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Preface

This book is intended to introduce the question of European Enlightenment to beginners who wish to get a glimpse of the history especially its philosophical foundations. Europe has to be studied in its entirety as its history is closely connected with our history of more than two hundred years. The formal departure of the British in 1947 is not the end of the rule of the Whites. They have left behind their legacy in politics, economics, religion, philosophy and so on. The privileged Other of India is the West. They need to be studied thoroughly. It goes a long way in visualizing our own futures that are entangled with theirs. Hope this book provides an introduction to the history of Enlightenment and its development in India.

I sincerely thank Dr R. Shashidhar who was my supervisor during the doctoral studies. I am also grateful to a host of friends who have stood by me especially during crucial junctures – Dominic, Vidya, Virupaksha K.C, Prabhakar Neemarga, Dattatreya M, Ashok D’Souza, Victor Vaz, Venkatesh, Ningayya, Muniraj Kolar, Cyril Mathias, Vincent Alva, Vaudeva Belle and Shrinivas Gileyar.

I cannot forget Suma who supports to boost my confidence. The innocent, smiling faces of Mahima and Achinth remain close to my heart. The silent prayers of my mother send positive signals.

My heartfelt thanks to Niratanka who readily agreed and kept up the promise to publish the book in time.

Robert Jose
Introduction

Complex socio-cultural and political dynamics of the Indian polity today cannot be understood without having a sound understanding of the unique way in which the various strands of enlightenment and modernism have entered and altered the socio-cultural, political and economic life of Indian communities at various times. The overview of the enlightenment and modernism in India provided by Dr. Jose in this concise book helps the reader obtain right perspectives to appreciate the intricacies of not just the prime concepts but also the related movements and processes such as imperialism, reform movements, nationalism and post-colonialism. His critical appreciation of the progressive as well as regressive roles played by the elite in India at various stages of the freedom movement is highly significant. The significance of Gandhi’s persona to pre- and post-Independent India is usefully explored through Ashish Nandy’s thoughts. However, the decisive insights provided in the book go beyond the efforts of merely summarising Nandy’s ideas. Thus, the work promises to provide a proper orientation to the novice readers while also illuminating the blurred understanding of those who already possess some familiarity with the subject.

Dr. Ashok Antony D'Souza
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Chapter 1

Trajectory of Enlightenment

The debate on modernity and tradition has never been uncontroversial. One encounters the problem of historical periodization where and when exactly tradition ceases to exist and modernity begins. Resorting to a method of enquiry to examine the past is itself fraught with many hassles. Romila Thapar discusses how the periodization of Indian history by the colonial historians has made us to pay heavy political price in the twentieth century.\(^1\) Indian history was categorized as Hindu, Muslim, and British that ultimately led to the partition of India and Pakistan: “The past is inevitably part of the present. But the relationship between the two, which includes continuities and disjunctures, becomes more meaningful if the past can be explained and understood, with all its features both agreeable and disagreeable, rather than being used arbitrarily to validate the agendas of the present”.\(^2\) A popular conceptual framework of tradition defines it in terms of the past, bygone era; something that is obsolete, static and, perhaps, regressive. Summarising T.S.Eliot’s ideas on tradition Edward Said comments, “The main idea is that even as we must fully comprehend the pastness of the past, there is no just way in which the past can be quarantined from the present. Past and present inform each other, each implies the other and… each coexists with the other….how we formulate or represent the past shapes our understanding and views of the present.”\(^3\) At the same time, the past cannot be represented in the way ‘karma’ theory defines it i.e. the actions of a person determines his/her life in the next birth. Such a theorizing ultimately justifies
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caste hierarchy. The problem with the karma theory is that it provides theological/eschatological reasons for social inequality/hierarchy. The past cannot be changed whereas the understanding of the past can be changed. The hermeneutical variation depends upon various factors—political, social, historical etc. Hence change pertains to the present with its future implications. Modernity and tradition have a dialectical relationship though popularly and more often its diachronic relationship is emphasized and stressed to its logical end proving itself to be self-defeating. Fred Dallmayr and G.N. Devy aptly observe that the process of modernization in non-Western societies is closely associated with colonial enterprise. Due to its ‘intrinsic ambivalence’, they contend, it has been contested from all quarters. In fact, all that is modern need not be considered good. Horkheimer and Adorno, in their celebrated work, Dialectics of Enlightenment have seriously questioned the assumptions/claims of Enlightenment, which is portrayed as a paragon of all the virtues and qualities of modernity. It brings us to the important question of Enlightenment, which is considered as the harbinger of modernity. A detailed overview of the Enlightenment issues and assumptions is necessary because the whole question of modernity is principally based on the Enlightenment ideas. And, in the context of the thesis, Nandy’s theorization takes Enlightenment as primordial to the project of modernity and directs his critical enquiry regarding many of the assumptions first formulated during the Enlightenment Age.

The Enlightenment was an eighteenth century phenomenon with a series of events, intellectual breakthroughs and complex historical processes with far reaching consequences for the European societies in particular and the world in general. However, Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich point out to the fact that many of the historiographies of the Enlightenment have
studied Enlightenment as systems of socially disembodied ideas without locating them within the socio-political milieu. They further indicate that many historians of Enlightenment have assumed it as basically a French movement disregarding the different forms Enlightenment took in different social and political environments of various nations of Europe. Dictionary of the History of Ideas points that it “… is broadly co-extensive with the eighteenth century, beginning with the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the writings of Locke and Boyle, and ending with either the Declaration of Independence of 1776 or the French Revolution of 1789 or the defeat of post revolutionary France in 1815 and the romantic reaction.” The debates on the enlightenment revolve round the ideas of progress, reason, science, religion, and politics. Although the philosophers associated with the enlightenment had serious differences among them with regard to the way they perceived and formulated epistemology or religion or politics they nevertheless had tacit agreement on certain vital issues. Most of them were critical of the church, its teachings, and the innumerable crimes committed in the name of religion. “They held that the barbarism of European culture in its Dark Ages had been due to ignorance and bigotry, and that the Crusades, the Inquisition and sectarian wars had been responsible for retarding the moral development of individuals and fragmenting their political communities.” It created a group of intellectuals who disregarded the authority of the church affronting its divinely sanctioned theology. These intellectuals showed the limitations of the church teachings from the point of view of newly acquired scientific knowledge. The church felt the pressures of the findings of Galileo though he himself was more than accommodating the Catholic theology. While it would have been easy to co-opt the Copernican revolution yet the hostility stemmed from the politics of epistemology- understanding and explaining the
universe in naturalistic ways. Since nature is not a metaphysical entity but rather a physical one, the terms and conditions (method) to explore the laws of nature have to be natural. The Enlightenment vindicated the faculty of reason, experience, and experiment to understand nature though at times the Enlightenment produced too simplistic epistemological and ethical principles. “If, they implied, the good was the right, the right the true, and, as scientific inquiry was demonstrating, the right was also the natural (since nature manifestly conformed to reason), so the natural must be the good.” Nevertheless, as Roy Porter has rightly pointed out, “the Enlightenment was the era which saw the emergence of a secular intelligentsia large enough and powerful enough for the first time to challenge the clergy.”

The intellectuals or the philosophes, as they were widely known, had a definite agenda. Immanuel Kant in his seminal essay, dated 30 September 1784, entitled An Answer to the question: What is Enlightenment?, defined the enlightenment as an intellectual coming of age. He further noted that it is coming out of the self-incurred immaturity. He called immaturity self-incurred because of the lack of courage to use understanding. Hence, the motto of the Enlightenment is, ‘have courage to use your own understanding’. Under the tutelage of the Catholic Church and the monarchy people had for long been accustomed to follow the dictums without daring to question. Kant, therefore, advocated the public use of reason, which alone he contended could bring about Enlightenment. Enlightenment, according to him, was a teleological process. “Freedom to think and to express thought, freedom to act, the casting-off of external controls (often self-imposed) in the use of the human mind, were all identified by Kant as key components of the spirit of the times.”

Further, the philosophes confronted head-on the traditional
established forms of knowledge dependent on biblical account of creation of the world and sought to replace it with new epistemology relying on experience, experiment, and reason. Knowledge, until the eighteenth century, had a strong dose of scriptural sources.\textsuperscript{13} Galileo, Kepler, and Copernicus with their astronomical observations and discoveries about the universe have radically challenged the geo-centric cosmology of the Christian church. “The philosophes challenged the traditional role of the clergy as the keepers and transmitters of knowledge: because they wished to redefine what was socially important knowledge, to bring it outside of the sphere of religion, and to provide it with a new meaning and relevance.”\textsuperscript{14} It is for this reason the Enlightenment period is very often perceived as an age that took it for itself the mission to liberate the social space from the clutches of religious bigotry.\textsuperscript{15}

The Eighteenth century Europe was essentially a society based upon the ownership of land. The Kings also were part of the landed gentry. The professional lawyers, clerics, state officials, small farmers belonged to the second group. And, then, there was the emergent middle class involved in trade and commerce – from the goldsmith to the shoemaker. Domestic servants, working class along with peasants made up the large section of the population. In France three estates represented the social order- clergy, nobility and the third estate. Some of the philosophes hailed from the second estate. Hence, it is pointed out that they were “less explicitly subversive of the traditional social order than of the traditional religious order”.\textsuperscript{16} The philosophes for all their rhetoric did very little to include the working class into confidence. Discussing about British imperialism P.J.Cain makes an interesting observation in his book British Imperialism. He observes that the revolution of 1688 created a kind of capitalism, which was headed by landlords in association with financiers. Capitalism joined hands
with traditional powers to consolidate their position in the domestic front and to expand their overseas territories and simultaneously the aristocracy employed imperialism as one of its strategies in association with capitalism to improve itself: “The joint enterprise established a tradition of modernization and was itself the product of a modernization of tradition that both conserved gentlemanly values and carried them forward into a changing world.”

It must be observed that during the Enlightenment period, most importantly, sea changes occurred in the economic front. A new entrepreneurial class began to invest in the manufacturing sector providing raw materials and tools with work specifications to the household and then marketed the goods. This new class, comprising of merchants, craftsmen, farmers including labourers, began to enjoy social and economic power throwing the challenge to the political power of the landowners.

One could discern the seeds of economic modernity in such a picture of the eighteenth century. Yet, one cannot suppose that the changes occurred suddenly or dramatically. It was a gradual process by which agricultural sector slowly got eclipsed to give way to the industrial sector. It is also called as an age of commerce because of the increased activity in buying and selling of consumer goods especially clothing and household goods setting new fashions. Roy Porter’s account of the eighteenth century in English Society in the Eighteenth Century depicts it as a consumer society in an embryonic form. During the middle years of the eighteenth century a group called physiocrats led by Francois Quesnay dominated France. They believed and advocated that the real source of national wealth was land and commerce and industry hardly made any difference to it. It was for the first time the laissez-faire policy was introduced to denote non-interference of the state in industry. Their influence on Adam Smith was perceptible.
In 1776, Adam Smith published Wealth of Nations inaugurating the scientific study of economy. The book helped in the growth of liberal capitalism. Smith’s writing endorsed the new market oriented commerce. It stressed the need for making profit through market economy. The book postulated and argued relentlessly about how the activity of individual making profit ultimately results in the prosperity of the society as a whole:

“...Smith was very much following the general approach of the eighteenth century, which placed considerable importance on the right to use one’s own property. Indeed, for Smith one of the social benefits of a commercial society was that the monetized relations replacing the older relations of servitude and dependence were conducive to greater liberty for all, including the lower ranks of society; ...”

He also accurately analysed how the competitive market price determines the difference between demand and supply. He indicated that if rise in demand is higher than supply then the market price will increase and vice versa. Nevertheless, the market is not arbitrary. It, eventually, strikes a balance. He envisages the least state interference in the economic activity. Interestingly, the process of economic modernity, simultaneously, reinforces and inverts the role of the state as a patron who takes the responsibility of fulfilling the basic needs of the people. Thus, the laissez-faire capitalism enabled the economy to be treated as a separate entity quite distinct from the political power and moral duties of the state.

The philosophers discerned the role of science in their project of facing up to religious intolerance. Science, according to the intellectuals of the eighteenth century was the epitome of knowledge. The epistemology underpinned by experiments, they thought, would lead to a quantitative and qualitative shift
in the society. The scientific revolution of the preceding cen-
tury gave the necessary impetus to develop and apply those theories to various aspects of society. Other systems of knowl-
edge took science as an ideal to be emulated. The discoveries in the scientific field had double effect: one, wonder at the new discoveries about the universe; and two, the excitement that “human intelligence would formulate laws which governed the motions, relations, and physical properties of that universe.”

Newton was a name to reckon with. Newton synthesized em-
pirical observation with mathematical method to produce sci-
entific knowledge. “His method is to deduce mathematical formulae from the observed motions of bodies in the heavens and on earth, and then from the formulae to deduce other motions which could be checked against further observations…”

He applied his theories to phenomena such as perturbations in the moon’s orbit, the rise and fall of tides, and the behaviour of light. As a result of the scientific changes metaphysics was relegated to a secondary position and the stress was laid on a posteriori deductions rather than a priori assumptions. In other words, inductive logic was preferred to deductive logic.

Newton’s principle of gravitation, “that every body attracts every other body with a force proportional to its mass and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them” attracted the attention of astronomers, physicists, and mathematicians in England and Europe throughout the eighteenth century. The ubiquitous presence of ether—an expanded fluid medium, according to Newton, throughout the universe including the pores of bodies, is responsible for gravity, magnetism, and electricity. Newton’s theory of light most significantly demonstrated that white light is a mixture of many colours. As a result of Newton’s Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica many got interested in astronomy. Astronomy, on its part, helped further the aspiration of trade
through the improvement of navigation. The philosophers of the Enlightenment were impressed by this new development: “They recognized full well that Newton’s observations themselves required metaphysical grounding— that is, a belief in the existence of order created by god. But what they found remarkable was that Newton used this metaphysical belief as a springboard for empirical examination, rather than as an a priori truth to explain material phenomenon.”

Likewise, the perceptible shifts in the mode of production in the fields of agriculture gave rise to large-scale farming. Newer machines produced a culture of machines and sophisticated weapons of war in the industrial field. Thus, the underlying technological changes in the European society led to changes in every sphere of life. Achievements in natural science led philosophes including Newton to believe that scientific method might be applied to society and enlarge the horizons of moral philosophy. Voltaire who visited England in the 1720's published Letters Philosophiques (1732). It is a heuristic presentation of Locke’s empiricism, Bacon’s empirical method, Newton’s scientific knowledge of the universe, and the religious pluralism and tolerance that he witnessed in England. The immediate banning of the book popularized its content in France.

Moreover these changes were backed up by institutional support. These institutions created an intellectual ambience for the intellectuals to work and mutually exchange views. Academie francaise established in 1635 and the Royal Society of London established in 1645 were the first modern organizations for the study and dissemination of ideas. The epistemological grounding in experience distinguished them from others who relied on religious dogmas, secular authority, and mysticism. Thanks to the tireless efforts of people like D’Almbert and others the ideas were debated in the public sphere.
The Encyclopedie popularized the belief and the beneficial effects of science. Although, intended to be a translation of an English work, Ephraim Chamber’s Cyclopaedia or Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences (1728) it metamorphosed into an excellent masterpiece in the hands of its editors, Denis Diderot and Jean d’Alembert. It was a mission that took nearly twenty years with a production of seventeen volumes of text and eleven volumes of engravings. Such a grand accomplishment hoped to place man at the center of creation. In an entry under the heading ‘Encyclopedie’ Diderot spelt out the aim of the Encyclopedie to be “something which would order knowledge and information as ‘a grand and noble avenue, stretching into the distance, and along which one would find other avenues, arranged in an orderly manner and leading off to isolated and remote objects by the easiest and quickest route.”

The method of enquiry adopted was critical and rational as against prejudice, superstition, and dogmatism of all hues and colours. The polemical approach adopted by the Encyclopedists invited opposition from the political especially the ecclesiastical circles. By 1789 nearly 50 per cent of 25,000 copies were sold outside France proving the pre-eminence of French as a language of culture and the so-called cultivated. It is said that popularity of the Encyclopedie was due to its critical and irreverent notoriety than for any project it represented. The term, ‘Encyclopedism’, was used synonymously with refusal to accept anything uncritically. The contributors to the volumes ranged from French authors, scientists, architects, artists, Voltaire, Rousseau, Bayle, Montesquieu, Buffon, Lamarck etc. It was as systematic comprehensive compilation of articles on ‘man’, ‘society’, ‘method’, ‘nature’ as well as on the natural social sciences. “The practical application of thought, in terms of both social reform and the mechanical arts, received particular emphasis; a humanitarian concern and a desire for free-
dom (intellectual, civil, economic, political) were recurring themes, although the work was not politically radical”.

The propagation of the Enlightenment ideas depended upon learned journals, coffee houses, academies etc. New journals were started to disseminate ideas about literary matters, news, arts, science, theology, philosophy and other matters of contemporary concern. The reading public simultaneously grew along with circulating libraries. Yet, it must be noted that the readers were mainly nobles, clerics and the professional bourgeoisie who mostly resided in the towns. It has been indicated that the manufacturing and the trading class did not show interest in the intellectual culture of the day. The periodicals gained popularity in England. Terry Eagleton sees the periodicals as part of the emergent bourgeois public sphere. It, Eagleton writes, served as a vehicle/instrument to further its ‘demands and self-esteem in the context of absolutist state and a hierarchical society.’ Invariably, the clubs, periodicals, coffee houses provided the physical space for such a literary discussion:

“The English bourgeois public sphere of the early eighteenth century, of which Steele’s Tattler and Addison’s Spectator are central institutions, is indeed animated by moral correction and satiric ridicule of a licentious, socially regressive aristocracy; but its major impulse is one of class consolidation, a codifying of the norms and regulating of the practices whereby the English bourgeoisie may negotiate an historic alliance with its social superiors.”

The coffee houses provided a rallying point for people of heterogeneous backgrounds to interact temporarily suspending the social distinctions. It was reason more than power, which guided the public sphere in its discourses, thus, creating a semblance of equality among those who participated in it. The entire discourse was founded on the assumption that politics
and knowledge were separate entities. Although the public sphere extended to bring within its fold hitherto marginal classes such as the lawyers, surgeons, actors and so on it left out farm labourers, domestic servants etc: “To collaborate in the public sphere thus becomes the criterion of one's right to do so, though it is of course inconceivable that those without property … could participate in this realm.  

The key thinkers like Voltaire and Diderot frequented salons, especially in France. Financed and run by the wealthy women it also sponsored the Encyclopedie when the French court suppressed it. Yet, the salons won notoriety in the eyes both of the public as well as the intellectuals who enjoyed the privilege of the intellectual and emotional company of these women. Further and most importantly, the writings of the philosophes did not reflect in any way concern for women. They projected women as beings subordinate to men and consequently condemned the political involvement of women. In spite of its revolutionary content, Enlightenment hardly changed the lives of women. However, a few women raised objections to the present state of affairs. In France, Marie Olympe Aubry de Gouges championed the cause of women especially at a time when it was natural to consider woman as a second-class citizen. Her political pamphlet, The Rights of Woman challenged the Declaration of 1789 for its failure to include the civil rights and responsibilities of women. The passionate appeals of Gourges and others fell on deaf ears and ended with her execution. Mary Wollstonecraft was equally eloquent about the rights of woman in her celebrated work, A Vindication of the Rights of Woman. Her basic faith in the Enlightenment ideas of progress prompted her to criticize the socio-legal-religious-political authorities that have deprived women of their rightful place. Education, she thought, would help in the formation of women to take up new roles in the society.
One of the most significant components of the Enlightenment was reason. Perceived as an antithesis to imagination, the romantics and a sizeable number of traditionalists in the 20th and 21st century have objected to its truncated vision of human person. As opposed to the popular critique of Enlightenment that it promoted monolithic understanding of nature, reason etc Montesquieu, a leading philosopher of the Enlightenment defended the plurality of reason. He argued that every society has its own brand of nature and that it applies reason differently with different solutions in different types of societies. Yet it must be observed that in theorizing and in practice a monolithic western ideal of rationality has been privileged. The tradition of rationality can be traced back to Aristotle who declared, 'man is a rational animal'. Rationality, according to Aristotle is a distinguishing marker that separates man in its gendered sense from other animals. In Aristotle’s scheme of things man occupied the highest place.

Rene Descartes, a French philosopher of the seventeenth century, proposed to replace Aristotelian philosophy with his own brand of metaphysics and human psychology based on absolute certainty. Descartes constructs a system that included a method of inquiry, metaphysics, a mechanistic physics and biology. He is also known for the new analytic geometry, which combines geometry and algebra. In Meditations (1641) Descartes clears the metaphysical grounds of knowledge. He begins with his method of doubt. Refuting the Aristotelian and Scholastic traditions of the medieval period he attempted to start philosophy anew. He begins with his method of doubt (sometimes called hyperbolic method of doubt). First of all, he doubts the information received through the senses. He rejects the senses as the foundation for philosophy because it is known at times to communicate false information and therefore, resolves to accept what is certain and beyond doubt.
Descartes also proposes a hypothesis, ‘I am dreaming even though I believe myself to be awake’, thus doubting the existence of the self. Descartes next speculates that God himself is as deceiver but immediately corrects that it is as theoretical doubt and goodness is the attribute of God. And, accordingly proposes that a malevolent demon deceives him. Hence new epistemology, which is beyond doubt, must be the search of philosophy. The rebuilding of the world begins with the discovery of the self through the ‘Cogito argument’- ‘I think, therefore I am’. The self is known independent of the senses. An idea of God that is perfect is found within the self. No one who is less than God can implant such a perfect idea. Therefore, Descartes concludes that both God and reason exist. He then presents a hierarchy of knowledge:

Throughout his career he held firmly to the notion that the interconnected body of knowledge that he sought to build has a particular order. Knowledge, for Descartes, begins in metaphysics, and metaphysics begins with the self. From the self we arrive at God, and from God we arrive at the full knowledge of mind and body. This, in turn, grounds the knowledge of physics, in which the general truths of physics (the nature of body as extension, the denial of the vacuum, the laws of nature) ground more particular truths about the physical world. Physics, in turn, grounds the applied sciences of medicine (the science of the human body), mechanics (the science of machines) and morals (the science of the embodied mind).

Descartes’ metaphysics also speculates on the distinction between mind and body. If body is a substance whose essence is extension, a geometry object, thought is the essence of the mind, Yet, Descates held the view that the mind and the body are closely united with one another. Descartes next discusses how ideas may represent reality. The inquiry presupposes that
ideas are different from the world. And, the representation can be false, for example, in the case of a far away object appearing small.

John Locke rejected the hypothesis of the Cartesians that certain notions are innate in the mind. In An Essay concerning Human Understanding (1690) Locke postulated that the mind was a tabula rasa or a blank slate at birth and acquired knowledge by experience. He accommodated reflection that had nothing to do with external object as ‘internal sense’. Descartes had postulated that sensation needs intellectual reflection in order to recognize it as an independent body. Moreover, to arrive at knowledge rational proof is required and that involves reflection on the mechanism of the sense. Lockean formulations of human perceptions immediately caught the enthusiasm of Enlightenment that it was used as pedagogy for social revolution. Locke further assumed that “perception is brought about causally by the action of physical objects on the mind through the senses and the brain”. Thus, we have the knowledge of their existence than the essence of objects. The external objects possessed two kinds of qualities: primary and secondary. Solidity, extension, figure, motion or rest and number are primary qualities, and, they exist inspite of one’s perception of them. Secondary qualities- on the other hand, colours, sounds, tastes- require perception. The mind perceived simple ideas through the senses and combines them into complex ideas either passively or volitionally. He further “…distinguishes between general substance matter and the particular constitution of matter from which flow the observable properties by which we define each sort of substance-gold, horse, iron and so on”. If Locke placed knowledge at the lowest level of certainty, the knowledge of a God was kept at the second degree. And in the highest degree he placed ‘intuition’ by which one knew his/her existence. However, Locke rules
out the rationalist innate intuitionism as it has no relation with the actual. Whereas, he demonstrated that the empirical intuitionism is experiential and sensory.

Locke further argued that values such as justice, piety, gratitude, and equity are the impact of cultural environment on individuals. As such it opposed the belief of some philosophers that values are innately present in an individual. Although Locke is known for his theorization on empirical knowledge he does acknowledge instructive apriori knowledge especially regarding mathematical propositions. Hence, Locke inaugurated the science of man which was primarily empirical in nature.

George Berkeley reverses the scientific trend of Locke. He asserts that the world exists independent of human perception and it exists as idea in the mind of God. Our knowledge of the world is the idea impressed upon by God. David Hume says that human perceptions have two distinct categories viz. impressions and ideas. Sensations, passions, and emotions are impressions that strongly and forcefully enter into the mind. The images of impressions in thinking and reasoning are called ideas. The principle of association combines together simple ideas into complex ideas. Even soul, according to Hume, is as quick succession of perceptions. He also postulates that the basis for moral subject cannot be rational argument. And, concludes that belief is a matter of feeling or habit. He defines human person as bundle of emotions. David Priestley abolishes all distinctions between mind and matter and declares that matter is a form of energy, which is nothing but the revelation of divine force. The natural law regulates the choices of will.

The philosophical writings also sought to deconstruct the semi-divine status of the kings. The kings till then enjoyed absolute power. It was sanctioned by the papacy. The church-state nexus reinforced each other’s authority. Rousseau in his
celebrated book questioned the sanctity of the kings and strongly advocated rule by the people. The nation-state is a modern administrative/political apparatus. It has its distinct features. Having jurisdiction over a demarcated territorial area the nation-state functions by controlling the means of violence through army and police. Further, the legitimacy of the nation-state stems from the fact that it enjoys the support of the citizens unlike the divine right theory of kingship.

Grotius, has left his mark on theories regarding natural law. He sketched the difference between theology and natural law. The ideas of Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf constituted the bases for the eighteenth century thinkers such as Montaigue, Rousseau, and Hume. The political and religious discourses also came out of academic treatises into the public domain. Pufendorf’s On the Law of Nature and Nations (1672) and On the Duty of Man and Citizen (1673) made significant contributions to the evolution of natural law. He argued that sociability served long-term self-interests of the individual. Further, he knew that the state provides much needed order, stability, and progress and therefore tried to develop a new political theory that is non-sectarian/secular. He knew that the public has the power to check the tyrannical tendencies of sovereign power. The desire for sociability that is an expression of natural law, according to Pufendorf stems from the desire to survive and advance one’s well being. Thus his ideas have animated the Enlightenment debates on power and political modernity. Burlamaqui, another natural law theorist, discerned divine design and purpose in civil order. He clearly explained the purpose of divine will to be the happiness of man and that too in secular terms. In order to realize the happiness, Burlamaqui thought, one has to surrender part of his/her freedom to a sovereign authority. Natural right, he thought, is an attribute, which prompts a person to act according to reason that submits it-
self to divine will. He classifies right to survival as natural right and the authority to govern as acquired right. He defined natural law as divinely revealed yet known through human reason and study of human person. The divine right to sovereignty was confirmed not by scriptures but by human reason. He deliberated on these ideas in his book, Principles of Natural Right and Natural Law.

Historicists have pointed out that the tradition of Enlightenment has tried to look into what constitutes the natural law and how it governs human behaviour. Accordingly, cultures are evaluated to find out how far it has reached the ideal. On the other hand, historicists argue that human nature is too diverse to be fixed into a universal mould. Therefore, instead of applying the scientific, law-governed paradigm of Enlightenment historicists sought to analyze the socio-cultural diversity that constitutes the human beings. By contextualizing historically, philosophical, social or aesthetic statements it challenges the universal claims of the Enlightenment.

Building on the ideas of earlier thinkers Rousseau postulated a civil order which is accountable to the people. He vehemently rejected the Enlightenment idea of progress which in the ultimate analysis is detrimental to human beings creating a society of unequals. He also criticized the undue importance given to reason. He envisages in Social Contract a new contract, which takes care of the well being of all. Individual freedom, he argued, presupposes a social component that guarantees the collective life of the society.

Joseph Priestley was an ardent believer of Newtonian rationality. Like Rousseau he too endorsed the view that society is an arrangement based on contract that expects protection. He became a precursor to the Utilitarian thought in the sense that he advocated minimum state intervention.

Voltaire was skeptical of the concept of nation-state. He
was afraid that insistence on patriotism might turn man against man. His idea of a society did not endorse the racial/cultural implications of a nation.\textsuperscript{44}

Gottfried Herder of Germany took an organic view of nation that looked at the past as linker. He envisaged a nation-state that grows and decays like any other organism. He further argued that nation is not a human construct but a product of nature. His ideas on nation-state have been used and misused to further, in the beginning of the twentieth century, German fascism. Hume insisted that a regular government is required to guarantee security and justice. He also assumed all governments have a precarious life shifting towards either monarchy or republicanism. In A Treatise of Human Nature he expounded a theory on the science of the human mind. He was heavily influenced by Newtonian physics and Locke’s epistemological principles.\textsuperscript{45} He was anxious about freedom as well as autocratic rule.

Williams observes that the modern commentators on the Enlightenment views on government have preferred examining theory to almost a total neglect of praxis. Montesquieu, in his most influential work, Spirit of the Laws discussed elaborately on units of government and how legislative, executive and judicial units of government act as checks and balances. The success of the civil order, he believed, lay in the way government and laws mutually interact. In this context Friedrich Karl von Moser an important representative of German Enlightenment deserves special attention. His Master and the Servant combines his erudite scholarship and his practical experience as a civil servant. He makes pungent criticism of corruption, injustice, public debt and so on. The book deals at length the psychological and moral imperative of the functioning of the government than on its political implications.

It is important to remind ourselves that the reformist ideals
of enlightenment took shape when autocracy was considered as a divinely ordained right of kings. Unsurprisingly, therefore, theologians of Paris raised objections to Diderot’s conception of political authority from the angle of human rights. With all said and done he could not see reason in the voice of protest and strongly advocated absolute monarchy, which he considered ‘to be the true repository and executor of the General will.’ The liberal ideals on rights refused to recognize citizenship to blacks and slaves when ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen’ was drafted in 1789. The economic profitability of slaves as a source of cheap labour in the sugar industry postponed its abolition till 1794.

The enlightenment thinkers differed among themselves on the question of freedom and liberty. If Rousseau advocated peoples right for liberty, Voltaire, Diderot and others feared the dangers of misuse of freedom in the hands of the masses.

The above discussion throws light on how the Enlightenment ideas tried to promote a monolithic representation of the world. In the nineteenth century the grand narrativisation was increasingly challenged from many a thinker. They emphasised the plural representations of the world and its social structure. The Romantics especially laid emphasis on feelings in their efforts to understand the self. Blake’s anti-rational stand though not analytical yet tried to grapple with the creative energies dormant in human beings. Nietzsche showed how reason as a myth degenerates a culture into bondage. The enlightenment reason has smothered the creative energies. Nietzsche finds in the legacy of Enlightenment glorification of scientific thought and annihilation of the eternal. “Enlightenment science leads to the domination of positivism with its basis in the facticity of the social world in which surface constitutes the living reality.” Continuing Nietzsche’s hostility towards Enlightenment Max Weber posits metanarrative of history which showed how
rationality is limiting in its depersonalized administration and authority. Weber envisages that there is no intermixing of spheres, “which enables individuals to produce meanings free of centralized authority.”

Weber’s understanding of rationality sees its both emancipatory (substantive) and utilitarian (formal) elements. The dialectic between these two ultimately strengthens capitalism and administrative apparatus rather than enhancing its emancipatory possibilities.
Chapter 2

Journey into India

When we come to the nineteenth century, colonial experience becomes essential to understand India and Britain and their inter-relationship. The question of nation-state and religion plays an important role in understanding modernity and its effect on both the countries. It is normally assumed in imagining India and Britain that India is religious whereas Britain is a secular state. Sociologists such as Louis Dumont would argue that India should not be judged by categories like nation-state because India’s primary organizing principle is religion and vice versa in the case of Britain. In eighteenth century with a new and a growing reading public Britain had an esoteric idea of the colonies. James Mill in the 19th Century published History of British India without having any direct acquaintance with India. He attacked traditional Indian institutions as well as Orientalists who defended them. In the same breath Mill did not spare Indian feudalism for keeping India undeveloped. Peter Van Der Veer comments, “Mill is the first major thinker who identifies the need to push India into modernity as one of the main objectives of the East India company...”.49 In other words, Mill cut out the task of civilizing mission to the company. Mill’s History of British India enjoyed hegemonic status throughout the 19th century. Thomas Macaulay’s Minute on Indian Education(1935) need to be understood in this context of civilizing mission that made it imperative for the company to take up the responsibility of educating the Indian elites. The native knowledge systems in this noble venture had to play the second fiddle. Macaulay could not see anything worth while in
eastern knowledge systems. The Utilitarians wanted to wake Indians from their oriental slumber. As a policy matter the company was averse to the entry of the church into the colonies. It found a way to come out of this predicament. English literature, Gauri Viswanathan argues, helped to teach Christian values. English literature was transformed into a secular religion to impart moral values. [Gauri Vishwanthan, Masks of Conquests: Literary study and British rule in India. (Boston: Beacon press, 1977), cited in Peter Van Der Veer, 2001, p.7]

The utilitarian rhetoric targeted the conservatism of the writers like Edmund Burke who tried to respond to the dangers of French revolution. The debate between the two constituted their aesthetic and linguistic attitudes and their views on Indians as well. They also concerenced themselves with the definition and depiction of cultural identities of conservatives. Bentham notes how the reign of George III witnessed the increase of the number and the splendour of public ceremonies to enhance the public image of the monarchy. Furthermore, it is estimated that one in every ten young men were conscripted in Britain and Ireland. The forces were used to contain unrest at home and also to continue the war with France. C.A Bayly points out that British imperial annexure of colonies grew rapidly when it had trouble with France. India was made the base for the British to strike business deal with Middle East, East Africa and China Coast.50

Reflecting upon this phenomenon Javed comments that the fear of the French was an important factor for colonial expansion. More than economic considerations the empire was bothered about the internal and external threats. It is interesting to note that Burke who was a conservative propagated the native rule. Utilitarians attack must be interpreted in the context of the position of the conservatives including William Jones.

William Jones made a comparison between cultures. He
could find out the relationship among languages belonging to indo-European family. This attempt to form an idiom and in order to compare and contrast cultures, according to Majeed, was a way to compare, determine, and unify the heterogeneous British empire. He learnt Sanskrit in order to produce a digest of Indian laws. He thought it would check the power of the pandits and maulvis in the court. Ranjit Guha, analyzing this phenomenon, inferred that the British had a fear of indigenous knowledge that may become a threat to imperial authority. So, they calculated that translation may break the monopoly of pandits and maulvis. It also must be noted that the British followed the Mughal culture of administration - its administration of justice, the collection of taxation, and the maintenance of a police force. The British did not allow missionary activity as part of its sensitivity to religious beliefs and sensibilities.

Jones was particular about the administration of law to the natives. There were British law, Hindu law, and the Muslim law. At times the British followed Sharia more rigorously than the Mughals. This simultaneously consolidated caste hierarchy because Jones and others derived much of their material from the Brahminical centres of learning in Tanjore, Benares, and Wadia. Javed Majeed recalls Susan Bayly’s comments, “It was this tradition emphasizing rigid caste distinctions which influenced the law dispensed to caste and communities by the British. Furthermore, the British themselves ranked and graded Indian social orders in an attempt to understand them”.  

Cornwallis instituted a land revenue system in 1793 that gave permanent land ownership to the proprietors. It, the administration believed, would not only consolidate rural land owning class but also ensure loyalty of landlords and stability of the countryside. Majeed cites a letter of Jones where he rejects the idea of democracy to the Indians as he thinks Indians are full of prejudices and habits. Romila Thapar com-
menting on Jones concludes that the works of Jones and his colleagues have paved the way for nationalist to get interested and glorify the past. (Majeed, p.36) the Asiatic society made a collection of myths, beliefs, rituals, and laws and integrated them into a coherent religion known as Hinduism. Jones poems testify to the fact that he was preoccupied with the definition of Hinduism. Majeed sees the work of Jones as part of the ‘revitalized conservatism of the period, arose partly due to the fear of the French revolution and unrest also be seen in the way the past is represented: “Perhaps the fixity of identity for which Englishness developed such a reputation arose because it was in fact continually being contested, and was rather designed to mask its uncertainty, its sense of being estranged from itself, sick with desire for the other”.

In other words, as Robert C Young later clarifies that in times of crises, conflict and change one seeks fixity of identity. On the contrary, multiple identities and may be a sign of stability and self-assurance.

Max Muller took upon himself the responsibility of compiling and editing the Vedas. His book, A History of Ancient Indian Literature (1859) tried to bring together the available information on the literature and religion of the Vedic period. It is quite interesting to note now he sees his language, religion and mythology from that of the Semitics. He traces German language to the Aryan race providing philological evidence. Only Vedic literature, Muller considers, authentic and true. And dumps later Sanskrit literature as modern and artificial.
Chapter 3
Imperialism, Social Reform and Nationalism

The nineteenth century witnessed a host of social and religious reformers - moderates and radicals; Indians and Europeans. They tried to rejuvenate and reconstruct Hinduism by going back to the Vedic texts and Upanishads. It was also the time when the British aggressively followed the policy of colonial rule extending beyond the boundaries of trade and commerce to the political, social, religious, and cultural aspects of Indian society. These two contexts can not be looked independently of each other. One feeds off the other and inversely get transformed by the other. This complex relationship between the colonizer and the colonized requires an in-depth analysis. It is all the more imperative that non-essential kind of reformulation is necessary to counteract the essentialising of culture: “...essentialism is the idea that humans and human institutions for example, the ‘individual’ and the ‘nation-state’, are governed by determinate natures that inhere in them in the same way that they are supposed to inhere in the entities of the natural world.” In order to counteract deterministic scientific approaches Ronald Inden suggests a theory of human agency: “...far from embodying simple, unchanging essences, all agents are relatively complex and shifting. They make and remake one another through a dialectic process in changing situations. The general rubric under which I deploy this notion of human agency in order to rework previous depictions of India (and of the West, too) is that of an imperial formation. By this I mean a complex polity consisting of overlapping and
contending agents related to one another in a ‘world’ whose spokesmen claim universality for it”. He begins with the assumption that India and Europe dialectically constitute one another. In other words, India played a vital role in the construction of Europe as Europe had a pervasive presence in India.

It is worthwhile to note, however, that Indians were not passive recipients. Raj Ram Mohan Roy, for instance, who was fascinated by a rational approach to religion promulgated by utilitarians, was also able to see the limits and thought of a universal religion based on the Vedas and the Upanishads. The advaita philosophy of Shankara was placed at the negotiating table to provide a critique of monotheistic Christianity. Probably, it is better to rethink of the question of tradition and modernity as a process of interaction among cultures:

“However, modern India and Britain are products of a shared colonial experience. Key concepts of modernity, like secularity, liberty, and equality are created and re-created in the interaction between colony and metropole. No doubt, this is a history of power and knowledge, but not simply one of the impositions of British knowledge on Indian barbarism, as Macaulay liked to think. Both colonizer and colonized were intimately connected and transformed through a shared process of colonization”.

Assessing Orientalism Arjun Appadurai says that although it discusses forms of knowledge which are typically Oriental Said “does not specify how exactly the orientalist knowledge project and the colonial project of domination and extraction were connected”.

Neo-Marxian historians have shown that capitalism in Britain developed due to imperialism and in contrast, the peripheral societies have made significant changes without European intervention.
Speaking about Christianity in India Keshabchandra Sen makes an interesting comment: “Yes, their muscular Christianity has led many a Native to identify the religion of Jesus with the power and privilege of inflicting blows and kicks with impunity. And thus has Jesus been dishonoured in India”. \(^{(58)}\) (Peter Van Der Veer p.68). Religion of the colonizers get suspected introducing an element of ambivalence and disjunction to the colonial supremacy.

In the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries it was important to deny human agency from the East. The scholars from the west were given the task to define the east. Ronald Inden points to the two ideas- ‘Oriental despotism’ and ‘Asiatic mode of production’ -that had a popular appeal in the nineteenth century. Montesquieu and Marx formulated these phrases which came to define the East. They represent the east as irrational having a mode of production that is essentially Asiatic. Its political institution is dominated by an autocrat and economy depends upon agriculture.

One of the characteristics of Indian civilization that attracted the analytic attention of every orientalist, historian, and social reformers was caste. Nicholes B. Dirks has done a detailed study of the various responses. He begins his book, Castes of Mind : Colonialism and the making and Modern India with the hypothesis that although caste existed even before the arrival of the British it took its present form during the colonial rule : “…caste….is a modern phenomenon, that it is specifically, the product of an historical encounter between India and Western colonial rule”. Further he asserts, “…it was under the British that “caste” became a single term capable of expressing, organizing and above all “systematizing” India’s diverse forms of social identity, community, and organization”. \(^{(59)}\)

Analyzing the caste factor of nationalism M.S.S. Pandian shows how the anti-colonial nationalism in its effort to counter
colonial domination involved Vedic civilization. And, simultaneously, it hierarchized different groups considering others as inferior. “That is, the very domain of sovereignty that nationalism carves out in the face of colonial domination is simultaneously a domain of enforcing domination over subaltern social groups such as lower castes, women and marginal linguistic regions, by the national elite.”

Further he analyses the biography of P.S.Sivaswami Aiyer, prominent public figure in colonial Madras to find out the ways caste operates in a person who was wedded to western modernity in the public domain. The details of his personal life show how he religiously followed the rituals of upper caste life which includes notions of purity and pollution, feeding of Brahmins etc. “…the so-called sovereign domain of culture uncolonised by the west remained a domain to affirm elite upper caste culture/spirituality as the culture of the nations.”

As part of its effort to colonise the British used cultural categories of knowledge: “Colonial knowledge both enabled conquest and was produced by it; in certain important ways, knowledge was what colonialism was all about. Cultural forms in societies newly classified as “traditional” were reconstructed and transformed by this knowledge, which created new categories and oppositions between colonizers and colonized, European and Asian, modern and traditional, West and East.”

The active agency of the British in restructuring the rules of vernacular grammar, archaeological discoveries, new taxation regime, the census is all too obvious.

Most importantly, the British played an important role in the identification and the production of traditions and thereby legitimizing its power. The colonized as part of its strategy of resistance use tradition constructed by the colonizer. “…attempts at historical recuperation typically took the form of finding an Orientalist golden age, a time when caste was an
ideal system of mutual responsibility, reasoned interdependence, and genuine spiritual authority. Only a few non-Brahman and Dalit voices rejected this kind of Orientalist nostalgia, all the while feeling increasingly trapped by the demands of anticolonial nationalism to downplay and defer all critiques of Indian culture and civilization. If the rise of nation-states allowed individuals a free public space, caste, on the other hand, restricted the members from taking part in the civil society. “Further, caste conferred citizenship only in social and ritual rather than in political contexts, and opposed the ideas of both individual action and social mobilization.” What we consider to be caste was one of the ways of arranging the society. The pre-colonial Indian society had heterogeneous groups apart from caste. “Temple communities, territorial groups, lineage segments, family units, royal retinues, warrior subcastes, “little” kingdoms, occupational reference groups, agricultural or trading associations, devotionally conceived networks and sectarian communities, even priestly cabals were just some of the significant units of identification all of them at various times far more significant than any uniform metonymy of endogamous “caste” grouping. A recent thesis by D. Dominic has explored the category of ‘Kula’ in his understanding of cultural representation during colonial rule. One of the contentions of the thesis is that ‘Kula’ is the organizing principle of social formation. In the present context, it creates space for ethnic groups to organize politically and negotiate with the nation state.

Later on Vedic texts and the texts of Manu provided a space for the British attitude and administration to understand and rule Indian society. Although one can consider that colonialism is responsible for the primordial status accorded to caste it cannot be denied that caste hierarchy with its concept of purity informed social relations that hierarchized individuals and
communities on the basis of one’s birth. (But the Enlighten-
ment process grounded the hierarchy on the basis of individual
achievement.)

The caste also was a constitutive part of social reform in
India and to a certain extent opposed to national movement. A
heavy presence of upper caste men in the reform movements
highlighted, for example, the problem of women in the upper
caste society but not caste itself.

**Nationalism**

The growth of nationalism is invariably linked with colonial-
ism. Speaking of national languages one cannot but see the
process of how a language get hegemonised from among the
many dialects: “They are usually attempts to devise a
standardised idiom out of a multiplicity of actually spoken idi-
oms, which are thereafter downgraded to dialects, the main
problem in their construction being usually, which dialect to
choose as the base of the standardised and homogenised lan-
guage.”66 For the national elites and literates it was important
to have a national language to provide a context for intellec-
tual communication. “In fact, the mystical identification of na-
tionality with a sort of Platonic idea of the language existing
behind and above all its variant and imperfect versions, is much
more characteristic of the ideological construction of nation-
alist intellectuals, of whom Herder is the prophet than of the
actual grassroots users of the idiom. It is a literary and not an
existential concept.”67

The privileging of a language simultaneously provides a privi-
leged position to the elites who partake in the administrative
structures of power. As this language has been a constructed
reality, it attained fixity when it got printed. Anderson and Pe-
ter Van Der Veer would call it print capitalism. Later on, with
the emergence and growth of nation-state, it becomes the lan-
guage of the modern nation state through education. By the
1830’s East India Company replaces the Persian language with English. \(^{68}\)

The emerging bourgeoisie had to contend with multiplicity of languages at the same time. The resurgence of these speakers with diverse ethnic backgrounds especially in a large nation-state are a force to reckon with.

The hegemonisation of the population by creating a national linguistic community through a pedagogic intervention of the state becomes essential to naturalise ethnic assertions. The primary education is given in a language not understood or spoken by a large body of persons. A pragmatic approach to language considers it to be the medium of communication. To that extent it is an easy tool to be used by a large section of the country. Yet, as Hobsbawm describes, language becomes critical when constructing a nationality. \(^{69}\)

In this context, probably we can go back to 1789, the year of the French revolution as the birth day of the nation when people demanded a share in the power. German romantics of the early 19th century were indirectly responsible for a nationalist movement and discourse. With their insistence on simplicity, ordinary life-style, and the vernacular language German romantics paved the way for nationalistic renaissance. In the second half of the 19th century Darwin’s theory of evolution introduced genetic element into the racial theory. The scientific data/ reasons provided to ethnic politics solid secularity. Thus, race and language feed each other in the development of nationalism and nationalist discourse: “The links between racism and nationalism are obvious. ‘Race’ and language are easily confused as in the case of ‘Aryans’ and ‘Semites’ to the indignation of scrupulous scholars like Max Muller who pointed out that race, a genetic concept, could not be inferred from language, which was not inherited. Moreover, there is an evident analogy between the insistence of racists on the importance of racial purity and the horrors of miscegenation and
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the insistence of so many – one is tempted to say of most – forms of linguistic nationalism on the need to purify the national language from foreign elements... Linguistic and ethnic nationalism thus, reinforced each other.”

Hobsbawm further traces three developments that may have been responsible for the emergence of nationalities: growing resistance to modernity by traditional groups; urban centres and its challenges; unprecedented migrations leading to a sense of alienation/strangeness toward each other.

A privileged status to a language also means marginalisation of communities speaking other dialects – most of the time, they are of lower class/caste. They are consequently denied entry into the public sphere. The illiterate may find a need to learn the standardised language or as Hobsbawm put it, they would become conscious of their lack of knowledge in relation to the creamy layer.

In addition, being a bi-lingual was necessary for an elite to be successful in the world market specially when one’s own language doesn’t have a wider access. Therefore the elite didn't see much use in linguistic nationalism. Hobsbawm observes linguistic nationalism among the lower middle class. Nationalism that triumphed itself in the formation of nation-states had its success towards the end of World War I. The inter-war years tested the limitations and potentiality of nation-state. Mass media and sports were the symbolic icons that gave identity to the nation. If media propagated ideologies, sports provided a safety valve to soften group tensions.

Decolonisation according to Hobsbawm, did not mean much to the populace. The western educated elite find a state in the decolonised society.

Gandhi needs to be understood in this context of nationalism. For Nandy, Gandhi is a true response to the colonial British. Bhikhu Parekh would categorise him as a critical traditionalist who thought that the traditional past has the power to re-
generate the Indian society but at the same time he recognised that society must be cleansed of certain evils: “For his adversaries, the tradition was autonomous in the sense that its authority was located within it. For Gandhi, its authority was located outside of it so that a practice did not acquire authority merely by virtue of being traditional.”

The British justified their rule in civilisational terms. India’s culture, according to them, lacked scientific, rational bent of mind. The British rule is supposed to create a society based on reason. Education was a tool to educate the Indians out of Indianness into British culture.

The British also thought that there is nothing to learn from the Indians. As Bhikhu Parekh argues Indians had to justify their knowledge in British terms, “… they had to translate that difference and demonstrate its value in British terms, an inherently doomed enterprise. Within the absolutist colonial discourse, difference had not only no value but also signified deficiency.” The worth of Indians lay in proving to the other. The psychological pressure in proving to the colonial master was a challenge taken by many like Vivekananda, Bankim Chatterjee and others. Bhikhu says rationality had to prove its instrumentality – utilitarian value.

The pre-colonial India is usually characterised as caste-based with Brahmins at the top of the order. The specific form of ascriptive hierarchy and unequal distribution of power in India is known as the caste system. Each caste following hereditary occupation there was hardly any room for social mobility. The Sanskritic texts were held as primordial giving a divine sanction to caste hierarchy.

Yet the hegemony had to face resistance. “Pre-modern forms of resistance to ascriptive and hierarchical power distribution took several forms: subversion, sabotage, flight, revolt or the creation of a counter-culture/ideology. These have been studied as primitive revolts, social banditry, messianic or chiliastic
movements, formation of heterodox cults and sects or simply as peasant movements”. In spite of the upheavals in the polity caste has remained stable absorbing the changes in the society. Many studies have been indicating the limited role of kings in the day-to-day functioning of the society. The anti-hierarchical movements were also to be found throughout the Indian history. Buddhism, Jainism, Bhakti Movements, different sects such as Veerashaivism challenged the rigid hierarchy of Brahmanism. Apart from caste there were other contradictions based on gender, class and ethnicity. These contradictions are inter-woven into caste.

Discussing the colonial period Aloysius remarks that the social aspect did not undergo radical change under the British. This observation makes sense especially in the context of Nandy's hypothesis that colonialism was a totalising system. The caste hierarchy adjusted itself to the colonial rule and reinforced its status with certain alterations. Aloysius enumerates four changes: “structural unifications, economic transformations, expansion of civil society and introduction of liberal, secular ideas and reforms.”

Systematic bureaucratisation along with postal and railway brought the far-off places under the central authority. The land revenue system was a top priority which the British successfully accomplished using the local Zamindari, ryotwari and mahalwari system. The absolute property rights initiated by the British ultimately helped the upper castes. Even the benefit of English education invariably was grabbed by the upper castes. When the authorities due to the interest shown by Orientalists tried to introduce vernacular there was a wide spread agitation. The census report of 1901 gives the report about upper class opposition (violent) to the govt. desire to open the schools to the depressed classes. Further, the upper castes captured the bureaucratic power consolidating their position. The Europeans who were few and expensive took up
supervisory jobs giving the bureaucracy its racial colour. It will be safe to argue that caste got its new shape lift during colonial times. Apart from material prosperity it was able to codify its laws to maintain social supremacy. Even the census revived the classification based on caste. The above description of caste and bureaucracy during colonial times has shown how caste in a very significant way negotiated with the colonial structure to codify and perpetuate its interests. Nandy in his discussion of the coloniser – colonised binary opposition has glossed over the caste aspect of our colonial experience.

Can we ascribe contemporary categories of understanding caste to precolonial social structure anachronistically?

Despite its policy of non-interference in religious matters the British did initiate certain religious reforms under pressure from a few upper caste educated Brahmins and missionaries. The abolition of sati, removal of caste and religious disabilities were some of the measures of British rule. Simultaneously awakening, though in small measure, of the lower castes occurred all over the country. The reform movements such as Brahmo samaj, Arya Samaj, and theosophy movements could be considered as the organisational response of the upper caste to the British. The theory of the Aryan race lent scientific legitimacy. A pan Indian re-grouping of upper castes via the state power helped it recast its Brahminical ideology.

It is in this context of Nationalism this ideology gains ground. Hans Kohn comments, “Religious renaissance in India became a source of renewed strength of Hindu Orthodoxy. All these movements finally merged in India’s new consciousness of her unity and her mission in Indian Nationalism.”

The secular ideology of national is no more understood as state and religious divide. It is closely linked to nationalism and the religious reform which ultimately safeguards the interests of the upper castes. The birth of the Indian National Congress in 1885 rendered the national movement a pan Indian
character. The group thought itself to be the representative of national interests. They demanded increased bureaucratic and political representation. But the question need to be asked: Whether the nations were ready to share the privileges with economically and socially backwards. Therefore, ‘go back to tradition’ slogan of the many social reformers and congressmen need to be understood in the caste interest articulating its hegemonic demands vis-à-vis the British rule who had economic and political interests.

The above discussion of nationalist struggles tells us that nationalism as an ideology cannot be a monolithic concept but pluralistic: “If by nationalism is meant the style of thought, its terminology, its formulation including the historically specific form of the nation-state with all its formal paraphernalia, then it was developed in the West. If however nationalism means the coming together of culture and power, a kind of social and societal change in which ascription is challenged and the social power balance in general is tilted towards the hitherto excluded masses within culture, and also an aspiration of cultures for recognition and self-determination then nationalism is neither an invention of the West nor its monopoly domain”.78 The ethnic and linguistic nationalisms were down played in favour of political and cultural nationalisms. The interaction – collaborational as well as confrontational – between the elites belonging to the the Indian Nationalism and British powers did not entertain the concerns raised by these politically awakened groups. Thus, it widened the cleavage between the higher and the lower castes.

By the time Gandhi entered the national scene there were attempts to regroup at the national level the earlier groupings. The Pan-Muslim and pan-Hindu political mobility created little success. Gandhi through his novel programmes of non-cooperation, civil disobedience, quit India, was trying to bring together the contending groups. He was able to generate mul-
tiple energies bringing to focus the nationalist interests. Gandhi’s act and message had double consequence: one to the rulers and the other to the alternate national contestants. He combined the religious and the political to respond to the reality around. G Aloysius laments that few have tried to study the ambiguity in Gandhi’s approach: “But few have pointed out the ambiguous or even contradictory relationship between the two and fewer still the differential impact such a combination had on groups located unequally and related antagonistically within the traditional social structure.”

With regard to the masses one can say that Gandhi brought them to the national politics. Discussing Gandhi’s strategy for mobilisation, Aloysius comments, “He never approached the masses directly but always through the regional and local elite, who in the process tended to gain importance, which they then owed to the supreme leader.” In one way, the Gandhian politics left the traditional caste order intact. Nor did it address the economic interests of the masses. G. Aloysius says that under the guise of nationalism traditional power has transformed itself into state power without any change in substance. “If colonial modernity had substantially empowered and elevated traditional dominance, it had also formally delegitimised traditional subjugation. However, there has been no significant commensurate actualization of these principles within the subcontinent which is still largely a continuity with the past in this sense. The underlying contradiction between the formal and the substantial is what is troubling post colonial India.”
Chapter 4
Modernism and The Dialectics of Enlightenment

Modernity in the cultural field took a very different shape. In Swingewood’s words, “The modernist movement in the arts attests to the broad changes taking place within the aesthetic sphere, the search for a new language and new forms to provide expression to the ‘newness’ of modern society.”\(^{82}\) So, search for novelty especially language to represent became a response to the industrial capitalist society with its totalizing culture. Raymond Williams keenly notes the emergence of new words related to culture giving expression to new modes of experience towards the end of the eighteenth century.\(^{83}\) The search resulted in various forms of modernisms. Surrealists, for example, abhorred the scientific rationalism and machine culture of modernity whereas the Italian futurists celebrated new technology. T.S. Eliot and company chose to remain outside the realm of popular with their mission to generate high culture.

Baudelaire builds a new aesthetic based on the new modes of experience and feeling peculiar to new urban life. It is anti-Enlightenment in the sense it has no ideals like reason or science to underpin it. Swingewood quotes Baudelaire who defined modernity as “the transient, the fleeting, the contingent; it is one half of art, the other being the eternal and immutable.”\(^{84}\) For Baudelaire the root of modernity is in the fragmented and alienated modern life: “Baudelaire describes modernity as the alienated experience of the ‘fragmented’ nature of modern urban life, what he calls the newness of the present with its ‘fleeting moment’ suggestive of the eternal….while the painter of modern life has broken from the
past, rejecting tradition in favour of the fragmentary and ephem-
eral, he or she necessarily seeks the hidden truth which lies
below the chaotic and impressionist surface of the everyday."\(^85\)

Frankfurt School takes up Weber’s conceptual framework
in order to show how totalitarian regimes are the products of
Enlightenment reason. Among the modern anti-Enlightenment
works Dialectic of Enlightenment of Max Horkheimer and
Theodor Adorno is quite prominent. They asked disturbing ques-
tions especially in the aftermath of two world wars. They
wanted to know why science instead of alleviating human suf-
fering has been the cause of human cruelty. One of their con-
clusions was that Enlightenment had been serving totalitarian
goals all along its history. They argued that rationality takes
many forms. There is no one true rationality. The over enthusi-
asm of Enlightenment rejected authorities hitherto considered
moral guardians. Unchecked epistemology, they contended,
resulted in industrial dehumanization, atomic bombs etc. They
find Enlightenment totalitarian with its ‘organising elements of
calculation, quantification, formalism, utility and efficiency’:
“What men want to learn from nature is how to use it in order
wholly to dominate it and other men. That is the only aim. Ruth-
lessly, in despite of itself, the Enlightenment has extinguished
any trace of its own self-consciousness”.\(^86\) Adorno and
Horkheimer analyse how knowledge is hierarchized and ulti-
mately subjugate people:

“The universality of ideas as developed by discursive logic,
domination in the conceptual sphere, is raised up on the basis
of actual domination. The dissolution of the magical heritage,
of the old diffuse ideas, by conceptual unity, expresses the
hierarchical constitution of life determined by those who are
free. The individuality that learned order and subordination in
the subjection of the world, soon wholly equated truth with the
regulative thought without whose fixed distinctions universal
truth cannot exist”.\(^87\)

The self here becomes fixed and homogenous with quali-
ties like strong individuality, rational, objective, scientific temperament etc and naturally and consequently the other is perceived as non rational, emotional, lacking in individuality, inferior. In the colonial context the colonial master embodies the former whereas the colonized is destined to be inferior.

At the same time, it must be noted that there is no single movement called modernism. There are many types of modernisms, at times opposing each other. To be modern is to be civilized. The civility a society inculcates is not only an end but also a process. Therefore a narrative had to be constructed of the evolution from savagery, ancient, Medieval, Renaissance to the civilization of the present. Robert young cites the example of Condorcet whose Outline of the Intellectual Progress of Mankind (1745) presents a teleological development of European civilization into ten incremental stages. It was, according to Williams, an Enlightenment attempt to interpret evolution in terms of a growth in the rational content of thoughts, customs and institutions. This view is criticized for its Eurocentrism. Culture was referred to an individual or a group as a form of intellectual development. Due to education and training. ‘The concept of culture was developed as part of the Enlightenment stress on education as enculturation: this radical egalitarian position, whose origins can be traced back to Locke and which became the basis of much nineteenth-century Liberal thought, underlies the Enlightenment claim of the fundamental equality of all men and women. According to this idea, if equality does not actually exist in the present, the possibility of enculturation means that every one is at least potentially equal to everyone else’.

Gradually, Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations categorized and hierarchised the civilization according to economic development: hunting, pasturage, agriculture and commerce. In the nineteenth century, at the cultural racial level civilization was categorized into savagery, barbarism, & civilization Although Matthew Arnold was the first to distinguish between savagery
and barbarians J.S. Mill hierarchized it bringing history and geography together by promulgating the superiority of the white race. Robert C. Young gives a quotation from Lenin's Imperialism who cites Cecil Rhodes: "I was in the East End of London [working-class quarter] yesterday and attended a meeting of the unemployed. I listened to the wild speeches, which were just a cry for 'bread'...I became more than ever convinced of the importance of imperialism....My cherished idea is a solution for the social problem, i.e., in order to save the 40,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a bloody civil war, we colonial statesmen must acquire new lands to settle the surplus population,..."  

From the above discussion certain things become clear. The distinction between culture & civilization was not uniformly felt within Europe. If France felt confident of modernity the other European countries' keen interest in the exploration of India, China, Persia etc showed the relativity of European values. Romantic writers turned to classical or popular culture as a way to interrogate Enlightenment values. Herder in Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man enumerates how down the human civilization different cultures have contributed knowledge and technology and how later civilizations have used them. In this way, he tries to debunk the claims regarding European superiority. Continuing his argument Herder says each nation develops its own culture due to local climate, its relationship to the land, and the popular traditions growing out of it. Thus, Herder propagates cultural relativism and criticizes colonialism and slavery. At the same time, Herder's arguments turn parochial when he advocates regeneration of nations by interacting with other nations. Thus, for example, Europe has developed by learning science, mathematics, religion from the Greeks, the Arabs, the Jews and so on.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, the universal sameness and equality of humanity was increasingly questioned by polygenists arguing that there are many cultures each at
different stages of progress. One can safely argue that the responsibility for the notion of culture as elitist can be put on Matthew Arnold who proclaimed that culture is ‘to know the best that has been thought and said in the world. Arnold visualized a social function for culture. He tried to go beyond aesthetics to kind a larger canvas for literature. In his scheme of things there is no place for the working class. It was a time when England was tormented by internal and external unrest and rebellion. He therefore envisaged a greater role for the state to go beyond the interests of any one class. Arnold sees two conflictual roles for culture: it harmonizes, stabilizes, and reduces conflict, and, at the same time, it subverts fetishizing interest of each class. Moreover, there was a systematic way of institutionalizing culture. In England, the primary education was made compulsory by the late nineteenth century.

Williams presents three broad categories of the usage of the term culture:

1. a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development (from the eighteenth century);
2. a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group;
3. the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity (late nineteenth, early twentieth century).”

Summarizing the analysis of culture Robert C Young makes some important statements:

“….. culture must apparently always operate antithetically. Culture never stands alone but always participates in a conflictual economy acting out the tension between sameness and difference, comparison and differentiation, unity and diversity, cohesion and dispersion, containment and subversion. Culture is never liable to fall into fixity, stasis or organic totalization: the constant construction and reconstruction of cultures and cultural differences is fuelled by an unending internal dissension in the imbal-
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ances of the capitalist economies that produce them. Culture has inscribed within itself the complex and often contradictory differences through which European society has defined itself. Culture has always been racially constructed.”

Habermas argues that Adorno and Horkheimer have oversimplified modernity ignoring the rational content of cultural modernity. He observes that the growth of autonomous spheres does not necessarily imply success of instrumental rationality because “…validity claims made by and mediated by specialists must justify the specific principles and practices inherent in each sphere.” The values are not automatically legitimized. They require consensus from non-specialists. While using Weber’s classification of the autonomous spheres into science, morality, and art Habermas goes beyond the pessimism of Weber:

“The project of modernity formulated in the eighteenth century by the philosophers of the Enlightenment consisted of their efforts to develop objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic. At the same time, this project intended to release the cognitive potentials of each of these domains from their esoteric forms. The Enlightenment philosophers wanted to utilize this accumulation of specialized culture for the enrichment of everyday life—that is to say, for the rational organization of everyday social life.”

Habermas is perhaps the last major thinkers to embrace the project of enlightenment. He is Kantian in his approach to reason, ethics, and moral philosophy. One of his theoretical concerns is to provide universality to critical rationality. He explores the possibility of salvaging rationality. He wants to show that the transition from traditional to modern involved progressive secularization of normative behaviour reconstructed through communicative action.
Chapter 5: 
*Post Colonialism*

The post colonial theories in general try to come to terms with the experience of societies that were under the colonial rule. It further analyses how the colonial power relations still continue in diverse ways in modern global culture. The colonial powers did establish power structures whose impact can be perceived from the perspective of nation - state, class, caste, race, gender, economics and so and so forth. There is no one omniscient cohesive theory of post colonialism. It takes from diverse theoretical positions and combines and diverges from them to formulate its theory and strategic interventions. The term post colonial itself has been contested by many a postcolonial theorists. Postcolonial theory, for instance, is avow- edly anti-linear but at the time the term suggests a linear con- ception of time - periodizing time into pre-colonial, colonial and postcolonial raising colonial to the privileged position.  

Whereas others have agreed that post refers to the official exit of colonialism and at the same time continuation of the effects of colonial structures of power and domination. Post colonial theory deconstructs European categories of knowl- edge in polical science, philosophy, history, literature, sociol- ogy, etc. 

Anne McClintock shows an important lacunae in the term post colonial :

“Most importantly, orienting theory around the temporal axis colonial – post colonial makes it easier not to see and therefore harder to theorize, the continuities in interna- tional imbalances in imperial power. Since the 1940’s the
U.S imperialism—without-colonies has taken a number of distinct forms (military, political, economic and cultural), some concealed, some half-concealed. The power of U.S finance capital and huge multinational corporations to command the flows of capital, research, consumer goods and media information around the world can exert a coercive power as great as any colonial gunboat. It is precisely the greater subtlety, innovation and variety of these forms of imperialism that make the historical rupture implied by the term postcolonial especially unwarranted” (Anne Mcclontosh, p.13).

Well before the structuralist and post-structuralists Franz Fanon (1925-1961) explored into the cultural contradiction inherent in colonial rule. His two books, The wretched of the Earth and Black Skin, White Masks have opened up the enquiry into culture with special emphasis in marginalized groups and communities. The cultural contradiction between the hegemonic way of life of the white and the black African way of life prompted Fanon to formulate a culture based on resistance. He first tries to unravel the colonial subjectivity and then goes on to probe into the emergence of anti-colonial resistance. According to Fanon an intellectual undergoes three stages in his development:

“In the first phase, the native intellectual gives proof that he has assimilated the culture of the occupying power. His writings correspond point by point with those of his opposite numbers in the mother country. His inspiration is European and we can easily link up these works with definite trends in the literature of the mother country. This is the period of unqualified assimilation …

In the second phase we find the native is disturbed; he decides to remember what he is. This period of creative work approximately corresponds to that immersion which
we have just described. But since the native is not a part of his people, he is content to recall their life only. Past happenings of the bygone days of his childhood will be brought up out of the depths of this memory: old legends will be reinterpreted in the light of a borrowed aestheticism and of a conception of the world which was discovered under other skies.

Finally, in the third phase, which is called the fighting phase, the native, after having tried to lose himself in the people and with the people, will on the contrary shake the people... hence comes a fighting literature, and a national literature. 96

The subjects determination to counter the colonial power is inspired by two factors: 1. colonial education, and 2. the memory of ones own lived culture. From the 1970s a new explosion in the intellectual life provided new tools to understand the cultural formation. Jacques Lacan, a neo-freudian, tried to show the way in which the ‘other’ get constituted in culture. Lacanian mirror phase is the stage, when a native or a colonized subject realizes and he/she recollects the past from the new perspective. Instead of common culture different individuals recollect different culture. It needs to be noted the difference is not of individual variation but the social heterogeneity. Lacan insists on the synchronic time where past, present and future inter-relate and overlap in unpredictable ways. So he deliberately rejects diachronic, linear time. In todays context, though we live in a mondithic globalized world the cultural differences retain and maintain different identities in social life. Louis Althusser has shown how different ideological state apparatuses function in order to constitute the individual subject. In the Indian society it is the caste system that has worked like the state apparatus.

Antonio Gramsci has offered the theory of hegemony to understand society. He writes
“In England the development is very different from France. The new social grouping that grew up on the basis of modern industrialism shows a remarkable economic-corporate development but advances only gropingly in the intellectual-political field. There is a very extensive category of organic intellectuals—those, that is, who come into existence on the same industrial terrain as the economic group—but in the higher sphere we find that the old land owning class preserves its position of virtual monopoly. It loses its economic supremacy but maintains for a long time a politico-intellectual supremacy and is assimilated as “traditional intellectuals” and as directive group by the new group in power. The old land-owning aristocracy is joined to the industrialists by a kind of su- ture which is precisely that which in other countries unites the traditional intellectuals with the new dominant classes.”

If culture is a construction “…..then this ought logically to include industry as well as media, ways of making rubber ducks as well as ways of making love or making merry”. Derrida has deconstructed the hierarchy in culture i.e certain cultures being preferred to others.

Edward Said’s seminal work Orientalism, remains a crucial work in understanding post colonial discourse. He argued that Orientalism need to be understood “….as a discourse… by which European culture was able to manage and even produce the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily during the post enlightenment period” Said has been able to explore how orientalism controlled the orient through controlling and producing knowledge. Orientalism by engaging itself in various disciplines like philology, literature, political science, ethnography etc produced the orient. Thus, unraveling the various layers of imperialism also meant interrogating the cultural texts
that did the ground work to build the edifice called imperial empire. This shift to the analysis of texts/language has problematized the assumed transparency of language to and the over whelming confidence of literary texts to reflect reality. Moreover post colonialism problematizes the epistemological categories of the West. The emergence of new movements - race, gender, and ethnicity - have begun to assert their rights hitherto not known. They have affronted the terms and categories used by the West as well as the national elite to understand the present reality. Yet, the problem with the discourse analysis employed by Said is that it tends to neglect the actual conditions of colonialism.

Homi K. Bhabha vindicates Said adding psychoanalysis to what Said had not developed i.e., orientalism working at two conflictual levels: “... distinguished between a ‘manifest’ Orientalism, the conscious body of ‘scientific’ knowledge about the Orient, and a ‘latent’ Orientalism, an unconscious positivity of fantasmatic desire”. In a postcolonial context Bhabha demonstrates though analysis of government orders, missionary accounts etc the ways in which the authority gets subverted. The post colonial criticism brings to radical focus enlightenment knowledge - its certainties, reason, etc- it cannot depart completely from its legacies. It does acknowledge the continuing and the residual power of colonialism. Homi Bhabha, commenting on colonial discourse challenges the certainties produced by enlightenment knowledge:

“... it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalization; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically construed”.
The post colonial discourse, in other words, radically changes the conception of the self that was dependent on Kantian formulation based on certainty. The feminist theorists have focused on the uncertain including dreams, fantasies emotion etc. The privileged healthy, middle class, middle aged white male ignored the multiplicities of self, constituted by class, caste, gender, sexual orientation, age etc. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has introduces a new twist to colonial discourse by getting engaged with subaltern history that challenges colonizing administration as well as the native national elite. Spivak draws attention to the native subaltern women who according to her have experienced double colonization – patriarchy of men at the domestic level and the domination of colonial power at the public sphere.

The enlightened male subject is counterpoised by socially situated awkwardly heterogeneous female and male with conscious and unconscious desires. Julia Kristeva, Nancy Chodorow, Judith Butler and a host of other feminists with divergent views on feminism have systematically affronted the liberal, rational male self. They have drawn lessons from psychoanalysis, post structuralism, Marxism in order to contest the patriarchal construction of the self. The act of subverting the Kantian ethical subject that uses reason to transcend cultural determinants to arrive at absolute truth is a way of recovering the lost self. The rational-ethical subject is by and large free of desires, hatred, ambivalence, obsessions, prejudice etc. Such a male subject, feminists point out, is ideal for politics and commerce - fields that were prohibited to women. Hence, the ideal self, according to these standards, is to follow the male in his rationality. In order to repudiate the unitary, masculine self many feminists have put forward theories of inter-subjectivity and human inter-connectedness.

In spite of the majority of feminists who have radically chal-
lenged the unitary rational terrain of self there have been at-
ttempts to explore yet another conception of self inspired by
Jurgen Habermas’ communicative ethics. Seylas Berhabib, for
example, recognizes the socially situated, inter-personally
bonded individual but at the same time upholds the individual’s
capacity to be responsible and be committed to rational, philo-
sophical justifications of universal moral norms.

“Subjectivity is the site of our consciousness, but far from
being a fully independent entity, it is bound up by the structures
and discourses of institutional and interpersonal order, power
and ideology”\textsuperscript{102} According to Anthony Giddens the self has
to vie with many possibilities, in the midst of tensions and dif-
ficulties: “In a post traditional order, however, an indefinite
range of possibilities present themselves, not just in respect
of options for behaviour, but in respect also of the ‘openness
of the world’ to the individual. ‘The world’, as indicated above,
is not a seamless order of time and space stretching away
from the individual; it intrudes into presence via an array of
varying channels and sources”.\textsuperscript{103} The time-space concept
becomes a new challenge. Someone / an event of a far away
place may become familiar than someone/something in the
next door. Further, it cannot be thought that diversity of con-
texts is responsible for fragmentation of self or multiple lev-
els.
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