatorships of today have proven anew how comparatively easy it is to make the younger generation believe whatever it is told.

National consciousness, then, is not inevitable, and being man-made and man-communicated, it can be modified and be adjusted. In conclusion may we bring the following observation of L. Perla (2) who maintains that the sensitiveness of honour can have no relation to the clarity of reason, but obviously depends upon emotionalism. The less rational a man becomes the more sensitive does his honour become. Insistence upon a national honour has diverted men from the wider code and more fundamental general principles of morality.

1. Sulzbach, W.

Ibid

p. 6

2. Perla, L.

Ibid

pp. 154-163

CHAPTER X

A Nation Defined

What is a nation? What is the essence of a nation? What are the ties of affinity which are necessary to constitute a nation?

Research into the nature of nationality was always fraught with great difficulty. A nation is a cultural and historical fact. A nation is a sociological reality. A nation is composed of individuals and the very nature of the material precludes the use of experimental methods of establishing and scientifically determining its real nature. The intrinsic qualities of individuals, cultures, and societies, are such, that it is impossible to study them or to produce them to order, under rigid control conditions, for scientific experiments. The minute analysis of individuals, cultures, or societies, will not tell us the true nature of the object because the whole is always larger than its parts.

R. Linton (1) states that personalities, cultures, and societies are all configurations of personalities, cultures, and societies. Nationality, with a number of component elements which defy exact scientific analysis. These component elements cannot be measured because it is impossible to apply many of the scientific mathematical techniques to cultural and social phenomena. In other words, a nation is constituted by factors in the psychological and moral order rather than^{by} the biological or juridical order. However, before attempting to define nationality, we shall, for the sake of clarity, recapitulate some of

1. Linton, R. Culture and Personality

the essential elements and concepts of nationality which have been dealt with separately in previous chapters.

We have seen that neither race, nor common origin, nor common political allegiance, nor common mutual interests, nor language, are sufficient by themselves to create a nation. Nationality is an elusive idea, difficult to define, because it cannot be tested by formulae or analysed by scientific methods. Nationality is a sentiment, based on tradition and strengthened by common ties such as language, history, common territory, homeland, and any other factors that may contribute to its vitality.

A nationality arises from a 'vouloir-vivre collectif' summarizes J.J. Wright (1). It united those whose material and intellectual interests and problems, their common good and means to attain it, are similar. The differences in material problems and especially of cultural goods, together with the resultant differences in the traditions and customs acquired by the organized groups, give the national societies thus formed the particular characteristic by which they become distinguishable one from another and localized or delimited as particularized forms of universal human society.

J.J. Wright tells us that among Catholic writers such as Jacques Leclercq in his book "De la Communante Populaire", and Monsignor J. A. Ryan in his book "The Catholic Church and the Citizen", is developed the concept of a nation as a collective friendship based on the possession of common traditional goods and the consciousness of a common collective mission within the family of nations. A nation, ac-

1. Wright, J.J. Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp. 69-70

According to their definition, is a group of men united by the desire of living in a social community, whether or not they possess a common political organization of that community and sharing a sense of historical and cultural solidarity based on a community of traditions, problems, characteristics, and aspirations, in which they enjoy a group existence which makes them recognizable as a people apart in the international community.

Professor P. Gooch (1) defines a nation as a spiritual entity. He states that neither the occupation of a defined area, nor community of race, language, religion or economic interests are indispensable to national self-consciousness, yet each of these factors constitute a powerful tie and tend to produce the cohesiveness and solidarity in which the strength of the nation resides.

B. Joseph (2) contends that a nationality as a quality is the subjective corporate sentiment permanently present in and giving a sense of distinctive unity to the majority of the members of a particular civilized section of humanity, which at the same time objectively constitutes a distinct group by virtue of possessing certain collective attributes peculiar to it such as a homeland, language, religion, history, culture, or traditions. Nationality as a concrete designation denotes a group possessed of the quality of nationality as so defined.

Prof. Miller (3) discussing the attributes of a nation, emphasizes that a nation usually has some geographical relation but may exist without it. It may adhere a consciousness of blood relationship, but

-
1. Gooch, P. Nationalism
 2. Joseph, B. Nationality
 3. Prof. Miller Nationalism

aliens may be adopted in it. It may turn on tradition and history, but myth may be just as effective. It may claim high moral justification and purpose but an analysis of its history may show that it came into existence by ruthless injustice. A nation is merely a psychological union for political and economic administration. It also satisfied the yearnings of the individual to belong to a group that will give him social dignity.

H. Syrkin (1) asserts that the true foundation of a nation is spiritual and cultural. A social group which has perfected in the course of generations a certain equality and unity in its spiritual life, in its thoughts and feelings, and possesses a historical fate of which it is conscious, and has a desire for further historical continuity - such a group is a nation. Common reminiscences, common consciousness of its present and common aspirations for the future - these build a nation.

According to the above concepts conquered, scattered, peoples, peoples robbed of their rights by ruling powers, still have a right to a nationality and national recognition and are to be considered as nations as long as they possess yearnings, a common will and consciousness for their future national destinies.

Chapter XI

The Individual and Nationality

What is the relationship between the individual and the national group?

What has priority, the individual or the nation?

J. Hegel, and the German philosophers since Hegel, have spoken as if a nation, particularly the German nation, was the embodiment of a special spirit of divine or mysterious origin and as if the advancement of that spirit was demanded for the improvement not only of themselves but of the world.

Hegel recognized various national missions in nations missions charged by historical processes. He developed the theory that human history follows a plan and that the historical epochs represent distinct acts in the universal divine drama. For Hegel, history was the march of spirit towards freedom. History works unconsciously, but it has a certain predetermined way, and ideal good, the realization of an absolute idea. The state, according to Hegel, is the realization of an ethical ideal. The true state is the ethical whole and the realization of freedom. The State is the March of God through the world.

These claims of Hegel raised the state to a supernatural level. The state is superior to all individuals and associations which are within it. Everything is for the state. No individual may claim natural rights or civil liberties which the state is obliged to recognize. There is nothing outside the state. It was Hegel who said that Germany needed a hero of blood and iron and it was Hegel who claimed that there was an ethical element in war, because it preserves the entity of the state by taking

away the mind of the nation from internal problems.

W. Pillsbury (1) in discussing this contention points out that there are theories that would assign to the national mind very much as mind is assigned to an individual. According to this theory a nation possesses a super-individual mind and that by living together the members of a nation in some way develop an actual new mind that is related to the bodies of the individuals in very much the same way that the mind of the individual is to the cells of which his body is composed. The fact remains, however, that we have no evidence of the existence of a super-consciousness in society. No one knows the consciousness of a crowd apart from the minds of the individuals who compose it. Society has no means of expression apart from the language of its members. One knows of the emotions of a crowd or what a nation believes, only on the basis of the assent of its members or the emotional expressions of individuals. There is no possibility of communicating with the souls of a nation other than by way of the souls of its elements.

The social whole, in our case a nation, cannot be regarded as an entity apart from or added to the individuals who compose it. The social whole has no means of acquiring knowledge. The sense organs of a group are the sense organs of its members. All that a group may add is a readiness to interpret the contributions of the senses in harmony with the suggestions received from others.

A nation does not think. The thinking is always of the individual but the acceptance is determined by the group. As a mind, the nation as a whole originates nothing. All reasoning of the nation is limited to the accept-

1. Pillsbury, P. The Psychology of Nations

ance or rejection of suggestions made by individuals. A nation thinks only as individuals that compose it think, but it must be added that the individual would not think as he does were he not a member of the nation. All that the nation does is to express more clearly the ideals that are latent in all.

W. Pillsbury comes to the conclusion that the social mind is merely a metaphor and has no real existence. Nevertheless, the phenomena that it is used to designate are real. The nation is in a sense a mental aggregate, and ability to develop and to be controlled by common ideals and to carry out acts in common is the prime criterion of the existence of a nation. In many ways the nation provides a medium in which the ideal of the individual may develop to the fullest extent. The nation spurs the individual to accomplishments that he would not otherwise be capable of, and restraints divergent tendencies that he would be liable to in another environment.

The thought is, however, always the thought of the individual, the acts are the acts of individuals, the emotions are reverberations in the bodies of individuals. National ideals have no existence except as they are expressed by individuals. What makes the group behave as a nation are the qualities of the individuals that compose it, not a single super-individual entity. Nationality is an ideal rather than a material inheritance of races of men. It grows with experience, which is the experiences of individuals, which are effective only in so far as these individuals make them appeal to themselves and to others.

The nation as a concept is a reality. It has a self. Increasing or improving it gives the member of the nations emotions of joy. Impairing its

existence or efficiency gives sorrow or anger. Because a nation is a spiritual concept it is more effective in controlling the action of the individuals than any material forces. This now brings us to the place of the individual in society.

H. Sommerville (1) discussing the indestructible sense of right states that every one of us has physical faculties like sight, hearing, speech, smell, touch; we have organs like hands and feet. In addition to these physical possessions, which are part of our human nature, we are conscious of moral endowments called rights. A right is a power in a person which is morally wrong for others persons to violate.

There is a sacredness of the Human individual. As one man cannot treat another as a mere means to an end, as a thing instead of a person, neither may any group so sacrifice the individual. The State, or the nation, do not represent ends towards which the individuals may serve only as a means. On the contrary, the state is a means to enable the individual to attain his ends. It is only by regarding rights as inherent in human nature that we can safeguard the dignity of personality, give meaning to the notion of human equality and condemn tyranny, slavery, and other forms of exploitation of man by man.

The false philosophies of superiority of the state over the individual maintain that if rights come only from the state there are no unjust laws. If all men are not persons, that is, if every man is not an end in himself, whom it is wrong to treat merely as a means, there is no wrong in slavery. The pagan philosopher's definition of a slave was "animated tool", i.e.,

1. Sommerville, H. A Course of Social Studies for Catholic Clubs
pp. 40-44

he was another's instrument, not an end in himself. We must assume, therefore, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. No other doctrine protects human personality.

W. Lippman (1) writes that to the masses of the western world the news that all men are more than things was proclaimed by the Christian gospel and was celebrated in its central mysteries. It proclaimed the news to all men that they were not brute things, to all men without exception; the weak, the outcast, the down-trodden, the enslaved and the utterly dejected. The influence of that gospel has been inexhaustible. It anchored the rights of men in the structure of the universe. It set these rights apart from and beyond human interference.

Thus the pretensions of despots became heretical. And since that revelation, though many despots have had the blessings of the clergy, no tyranny has possessed a clear title before the tribunal of the human conscience, no slave has had to feel that the hope of freedom was forever closed. For in the recognition that there is in each man a final essence, that is to say, an immortal soul, which only God can judge, a limit was set upon the dominion of men over men. The prerogatives of supremacy were radically undermined. The inviolability of the human person was declared.

J.J. Wright (2) in discussing the primacy of personality in Catholic social teaching as one of the most essential postulates in the study of patriotism states that logically, at least, prior to all social groupings and all positive conventions, there exists man, the human person, with the

-
1. Lippman, W. The Good Society p. 379
 2. Wright, J.J. National Patriotism in Papal Teaching pp. 6-8

dignity and dominion over all things that God conferred upon man. The primacy of Adam over all things created was based on the spiritual nature by which he was fashioned in the image of God and which indicated his immortal destiny.

For Catholic moral teaching every man, in the phrase of St. Augustine, is Adam which implies the premise of the primacy of individual personality. All things created have for their essential purpose, their *raison d'être*, to assist in the perfection of the moral personality which is man. In this universal subordination of created things to man is included the subordination of all society and of each community.

J.J. White quotes Pope Pius XI (1) as saying that in the plan of the Creator, society is a natural means which man can and must use to reach his destined end. Society is for man and not vice versa. This must not be understood in the sense of liberalistic individualism, which subordinates society to the selfish use of the individual; but only in the sense that by means of an organic union with society and by mutual collaboration is the attainment of earthly happiness placed within the reach of all. In a further sense, it is society which affords the opportunities for the development of all the individual and social life bestowed on human nature...It is according to the dictates of reason that ultimately all material things should ^{be} ordained to man as a person, that through his mediation they may find their way to the Creator.

-
1. Pope Pius XI Divini Redemptoris para 29-30, cited by
J.J. Wright *ibid*
 2. Pope Pius XI Mit brennender Sorge para 34 AAS XXIX (1937)
pp. 159-160, cited by J.J. Wright *ibid*

In another quotation Pope Pius XI (1) emphasizes that the true public good is finally determined and recognized by the nature of man with its harmonious coordination of personal rights and social obligations, as well as by the purpose of the community which is in turn conditioned by the same human nature. The community is willed by the Creator as the means to the full development of the individual and social attainments which the individual in give-and-take has to employ to his own good and that of others. Also those higher and more comprehensive values that cannot be realized by the individual but only by the community, in the final analysis are intended by the Creator for the sake of the individual, for his natural and supernatural development and perfection.

Thus, the individual person enjoys a primacy over all created things, society and its subordinate communities included, and possesses a claim to their service in accordance with their nature, that he may employ them to his own good and the good of others.

Thus, man, is the measure of all things in the social sphere. Human society in general, and national communities in particular, exist in ultimate subordination to the claims of spiritual personality, to the needs of man.

E. Pope Pius XI Mit brennender Sorge para 34 AAS XXIX (1937)
pp. 159-160 cited by J.J. Wright ibid

CHAPTER XII

Nationalism as a Constructive ForceShould Nationality Survive?

Has nationality a future? Should nationality survive, and if it should survive what role should it play in the social world organization of the future? Under what conditions could nationality become a constructive force?

Nationalism today is one of the most serious problems men have to solve. All the evils of the world order have been laid at its doors - international hatreds, rivalries, wars, etc. There is no doubt that nationalism, without a sound moral principle can be and has been a source of evil in the world. Its record is sordid enough. But there is no reason, why nationalism, based upon sound moral principles, should be rejected as undersirable and without any good in it at all.

S. Herbert (1) discussing the future of nationality starts off his discussion with the question whether or not we desire the survival of nationality. And he replies that we can best work towards a reply to this question by an analogy. What is it that gives its main value to social intercourse? The answer is obvious, it is individuality. We feel that it is necessary and good that men should be themselves, should develop their own natures, and not be the pale patterns and imitations of other men. This development of the unique in personall qualities is the avowed aim of our education.

The full possession of character, of personality is the end towards
 which

1. Herbert, S. Nationality and its problems pp. 155-170

which we strive. It is the final justification of all culture, of all esthetic and intellectual effort. Nationality to a social group is what personality is to an individual. It is a complex product of heredity and environment leading to differentiation. That being so, the justification for its persistence is clear. Does any one really desire that national differences should disappear, and all human groups should look alike, think alike, react to the same stimuli, respond to the same emotions?

There is a fundamental likeness between all men. There are some basic things that unify mankind. But these basic things apart, we wish, as we say, to be ourselves, and this is true of nations as of men. Nations, too, wish to be themselves, to retain their unique qualities, to make, unhindered, their peculiar contribution to the sum of human effort. We should desire the survival of nationality feeling that its disappearance would rob life of colour and significance and would ultimately involve the undermining of personality itself.

J.G. Herder (1) pictures the history of mankind as a series of national organism, each one growing like a tree on its stem. Each national organism has a national soul which is the basis and mother of all culture upon the earth. The national group is a genetic individual. Having a body and a soul it becomes a personality, an individuality. It expresses itself in all the phenomena of its history, in all its aspects, such as its language, its literature, art, science, etc. The sum of all its expressions is the culture of the nation. Each nationality has something peculiarly characteristic, and it should contribute the ex-

1. Herder, J.G. *Sammtliche Werke* Quoted in Esgange "Herder and the Foundation of German Nationalism"

pression of its national type to the development of humanity in general

Herder envisaged the world as a garden of separate flower beds, each beautiful and fragrant in its distinctive manner, each deserving to be tended and filled with loving care, and together constituting the multi-coloured, multi-scented bouquet of perfect humanity. He dwelt upon and amplified his picture of the ideal nationality, conscious of the dignity of its own heritage, reverencing its task, labouring with informed ability toward the future consummation of the promise of the past, respecting the similar-dissimilar activities of other peoples, reaching out toward the object of a fulfilled humanity, - the common end toward each nationality came struggling up in its own way.

The tendency of people to form national aggregates is not a tragedy but a triumph of civilization. Through the full development of national cultures a universal human culture is being created. Every nation has a right to exist. It is a tribute to the moral health of any human and social organism that it refuses to yield to dismemberment and that it reaches for rebirth for new life and new creativity.

We have seen the destructive possibilities of a cosmopolitan society. It attempts to unite men on a purely economic ground, and fails to realize that the satisfaction of merely material needs can never be a lasting social bond. On the other hand, chauvinistic nationalism is a bitterly reactionary thing. Its aim is not service and cooperation but exclusiveness and monopoly. It is concerned with keeping men apart rather than bringing them together. It is not nationality which makes

1. Herbert, S. ibid

wars, but its perversion, a perversion due to a radically false social philosophy.

To fashion men nobly for noble ends should be the aim of social life, and what better instrument for this purpose can we find than national tradition contends S. Herbert (1). To seek out what is best and highest in the heritage of the past, to mould it into the very fabric of the living present, that is the task of constructive nationalism. This does not mean that nationality must be a fugitive and cloistered culture which shrinks from contact with the outer world and strives to perpetuate itself in impossible purity. The inevitable fate of such a national culture is to etiolate and die.

Just as the mingling of diverse races has given birth to vigorous national communities, so the contact of different cultures has produced a higher culture. Chaucer's genius was not weakened by acquaintance with the Romance literatures. The French philosophers did not lose out gained by sitting at the feet of Locke and Newton. It is obvious that the German geist of Goethe was influenced by the English geist of Shakespeare and the English geist of Shakespeare was influenced by the Jewish geist of the Bible. The lover of his nationality will not reject the proffered gifts of other nations as alien and unclean. He will seek out what is best among them and put to good use all that is capable of assimilation by his own national spirit.

Of course there must be political machinery for the protection of nationalities. National states must be protected in their rights and

. Herbert, S. ibid

national minorities must be protected against oppression. We need political institutions to safeguard national liberties. In this connection one thing must be remembered. The most elaborate political institutions, framed with most just intentions, will produce evil rather than good if they are manipulated by men of ill-will. Figs are not to be gathered from thistles, nor will justice and freedom live in a community drunk with hate and the desire for vengeance. Until men learn that their own liberties depend upon the respect they show for liberties of others, political machinery, though planned with utmost care, will be of small avail. A mountain of legal documents will not prevent a nation imbued with the fatal philosophy of sacro-egoismo from oppressing another nation. Some superior power is needed to control the national egotism.

J.J. Wright (1) discussing the solution of the problem of Nationalism in Papal Social Teachings states that the reconstruction of the international order, insofar as it involves the solution of the moral problem of nationalism, must begin, as must the solution of any social problem in accordance with papal teaching, with the moral reclamation of the individual. The reclamation of the individual, as it were, is the first condition of social reconstruction. Society, as composed of individuals can only be the sum and expression of the morality of the individuals, who compose it. The community, national or international, will be only as moral as are its members, since from these its qualities flow, and on these, its vigor, moral and otherwise depends.

Pope Pius XI (2) stating the general rule for all social problems

-
1. Wright, J.J. Nationalism Patriotism in Papal Teachings pp. 287-322
 2. Pope Pius XI Encyclical Quinquagesimo ante anno AAS XXI (1929)
cited by J.J. Wright ibid

writes that to the extent that individuals progress in spiritual development, by that much is probity and virtue added to public life and morals. Pope, Pius XI describes excessive nationalism, as disguised individualism, an egotism made sacred and being to the interest of private parties the social good and structure of nations. It is an individualism which subordinates and orders everything to his own advantage. The good of human society has preference and is above the good of individual nations. The interests of the individual nation are subordinate to humanity, and the social unity of the human community finds its perfection and seal in the universal subordination of humankind to God and His regal dominion over human society.

What are the advantages of nationality to the individual, to the group and to civilization?

A Zimmern (1) writes that only those who have seen what a moral degradation the loss of nationality involves can realize what a vast reservoir is lying ready, in the form of national feelings, in the hands of teachers and statesmen. To seek to ignore or to stamp out this force is to promote spiritual impoverishment. You cannot make, writes A. Zimmern a Jew or an Italian or a Pole into an inheritor of Puritan or Virginian culture by waving a flag before his admiring eyes. But what you can achieve thereby is to kill in him his own little spiritual inheritance. You can make him ashamed of Mazzini and Kossuth and the Vilna Gaon, of the songs and stories of his father and the teachings of his rabbi, of the lump in his throat at the mention of the holy names of Rome, Poland, or Palestine.

1. Zimmern, A. Nationality and Government pp. 55-75

B. Joseph (2) lists, among others, the following advantages of nationality. Nationality promotes liberty and democracy. It inspires people to strive and struggle for freedom. The individual members of a nationality also derive added vitality from their nationality, for they are capable of greater things when working amongst their own people in surroundings and under conditions of life to which they are accustomed and sympathetic. The individual, is strengthened in his private effort and enterprise by the consciousness that they are a part of a larger endeavour. National groups as such also benefit greatly from their nationality. The ideal of nationality appears to have reinvigorated many backward nations. Nationality tends to eliminate social strife and encourages solidarity. A variety of national lives enriches the general civilization of the world.

C.D. Burns (1) sums up the benefits following the national diversity, asserting that in the first place, as the destruction of individuality may destroy genius, so the attempt to make all groups of men exactly alike in their customs and creeds may destroy some special character of endurance or wit which may be developed even in small nations. There is some special quality in every group which it would be well for the sake of the whole of humanity to preserve. But this can only be preserved if the group has an opportunity for characteristic development of its own laws and institutions. Just as the individual should not model himself altogether upon someone else, even though he may receive hints and corrections from the study of others, so the nation should be conceived as having a separate character, distinct from that of any other nation.

If each nationality is to develop its own characteristics, then each

-
1. Joseph, B. Nationality pp. 360-369
 2. Burns, C.D. Political Ideal pp. 179-183

nation is valuable to every other, not as a rival of exactly the same kind but as a contrast, and humanity at large is benefited by the preservation of so many distinct types. For the human race is not at its best when every man or every group is a copy of every other. Civilization progresses by differentiation as well as by assimilation of interests and character.

B. Joseph (1) continues to emphasize the advantages of nationality saying that it profits humanity by bringing out the better qualities of the individual, his altruism, his spirit of self-sacrifice and his sense of duty to the community. The sentiment of nationality impels the individual to make sacrifices for his nationality and to endeavour to live up to the national ideals. Nationality also fulfills a fundamental need of organized civilized life. Nationalities are the framework of civilization. To constitute nationalities the natural normal units of such organization is to satisfy the instincts, proclivities, spiritual and cultural associations, and corporate sentiment of the individual, and to afford him an opportunity of serving humanity through the medium best suited for the purpose.

Whatever may be said for or against nationality and nationalism, the existence of it is in any case unaffected by views as to its expediency or desirability. The question and the problems which remain and which require solution is how to restrict the undesirable aspects of nationality to a minimum and how to extract from it the maximum of good. In other words, the problem is how to make nationality a constructive force.

1. Joseph, B. ibid

Rabbi I. Eisenstein (1) discussing the question of Jewish nationalism and Jewish nationhood emphasizes the point that nationalism today is one of the most serious problems men have to solve, but there is no reason why nationalism should be rejected as undesirable and without any good in it at all. Nationalism is a powerful force, and can be used for good or bad purposes. It is like dynamite: dynamite can be used to wreck a train and kill people, or it can be used to stop a raging fire. Chemistry can be used to cure disease, and it can be used to manufacture poison gas. Dynamite, chemistry, nationalism, as such are not destructive. It all depends on how they are used. Nationalism properly understood can be harmonized with the highest ideals of men. It can contribute to peace, culture, security, to all that men desire. What the world needs today is an ethical conception of nationalism.

That nationalism can be a source of evil in the world has been proven all too tragically by the facts of the current catastrophe in Europe. Each nation considered itself a law unto itself. So long as this feeling prevailed peace could not be achieved. The nationhood was used for evil purposes and the state used the spirit of nationalism to whip up enthusiasm for slaughter. Spurred on by aspirations of a chauvinistic militant nationalism, Nazi Germany set the world aflame.

To promote the glories of nationhood men have been willing to commit falsehood, arson, and murder; to violate every plighted word and every ideal of honour and right. Liberals, religious and secular alike, have frequently spoken in dispraise of nationalism. All the evils of the modern world have been laid at its doors - international hatreds,

1. Rabbi I. Eisenstein The Nationhood of Israel

rivalries and wars.

The doctrine of nationalism is considered by some as obsolete as feudalism and could only mean an even deeper hell on earth. The indictment of the sordid manifestation of nationalism is as Dr. B.S. Bokser (1) stated, however, no indictment of nationalism itself. It can, for example, be shown that loyalty to family life has had a similarly sordid record in the history of civilization. Men have evaded the most pressing social responsibilities because of preoccupation with family life. They have frequently violated every ethical imperative in their quest for family security. No one would, however, dream of translating this fact into an indictment of family life.

Family life at its best is fully compatible with the more comprehensive claims of society as a whole. It equips a person with new resources of faith and power with which to function as a social being. The same is true of nationalism. At its best, nationalism is fully compatible with loyalty to mankind as a whole, and it is a source not of strife but of added power to serve the cause of world citizenship. The tendency of people to form national aggregates is not the tragedy but the triumph of civilization. Through the medium of national life, unique values in culture, religion, art, and social relations have come into the world and have been made available to all men.

The future of civilization demands not the dissolution of unique national units but their subordination to a transcending loyalty, an international world order. The future of civilization demands not the

1. Bokser, B.S. What do we Mean by Nationalism?

liquidation of distinct national communities and the creation of a cosmopolitan world state, but an international fellowship of free societies each pursuing its unique destiny and dedicating the best in itself to a common human service.

Such a conception of nationalism was developed by the prophets of ancient Israel. They loved their people and were devoted to its tradition. Through the medium of their identification with Israel's national life, they came into possession of ideals and values which they could never have cultivated in detachment from national life. But they never regarded their nation as the ultimate moral end. Loyalty to the nation they held is to be superceded by a transcending loyalty to God and to humanity as a whole. Their nation was itself an instrument chosen for a larger service to all mankind.

Nationality is a fact, and the tides of nationalism are still rising. Taking the present world situation we can see that a dangerous paradox faces the world. The moment is one in which recognition is being accorded to the fact that most international ills at present are derived from clashing nationalism and that the only remedy for the dangers which beset the world is of abating national sovereignty in favour of closer international cooperation. Yet against this situation, the tendency in most parts of the earth is towards a rising nationalism, increasing in intensity where it existed before and being born where it had not previously existed.

In the case of Russia it has become commonplace to point out that her original internationalism has now become converted into Russian nationalism. Against the strong nationalism of Moscow is opposed a strong nationalism in the United States.

Throughout Europe the tides of nationalism are rising high. Iceland and the Faroe Islands are showing coolness towards Denmark. Slovakia insists on autonomy from Prague. Warring nationalism clash at many critical points. Italian and Yugoslav in Trieste, Serbian nationalism and Yugoslav federalism within Yugoslavia. Polish and Russian all over Europe. Greek and Albanian in northern Epirus; Greek and Bulgarian in eastern Greece; Turkish, British, Russian, and American at the Dardanelles.

In the Near East, two new nationalisms have arisen, that of the Arabs, hardly conscious in the past of any common interests, and that of the Jews. In Iran, a minute nationalism, that of Azerbidjan is arising. The East Indian nationalism and Indo-Chinese nationalism are carrying on the struggle against Dutch and French nationalism. Thus the world today is still a battleground of nationalism.

Attempts are being made to create and to effect international cooperation. League of Nations and international organizations are being set up. The point to remember, however, is that if the participants in a league of nations consider the specifically national values as the highest values, international collaboration against aggressive and treaty-breaking state will not work, regardless of any clever scheme invented for an international parliament and the distribution of voting power among the several states. The League of Nations did not fail because of technical deficiencies in the League's Covenant. It failed because the nations acknowledged the supreme value of national consciousness, attempting to use an international organization for national aims. But if national consciousness should recede into the background and the consciousness of

value common to all mankind should gain in strength, a new League of Nations may very well succeed.

What is it that we need to make nationalism a constructive force? Briefly the answer was given. We need an ethical conception of nationalism, where loyalty to the nation is superceded by a loyalty to mankind and by a transcending loyalty to God. The Holy Father, Pius XII (1), in answering the question as to what is the fundamental cause of the ills of the world at the present time stated that before all else, it is certain that the radical and ultimate cause of the evils which we deplore in modern society is the denial and rejection of a universal form of morality as well for individual and social life as for international relations. By a universal norm of morality is obviously meant a standard of morality that has reference to human nature, and that is applicable at all times and in all places.

The foundation of a universal moral judgment states Rt. Rev. Msgr. F.J. Sheen (2) is conscience which is a reflection of God's Eternal Reason and Holy Will ordaining us to preserve order in His universe and through it to come to self-perfection in Him which is happiness. Good and evil thus become judged not in terms of my interest or my pleasure, or those of our race, our class, or our nation, but in terms of the purpose for which we all were made, namely God.

Nations are individuals of humanity. Any nationality, no matter how small, has the inherent right to its nationhood. To us all as to Seneca-

1. Pope Pius XII Summi Pontificus N.C.W.S. p. 63 quoted by J.J.Wright
ibid

2. Sheen, F.J. Addresses delivered during Catholic Hour January 1940

Homo res sacra homini. Man is sacred in the ultimate recesses of his nature under God. One of the greatest paradoxes of our times is that as mankind is drawn closer and closer mechanically, it has grown further and further apart spiritually. Radio, telephone, telegraph, the aeroplane, have pulled men together spacially, but at a moment when men have lost all common ideals and purposes. The explanation is simple. Men have lost the unifying bond of the spiritual. A scientist can bring together in his laboratory every chemical constituent of the human body, but he cannot make a man. What these chemicals are without a soul, that our civilization is without God. We cannot create a brotherhood of men without the Fatherhood of God.

Nationalism can be a constructive force only on one condition and that is that as no man can be law unto himself, so each nationality must recognize that it also cannot be law unto itself.

The interests of a nation must be superceded by a transcending loyalty to the interests of humanity and loyalty to God. Religion, however, is not only a personal act, it is not only a communion of the soul with God. Man is not only an individual, he is also a member of society. His love of humanity and God is inseparable from his love of his neighbour. "If any man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God who he hath not seen. And this commandment we have from Him, That he who loveth God, love his brother also". (1 John 4:20-21)

It is only through the acceptance of this doctrine that nationalism can become a constructive force. The tendency of people to form national aggregates is not a tragedy but a triumph of civilization.

Through the medium of national life unique values in culture, art, and social relations have come into the world. Through the full development of national cultures a universal human culture is being created. The cultural and social products of each national unit have been made available to all men. On the other hand, national cultures, influenced by a universal culture, will be filled with a universal human content.

The present day nationalism is a curse for humanity. But the curse of the world today, if exercised rightly, and if placed on a sound moral basis, can become a blessing to humanity of tomorrow. Of course there remains the very important economic question, the right of every nation to have three meals a day. The wealth of the world can provide every human being with more than three meals a day and there is no reason why anyone in this world should go hungry. God said: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread", but he did not say, "Thou shalt not have thy bread".

Nationalism, like any other social concept, social theory or social movement, can be^a constructive force only when the basic elements of the universal norm of morality, like the primacy of the individual with a transcending primacy of mankind and God, become a part of it and are faithfully practised.

CHAPTER XIII

Unity of Mankind: Nationalism and Internationalism

One of the main doctrines opposed to nationality is cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism signifies a mental attitude prompting the individual to substitute for his attachment to his immediate homeland an analogous relationship towards the whole world, which he comes to regard as a greater and higher fatherland. The cosmopolite negates the distribution of society into nationalities. The cosmopolite refused to acknowledge the division of humanity into Russians, Germans, Poles, etc. He accepts only one social entity - humanity as a whole. The Russians, Frenchmen, Poles, etc., are all human beings, though differing slightly one from another.

Lessing, one of the outstanding German intellectuals believed that he had no conception of the love of country, and it seemed to him at best a heroic feeling which he was well content to be without. Shiller, another famous German author, considered himself as a citizen of the world who serves no Prince. He lost his fatherland to exchange it for the great world.

The greatest nation is to be viewed as but a fragment of humanity. Cosmopolitanism believes in the unity of mankind, and it hopes that all nations will melt themselves into one humanity. The ideal of cosmopolitanism is the disappearance of separate national units and national differences. Cosmopolitanism visualizes the future humanity as a mixture of individuals. The cosmopolite completely disregards the national content of culture. He claims to seek exclusively the interests of the human race as a whole and emphasizes the non-national

aspect of things.

Discussing cosmopolitanism and internationalism, B. Joseph (1) writes, that the main argument put forward on behalf of cosmopolitanism is the existing tendency towards the integration and coordination of world interests. So many of the public facilities are provided more economically on an international basis, that if the maximum of progress and accomplishment is to be achieved, the trend of events must lead to the breaking down of national barriers and to the treatment of the world as one great society of individuals. The cosmopolites argue that the laws of science are universal and not national, and that the differentiation of mankind into national groups results in their warring, to the detriment of the human race, consequently, they maintain, the human race will benefit from the blending of attributes and peculiarities of diverse nationalities into a common union.

The principal argument against the idea of cosmopolitanism is its utter impracticability. Cosmopolitanism undoubtedly, sounds very moral and altruistic in theory, but in carrying the idea to a logical conclusion one would have to bring about uniformity of language, religion, politics, morals, and administrative systems, a condition which is, for the time being, beyond realization. It is a psychological improbability to expect people to disregard the distinctions of nationality entirely in their relation with and affection for each other. Mankind as a whole has no language or literature or history to which individuals feel a sense of attachment. The First and Second Great Wars furnished con-

clusive evidence of the impracticability of cosmopolitanism. The so-called cosmopolitans soon forget their world-citizenship responding to national needs. The crucial weakness of cosmopolitanism is that it falls to the ground when put to the test.

M. Boehm (1) writes that the form which cosmopolitanism assumes is in general conditioned by the particular social entity or group ideal from which it represents a reaction. In antiquity the dominant social entity was usually the polis, in the Roman Empire the province, in the Enlightenment the religious faith, class and state; at present it is mainly the state, nation, and race.

The cosmopolitanism of international finance and of export trade develops as a protest against a merely national economy and begets the conception of world-wide economic interdependence. Moreover, all business magnates, in order to escape the strictures with which narrow solidarity binds the passion for gain, have a tendency to embrace cosmopolitanism, and to wrest from it an ethical sanction for all their activity. The Marxian doctrine that economic interests take precedence over political and ethnical attachments find its moral basis in the same source.

The sportsman and the virtuoso, who in their desire to establish record or to win unique fame roaming homelessly from place to place, express a form of cosmopolitanism. In the prevalent conceptions of the internationalism of science and of art, other types of cosmopolitanism are implicit.

1. Boehm, M. Cosmopolitanism Encyc. of Socialism

In all these cases it is apparent that cosmopolitanism takes form as a cosmic principle through an essentially uncritical generalization from the vocational ethic and that its guise of universality conceals either an unconscious recognition of the particularistic solidarity or even a very one-sided individual interest.

If, therefore, in time of crisis or upheaval, such as might be occasioned by war, revolution, or personal strife, and imperative appeal is made to the traditional social impulses which have been crowded into the background by cosmopolitanism, the latter may suddenly lapse into its extreme antithesis, a fanatical devotion to a narrow allegiance. Even while his basic individualism remains untouched by such fluctuations of solidarity consciousness, the former cosmopolitan may, in these circumstances, become an impassioned spokesman of chauvinism or of any other narrow social hatred.

This brings us to another doctrine which opposes nationality as a constructive force, and that is the chauvinistic nationalism.

In contrast to the cosmopolite, humanity, for the chauvinist, is only a word which has no meaning, an empty sound. The chauvinist claims that in reality there is no humanity as such. The world is composed and subdivided into nations each one of which is an independent, self-contained unit. It carries no moral responsibility and obligation to the other nations, and if it has the power, it can do as it pleases with other nations. Dealings with other nations, would depend only upon the self-interest of the nation. Each nation has a right to wage war or to conclude peace and no other nation has any right of interference.

The chauvinist denies completely and unequivocally the existence of a universal culture. He emphasizes with all the means at his command that national cultures are entirely different and have nothing in common. He negates the universal concept of religion, politics, social life, and community of interest, which individuals of various nations may have in common. T.

The essence of chauvinistic theory consists in the idea that first and foremost a nation must attain its national independence, and there where national independence has been attained, the nation should strengthen its independence through conquest and subduance of other nations, and through complete isolation of national culture from outside influences. The chauvinist claims that nationalism is the only basis for the internal and external policy of a nation. The cornerstone of national politics, according to the chauvinist, is the development of a specific content in every phase of national culture; it makes little difference whether or not the content is of desirable quality. As long as it has been produced by the nation it should be preserved as a product of the nation's spirit.

The chauvinist does not believe in universal concepts of justice, truth, and beauty. He claims that these concepts differ among various nations. He does not believe in a universal criteria of justice and truth, and ^{believes that} each nation exists and produces merely for its own benefit. The chauvinist also claims that each nation possesses a special folk character, folk-spirit which is transmitted from generation to generation and that no other nation can possibly possess.

The chauvinist glorifies the state-nation, claiming that the state-

nation is the realization of an ethical ideal, and raises the state to a supernatural level. The state and nation are superior to all individuals and associations which are within it. No individual may claim civil liberties or natural rights which the state is obliged to recognize. Denying individual liberty and exalting the state, chauvinism was bound to lead to international hatreds and war.

One of the outstanding exponents of German chauvinism, Heinrich von Treitschne, in his essay "Bundesstaat and Einheitsstaat" pleaded for an effective unity of Germans so that they might be able to compete with other peoples for the commerce of the oceans. Treitschne claimed that since people differed widely in character, so, too, they must differ in their politics. He proceeded to claim that in matters of politics there was no positive right or wrong. Consequently, he regarded international agreements as "scraps of paper".

It was Kaiser Wilhelm II who uttered ideas such as "we are the salt of the earth...The German nation alone has been called upon to defend, cultivate, and develop great ideas...Our German nation shall be the rock of granite on which the Almighty will finish his work of civilizing the world.

This is the chauvinistic nationalism which denies the right of existence to other nations, which aims to suppress and subdue other nations and which propagates isolation from other nations. It is the nationalism a la Hitler.

Between these two extremes, between cosmopolitanism on the one hand, and national chauvinism on the other, there arises the concept of constructive nationalism and internationalism.

There is a definite unity of mankind. The unity of mankind is not merely the unity of a single species, but also that of a single family. The human race, said E. Duthrit (1), is something more than the sum total of beings born one from another, who live simultaneously on the same planet, and who therefore succeed one another, who have a common father and are joined by the bond of a common species. The unity binding men is specifically social, bearing witness to a fundamental dependence, universal and mutual. Even in a divided human society, the acts of each member have their repercussions on the others, perhaps at a great distance and after a lapse of time, but nevertheless with irresistible strength.

J.J. Wright (2) discussing national patriotism and international order writes that the social unity of the human race which was in the beginning suffered a gradual breakdown in which the play of natural forces on concrete human groups has led to the growth of particularistic habits, particular interests and particular traditions, by which special bonds have united on a basis of common aspirations groups within the generic human family in order that the end of society itself, the perfection of personality might be historically achieved.

This division, is, as we have seen from the previous chapters, both natural and inevitable. It is, moreover, the source of very real preferential obligations on the part of the individual towards the subordinate social groups thus constituted. Division into particular communities, however, has not broken the essential unity of the original

-
1. Duthrit, E. *Semain Sociale de France* p. 61
quoted by J.J. Wright
 2. Wright, J.J. *ibid* p. 146

family, nor eliminated those exigencies of individual personality by which it still requires the social collaboration of the entire human community in order to achieve its true perfection.

Just as the increase of contacts and relationships between families brought into being the fact of nations and the necessity of widened loyalties and moral relations proportionate to the national societies thus created, so the conditions of the modern world imposes the obligation of embracing by explicit moral ties the wider community to which modern social exigencies have given explicit existence.

Hayes & Moon (1) declare that the horizon of the civilized world is no longer limited to a single continent, but includes the entire globe. As a result of exploration, of travel, of oceanic steamships, and world commerce, of world politics, and of the intermingling of races by migration, our mental outlook has become incomparably broader. Moreover, we have built up an economic structure that is world-wide, with the result that each continent is dependent upon the others for every-day articles of food and commerce. No nation, no continent, can now shut itself off from the rest of the world as in bygone days.

Thus, the same social exigencies which elicited the moral ties by which the national community was constituted, demand on the same principle and on the same validity the recognition of subordination of the national community to the wider world society embracing individual and nations alike. J.J. Wright quotes the Encyclical *Caritae Christi Compulsi*, AAS XXIV (1932) p. 179, saying that patriotism finds its place with the

right order of Christian charity, but does not exhaust it, since should it become exclusive it offends against that same order implicit in the great law of love and human brotherhood, which embraces and holds in a single family all nations and peoples.

Nationality can be considered as a necessary stepping stone between the individual and humanity. The problems of the world are too vast to enable the individual to cope with them. Nationality, on the other hand, is an entity which the individual understands. The love of one's fatherland or nation should not detract from one's sentiment of humanity, any more that it should detract the affection one entertains for one's immediate family.

A nation is a group of men, bound together by historic conditions, traditions, and other cultural ties, though concerned with its own well-being and advancement, yet contributes to the service of humanity as a whole. If a nation exists to serve the individual, and if its goal is the perfection of individual personality, it exists no less to serve humanity. No nation has a destiny of its own. The destiny of a nation is that of individuals that comprise it. Through the individuals the nation achieves its destiny, rather than through the nation they achieve theirs. In either case, the relation of any national destiny to the general good of the human race proves that the function of the nation is subordinate to the ends of the general human community, and that it cannot, therefore, legitimately separate a people from the human community they share with all men.

Father Lachance (1) writes that the very inequalities of the nation

1. Father Lachance Nationalisme et religion p. 32, quoted by
J.J. Wright

bear witness to the need they have of one another, a need which, for example, Catholic social theory, has always esteemed providential. It is only in uniting and coordinating the possibilities proper to each people that there are finally remedied the inadequacy and deficiencies of each and there is produced the harmony resulting from the tone of all the material moral, artistic, and spritual values included under the term of "human good". In a free universe, concludes Father Lachance, as that of matter, the forces apparently most different are destined to balance and compliment one another; what is lacking in one thing is supplied in another.

J.J. Wright (1) says that the emphasis in papal teaching seems to warrant the conclusion that the international community exists not so much as the aggregate of the national communities to which the individuals belong, but as a community enjoying its proper existence in transcendence of the relation to one another of the nations, and exacting its own claims diretly on the individual simultaneously with and superior to the claims of the national community. First among the elements of unity of the human society thus transcending all national lines of division is the common essential human nature.

Humanity, said Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical *Caritae Christi Compulis* AAS XXIV p. 187, is that great family which extends beyond the boundaries of any country and continent. Thus, there exists an international human community, which acts as a natural limitation on the claims of the nation. There is a mutual interdependence among nations.

1. J.J. Wright

Ibid

As R. Muir (1) summarizes the problem of national interdependence, stating the war seemed, at first, to destroy the powerful movement toward internationalism, yet the very ruin that it wrought showed to all nations how dependent they become each upon all the rest. The people of Europe learnt, or ought to have learnt, that they had suffered far more by the severance of their relations than they could conceivably have gained by the most decisive victory. They learnt, also, that they could no longer do without the non-European world. That not only America, but Asia and Africa were necessary to their existence. The war showed that civilization will be blotted out unless it could find some means of achieving peace and justice in the relation between peoples, and avoiding the hideous waste and folly of war.

The solidarity of mankind is being made stronger and stronger as the means of human intercommunication become increasingly facilitated. W.J. Perry (2) writes that civilization connotes the sum total of the activities of men, the various arts and crafts that they have invented, the means of intercommunication and all that goes to make life richer and fuller. The more this process of development is studied the clearer does it become that, as in other manifestations of life, continuity is the universal rule. There is no reason whatever to believe in the independent development of culture in different parts of the earth. What really is meant by the civilization of any country is simply the variety of world-wide civilization possessed by that country. Every community, like every individual, is different from every

-
1. Muir, R. The Political Consequences of the Great War pp. 46-47
 2. Perry, W.J. The Growth of Civilization p. 141

other community, simply because circumstances of its growth and development are different, and for no other reason that counts.

The social unity and universality of mankind finds its expression also in the intellectual sphere. The good, the true, and the beautiful are universal. The values, therefore, by which national cultures are truly cultures are transcendental so that there exist no exclusively national truths, virtues, or things of beauty. Goethe does not belong only to the Germans, he belongs to the whole world. Shakespeare does not belong only to the English, and the Prophets do not belong only to the Jewish nation. They are a part of humanity. Because they are true, because they are just and beautiful, they are universal. Finally, the social unity of the human community finds its perfection in the universal subordination to God.

This brings us to the conclusion that internationalism is a must in our society. An ideal international world means a world of nations living at their best. Internationalism, in this sense does not deny the existence of nationalities, on the contrary, it actually postulates it. Nationality and its desire to retain its identity of ideals, traditions and institutions, is a prerequisite of true internationalism. The principle of internationalism is based on the idea of brotherhood among nations. Internationalism does not demand that one brother be similar or identical to the other. It takes two men to make one brother. Internationalism would mean then that all the nations are united into one family of nations, where each nation enjoys equal rights, and whose interests are not contradictory to the interests of others.

Just as the life of an individual is enriched by his forming part of

the society of others, similarly a nationality will derive benefit from internationalism. Internationalism does not deny the importance of national creativity. Through internationalism, however, the national cultures will be filled with a universal human content. True internationalism is concerned with the promoting the cooperation of nationalities and not with curbing their self-expression. It strives for world unity without destroying the loyalty of the individual to his nationality.

We can see thus that nationalism can become a constructive force only when it refutes the nation as the absolute value to which all life is subordinated, because in so doing it becomes idolatory. The nation replaces God. Nationalism will become a constructive force only when it will recognize that it is not law unto itself, that its interests are subordinated to the interests of humanity at large. Each nation is a member of a universal unity. It can achieve its ends only in collaboration with others. Nationalism becomes constructive when it subordinates and recognizes the supremacy of the entire human community and God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, E.N. National and Cultural Crisis in Prussia 1806-1815
Farrow & Rheinhard, New York, 1939
- Barker, E. National Character and Factors in its Formation
Methuen & Co., London, 1927
- Barker, E. The Romantic Factor in Modern Politics
Philosophy, Volume 11, Number 44, October 1936
- Barzun, J. Romanticism and the Modern Ego
Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1943
- Batten, E. Nationalism, Politics and Economics
P.J. King & Son, London, 1929
- Bokser, B.J. What do we Mean by Nationalism?
Zionism Today. Department of Youth and Education.
Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1941
- Buckle, H.T. History of Civilization in England
H. Milford Press, London, 1925
- Burns, C.D. Political Ideals
Oxford University Press, London, 1929
- Chamberlain, H.S. The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century
John Lane Co., New York, 1911
- Dewey, J. German Philosophy and Politics
New York, 1915
- Eisenstein, I. The Nationhood of Israel
Zionism Today. Department of Youth and Education
Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1941
- Engeln von, O.D. Inheriting the Earth
London, 1915
- Ergang, O. Herder and the Foundation of German Nationalism
Columbia University Press, New York, 1931
- Falnes, O.J. National Romanticism in Norway
Columbia University Press, New York, 1933
- Featherstone, H.L. A Century of Nationalism
T. Nelson & Sons, New York, 1939
- Forst de Battaglia La Mysterie du Sang
Les Edition du Cerf, Paris, 1934

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gooch, G.P. **Nationalism**
The Swarthmore Press, London, 1920
- Grant, A.J. and
Temperley, H. **Europe in the Nineteenth Century**
Longman & Green, New York, 1939
- Hayes, C.J.H. **The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism**
R.R. Smith Inc., New York, 1931
- Hayes, C.J.H. **Essays on Nationalism**
Macmillan Co., New York, 1933
- Herbert, S. **Nationality and its Problems**
New York, n.d.
- Hertz, F.O. **Race and Civilization**
Macmillan Co., New York, 1928
- Jenks, E. **A History of Politics**
The Temple Printers, London, 1910
- Joseph, B. **Nationality**
G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1929
- King, B. **The Life of Mazzini**
New York
- Kleinberg, O. **Social Psychology**
Holt, 1940
- Lafarge, J. **Interracial Justice**
The American Press, New York, 1937
- Laski, H. **Grammar of Politics**
G. Allen & Unwin Ltd., London
- Linton, R. **The Cultural Background of Personality**
D. Appleton Century Co., 1945
- Lippman, W. **The Good Society**
Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1937
- Madelin, L. **The French Revolution**
W. Heinman Ltd., New York, 1926
- Madiagara, S. **Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards**
- Mazzini, J. **Essays**
J.M. Dent Co., London, 1929

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mazzini, J. Collected Works. The Duties of Men
J.M. Dent & Co., London, 1929
- Mill, J.S. Consideration on Representative Government
Longman, Green & Co., 1926
- Miller, P. Nationalism
Annals of the American Academy of Political
and Social Science, July 1934
- Moon, P. Syllabus of International Relations
Macmillan Co., New York, 1925
- Muir, R. Nationalism and Internationalism
Constable, London, 1916
- Oakesmith, J. Race and Nationality
New York, N.Y.
- Partridge, E. The Psychology of Nations
Macmillan Co., New York, 1919
- Perla, L. What is National Honour?
- Pillsbury, P. The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism
New York, 1919
- Rose, H. Nationality as a Factor in Modern History
Rivingstone, London, 1916
- Sommerville, H. A Course of Social Science for Catholic Clubs
Toronto, 1931
- Sulzbach, W. National Consciousness
American Council on Public Affairs
Washington, 1943
- Syrkin, H. Essays on Zionism
Hobson, New York, 1938
- Wright, J.J. Nationalism and Patriotism in Papal Teachings
The Newman Bookshop, Boston
- Young Kimbel Social Psychology
F.S. Crofts & Co., New York, 1931
- Zangwill, I. The Principle of Nationalities
Macmillan Co., New York, 1917
- Zimmern, A. Nationality and Government
Chatts and Windus, London, 1918
- Encyclopedia of Social Sciences