INTRODUCTION
The science has an explicit object of knowledge about the governing law of human world. There are three ways by which we can define the scientific discourse; (a) romantic epistemology of science (b) rationalist epistemology of science and (c) empiricist epistemology of science. Each scientific discourse has its own epistemology, ontology and logic of inquiry associated with its use of specific research strategy. To be clear, my value neutrality, and value judgement regarding making a Ph.D. research inquiry on the topic of "the constitution of modern ideology: a discourse analysis of the Intellectual of Delhi," is based upon the assumption of rationalist epistemology, ontology and logic. The modern version of rationalism is reflected by structuralist textual discourse analysis which heavily relies on the use of content analysis of the writings of intellectual's ideology of both western and Indian societies. The topic of my research can be broken into two parts. The first part is "The constitution of modern ideology". The second part is "The discourse analysis of the intellectuals of the Delhi". The first part can not be explained unless we examine the philosophical and textual discourses of "Marx and Marxists" and "Weber and critical theorist's" works; because these people laid down the ground-stone of modern ideology. The modern ideology can be explained through the concepts of democracy, socialism, nationalism, secularism and a distinction between civil society and political state. The modern ideologies are the product of scientific revolution, Industrial revolution and Cultural transformation in the west. The problems which we have examined are as follows:

(a) There is a correlation between ideology and social order
(b) There is a correlation between scientific activity and ideology
(c) There is a correlation between ideology and economic activity
(d) There is a correlation between ideology and political activities.

We have validated all these generalizations with reference to the statements, made by Marx and Marxists who are the champion of socialism; and also we have analysed the statements of Weber and critical theorists who are the champion of rational capitalism and democracy. Thus, chapters II and III have legitimized the tentative generalizations which we have made regarding the nature and function of modern ideology.

In part II of my thesis, we have examined the jumbles of statements taken together, from the writings of Delhi-intellectuals. In this section, we have, through textual discourse analysis, validated the generalizations which Prof. Bipan Chandra has made on the question of Indian nationalism. The treatment of Bipan Chandra works has been done in chapter III and in chapter IV we have treated the statements of Prof. Rajni Kothari which he made on the nature of Indian democracy. The problems which we have posed and got validated by the works of Bipan Chandra and Rajni Kothari are as follows:

(a) the social origins and social composition of works of Bipan Chandra and Rajni Kothari on the questions of Indian nationalism and democracy

(b) the basic value-orientations and attitudes of Bipan Chandra and Rajni Kothari as the intellectuals of Delhi

(c) their interpretation of the contemporary social situations and their vision of future society

(d) their position and activities vis-a-vis economy

(e) their position and activities vis-a-vis polity; and

(f) their contribution to and vision of human civilization.
The first chapter of my thesis stresses the uses and merits of discourse analysis after the logical falsification of romantic and empiricist epistemological generalizations about the human-world. The chapter VI gives a new vision about the western modern ideology and modern Indian ideology. Keeping in mind the demands of my entire research thesis we here explain the concept of discourse analysis as a tool and method for textual interpretation of the works of intellectuals. Further, we also propose to explain the concepts of ideology and intellectuals in the sense in which we have explained in our research thesis. The concepts of (a) discourse analysis (b) content analysis (c) the constitution of modern ideology and (d) intellectuals, have been used in the following specific meaning structures.

(A) DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The structuralist interpretation of discourse starts from structural linguistics which tries to separate out the differences between living speech, its contingency, its quick dramatic life and death and the deeper underlying ordering forms which govern our ability to undertake such episodic speech through grammars ordinarily unavailable to common thinking. These are deeper regularities - forms, constraints, limits - which make speaking, writing, thinking what they are without being interchangeable with them. Speakers implicitly obey constraints of grammar without being able to formulate its formal rules and exact restrictions. These rules form a structure, latent, constraining, unavailable to the ordinary user of language, and consequently recoverable strategies of research. Foucault extended the existence of such grammars from natural language to conceptual and theoretical languages and would identify deep structural
networks of exclusion, silence, various forms of unutterability constituting the vital frontier between what can be said inside a discourse and what cannot. Althusser makes a distinction between thought-in-concrete and concrete reality. "Thought-in-concrete and" or what Levi Strauss calls a "cognitive model" is a real order of thing which can be validated by its own internal systemic laws. The concrete reality or what Radcliffe Brown calls the "existing network of relationship" gives only raw material from which certain internal principles of social order can be deduced. It is wrong on the part of postivism which makes distinction between "science" and "ideology" considering the first, 'real' and the second, 'false'. Ideology is as real as science. The only distinction between them is that ideology is linked with class-interest whereas science is value/interest free. Further science has a history, an object and a time scale whereas ideology has no history, no object and no time scale.

The science of linguistics concerns itself with discovering, describing and explaining (i) the units of linguistics form or content, (ii) the structures or patterns in which these units are defined and situated, (iii) the roles or functions that these units serve in these structures and (iv) the dependencies or interpretative links that obtain between different units in the same text. We can speak of units, roles, structures and intratextual connections at many levels in the description of a language and in the description of text. The production of text is a product of human linguistic capacity, including thus, words and tone groups at the narrow end of its scope, and novels and bodies of law at the wider end.

The organization of users' knowledge of their language can be seen as having intertextually, intratextual and extratextual dimensions. Intertextually we recognize relations between what we actually
find in a given segment of text and what might have been their in its place. Intratextually, we have to do with relations between given pieces of a single text and "its worlds" we can discern at least seven types of relations involving units of linguistic form. Among the intertextual relations are those which hold between (1) a given unit and other units that are structurally, mutually substitutable with it and those which hold between (2) a given unit and other units that can be thought of as coming from the linguistic domain as the observed units. Relation of types 1 and 2 may be spoken of as relations of "alternatively" and "association" respectively. Intratextual relations are those that hold between (3) a given unit in the text and a larger units of which it can be seen as a part, (4) there is a relationship between a given unit in a text and its companions or co-constituents, that is, the other units found in its containing structure or between (5) a given units in a text and other units in the same text which it holds the relation of obligatory or potential co-interpretation. With respect to extratextuality we can distinguish (6) the world within which the text is produced and what we call the text-external world. and (7) there is a distinction between the world whose properties the text represents and what we call text-internal world. In general, relations of the first four types are found at every linguistic level. The relations of the fifth through seventh types are found only at the level of structures capable of receiving semantic interpretation.

Analogous to but distinct from the contrast made here between teh intertextual and intratextual is a more traditional distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimension given by Saussure. Briefly paradigmatic dimension is that within which one speaks of "Contrast" and "alternation" (to which our category first is the closest
approximation); while the syntagmatic dimension is that within which one speaks of "structure", "co-occurrence", "dependencies" and the like-in short "combinatorics" of language-represented here by categories 3-5; but also much of 2. The distinction made here between intertextual and intratextual can be pharsed as the difference between (1) Knowledge that a text interpreter brings to the text in order to achieve an interpretation of it and (2) an awareness of the text itself and the data which it provides. With respect to intratextual relations, there are two possible directions of dependencies: "anapronic": leading from a present unit to entities appearing later in the text. In familiar discussions within linguistic, these terms are generally restricted to discourse about pronominalization phenomena and various other reduction or deletion processes. But we are generalizing the two terms, for our purposes, to the two situations of (a) recognizing what something is or seeing how it is to be interpreted, though an awareness of its connection to something earlier in the text and (b) recognizing what something is and by virtue of that recognition, sensing its connectedness to something found later in the text.

(B) CONTENT ANALYSIS

Content analysis is the best method for our understanding of the mode of thought and code of conduct of philosophers, sociologists, historians and political scientists' textual discourse. It is through semantic interpretation and content analysis by which we can discover the ideological partisanship of Marx and Marxist intellectuals in the western context and Bipan Chandra and Rajni Kothari who are Delhi-based hegemonic Indian intellectuals. Content analysis is a relatively new technique which consists in the direct use of quantitative methods. It reads the meaningful ideas of
authors' textual discourse because it reduces the possibility of impressionistic distortion. One can define content analysis as a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of human communication and human discourse.

Content analysis is a methodologically sophisticated version of the common sense technique of finding out how an author of book has treated a particular subject/or an object of analysis. This can be found out easily enough by the common sense practice of looking at the index of the book. We can use content analysis for the following purposes:

(i) to describe trend in communication content of intellectuals.
(ii) to trace the development of scholarship of intellectuals.
(iii) to disclose the international differences in the communication of content; of intellectuals.
(iv) to compare the ideological partisanship of intellectuals of west and India.
(v) to audit communication content against intellectuals' objectives.
(vi) to contract and apply the communication standards of intellectuals.
(vii) to expose propaganda techniques of intellectuals; and
(viii) to identify stylistic features of intellectual.

There are many scholars who have used the content-analysis method in their studies. Content analysis was used during the initial interviewing programme in the "Hawthrone electrical company studies". It was also included in the preparatory technique for the "focussed interview" undertaken by Merton and Kendall. R.K. White analysed for content of the public speeches of Hitler and Roosevelt with a view to identifying the propaganda techniques and describing the appeals of political leaders to their followers. White systematically ascertained the
"values" to which the two leaders appealed in their public speeches. In
main, he identified three values on which he compared the two leaders,
one, authoritarian and the other, democratic, i.e. strength values, moral
values and economic values. One of the more exciting uses to which content
analysis has been put, is exemplified by D. McCelland's study of the
historical relationship between the motivation to achieve among the
members of society and economic development of the society. McCelland
and his associates measured the frequency of "achievement misery" in the
popular literature of the society at various periods and related these
frequencies to economic indicators. For example, they found a close
correspondence between the content analysis of data and coal imports
from London from 1550 to 1850. Another leading sociologist Pritim A.
Sorokin used content analysis to analyse the grand culture changes over
millenium. He clearly brought out how the proportion of philosophers of
different outlooks has changed from century as a proxy for the way held
by the various system of truth.

As against the conventional impressionistic view of
communication content, the use of latest content analysis has the following
advantages. Firstly, the categories of analysis used to classify the content
are clearly and explicitly defined so that the other individuals can apply
them to the same extent to verify the earlier conclusions. Secondly, the
analyst is not free to select and report merely what strikes him as
interesting but must methodologically relevant materials in his sample;
Thirdly, a quantitative procedure is used in order to provide a measure of
the dominance and emphasis in the material of certain ideas or themes
found and to make a possible a comparison with other samples of materials.
(C) THE CONSTITUTION OF MODERN IDEOLOGY

Ideology can be seen as a set of closely beliefs or ideas or even attitudes of a group or community. Similarly, ideology can be seen as that which provides a common universe of ultimate values involving a common cognitive orientation towards goals and the means for their attainment. Probably, all ideologies -Liberals or Marxists- are characterized by contradictions, inconsistencies and exaggerations of one kind or another. The language of ideology can itself be the vehicle of distortion. Religious ideologies in particular thrive on metaphor which involves a "semantic tension" between associated images. Language invokes a multiplicity of referential connections and symbolic associations and ideology provides a potent kind of organizing principle for the "correct" ordering of this experience. Ideologies dispel conceptual uncertainty by supplying a blueprint or a heuristic answer where other institutional aids have inadequate answers. In very broad terms, the main functions of ideologies can be classified under four headings:

(1) CATHARTIC FUNCTIONS

The argument here is that in various ways ideologies can act as emotional release mechanism. In religious movements, for example, the catharsis involved can be seen in cultic exercises where the actual content of the rituals may be secondary to the euphoria-generating conditions in which they are performed. More specifically, social catharsis may be concerned in some system, with the 'identification' of suitable scapegoats. This is not unusual phenomenon. It can be found in pre-industrial societies; but it is perhaps more commonly a feature of totalitarian system. This is starkly evidenced by the Nazi policies of institutionalized anti-semitism and systematic genocide.
(2) MORALE-MAINTENANCE FUNCTIONS

Ideologies can have sustaining functions which usually operate in either of two ways mentioned above. These have a kind of complementarity in that they represent primary and secondary level defences against more-threatening incursions.

(3) SOLIDARITY - REINFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS

Ideologies customarily operate to promote unity at least among its adherents. This can involve the rehearsal of venerated traditions or the reiteration and perpetuation of popular myths. This point is made by Emile Durkheim in relation to religion.

(4) ADVOCATORY FUNCTIONS

It can be argued that ideologies articulate the strain which impel them. This has two principal effects. First, it forces the masses to recognize the nature of issues involved and second, it polarises their response to those issues.

Further, we can say that the great debate between Idealists and Materialists - Hegelians and Marxists for example - as to whether ideas are causes or effects will be never settled by empirical social science, because it turns on the nature of "ultimate reality" rather than on observable events. In both systems of ideology individual is sub-ordinated to impersonal forces - ideal force in Hegelian ideology and material force in Marxian ideology. We can forcefully argue that individual use of political formulas to believe in ideology, is grounded in the need of human nature to believe that it is easier to submit to an abstract principle than to another man who rules him because he knows how to rule. All the characteristic features and functions of modern ideologies can be explained by the emergence of industrial and democratic revolution of the west which replaced the
established religious divinity as a formula of legitimation by the theory of people popular sovereignty as a means of legitimation. Modern ideologies are, therefore, all democratic; their mandates are carried out in the name of the "people" and their appeal is to mass movements. Paired with this, in most cases, however, is elite leadership by a vigorous and talented minority - the Leninist idea of the party as vanguard, the fascist elite party of superman. Goals are unrealistically optimistic - the capitalist "free market", the Marxist "classless" society. And the adherent of each of the doctrines is imbued with a sense of righteousness about his own values and goals. Modern ideology is a "historical consciousness" which is spreading from west to the "third world" countries as a solvent of traditional ideas and ways. In the process of change, ideology serves as an active instrument and is not merely a reflex of the process of social transformation. Traditional consciousness takes the world as "pre-given", whereas the historical consciousness of modern ideological thinking implies possibility of imagining qualitatively new social arrangements. In brief, we can argue that there are homologies and differences between established Liberalism, Fascism and Revolutionary socialism.

(1) THE COMMON CURRENCY OF MODERNITY:
Between Established Liberalism, Fascism and Revolutionary socialism
(a) Abundance as Goal value

One is a paramount concern with material abundance as a leading goal value of the modern political system. Liberal culture was the first to articulate this value clearly and to develop institutions designated to produce its systematic realization. Communist regimes felt the need for accelerating the pace to economic superabundance so long as this regime
developed in poorer countries. Fascists also have made material abundance a priority goal, although they typically have differed from those of Liberals and Communists. While Liberals and Communists have concentrated on economic development and rationalization of production at home, Fascist regimes have relied upon war and conquest to acquire "living room".

(B) BELIEFS

We have emphasized in our work the importance of a "work ethics" as a central "belief" in modern political cultures that see abundance through industrialization and the rationalization of production. Modern political culture involves the concept of individual freedom, self-determination and the value of human equality as well, because rational individual order requires command, hierarchy and highly structured individual role playing. Modernity believes in continuous progress and change as its core value. Modern ideology conceived the world as rational, dynamic and eternal pattern of goodness. It is found in the liberalism as well as in Marxism.

(C) NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND NATIONALISM

Another common element of ideological modernity is the concept of "nation" both as belief and as goal value. The "concept of the public religion" was replaced by the "concept of nation", where liberal movements have had to revolutionize the old order, the national appeal has been prominent, highly emotional and often stridents, as in eighteenth century France or nineteenth century Italy. Where liberal regimes have gotten into trouble and failed to realize their goal, especially the economic ones, the theory of "nation" has served as a psychological support and
has often acquired a primacy of value. We can see this in the emotional nationalism of America conservatives and in a much more extreme form in the "aggressive nationalism" of Germans. In the communist world, ironically, nationalism has stolen the thunder of "class" as the leading concept of community. Perhaps this is because "classlessness" has never become a tangible reality in the communist regimes. In any case, it is certainly true that in both the Soviet Union and in China, ethnic and linguistic nationalisms have been vital psychological cements, especially in the time of rapid change and international conflict.

(D) CONCEPTIONS OF AUTHORITY

We see that in addition to being a principle of identity and of community, the "nation" is a central ideology in a man centered world. "All authority proceeds from the nation". As conception of "authority", the idea of the "nation" is as its vaquest and can be used to clothe any number of kinds of very different institutions of political administration, from an America Congress to a republican dictator like a De Gaulle, to a totalitarian "Fuhrer" to a charismatic prophet like Mao-Tse-Tung or a collective leadership like the soviet presidium to the charismatic leadership (new style) of the Islamic holy man calling for "Jehad". Allied with the idea of the "nation" as a leading modern conception of authority is the concept of the "people" meaning in some senses, all the individuals in the polity as collectivity. Whether the regime is liberal, communist, Fascist or Third world, a modern government also must identify itself with the "people". Elections, plebiscites and mass meeting of all kinds are crucial in all modern politics.
(2) THE SALIENT DIFFERENCES:
Between liberalism and socialism

(A) REVOLUTIONARY TRANSFORMATION
Liberalism believes in the concept of "possessive individualism"; whereas the communist believes in the "class-humanism" as a major goal of changing modern industrial, technocratic and bureaucratic social order.

(B) CONFLICT AND HARMONY
Liberalism believes in "value-consensus" or in what Durkheim calls "collective consciousness" and "collective representation"; Whereas communist believes in the class-struggle and value-conflict as a preferred value.

(C) PRAGMATISM: liberalism and totalitarianism
Liberal approach, in contrast to totalitarian absolutism, assumes politics to be a matter of trial and error and regards political systems as pragmatic contrivances of human ingenuity and spontaneity. Totalitarianism believes in the concept of politics as an ultimate value for establishing the hegemony of dictatorship of proletariat.

(3) CRISIS IN BOTH SYSTEMS: liberalism and communism
Crisis emerges when we find that, in both democratic order and totalitarian order, there is exploitation of man by man. Ideally, liberalism and communism should have guaranteed the "political liberty" and "economic liberty" of man, but what we find in reality that in capitalism there is a concept of political liberty at the cost of economic equality of
men. Similarly in the communist society, there is a guarantee of economic right at the cost of political freedom. Hence, the negative effect of both regimes is the creation of what Marcuse calls "the one dimensional man". One can advance this logic that there is a private capitalism in liberal countries whereas there is a "state capitalism" in the communist society.

(D) INTELLECTUAL: GENESIS AND FORMS

Intellectuals of any society are the social engineers who visualize and anticipate the philosophy of conditions of human existence. Their genesis could be traced, in secular form, in the industrial capitalist social order who work for the conscious synthesis of inter and intra class relations. In this sense, intellectuals have to do with philosophy of praxis. They are supposed to demystify the always-already mystified world. In the Marxian sense we can argue that hitherto philosophers have interpreted the world; however the problem is how to change it. For Marx, change takes place through class struggle whose leadership is in the hand of intellectuals who announce constitutional displacement of false consciousness by real consciousness. In responding to my research thesis entitled "The constitution of modern ideology: a discourse analysis of the intellectuals of Delhi". We can recall Max Weber's lecture on "Science as a vocation" with its picture of the college professor as "at once distinct, noble and moving" with his mission to transmit knowledge and to prepare the student to think, not to indulge in "value judgement" least of all, in the guise of letting the "facts speak for themselves". We can argue that the widespread concurrence with Weber's view by American social scientists largely ignored the historical circumstances in which this view had been set forth, notably among these circumstances, in the Second Reich,
patriotism or chauvinism expounded in the classroom to captive audiences for "leadership" and "personality". Weber had thrown all his passionate severity into urging future scholars and scientists to fight their temptation to play the role of "prophet" and "leader". His plea, of course had been impotent. Not much more than a decade later, the world witnessed the enthronement, by due process, of the "Fuhrer" whose destructiveness Weber had been so innocent to have envisaged, even though he had a distinct sense of the tragic.

The notion of intellectuals as a distinct social category independent of class, is a myth. There is a close relationship between philosophy and politics. Doing philosophy means doing politics. Thus in a class-divided society intellectual is a partisan of a particular view. Intellectuals, in this sense, fall into two groups: (a) there are the traditional professional intellectuals, literary, scientific and so on, whose position in the society, has a certain interclass aura about it; but derives ultimately from past and present class relations and conceals an attachment to various historical class formation and ; (b) there are the "organic" intellectuals thinking and organizing element of a particularly fundamental social class. They direct and organize a particular social class, particularly proletariat, socially and politically for the transformation of capitalist social formation through democratic education.

Thus, we are not in favour of platonic academy, not in a dictatorship by intellectuals, but in the elevation into consciousness of something spontaneous which is going on and which we must develop into a principle of conduct. This can be realized by the method of trial and error by democratic intellectuals. This suggests that intellectuals, legitimized by their consciousness and conscience and on the basis of
thought and information, judge and assess their society, appealing to the reason in the majority of their fellowmen. Further we can argue that as a type of social man, the intellectual does not have any political direction but his work does not have a distinct kind of political apathy; his politics, in the first instance, are the politics of truth, for his job is the maintenance of an adequate definition of reality. The intellectual ought to be moral conscience of his society, at least, with reference to the value of truth. And he also ought to be man absorbed in the attempt to know what is real and what is unreal. If we ask to what the intellectuals belong, we must answer that intellectuals belong to all that minority which has carried on the big discourse of the rational mind. Thus, it is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and expose lies. This is in this sense that we have shown how Marx and Marxist, Weber and critical theorists (in western context) how Prof. Bipan Chandra and Prof. Rajni Kothari (in the Indian context) have exposed the underlying principles and ideologies of capitalist society- be it western or Indian.

In brief, the essential methodological characteristics of my PhD research topic which gives it unique quality, can be summed up as follows:

(1) It is primarily concerned with identifying and analysing the modern ideological construct which can be divided into two parts: (a) Western part and (b) Indian part. Chapter one deals with the "ideology and methods in social sciences", Chapter two deals with the theory and practice of ideology (at the macro level) given by Marx and Marxists. Chapter three deals with the theory, practice and dimension of modern ideology (at macro level) given by Weber and critical theorists. Under the Indian part of modern ideology, chapter four deals with the theory of ideology of
Indian nationalism given by Bipan chandra; and the chapter five deals with the ideology of Indian democracy given by Rajni Kothari. In the chapter six (i.e. conclusion) we will try to theorize the relation between western modern ideology and modern Indian ideology. The nature of my Ph.d research is polemical and it will compare the western part of modern ideology with the Indian part of modern ideology.

(2) My Ph.d research is committed to an inter-disciplinary approach. It draws together (in respect of both the selection of topics, intellectuals and methodology) ideological practitioners of different social science disciplines. At the same time, it also brings together the leftist intellectuals and rightist intellectuals. They are called upon to discuss the ideological dimension by Marx and Marxists and liberal radical theorists (Weber and critical theorists) of their specific topics from the methodological perspective of their respective particular social science discipline.

(3) My work will be based upon the research strategies and research techniques of discourse analysis which has close connection with structuralist orientation and school of modern social science. The research will be only concerned with textual discourse of leftist and rightist intellectuals at macro level and micro level. The underlying principle and orientation of modern intellectuals will be based on the process of intellectual abstraction from their concrete published works. If a particular intellectual is a subject, then his published works will be an object. The tacit unity between subject and object has been identified by explaining the nature and form of ideological partisanship.

(4) Its scope is comparative because emphasis has been given to compare different ideological polarities of western intellectuals and Indian intellectuals.
(5) In the Indian case, we have seen that there are structural contradictions in the practices of Indian intellectuals and at the same time we have seen as to how "the law of unevenness", given by Althusser, is operative in modern Indian social formation which consists of three practices:

(a) Ideological (b) Political and (c) Economic.

(6) In selection of intellectuals, care has been taken to include the established (ie recognized by intellectuals community) scholars of different disciplines such as philosophy, political science, sociology and history while ensuring that discourse of each topic remained scientific and academic. In a sense, thematic coherence has been made to serve the interests of unifying ideological gap which would otherwise have remained a fragmented exercise.

Now, let us summarize the connotative and narrative ideological discourse of all six chapters which we have map out in order to analysis my Ph.d. research topic entitled "THE CONSTITUTION OF MODERN IDEOLOGY: a discourse analysis of the intellectuals of Delhi". The main title of my thesis can be understood at the macro and abstract level. This will include the contributions of Marx and Marxist, (leftist ideologues) and Weber and critical theorists (liberal-radical ideologues). The sub-title of my thesis is concerned with the substantive dimensions of micro and empirical research-in order to discover the specific ideological and cognitive map of Delhi-based intellectuals. Bipan Chandra, as we see, has moved from his early Marxist analysis to his Gandhian-Nehruvian liberal analysis. Prof. Rajni Kothari also made an epistemological rupture between his early Gandhian-Nehruvian, liberal ideological analysis and his latter Jay Praksh Narayan's radical ideological analysis of "total revolution"; alltrough Prof. Kothari says that neither he was pro-congress
in 1960s nor he is in favour of radical change of Indian society.

In this chapter one entitled "Ideology and Methods of Social Sciences" we have seen how the empiricists and positivists' research strategies are not sufficient for analysing and theorizing the concept of ideology which is basically a cultural construct. Similarly the romantics' and philosophic Marxists' research strategies are not able to comprehend the structural causality of mode of production of which ideological practice is a part. Empiricist and positivist are responsible for making a dualism between ideology and science. They are more obsessed with the explanation of "object" which is concrete and, hence, quantifiable. On the other hand, the romantics and philosophical Marxists are generally obsessed with "subject" which is a matter of cognition and volition of an individual person. Thus, in order to make a reciprocal unity of subject and object, abstract and concrete and individual and society, we have chosen the research strategy of structural discourse analysis given by Althusser, Goffman and Foucault. Their method is anti-empirical and anti-historical and they believe in the structural causality which consists of two interrelated theses: (a) relative autonomy of part from whole and (b) the determination of part by the whole in the last instance. Structuralists are neither voluntaristics like romantics and philosophic Marxists, nor they are determinists like positivists and positivistic Marxists. Discourse analysis, as we have seen, is closely related to the textual discourse about which an author of the texts may not be fully aware about which problematics (in Althusserian sense) are operative in his analysis of reality. For them, theory is an intellectual production of knowledge which has its own internal system of verification. Further, in the discourse analysis absence of terms and categories in the text are as important as the presence of categories and
terms in that text. Analysis of text requires an intellectual competence in various disciplines of social sciences and humanities. Through discourse analysis, for example, we have seen how Marx and Marxists, Weber and Critical theorists, Bipan chandra and Rajni Kothari have changed the sense and essence of their theoretical formulation about ideology from time to time.

In the chapter two (entitled "A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF MARXIAN IDEOLOGY": (Marx and Marxists). We have discussed that ideology is a superstructural element which is based on economic infrastructure. We have conceptualized ideology as a system of beliefs values, ritual and rite which regulate the behaviour of persons. Marx says that in medieval Europe religion was the basic ideology. To say that ideology is a false consciousness, is neither acceptable to Marx nor to the Marxists. Gramsci gives a positive contents of ideology. He says that the capitalist social informations is based on the fusion of coercion and hegemony which are the product of political society and civil society respectively. He also makes a distinction between traditional intellectuals and organic intellectual. The significant concepts which Gramsci uses, are historical bloc, reciprocal relation between economic base ideological superstructure, homogeneous time scale, historicism (history is a process with subject). Another vibrant Marxist is G. Lukacs who makes three theses (a) proletariat is a subject and object of history (b) historical dialectic and (c) reification is an objectification which is produced in the capitalist society. Against both: Gramsci's historicism and Lukacs' humanism, Althusser, gives a structuralist interpretation of ideology. The terms which he uses are: structural causality of mode of production, relative autonomy of superstructure, doing philosophy is doing politics, materiality of ideology
and its apparatus. He talks about theory of multiple contradiction—a theory borrowed from Mao, epistemological rupture and, above all, he divides Marx into two Marxes: Young Marx and mature Marx which makes Althusser as the controversial western philosopher. Althusser, like Gramsci, also says that the capitalist society is based in ideological apparatus and repressive apparatus. In sum, we have seen that how Marx and Marxists conceptualized ideology in the positive term, not in the negative term. Ideology is a not a false consciousness, but a mediated imagination articulated by rituals and language of society.

In the third chapter entitled "A DISCOURSE ON RADICAL AND LIBERAL IDEOLOGY (WEBER AND CRITICAL THEORISTS)", We have discussed the theory of rationalization given by Weber and the critique of instrumental rationality made by "critical theorists like Marcuse, Habermas etc. We has defined rationalization as a universal process in the western society which is a product of the inner-worldly asceticism of the protestant religion. Rationality is that made of thought by which an individual adapts himself in a given situation in order to maximize his interest (material or ideal or both) by investing minimum inputs. Rationalization involves the element of (a) intellectualization, (b) demystification, (c) enlargement of normative control and (e) self-discipline, self rule and self-mastery. Rationality is not a product of scientific revolution, but a product of religio-cultural element of the protestant religion. Rationality is a historical and universal process reflected by the elements "politics as a vocation", "science as a vocation" entrepreneurial activity, secularism, democracy rational-legal bureaucracy and authority. In this early writings, Weber says that puritan religion is humanitarian in spirit and form which is a sign of good civilization. But in
in his mature writings, Weber said that capitalism creates an Iron cage and bureaucracy creates the element of "dehumanization". The mature Weber, it seems, is close to Marx. That is the reason, the critical theorists make a unity between Hegal, Marx and Weber; and try to explain the theory of negative diabetics, liberation of man from instrumental rationality and humanization of man by making a unity of subject-object, and above all, they stand for participatory democracy by annihilating the Stalinist's theories of democratic centralism and dictatorship of proletariat. By criticizing the positivism or positive the philosophy which belives in unity of sciences, the critical theorists talk about the discourse of historical dialectic and argue that unity of subject and object will eliminate the phenomenon of dehumanization of man; and it will liberate man from external constraints which are the product of capitalism and Stalin's "socialism without human face".

In the chapter four entitled "A DISCOURSE ON NATIONALISM (BIPAN CHANDRA)", We have argued that nationalism is not a false consciousness. It seems that Prof. Bipan chandra keeps the category of nation above the class. Further, he is opposed to class-reductionist theory of classical Marxism. He does not argue that nationalism is a bourgeois concept, rather he stresses this point that Indian nationalism is product of multi-class interaction in indian situation. He says that Gandhijee and Nehru contributed much to the development of Indian nation through the concept of democratic socialism. Influenced by Gramsci; who is a superstructural theorist, Bipan chandra has used tacitly the domination of democratic socialist over conservative within the congress party. In his latter writings he moved towards Gandhi and Nehru as the saviours of humanity rather than consdering Marxists as a champion
of humanism and naturalism which, taken together, constitute communism of Marx.

In chapter five entitled "A DISCOURSE ON DEMOCRACY: (Rajni Kothari)". We will deal with the dialectical of hegemony of congress party and counter-hegemony by the opposition party. He says that authoritarian politics was the conscious product of Indira Gandhi. She damaged the various democratic institutions and process in her regime. In fact, in his latter writings, he has been influenced by Jay Prakash Narayan's theory of total revolution. In his early writings of 1960s Prof. Rajni Kothari was influenced by Parsonsian structural-functional school, but when he visualized that even the opposition parties make a dualism between their prophecy and action, he became not a Marxist, but a liberal-radical of Marcusian and Habermasian variety. He says that Indian state is against participatory democracy. That is why Prof. Kothari is opposed to all forms of fascist and communist ideological discourse; and he, as a result, started a movement for preserving ecological balance, decentralized democracy, and protection of civil and political rights of the people which are under attack by the Indian state which is more bureaucratic, technocratic and oppressive.

In the six chapter, (i.e conclusion) we have theorized the concept of modern ideology. A comparison has been made between the ideological elements of western society and ideological elements of Indian tradition. We are in full agreement with Prof. Yugendra Singh's characterization of Indian tradition by his concepts of holism, hierarchy, transcendence and continuity. As opposed to it, the western society is characterized by the ideological universes of individualism, equality, secularism and change.
In fact, this chapter has defined the concept of modern ideology in a polemical way by preserving the unique character of civilization which believes more in spiritualism than in materialism. Further, we have argued that there is a dialectical or associative relationship between the modernity and tradition. The emergence of twin processes such as modernization of the tradition and traditionalization of modernity, made present situation more complex. Indian society is "unevenly-structured complex social formation" which can not be understood by the Hegelian "expressive ideological process", rather by the "theories and processes of multiple contradictions". This is more apparent in modern independent India in which the question "who is an Indian?" In the true sense, has became a problematic question. Similarly, the question :"Does Indian exist?" In the true sense of the term, in a situation of the relation of inter-states system in the world capitalism, has become problematic question. These two questions require our attention for an intensive, extensive, and multidimensional research project by the scholars, policy-makers and politicians through the method of discourse analysis coupled with content analysis.