CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

When we look at the constitution of modern ideology in the works of Marx and Marxists, Weber and critical theorists, Bipan Chandra and Rajni Kothari, we get a dialectical unity in their works. The unity gets reflected in the emergence of certain categories such as individualism, humanism, equality, liberty, democracy, nationalism and socialism. Marx and Marxists have analysed their ideological categories at the macro level in terms of abstract notions about social world. They have, polemically speaking, made a surgery of modern capitalist society which creates alienation of man from, his species, community, product, and nature. They argue that this happens in the capitalist society because in this society there is a dualism between theory and practice. Worker, as for example, is affirmed as free, equal and fraternal being in theory; but in practice he is negated once and for the all time. As a result, workers, through organization, develop revolutionary consciousness and overthrow the exploitative regime by class struggle. That is the reason, Marx in his book "Communist Manifesto" says that the history of hitherto to existing societies, is the history of class struggle. It is remarkable that this Eurocentric thesis of Marx and Marxists, has been adopted and reformulated by Prof. Bipan Chandra to explain the Indian war of Independence. Further, like Gramsci, Bipan Chandra explained the Indian war of Independence at many levels such as ethical, political, ideological and economic etc. One can say that Prof. Bipan Chandra is a Karl Marx of modern Indian history.

There is also a thematic unity between the works of Max Weber and critical theorists on the one hand, and Prof. Rajni Kothari on
the major question, which haunts my mind, is: "what constitutes the grammar of modern ideology? It is clear from the writings of western intellectuals that what defines the modern is a sense of openness to change, of detachment from place and time, of social and geographical mobility and a readiness, if not eagerness, to welcome the new, even at the expense of tradition and past. It is the proposition that there are no ends or purposes given in nature; that the individual, and his or her self-realization, is the new standard of judgement; and that one can remake one's self and remake society in an effort to achieve those goals. That is the reasons, the Indian constitution and state which is an embodiment of post-capitalist ideology-ensures us the ideological universes of freedom of speech, equality, fraternity, rationality, nationalism, secularism, democracy and socialism etc.

The modern ideology began in the Renaissance with the emphasis on uniqueness, originality, creativity, freedom, and individualism and equality. These elements constitute the structure of consciousness, a view of social order and liberty which emerged in a small section of the western world; and which, in the economic and political spheres, began to spread over the next 200 years throughout the rest of the world. We can specify five dimensions of modern ideology. The first dimension is that society is conceived not as a natural order, defined by a telos, but a social contract in which the individual, not the polis or the community, is the primary unit of society, and where the rights of the individuals (natural and inalienable), not those of a corporate body, become the foundation of the political order. The new issues of political philosophy are the modes of consent: which rights could be surrendered and which should not, how one defines liberty in the negative and positive senses; what are the
boundaries of the public and private questions raised by Hobbes and Locke, Bentham and Mill, Isian Berlin and John Rawls, and which remain today the central dilemmas of liberalism in a collective world. The second dimension of modern ideology is that it considers social-life as a movement from nature to culture in which human nature is seen as a "second nature" imposed on origianl human nature. Social life is an artifice, a set of multiple roles in which the definition of the true or "authentic" self becomes the troublesome question. For Rousseau (as later for Frued), social life meant a loss of "natural liberty" in the service of civilizations. For Weber, the loss of liberty of a capitalist is needful condition for the realization of "vocation" of human community. The third dimension is that it considers religion as a veil over man's self-understanding. For every modern thinker, from voltaire to Marx, religion was a superstition, the residue of the childhood of the human race that would disappear when men, in their maturity, come to see the world not darkely, but clearly. The criticism of religion, the demystification of world, was the starting point of ideology; the effort to change the world, the replacement of religion by ideology. The fourth dimension of modern ideology is associated with this idea that modernity emphasizes the autonomy of realms. In the classical view, ethics and politics, law and morality, are joined. In modern view, society is considered as, what Parsons calls, a movement from diflusences to specificity. For example, the modern economy is no longer subject to traditional or moral rules (e.g., "just price"), rather it is an autonomous activity, operating within its own self-contained boundaries, subject to its own laws, just as the discipline of economics itself comes to be set of self-contained concepts, detached from institutions. In culture, the aesthetic separates itself from moral, and the impulse to experiment and explanation
knows no boundaries. There is "nothing sacred". And in the polity law is independent of morality: law is purely formal and procedural, defining the rules of game, in order to permit individuals to freely negotiate their own arrangements so that in economic transactions, as in sexual conduct, "exchange" becomes a private matter. Given this separation of realms, no single code, moral or religious, controls all judgements. Similarly, the idea of natural law, like the natural order, is rejected as having no meaning. The fifth and last dimension of the modern ideology is that it acknowledges the variability of human nature. The classical idea of a pan-human nature, a set of constants or human universals, is replaced by the belief in variability, a variability defined by history or culture. For Marx, man was defined less by his species being than by history, a history that is the unfolding of man's power acquired through technology in gaining new powers, he also finds new horizons, new needs and new wants and so transforms himself. In anthropological theory, man is bound less by biology than culture and environment, so that one can not specify any definition of man by "essential" characteristics other than the elementry one of satisfying hunger and reproduction.

The name of the cultural impulse is "modernism". Modernism is the rejection of classicism; of order, symmetry, proportion; of realism; of the "correspondence theory of truth" which is the exact relation of sign to object. It turned to a pragmatic theory in which usage and experiment dictate interpretation and meaning. In modernism, representation and even reference are demoted to a secondary role or eliminated. Objects are things in themselves. Modernity, in its starkest form, includes the extremes of modernism in culture; yet extremes, though coarse, often reveal a salient outline. As in aesthetics, so in economics,
modernity is capitalism, capitalism is based on the theses of accumulation, optimization, maximization, the highest yield on capital etc. Capitalism has been a curious mixture of interests and passions, and as passions have become subdued, the interests have also become routinized. The overtly naked exploitations in the past, of men and the earth, have given way to corporate bureaucracies, harnessing technology to increase wealth. Yet as new technologies begin to shape new organizational forms that phase, too, is passing and a new kind of economics may be rising, an economics largely different from the mass production system of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In the domain of politics the world modernity is associated with the rise of liberalism. In classical thought (at least in its normative senses), the political is also the social, and the polis is the common bond, prior to the individual. In the redifinition of the polis that one finds in the Renaissance civic humanism, the normative ideal is republican virtue, the primacy of the "civitas" in the specification of the common good. Yet the modern man, as Rousseau pointed out so acutely, is both "bourgies" and "citoyen" impelled by his own self-interest, yet responsible to the common wealth. Liberalism, in its early form, is the effort to circumscribe the political, to separate the social form from the political, to enhance the private realm and reduce the public sphere. But the liberalism has been caught between the conflicting claims of economy and morality. Thus, in one transmutation, where the economic sphere had been unrestrained, liberalism invoked the "public interest" as against private economic power to make moral claims for regulation. Yet is the sphere of moral conduct (in personal and sexual relations) it has sought to limit the incursions of public morality into the private sphere and has insisted on the complete
free choice of personal decisions in matters of life style. Thus, liberalism is unable to formulate a coherent philosophy of moral obligation and of the proper distinctions between the public and private good.

The doctrines we today call, social, socialist or sociological and which multiplied so rapidly at the beginning of the last century, are all based on the idea of a separation or even a conflict between society and state. Saint-simonians and Auguste comte, mediating on the French Revolution, emphasized the lack of harmony between the organization of modern society and the centuries old political regime. They saw science industry, labour and the creation of goods as the true reality of modern society, with the real power held by bankers, scientists, engineers and industrialists. Saint Simonian formula, restated by Karl Marx, that the administration of things will be substituted for the government of peoples, is both an interpretation of modernity and a vision of the future. Marx's intellectual journey takes this as its point of departure: an acknowledgement of the divorce between civil society and the state. The individual viewed as a worker, as a member of civil society, is enclosed in his own individuality; at the same time he is subject to the requirements of producing goods and to the arbitrary will of the owners of the means of production. As a citizen, he possesses his atom of sovereignty and, thereby, partakes of the universal. But he expresses his citizenship only at intervals, by dropping a ballot in the ballot box- a ridiculous gesture that symbolizes his freedom yet does not free himself from servitude. The resolution as envisioned by Marx, would reestablish the unity of worker and citizen assuring, in the course of time, that freedom and universality which bourgeois democracy grants. Hegel believed that the distinction of civil society and the state was inevitable; he filled the breach between the
individuality of the workers and the universality of the state with agencies of mediation: professional groups, representative institutions, bureaucracy, even the incarnation of the totality in the form of king as a mediator between individual and the state. In Marx's eyes the separation between civil society and the state, between the worker and the citizen, is such that no mediation whatever is possible—at least, in a capitalist society. If the workers are to become citizens, they must themselves assume responsibility, as partners in production for the organization of the society. And state will wither away when it loses its repressive function.

Modern industrial societies are both egalitarian in aspiration and hierarchical in organization. They recognize the right of each individual to an equal dignity, to happiness, to citizenship and as a consequence to an equitable share of the assets produced by society. But the industrial societies also have as their objective the efficacy of the collective effort and this implies the subordinations of all to the decisions of a few. Of course, there is a dialectic of equality in modern times in theory but in practice we have the theory of "iron law of oligarchy". Modern man submits himself to a pitiless mechanism of production and economic growth.

The use of the term 'dialectic' is not a mere concession to fashion; a rather it means that society of the individual type is intelligible solely in its becoming. It has no fixed order: the only perceptible order is that of change. But change, in turn, can not be reduced to progress toward a pre-determined end nor to an even evolution whose laws and results are known. Neither in science nor in technology can the future be reckoned as a mere extension of the present. Even if we presume to estimate not only the number, but the knowledge and power of our descendents, We
still could not say with certainty what the social order of tomorrow will be. Mankind's aspirations for equality, individuality, and unity were born long before the species possessed the means to satisfy them. No one knows if tomorrow men will be satisfied with what society has to offer; if they are not, no one knows how they will express their dissatisfaction. History is not at an end. The societies of today are divided between spontaneous convictions, without which they would dissolve.

Modern society seems to conform to two imperatives: to produce as much as possible through mastery of the forces of nature and to treat its members as equals. In their relations with their environment men gravitate towards collective power, in their relations with each other, they proclaim their determination to recognize each other as equals in worth. Thus, equalitarian ideal is equivocal. In every century it has negated some form of inequality. Tocqueville talks about two kinds of equality: (a) Social equality and (b) Political equality. In his view, social equality stemmed from the elimination of the estate; political equality found expression in the right to vote and in the existence of representative institutions. But from the beginning of the last century, the socialist refused to confine themselves to those two kinds of equality; which they said, were merely formal. The socialists, if not communists of stalin variety, make a distinction between equality of opportunity, equality before law, equal conditions of existence and equality of effects. These four forms of equality, as we think today, would result into the formulation of two kinds of laws: (i) equalization of unequals among the original equals, and (ii) creation of unequals among the original equals. The first principle corresponds to the theory of social justice; whereas the second law corresponds to the theory of meritocracy. In fact, these two laws are in
operation in contemporary post-capitalist or welfare state.

Does not social equality logically imply at least a reduction of economic inequalities? And further, even supposing that a degree of economic inequality may be justified by an inequality of abilities and of service rendered to the community, must not equal opportunity be given to all. The first of these arguments leads to a demand for economic equality in the name of equality of needs; the second leads to a protest against the transmission of social and economic inequalities from one generation to another. Carried to an extreme, the first argument would justify making income proportional to need; the second would require that all men be given an equal start of life, thus implying a social order strictly non-hereditary, in character and devoid of any continuity.

The contradictions within the egalitarian ideal together with the contradictions between that ideal and other goals of the collectivity-productivity and the mastery of nature-have precluded any effective stabilization of modern societies. They are continually being unsettled by the progress of science and technology, and by the dissatisfaction of men. Order in such societies is always provisional. Therefore, the best way to understand its direction is to focus our analysis on the most obvious inequalities, those which have been at stake in contemporary ideological disputes and historical conflicts. These inequalities have been, so to speak, challenges hurled at societies themselves. The responses, they have made, enable us to identify the common characteristics as well as the specific dissimilarities of the social system of our time.

These challenges may be summerized in three words: (i) class, (ii) oligarchy and (iii) race. They denote the three principals kinds
of inequality. (1) Socio-economic inequality which depends on the part played by the individual in the productive process and in the distribution of income (2) Socio-political inequality dependent on the part individuals play separately or as members of a group in the management of public affairs and (3) national or (racial) inequality as in the case of sovereign state or a larger collectivity within which groups co-exist that are differentiated by language, culture and skin colour.

Thus, the questions which come to our minds are as: Is modern society being torn a part by the class struggle? Is it divided between the passive masses and all-powerful elite? or instead thanks to economic progress, are classes tending to dissolve? Is political power tending to become more widely diffused? Pessimists and optimists Marxist-Leninists and champions of western democracy answer these questions differently. But on the other hand; both camps would have to agree on one disconsolate fact: ethnic differences have proved to be the most difficult with the ideal of equality.

Weber, like Marx, is the child of modern industrial society, a society that emerged as a promise for liberation of man theocratic forces, but, it, ultimately, turned a man into a masterless slavery, depersonalized-entity and a spiritless body that has to be surpassed for the realization of organization goal of technocratic-cum-bureaucratic order. For good or bad, Weber was struggling for the resolution of a tension between ethics of spiritual life and ethos of instrumental science-a tension that he never negated, the resultant effect was emergence of a conviction that there are certain unintended objective consequences which can not be altered by the subjective volation of a man. When his authoratative scholarship confronted the internal aristocratic politics of Junkerdom of Germany
during the last decade of the 19th century on the one hand, the militant and expansionist attitude of aggressive nation state during the time of first world war on the other, his mind came to realize that vocation of freedom has become impossible and incomprehensible in the face of predestined history. Thus, Weber became either a sign for a predestined history or his writings were ransacked accordingly.

In fact, due to his existential experiences with the development negativism of new industrial society which reflected in the conservative thought of junker discourse, took form of composite substance having a tendency to generate conflictual arguments which might turn Weber against Weber. For example, Weber's original commitment to the ideas of meaningful action, subjectivism, idealism and formalism can be pitted against his final composition of history of ideas, which reflected through the concepts of objective possibility or impossibility of freedom, historical predestination of bondage, structuration of capitalism through constellation of material interests of hegemonic class and status-bloc politics.

We can argue that there was correspondence between Weber's developmental theoretical practice and the developmental history of modern west whose plurality of institutionalized and objectified spheres of action created a road to both: optimism and pessimism. The tone of pessimism is uttered by his sceptical attitude towards the laws of "fate", "pre-destined", "dehumanization", "instrumental/scientific-cum-military complex", "degeneration of calling", "disjunction between ethics of conviction and ethics of responsibility etc. In fact, his libertarian prophecy surrendered his currency in the manipulative world of terror and norror; his academic prophecy could not be carried buy any authentic prophet of
modern times and his was a case psychological manic-depressive alteration. Weber, in last instance makes a tacit compromise with the two unrecognized genius of the western civilization-Nietzsche and Marx who put their negative signature on the agenda of modern repressive civilization.

The basic ideas generated by Nietzschean Philosophy are as follows: there must emerge an ideal-typical stylization of the universal religion of love and brotherhood; life is struggle, knowledge is power. Superman possesses a canon of universal value; God is dead and in modern times there is no unifying centre like God in the classical antiquity. As opposed to mechanistic world view, he stood for the passionate interest in human life and he considered the intellectual righteousness as our ultimate virtue; his was a science of moral science. An anxiety of modernity finds its birth place in the life philosophy of Nietzsche who questioned the legitimacy of classical heritage in his text "Birth of Tragedy" - a masterpiece work which reflects that in Greek culture and classical word; order was not based upon stable values rather its existential in terms of the concepts of beauty and truth was the expression of violent and deed emotions of hatred, conflict jealously and aggression. His attitude of anti-christ finds its place in the text "Twilight of his Idols". The fate of times is godless time without prophet; and modern world is only a system of perspectives. The burden of past haunts our mind; however unlike east, the west learns not to perish on the rock of history. The challenge of history has to be arrested by the ideological operation of superman as in the case with Weber's charismatic ideal human type.

In fact, Weber, like Nietzsche, is concerned with the existential condition conflict in modern society. His early thought does not maintain its coherence when Weber saw that in Germany state
controlled by the economic supremacy of the aristocratic class of Junkes. There was a co-determination of political and economic powers; and he argues that there is a feudalization of bourgeois capital and there is identification of modern social order with the notions of "fate", "inevitable historical tragedy", and "cultural pessimism".

Along with Nietzsche, it was Marx's polemical inquiry into social system that provided a tool for Weber to develop a critical vision about the historically inevitable laws of capitalist society. He agrees with Marx that the capitalist system, primarily articulated by the unity of labour and capital, is the source of exploitation and dehumanization. But, he, at the sametime extends Marxism by saying that the over bureaucratization and impersonalization of society has affected both: the capitalist class and the working class. Inspired by Marx's work, Weber accepts that the fate of proletariat in the present capitalism is identical to the slaves of the past; but unlike Marx's theory of conflunctual history in economic sense of the term, Weber's theory of history discovered harder lesson such as if capitalism generates the seed of political and administrative bureaucratization, then socialism will be a further extension of compulsive and monolithic bureaucratic domination in the economic field. The theoretical tabulation of various events of human societies comples Weber to argue that history is not a linear development of economic-cum-ideological constellation of interest, rather its world is loaded with paradoxial meanings and events on the one hand, and the unanticipated objective consequences such as rise of dehumanization, on the other. Past revives in the present and present may retreat to the past. In fact, we live as did the ancients in past. Weber's theory of "dehumanization" is equavalent to Marx's theory of "alienation", Simmel's
theory of "culture of tragedy" and Durkham's theory of "anomie". The ideological crises of modern capitalist society will be resolved by the "rise of superman" (Nietzsche), "charismatic leader" (Weber), "Social revolution", (Marx), "Corporate socialism" (Durkheim) "trusteeship" (Ghandhiji), and "democratic socialism" (Nehruji).

The ideological universe of capitalist state, which ensures us the political goods and services of "democratic accountability", "self-management", "piecemeal social engineering" and "universalization of and institutionalization of political participation" forces the modern Marxist intellectuals to oppose the economistic and deterministic theoretical models of the classical Marxism. The voluminous production of philosophical, political historical and culture writings of the western Marxist- for example Lukacs(humanist model of Marxism) Gramsci (historicist model of Marxism) and Althusser(structural model of Marxism) in general and Indian Marxists like Bipan chandra, A.R.Desai etc in particular- suggest that the birth of their mutually exclusive polemics reflects a sense of historical pessimism and defeat of worker's movement in the modern capitalist system which maintains and reinforces its dynamic equilibrium on the basis of a fusion of ideological moment (concensus through legitimization / persuasive discourse) and the institutional moment (force/ domiantion). The consolidation of political power through democratic institutions, universal participatory process and the parliamentarization of government comes into existence when the hegemonic class, like congress party in India, absorbs and neutralizes the ideological contents of the dominated class in its fold on the one hand and articulates different visions of the world in such a way that potential antagonism is reduced to that of a simple difference on the other hand. The world-wide recomposition
of capital and creation of economic boom during 1950s and 1960s by replacing the old machine and smoke-stack industries with the new micro-electric method of production-control, operated by a new breed of technocrats and managers who create and regulate the system of economic planning and nationalized industries and services, have created this euphoria that the industrial democracy stands for the values of social justice, egalitarian order and humanism. An equalitarian social order can be achieved by the conscious intervention of the welfare state in the organization, ordering and distribution of national property; though at the existential level, "the central problem of liberal democratic theory is how to reconcile the claims of the free market economy with the claim of the whole man of individuals to some kind of equality. The formulation of numerous ideological notions such as advanced democracy, meritocratic social order, possessive market society, welfare state, mass society post-capitalist society and industrial society, the enforcement of ideologies of possessive individualism, fair justice, practical equality and politico-moral obligation; the positive and functional conceptualization of the existence of the model of multipolar and complex pattern of contradictions, conflicts and collectivites which are constituted by the prevailing modes of social integration, have been intentionally and consciously evolved by the politico-jural agents of the economically dominant class in order to provide a new grammar of politics. The new grammar of politics is based on the key process and logic of routinization of conflict, mediation, reconciliation and integration of the opposing tendencies of capital and labour for sustaining a new condition of existence and the structuration-process of the capitalist bloc and the bourgeois ideology which conceals the real exploitative relationship between men and their conditions of existence."
It is through new political ideology and technology coupled with the paradigm of welfare economics that the revolutionary potential of the working class was damaged in such a manner that the issue, locus, terms and conditions of worker's movement remained confined to the "thesis of conflict within regime", not to the "thesis of conflict over regime" in which the fundamentals and rules of the game are challenged. This has happened in India and elsewhere because a new balance of class force is supposed to have been created, since the proletariat's deficit in social power is compensated for by an advantage in political power. Thus, domination through inclusion of contradictory force appears to be the central tendency of the modern capitalist social formation. The whole structural and ideological indices of the post capitalist society can be identified with the emergent tendences of "the decomposition of capital, the decomposition of labour, the emergence of new middle class, high rate of social mobility through educational achievement, expansion of the notion of equality, liberty and citizenship in theory and practice and institutionalization of social conflicts.

(B) MODERN INDIAN IDEOLOGY

The ideological discourses of nationalism and democracy, expressed by the production of voluminous textual apparatus of Prof. Bipan chandra and Prof. Rajni kothari in the chapter four and five respectively, create the edifice over which we can express our polemical arguments about the indian civil society and political state. So far as the modern Indian ideology is concerned, we can say that a search for the peculiar spirit of Indianness has been a major thrust of the Indian intellectuals who changed the sense and essence of western ideology in
order to comprehend the Indian situation and, thereby, made an attempt to unite the Indian tradition, characterized by hierarchy, holism, continuity, transcendence, pluralism and tolerance, with modernity, characterized by equality, individualism, change, secularization, uniform civil order, and rebellionness. The Indian intellectual tradition believes in the idealistic ideology. Ideas of character, moral education, self esteem, religious tolerance and human dignity are the main guiding spirits of Indianess. The basic ethos of Indian ideology is a "unity in diversities".

Hierarchy implies the ordering of the units which constitute a system in relation to the whole in a superior-inferior gradation. It is based on the binary opposition of pure and impure. For example, the Brahmin who emerged from the mouth of the creator, is a pure caste; whereas the Sudra; who emerged from the feet of God, is an impure caste. Hierarchy manifested itself not only in the system of caste and sub-caste stratification based on the notion of ritual purity and pollution acquired by birth, but also in the Hindu concept of occupational life cycles and age grades and moral duties. Thus, the notion of hierarchy is omnipresent and it is related to the concept of encompassing-encompassed. The whole encompasses the parts. It is true that Dumont has made a major breakthrough in analysing the meaning of the conceptual categories of Sanyasa (renunciation), Kingship and Brahmanhood, not on the basis of the intrinsic properties of each, but on the basis of their relations to each other. It is the interrelationship between different categories that defines the universe of discourse. In fact the binary oppositions are intrinsic only to the process of human thought, not to its contents. Therefore, the category of mediation between various categories such as Brahman, King, and Sanyasi, becomes an essential approach to the study of Indian religion.
and caste. Hierarchy means "encompassing to the contrary". Domestic rituals and public rituals are related organically to the Hindu religion.

We can make certain qualifications about the Indian religion. First, from the very "start" of its history, Indian religion was characterized by developed-ritualism. Second, any particular religious tradition in ancient and medieval India came into existence against the background of an enormous and unparalleled proliferation of religious text. Third, Indian mythology has never figured as the content element in relation to ritual. Fourth, symbolic situations were ritualized. Lastly, Indian religion is probably the only religion in the world which has been able to produce and develop within itself its own objective theoretical awareness of itself. The concepts of mastery, lordship and overlordship are the essential ideologies of Hindu social thought. These ideas were the constitutive elements of the system of four varna in the "Dharmasastra". The building bloc of the caste system was the ideology of religious hierarchy. The distinction between the three twice-born varna and the once-born shudra was based on the distinction between those; who had the competence to become masters of the vedic fire and vedic montra and those who lacked this competence. The kshatriyas and Brahmans were not simply the masters of wife, sons, movable wealth etc. but also they were lords. The kshatriyas were the temporal lords and the Brahmans were spiritual lords.

Pluralism as a value implied tolerance of others' styles of life while preserving one's faith. Hinduism, the dominant religion of India, was essentially tolerant and it gradually assimilated other's faith. Hinduism believed in the existence of multiple paths leading to the same goal. But Gandhijee used the term "ahimsa" instead of the term religious tolerence because he argues that tolerence may imply a gratuitous, assumption of
the inferiority of other's faith to one's own; whereas ahimsa teaches us to entertain same respect for the religious faith of others, as we accord to our own faith. Gandhijee maintained a unity between "Truth and God". In opposition to the Machiavellian ideology, he advocated the philosophy of truth, peace and non-violence in order to overcome the evils of society. His thesis was: restrain evil by love and if we can not do it, restrain by force. He treated individual as an "end" and considered all men as equals before God. He stood for social and national integration, emancipation of women, Harijan etc. and pleaded the ideology of absolute social equality and abolition of untouchability. The Gandhian aesthetics of Sarvodya is undoubtedly a new dimension in the discovery of human consciousness.

The guiding principle of every religious thought is transcendence. It is related to the purification of mankind in all his thoughts and activites. The moral instincts of mankind are surcharged best by religious sensibilities that empower every human being to transcend. There is a kinship bond between religion and humanism because both of them lead to the path of self-realization of an individual. The strategies of ahimsa or non-violence are nothing but identification with every living force responding and representing God. It is also the inherent call of every religion to love every living being anywhere and everywhere. When Gandhijee emphasizes on prayer, he practically lays stress on peace and orderliness of mind for the welfare of the entire community. Character is destiny. National character is that on which the destiny of a nation is built. One can not have a great nation with men of a small character. Moral education is both: a source of knowledge and power to build up a great nation like ours. That is to say that our future destiny as a nation depends on our spiritual strengths rather than on our material wealth. The
greatest asset of a nation is the spirit and ethics of its people. The major function of any religion is to produce "a soul personality". One has to strike a unity between "soul in its essence" and "soul in its evolved, individualized form". Our religions have proclaimed, from the very beginning that each human individual is to be regarded as a "spark of the Divine". For the understanding of the highest truth which is also "truth par excellence", God acts as a symbol of humanism. Gandhijee, therefore, emphasises on service of humanity as service of God. Gandhijee was a mystic-humanist who establishes the glory of God- the glory that is felt inwardly with ceaseless endeavour and endless toil of the human soul which believes in the repirth of a man in terms of body, not in terms of soul which is essential and absolute. According to Sri Aurbindo, the soul takes birth each time and each time a mind, life and body are formed out of the materials of universal nature according to the soul's past evolution and its need for the future. Thus, all idealist philosophers of Indian intellectual tradition like Gandhijee, Tagore, Aurobindo, S.Radhakrishnan etc. believe in the ideology of religion as a philosophy of the self-actualization of man through God, in God and by God who is "supreme", Absolute and All-encompassing category" Gandhijee tries to keep his conception of man and God mobile and dynamic by thinking of "God" as force, as life etc., as if to make 'Him' admit divergent lines of a manifesting, incarnation and inspiration. Representing himself as a symbol of Truth, and purity of means, Gandhijee highlights the glory of man as a man. He upholds Truths and Non-violence like a rock and brings "Godness and Beauty" as the most prized objectives of humanity. Religion subordinates a man to the concept of holism.

Holism means that there is an ontological primacy of group,
as a totality of human existence, over an individual. It is the moral duty of an individual to satisfy the needs and expectation of his community, caste and kingroup to which he belongs. The individual subservice to collectivity was manifested in a multiplicity of contexts- be it familier, communism, village democracy or caste councils meetings. Since the individual was subordinated to the community, it implied a hierarchical relationships. Thus the ideology of hierarchy is all-embracing and all-powerful to such an extent that it subsumed the principals of pluralism and holism.

The constitutional discourse of modern independent India has adopted the ideologies of secularism, socialism and democracy. These ideological premises have been imported from the west; however they have got an Indian meaning because they operate in the Indian social context which is predominatly characterized by religious pluralism, caste pluralizm and linguistic pluralism. In India democracy, socialism, nationalism and secularism are considered as a "process", not as an 'event" because our nation is not a structured-reality rather, it is in the process of construction. In order to compat the communal and fascist forces, we have adopted the ideology of secularism and democracy and in order to check the tendency of acquistic capitalism, we have adopted the concept of democratic socialism which does not believe in the sudden transformation, but in the gradual and evolutionary transformation of the capitalist society of India.

The Indian ideologies of (a) democracy, which is a combination of economic liberty and political liberty, (b) secularism which means religious tolerence of one's own faith by the others and (c) socialism which is different from the concept of dictatorship of proletariat, are the manifestation of our assets of our national liberation movement. Like
Gandhijee, Nehrujtee was a great believer in the world peace, secularism, democratic socialism etc. As such he was hostile to the ideologies of imperialism, colonialism, acquisitive capitalism and "socialism without human face". His image of mind was shaped by the concepts of humanism, moral obedience and peaceful co-existence of species and nations. In fact, the concept of domination of man over man, blind exploitation of nature and the cult of personality were not legitimized by the intellectual tradition of India. There was an emphasis on adaptation and adjustment, rather than conflict with negation of Indian cultural tradition. True, the confrontation with the past in order to enlarge the margins of modern ideology in present, the assessment of weakness and strength of modern world view etc., have been a tendency of therapeutic approach to Indian history and polity. The Hindu view of time, space and event were linked with the conceptualization of cosmic force. Points of consistency in various field such as architecture, dance etc., are supposed to emerge in the meanings of spatial categories and bodily process. The public rituals include the ritualization of public events such as coronation and commemoration of gods through some sacrifices. There is a ritualization of passage of time; there is a strong reinforcement of tradition in the realms of modern ideology and technology.

Thus, the modern values, enshrined in the Indian constitution are not fully translated into practice. There is a dualism between theory and practice. For example, in theory of democracy, we talk about the concept of equality of opportunity or equal treatment of citizens; but in practice we find that the actual operation of the democratic process in India is infused with a high amount of traditional collectivism and hierarchy. There is also an inconsistency or contradiction between
private sectors and public sectors which implies a tension, in theory and practice, between individualism and socialism. Further, the official ideology of the Indian state is secularism, but in practice, we find that certain political organizations such as Bhartiya Janta Party and Shiv Sena etc. survive on the ideology of Hindu fundamentalism. Thus, we come to this conclusion that the Indian state reflects the ideology of post-capitalist society whereas the Indian society still practices the tradition values of hierarchy, holism or institutionalized collectivism etc. So there is no difference between India and the west at least in the operation of modern ideology in the contemporary global economic system. True, there is a gap between the lexis and praxis of the modern Indian social formation.

The regulated capitalism of Indian state, grounded into the discourse and institutional-materiality of the "scientist state" has formulated numerous ideal policies, programmes and law for the reduction of social inequality, eradication of poverty and implementation of social reforms and thereby, to dissolve the inherent tension between the system of labour and the system of capital, between the civil society and the state and between the realm of necessity and the realm of freedom in order to maintain equilibrium even in the face of crisis and tension. The old demand of establishing congruence between possessive individualism and possessive market society has been fulfilled by the managed capitalism through the equalization of "need-theorization" and "ability-theorization". However the dilemma of liberal-democratic theory remains it must continue to use the assumptions of possessive individualism-an individualism which refers to this fact that man is free and human by virtue of his proprietorship of his own person and that human society is essentially series of market relations- at a time when the structure of market no longer provides the
necessary conditions for deducing a valid theory of political obligations from those assumptions. In fact, there is no change in the basic structure of the liberal democratic state which operates in the class-divided possessive market society; there are changes between the pre-democratic liberal state and liberal democratic liberal state of the 20th century which initiated the process of constitutional development or political modernization or democratization, in which the mass-based polity compelled the structure of state to assume the status of relative autonomy from the interest of capital. However, the main function of the ruling class is not to create an equalitarian social order but to constitute and reproduce the relations of production so long as it is organically linked to the structural condition and institutional form of political power for the successful regulation and reproduction of the processes of capital accumulation and socialization and the universalization of commodity form.

The state is structurally and instrumentally biased towards the interest of capital, at least, in those situations when the operation of economics entails resource to organized violence and, in this circumstance, state performs the function of "repression through four modes": prohibition of opposition restriction of intra-systemic opposition, harassment and terror and surveillance. The state in class-divided societies is inevitably the guardian and protector of the economic interests and its function to ensure their continued pre-dominance, not to prevent it even at the cost of erosion of civil liberties and constitutional guarantees in the name of maintaining national interest, financial stability, social reforms and law and order problem. In normal time, the legitimation crisis is put under effective suspension by developing new political technology of state-monopolized scientific knowledge, parliamentary politics, managerial technology along
with different ideology formations like religio-cum-moral code, patriotism, freedom; competitive individualism and the functional nationalist emotions stirred by an accumulation of symbols in to order obscure class-relations. The manifestation of adaptive behaviour, complex modes of legitimation and effective enforcement of the compliance of the modern capitalist state has enabled it to construct such ideological universe-in which-threat wheather real or anticipatory-is scaled off by integrating the working class through the process of embourgeoisment, and by eliminating political explosions through the legitimate use of physical coercion within the boundry of capital-zone. Thus the capitalist state which has emerged in India, is a net balance of dictatorship plus hegemony and, for all purposes, ideological hegamony and coercive power complement one anther in the excercise of class-power. The welfare policies, adopted by Indira Gandhi should not be regarded neither as an expression of supra-class benevolence nor as a shrewed ruse of the ruling class; rather they are a manifestation of the inevitably contadictory and conflictual tendency of class rule.

In the late 20th century of Indian capitalism, a new form of domination came into existence with the appearance of modern science, technological manipulation, scienticization of politics and "power-knowledge industry" in which research process is used for economic exploitation and, in this situation, the word democracy simply means the institutionally defined and normatively regulated system of public communication that deal with how men can and want to live under the objectice condition of objectified labour. The whole practices of philosophy and techno-science are grounded into the logic of what Derrida calls the "unquestioned authority of the principle of reason" which, as a form of dominance, induces an element of politics in "end-oriented" scientific
resources. Bureaucratic and scientific instrumental rationality gives rise to authoritarian institutions such as the state, the army and the joint corporation which are instrument in the development of multi-national military-industrial complex. The Indian state enters into the constitution of the social division of labour by constantly producing social-fracturing individualization through materiality of ideology. The state consecrates and institutionalizes by constituting the social-economic monads as judicial and political individuals-persons-subject. The multinational capital of late capitalism has given rise to the phenomenon of post modernism in culture in which aesthetic production has become integrated into commodity production and is dominated by euphoria within a totalizing dynamic. Thus, the theory of cultural hegemony of late capitalism announces this principle that in consumer society the ideological mission is not associated with the primacy of industrial production and the omnipresence of class-struggle, but to construct a cognitive mapping of a pedagogical political culture and art in order to justify the existing interest of capital in the last intance.

At the economic level, the post war economic boom led to a new revolution in the system of production, technological structure and communication set which resulted into the centralization of capital and the internationalization of economic production coupled with the international division of labour among the imperialist countries. The accumulation had reinvestment of capital, aided by rapidly expanding state expenditures on research and development, revolutionalized technology in the core"capitalist" countries. There is a quantum leap in the evolution of machinery and power technology from the initial phase of machine production of steam driven motors (since 1790) to machine
production of electronic and nuclear power apparatuses (since 1940s) via machine production of electronic and combustion motors (since 1848). In the modern capitalism, which is a combination of organization and anarchy from the standpoint of functional capital, the surplus values is created by multinational in several different countries, because of the fact that there is an existence of decentered global interlocking network of economic order, whose complex articulation depends upon its uneven internal division into the "mature and dominant central formation on the one hand and the immature dependent peripheral formations on the other hand in which, on the basis of inscribed unequal exchange between parts of the global economic system, the surplus flows from the the latter zone to that of the former zone. The universal nature of commodity production and creation of surplus value along with the politico-jural state formation and deformation in the context of inter-state" relations and relations of imperialism, has come to form this view that the development of the capitalist world-economy has two tendencies: (i) the extension of (a) the interrelation of production, (b) the state systems (c) the capital-labour relations converging to form definite alternative periods of the system of overall expansion-stagnation; and (ii) the inherent contradiction between the development of the multiple state's jurisdiction. Thus we can notice that the compulsion towards the creation of a supranational imperialist state springs from the immediate economic function of the late capitalism. In fact, the late capitalism is associated with the phenomenon of over-capitalization by extracting countries. The core capitalist countries of the world capitalist system creates the phenomena of generalized universal industrialization, internationalization of commodity-production, mechanization, over specialization, and parcellization of labour force on
the basis of governing ideologies of automatic production technique, technological rationality and omnipotence of technological profit.

Thus, the entire ideological discourses of Prof. Bipan chandra and Prof. Rajni kothari have fallen into the trap of Hegelian or young Marxism essentialist, anthropological humanist or reductionalist problematic. Prof. Bipan chandra's ideological discourse of nationalism suffers from excessive compliance with theory of, what Marx would like to say, superstructural domain. It is clear from his discourse on the rise and growth of Indian nationalism that Prof. Bipan chandra is so preoccupied with Gramscian theory that he ultimately falls into the theory of hystoricism which is another picture of "Hegelian-teleological evolutionary-historical" dialectics Gramsci has defined the relationship between civil society (hegemony) and political society (coercion) in different and contradictory manner. Since Prof. Bipan chandra follows the path of Gramsci, he is not in position to define nationalism according to the demand of science of history (i.e historical materialism). There is no doubt about this fact that prof. Bipan chandra has not explained the modern Indian nationalist history in terms of, what Lukacs calls "totality" or social formation articulated by an interplay between nationalist ideology, congress politics and the colonial economy. The basic drawback of his theory of history is that he has explained ideology, politics and economics in terms of single, linear and evolutionary time scale.

Nationalism is the basic ideological overstone of modern complex capitalist social formation. After the breakdown of feudalism which was based upon the ideology of religion, nationalism has become a major cementing force in the capitalist society. It is through nationalism that the contradictions between classes and groups are negated to such
a degree, that consensus on national question is achieved by the ruling class through pursuasive discourse. Since nationalism is an ideology; it will divide the humanity. Of course, it is a liberating force and its function is to keep the people of one historical, geographical and cultural area united. Thus it unites a group of people against another group of people. Nationalism refers to the nation either as a tendency inspired by its existence or as the aspiration to build up a nation. The term 'nation', in the restricted sense of modern political group, possessed of certain characteristics, is generally defined within the modern framework of political ideas as a group of people united in accordance with and having certain attributes in common (territory, history, a common culture, a common language etc.).

Thus, we can argue that a "nation" is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of the common language, a common territory, a common economic life and a common psychological make up manifested in a common specific features of national culture. If we compare nationalism of old variety and nationalism as a new breed, we see that in the former the king in his official function mediates between the universal order or "dharma" and the empirical object, the population-territory, whereas in the modern republican nation, we find that the replacement of the "king" as sovereign, by the "people" entails a differentiation between the people and territory. What, here, takes place of "dharma" is the "law", but law being the will of the people. Dharma is actually repaced by people as a collective-individual mirroring itself in the territory. According to the conceptual category, we can maintain this position that the partition of India in 1947 was probably inevitable as a lesser evil in so far as the feeling of the
Muslims of being socially distinct was disregarded by leaders of the nationalist congress. Further, we can argue that the passionate desire to live in homogeneous nation state has incited some of the most important political crusades of the twentieth century. Under diverse historical political circumstances, the aspiration for stable independence has mobilized ethnic groups through a disparatic collection of nationalist ideologies. A spectre is haunting humanity of all nationalism—appeared to be libidial energy of modernity. This situation has appeared after the dissolution of communist dictatorship in U.S.S.R. However, as the twentieth century comes to a close—and despite the current nationalist upheavals in the soviet union—the power of the nation state appears in the longer run to be in decline. Besieged by economic superpowers and transnational corporations, these states now seek refuge in larger units thereby jeopardising at least some aspects of the political autonomy and state independence, so passionately fought for only a few decades ago. This is the new trap of world capitalism in which Indian nationalism has to be conceptualized.

Prof. Rajni kothari's intellectual discourse on Indian democracy, suffers, as we have conceived, from unholy romances between various intellectual traditions such as Parsonian functionalism, Habermansian and Marcusian critical theory and Gandhian liberalism. He starts his journey from structural-functional perspective and ends his travel in the ideological mirrage of critical theoreticians particularly Habermas who has provided a radical critique to the contemporary technocratic rationalist capitalist state. As we can visualize Prof. Rajni Kothari's concept of "one party dominance" in Indian politics is not correct, not because his conclusion about congress party is incorrect, but because
his problematic (in the Althusserian sense of the term) is inadequate to grasp the gravitational pool of Indian state. In fact, Prof. Kothari thinks that modern Indian state is rational; but its behaviour is irrational. In our opinion, the entire edifice of Indian democracy is based upon the illegitimate marriage of political democracy and economic democracy. In fact, Prof. Kothari is a liberal radical who like Gandhijee and Jayprakash Narayan, argues for the decentralization of power and democratization of entire society through mass movements. In his latter writings Prof. Kothari talks about "total revolution" following J.P ideology. One of the short comings in his writings is that he has demonstrated a feudal contempt for modern science and technology. Further one can argue that Prof. Rajni Kothari does not realize that the modern capitalist or socialist order is based upon the combination of force / domination / coercion and idea / persuasion / hegemony. Thus, there is a need to understand the emerging dialectics between civil society and state because the Indian state, in essence, is a democratic-capitalist state and we can say that Indian version of socialism is a form of populist ideology for seeking consent from the de-politicized Indian masses.