FUNDAMENTALISM AND SECULARISM

Professor T.N. Madan delivered three lectures as a Visiting Professor at the Institute during June 1995

The first lecture on "Defining Fundamentalism" stressed that Funda-mentalism is a trendy word envelo-ped by a great deal of ambiguity. It is a naming word and an evaluative term but not an analytical concept. Any attempt to introduce some precision into its use would help to lift it from everyday speech and make it useful as a concept. This may be done in a number of ways.

One way to proceed would be to take a couple of cases in respect of which the use of fundamentalism as a term of reference is well established, and try to construct from them, through a process of selection, a substantive notion of fundamentalism, which would not be a complete description of any particular case, but analytically useful in respect of all. In doing so one would have to be careful about the distinction between concept and reality.

Taking into consideration the case of American Protestant fundamentalists – with reference to whom the term seems to have been first used – and the Iranian Revolution of 1978-79 – which is generally regarded as fundamentalist – the following defining criteria are suggested: (1) Reactivity (fundamentalism is not an original impulse); (2) final authority and inerrancy of seripture; (3) cultural critique; (4) selective retrieval of tradition; (5) intolerance of dissent (monopoly over truth); and (6) quest for power.

Application of the above criteria to certain so-called Indian fundamentalist movements, e.g. the Arya Samaj and Bhindranwala's call for orthopraxis among the Sikhs confirms the heuristic value of the paradigm and introduces some order into the Indian materials.

The second lecture on Secularism and Pluralism in the Hindu Religious Tradition pointed out that Secularization, defined as the process by which the control of religious ideas, institutions and personalities over everyday life is gradually narrowed, is a universal process. In the West it has generated the ideology of secularism which arises out of not so much a total repudiation of religion as the dialectic of Protestantism and the Enlightenment.

In India we have adopted the ideals of a secularized society and the secular state. Whatever exists of them

empirically but not also ideologically exists but weakly. What support may we expect to draw from the Hindu religious tradition in the promotion of secularism in India?

Two arguments may be examined. First, does the classical tradition recognize the autonomy of secular power? Second, what is the nature of religious pluralism in modern Hinduism? Third argument worth examination would be the Weberian thesis that Hindu religious beliefs like *karma* and *samsara* do not promote rationalization of the type Protestantism did in Europe.

A quick examination of Vedic and post-Vedic texts reveals that spiritual authority and temporal power are joined together with the former encompassing the later. The contention of some scholars that the *Arthashastra* places *artha* above *dharma* and *kama* in the *purushartha* scheme is based on a partial reading of the texts.

The Smriti literature does seem to support a pluralist position. Thus, the *Manusmriti* maintains that if two shrutis are in conflict both must be accepted. In modern times, Swami Vivekananda emerged as the major promoter of the idea that Hinduism is pluralist in orientation and tolerant of other religions. This is a defensible thesis only partly. Not only the Hindu social organization, but also Hindu (brahmanical) thought is hierarchical. If tolerance of other religions takes the form of encompassing them, we do not then arrive at a truly pluralist position which requires the interdependence of different religious traditions.

The third lecture on Maulana Azad's Quest for Pluralism drew attention to the fact that there is a general agreement among the scholars of Islam that the ideology of secularism cannot be accommodated within this religious tradition. In India this point of view was stated forcefully by Muhammad Iqbal, Maulana Mawdudi, and Maulana Azad. Azad remained committed to pluralism, however, throughout his life.

In the first phase of his adult life, which is marked by pan-Islamism and fundamentalism, he argued for pluralism as a political necessity. No Muslim can put up with political slavery, but to drive out the British Indian Muslims must cooperate with the majority community, operating from a position of confidence. Towards the end of this phase, Azad embraced the position of a nationalist

Muslim under the influence of C.R. Das and Mahatma Gandhi. He became the President of the Indian National Congress in 1923 and placed Hindu-Muslim unity above national independence.

Subsequently, he tried to construct an argument on the basis of the *Quran* in favour of pluralism as religious philosophy. The core of this argument was the Quranic notion of God in relation to God's creation. Azad interpreted the notions of God's overlordship, mercy, and instruction

TIME, SPACE AND ICON: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON INDIAN ICONOGRAPHY

Professor Kalyan Kumar Dasgupta delivered three lectures as a Visiting Professor during May 1995 at the Institute.

In his introductory remarks on his three-part lecture on "Time, Space and Icon", Professor Dasgupta's aim was interpretative iconography, or iconology, rather than descriptive iconography; in other words, he would be dealing with ideas and ideologies—time-bound and timeless and space-bound and universal—which have been at work behind the countless images of major and marginal Indian divinities over the centuries. His study of Indian iconography from new perspectives draws on the works of Ananda Coomaraswamy, Mircea Eliade and Erwin Panofsky. He further added that the intrinsic meanings of our divine images would be clear from an inter-disciplinary study involving disciplines like Psychology, Comparative Religion and Anthropology.

In his first lecture, 'Indian Iconography and the Collective Unconscious', Professor Dasgupta stated that Indians in the remote past, as elsewhere, created icons of deities representing God, the supreme and the supernatural, the roots of which lie in what Jung has termed the collective unconscious. To illustrate his point he made use of Indian and non-Indian materials, both conceptual and visual and dealt with themes like archetypal parents, sexuality and life-cycles, ancestor worship and the cults connected with trees and snakes. These themes, he said, are timeless and universal as creative forces behind the icon-making activity.

In his focus specifically on Indian situation in the second lecture, he gave a connected narrative of the growth and development of iconography from the pre-Harappan times to the end of the sixth century A.D. Alongside the perpetuation of age-old

themes of primordial parents, tree-and-snake cults and the like, Indian iconography centering on the divinities of three pantheons as well as on the peripheral deities became crystallised, particularly during the age of the imperial Kushanas, from the first century of the Christian era. But the iconographic formulae were not yet clearly laid down and a number of iconic examples testify that the iconography was at an incipient stage. The most noteworthy contribution to Indian iconography of this period was the creation of the image of the Buddha. In a significant deviation from the established norm in Indian iconography, Professor Dasgupta divided Indian iconographic history into Period I (earliest times to the end of the first century B.C.), Period II (first century A.D. to 600 A.D.) and period III (600 A.D. to 1200 A.D.). This history terminated around 1200 A.D., when all creative potential and possibilities were virtually exhausted.

In his third lecture Professor Dasgupta confined himself chiefly to eastern India to illustrate that the trends and proclivities of earlier epochs, particularly the Gupta culture period (300-600 A.D.), were perhaps more articulate in this area than in other segments of the subcontinent. The chief characteristics of this period, period III of his chronological framework, included a culmination of all the trends and tendencies of the earlier epochs, relative preponderance of the archetypal mother, increasing popularity of syncretistic deities, the creation of new ones of the genre like Surya-Narayana and Martanda-Bhairava, close interaction between followers of all the three major religions, the rise of Tantrayana Buddhism, and, above all, the assertion of regionalism.

All the three lectures were illustrated by several slides.

in such a manner as to include non-Muslims too in a partnership with Muslims. He strove to find common motifs across religious traditions and saw *tawhid* and *advaita* as convergent concepts.

In the last phase of his life (during which he became the President of the Congress a second time and then Education Minister), he continued his quest for pluralism in both the religious traditions of India and in India's cultural history, which he portrayed as composite.

ON TRUTH, MEANING AND KNOWLEDGE

Professor Pranab Kumar Sen, who teaches philosophy at Jadavpur University, delivered three lectures at the Institute during June 1995 as a Visiting Professor.

The first lecture on 'Truth' is a defence of the correspondence theory of truth in one of its possible forms.

This form of correspondence theory was suggested by Aristotle, and later developed with great technical power and finesse by Alfred Tarski. The lecture begins with a consideration of the question regarding what can be taken to be the bearer of truth, and answers, tentatively, that it is the occasional utterance of a speaker which alone can be in the most fundamental sense. The paper then proceeds to consider Gottlob Frege's argument that all definitions of truth are doomed to failure because they inevitably lead to an infinite regress. In answer to this charge, Michael Dummett's suggestion is accepted, the suggestion being that a definition of truth would avoid the infinite regress if it admitted a (reductive) equivalence of the form 'It is true that p if and only if p'. It is then pointed out that this requirement of reductive equivalence is in fact the same as the Traski equivalence, the famous Convention T, which Tarski laid down as a condition of material adequacy of any proposed definition of truth. If that be so, the definition of truth which Tarski has worked out, and has taught us how to work out, can avoid Frege's regress, for, as Tarski has shown, this definition of his does avoid Frege's regress. Tarski's definition, however, makes use of the concept of satisfaction, which is basically the relation in which objects of which a given predicate is true stand to the predicate. This use of the concept of satisfaction establishes the definition to be a definition of something which is objective, and hence something which has to be understood in realistic terms. But the realism here is of the minimal form for it invokes as few entities as possible, although it can still make room for a certain concept of a fact, a concept which takes a fact to be transparent. (To talk about a fact is to talk about the things the fact is supposed to be a fact about.)

The second lecture on 'Meaning, Reference and Realism' builds upon first thesis that a theory of meaning must be a theory of truth, in the sense of a theory of truth-conditions; and that being a theory which has to make an essential use of the concept of reference (at least of objects by singular terms), the theory must be realistic. The thesis is developed in the following way. In order to be able

systematically to understand speech, we need a (general) theory for interpreting the words of the speaker, a theory which would enable us to tell what is said by the speaker X on any given occasion in the language he or she uses. This general theory is called 'a theory of meaning'. Now the question is: what must a theory of meaning be like? Whatever else the theory of meaning be like, it must be a theory based on a theory of truth, a theory which would enable us to specify for any given sentence of the language the conditions under which it would be true. A theory of truth of this kind must, however, make an essential use of the concept of reference. This use of the concept of reference, in its turn, leads to realism, at least in the minimal form. Thus understanding of speech, and of man for that matter, is possible only within a framework that is minimally realistic.

The third lecture on 'Knowledge, Truth and Scepticism' calls attention to what may be called a 'misuse' of the concept of truth, while the second lecture was concerned with an essential use of the same concept. In the classical account of knowledge, knowledge is defined as justified true belief. Usually, this account is given by laying down three conditions, supposed to be individually necessary and jointly sufficient. These are that the subject must have a belief, he or she be justified in having the belief and the belief be true. This way of formulating the classical conception of knowledge has the consequence that the condition relating to truth is treated as a separate and independent condition of knowledge. But the idea that truth is such an independent condition is bound to lead to absurdities and contradictions; as well as to scepticism of the worst kind. If truth is a condition of knowledge then, we have to realise, it is also a condition of ignorance. It is only when there is a truth that the question of knowing, or failing to know it, arises. So what we can say at most is that the existence of a true proposition is a presuppo-sition of knowing (as well as failing to know). But that is very different from saying that truth is a separate condition of knowing, on a par with belief and justification. In fact, episte-mically, there is no difference between a belief which is true and a belief which is justified. The addition of truth as a separate condition is funda-mentally wrong because of just this.

Objectivity in Social Sciences and Symposium on Understanding Tradition

A research seminar-cum-workshop on 'Objectivity in Social Sciences' meant for young scholars and teachers in humanities and social sciences was held at the Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur from March 23 to 30, 1995. It was sponsored by the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla under the auspices of Inter-University Centre for Humanities and Social Sciences. The seminar had two parts. The first one (March 23-28) was concerned with the main theme of the research seminar, namely objectivity in social sciences and other related issues. The second one (March 29-30) was devoted to a symposium on Understanding Tradition. The symposium was appropriately dedicated to Professor Mohini Mullick, one of the faculty members of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences of IIT Kanpur, who was retiring, and who has been deeply concerned not only with the methodological issues in social sciences, but also with practice of philosophy in contemporary India, and who believes in the intimate connection between philosophical practice and the socio-intellectual tradition in which the practitioner is situated.

Four resource persons to the research seminar included Professors M. Mullick (Philosophy, IIT Kanpur), Gurpreet Mahajan (Political Science, JNU), Rajan Gurukkal (History, Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam) and TVS Ram Mohan Rao (Economics, IIT Kanpur). Nineteen participants, drawn from various disciplines such as Economics, History, Linguistics, Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology, from all over the country took part in the seminar. Besides, there were several other local participants. These were a mix of university/college lecturers and research scholars.

Each day of the first part consisted of three sessions: morning, afternoon and after-dinner. The three-hour long morning sessions were mostly engaged in lectures by the resource persons followed by discussions. The three-hour long afternoon sessions and two-hour long after-dinner sessions were used for presentations by the participants followed by discussions.

In the last after-dinner session of the seminar, on 28th March, 1995, participants and the resource persons gave accounts of their impressions and suggestions regarding the conduct and the theme of the seminar. These accounts were audio-recorded. The resource persons delivered their lectures on the following topics: (i) 'Why Objectivity: Concept and Content' (ii) 'Truth, Objectivity and Relativism'

by Mullick; (i) 'Ethno-Social Science' (ii) 'Post-modernism and Social Sciences' by Gurpreet Mahajan; (i) 'Hermeneutics, Objectivity and Historian's Practice' (ii) 'Objectivity and Explanatory Human Geography' by Rajan Gurukkal; and 'Limitations of the Objectivity Paradigm' by TVS Rammohan Rao.

·Some of the notable presentations by the participants were on: 'Representing Social Process and Tribal Identity', 'The Process of Knowledge in a Traditional Religious Setting', 'Policy Research and the question of Objectivity', 'Rationalization of Politics and the Concern of Pluralism', 'Reflections on Critical Theory', 'Phenomenological Approach to Objectivity', 'Sources of Bias in Scientific Investigation: a View from Economics', and 'Objectivity in Linguistics'. The entire proceedings of the second part of the seminar, the symposium on 'Understanding Tradition' was audio-recorded. The symposiasts were Professors A.K. Saran, G.C. Pandey, K.N. Sharma, M. Mullick and Rajan Gurukkal. The central issue debated in the symposium was whether tradition is to be understood in terms of the actual manifest material process of human history or in terms of a certain transcendental core. While the latter view emphasized the eternal, ineffable and mysterious, essence of tradition and hence insistently denied any possibility of either pairing or contrasting tradition with modernity, the former, mainly advocated by the practicing social scientist and historian, considered the transcen-dentalization of tradition to be something programmatically inimical to his professed concern of 'scientifically' investigating socio-human reality. For the practitioner would then be confronted with a dilemma. If the core of tradition is inacessible, and yet alluding to that core is required in any deep understanding of socio-human reality, then how can the project of understanding any bit of socio-human reality ever get off the ground?

The problem of understanding tradition had appropriately echoed in the discussions and deliberations of the issue of ·objectivity in social understanding. For the concepts and categories employed in social inquiry may be alien to the inquirer's own social environment. And this mis-match between conceptual apparatus and social reality may result in serious misunderstanding of the object of research. Thus the relevance of the symposium to the seminar was deemed to be unquestionable.

Research Seminar on
TECHNOLOGY, CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT

The research Seminar on Technology, Change and Develop-ment was inaugurated by Prof. A. Sukumaran Nair, the Vice Chancellor of the Mahatma Gandhi University on 22nd February 1995 at 10.30 a.m.

The inaugural session was followed by the presentation of the approach paper by Prof. P.R.K. Rao of IIT Kanpur. In his exposition he dealt with theorising 'Failure of Theories of Social Change'. It provided an opportunity for discus-sing various issues concerning the problems of social change particularly focusing on material practices and cognitive orientations of agents involved in the process of change.

On the second day of the seminar, approach paper on 'Productivity and Growth in the Context of Techno-logical Change' was presented by K.K. Subramanian, of Centre for Development Studies, Ulloor, Trivandrum. The paper tried to highlight different aspects of the technology transfer in the context of the development paradigm and visualised the possibilities of repeating the miracle of development in countries like India, following the model of South-East Asian economies. All the presentations of the day were from the political economy perspective excepting that of Williama R. De Silva, Department of Sociology, University of Goa, who spoke on 'Technological Hegemony and the Loss of Master Discourse'. De Silva mainly concentrated on the ideological background of the genesis of technological hegemony in different discursive formations.

The presentation by Thomas Issac, 'From Handicrafts to Machine Power: Dynamics of Technological Change in a Labour Surplus Economy', tried to provide theoretical and empirical expositions of technological change in coir industry in Kerala. The paper was mainly within the classical Marxist tradition trying to look at issues of labour displacement and attendant issues emerging out of technological change. The other presentations of the day were by P.J. Philip and John Kurien. The former spoke on integration of small peasantry into the global economy, trying to identify the relationship between changing pattern within agrarian economy with the larger realities within the economy. The changing pattern of technology in the fisheries sector was the theme of the presentation by John Kurien. He tried to show the validity of the knowledge that fisherfolk had traditionally for determining various

technical aspects of fishing and how these forms of knowledge were obliterated when new technologies were introduced. But on the whole, he favoured the new technologies in this sector.

Shereen Ratnagar presented an approach paper, 'Technology and Society: The Proto-historic Period'. She dealt at length with various technological practices of the indigenous people of proto-historic India. Her paper emphatically proclaimed the relevance of traditional technology in the context of the survival struggles of rural communities today.

The afternoon discussion grappled with the question of traditional knowledge systems and the modern sciences in terms of epistemological issues and tried to bring to the fore conflicting positions about them. The discussions also digressed into general issues like the alleged autonomy of technology, its non-materiality and philosophical foundations.

In her presentation, Prema Rajagopalan spoke on the technological practices of goldsmiths in Madras city, particularly on the social aspects of the transfer of technological knowledge from one generation to another and cultural issues that determine the specialisation in a particular craft. There were also papers dealing with the questions of technology transfer in critical political economy perspectives, attacking the imperialist overtones of modern technology.

The presentation by Sunil V. of IIT Kanpur tried to focus on the philosophical aspects of modern technological development. This was followed by two special lectures by Shereen Ratnagar and P.R.K. Rao, on 'Technology and Past' and 'Technology and Future' respectively. B. Yajna Narayana of IIT Madras presented his paper on 'Computational Technology and Neural Networks Today'. He dealt with the frontier areas of research in this field. In the afternoon session Dr. Iqbal presen-ted a paper on 'Medical Technology and Modern Society' focussing on the evolving technological hegemony in this sphere.

On the final day of the seminar there was a symposium on Philosophising Technology and Change. P.R.K. Rao and Shereen Ratnagar led the delebrations of the symposium, which brought together the ideas discussed in the course of the research seminar, with ontological as well as epistemological conclusions.

Study Week on
Ethnic Movements in Contemporary India
June 26-July 1, 1995

The objectives of the study week, as outlined by Prof. S.L. Sharma, the Convenor, were as follows:

i) to gain a sharper and deeper understanding of the patterns and processes of some of the major ethnic movements, both separatist and secessionist, in post-independence era;

ii) to figure out the specificities and commonalities between various ethnic movements.

iii) to look for explanations for the upsurge of ethnic movements both in their specific manifestations and in general; and

iv) to attempt theoretical consolidation and to think of some policy considerations for a multiethnic democratic polity like India.

In his inaugural remarks, Professor Mrinal Miri, Director of the Institute, said that ethnicity signifies to a community as a supreme value, one that tends to override all other values including value of life. A community has its Swadharma, law of the land, and its notion of justice by means of which it provides a basis for a meaningful and purposeful human existence for its members. When a community is deprived of its Swadharma, its law of the land and notion of justice, it feels morally and spiritually denuded and takes recourse to political action. Modernity with its notion of universalistic rationality calls into question the notion of particularistic rationality of a community, which is why there is the upsurge of ethnic movements all over the world, including India.

In his lead paper "Comprehending Ethnic Movements in India", Partha N. Mukherji, subscribed to the view that ethnicity signifies protonational bonds, and observed that the concept of ethnicity cannot be understood without a reference to the concept of nation. In regard to the interface between ethnicity and nation he identified two conceptual orientations, one standing for ethno-national project and the other for state-sponsored project of nation building. In order to identify a movement as ethnic, he distinguished five domains, i.e., ethnicity, class, power, gender and eco-environment, each of which is marked by an internal structure of asymmetrical relationships, which contains within it contradictions which may be primary or secondary. It is the focus of the primary contradiction in a particular domain that

defines the character and basis of the movement.

On the concept of ethnicity, there emerged a measure of agreement on two conceptions of ethnicity labelled as generic and emergent by S.L. Sharma and cultural and power conceptions by R.K. Jain. On the question of differentiating ethnic from non-ethnic, R.K. Jain proposed the principle of social heredity as a defining feature of ethnicity which was contested by Kumar Suresh Singh. It was widely agreed that ethnicity signifies invocation of a sense of cultural distinction for purposes of political ends. There also emerged a great deal of consensus on the fact that ethnicity is a contextual category, an identity construct and a multi-dimensional phenomenon. Some of the important dimensions identified were linguistic, regional, religious, historical and tribal. Any one or combination of these dimen-sions could be invoked in a given situation for purposes of political mobilisation.

Ajit Bhattacharjea presented a political analysis of Kashmir's claim to self-determination and maintained that the Indian state has dithered in keeping its promises. Bashir Ahmad Dabla presented the perceptions of Kashmiri Muslims, which he found to be in agreement with Bhattacharjea's position. Disagreeing with both, T.N. Madan presented the perception of Kashmiri Pandits. Arguing that Kashmir does not have a single past, he said it has at least three pasts, a Hindu, a Muslim and a composite one, the last one representing the true meaning of Kashmiriyat. The Kashmir movement, in his opinion, is built up on a wrong premise, i.e., the Islamic past and not on Kashmiriyat, the composite character of Kashmiri culture. Riyaz Punjabi drew attention to the emergence of a middle class among Kashmiri Muslims which, in his opinion, was playing a critical role in the Kashmir movement.

On the Punjab movement, Bhisham Sahni maintained that it was not an ethnic movement, as religion alone cannot serve as the sole criterion for defining ethnicity. He found it heartening that there did not accur any communal divide in Punjab, in spite of the promptings from various groups. In his substantive paper, J.S. Grewal situated Punjab movement in its historical context. He maintained that Sikh identity was constructed

**Forthcoming events of
INDIAN COUNCIL OF PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH**

1. Refresher Course on "Applied Ethics" from 9 to 29 September 1995
    at ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow.

2. Seminar on "The Concept of Dreamless Sleep" from 14 to 17
    November 1995 at ICPR Academic Centre, Lucknow.

Ethnic Movements

long before the Khalistan movement appeared. In fact, it preceded the construct of Hindu identity as well. Khalistan movement was the invocation of Sikh identity for political purposes. Birinder Pal Singh attempted to explain the nature and signifcance of the Sikh religious identity in its historical perspective, taking into account both internal and external factors. He also examined the position of scholars like McLeod, Oberoi, Dhillon and Grewal, on the question of Sikh identity. A.S. Narang argued that it is a distorted form of capitalist development in Punjab coupled with the politicisation stimulated by struggle for power between the Congress and Akali parties that gave rise to Punjab movement.

Ethnic movements in the north-east received concentrated attention. Delving deep into the Naga insurgency, Kuki-Tankhul clash and Gorkhaland movement, A.C. Sinha pointed out that ethnic movements in

the north-east are essentially exercises in search for political autonomy or sovereignty. Drawing attention to the trend of networking among the leaders of various ethnic movements in the north-east, he sounded an alarmist note and pleaded for a regional perspective on ethnic issues and resource-sharing at the SAARC level. Sujata Miri focused on the role of religion in ethnic movements in the north-east. Making a comparison between the tribal religion and Christianity, she underlined the role of Christianisation in understanding the background of ethnic assertions in the region. Kailash Aggarwal analysed the role of linguistic ethnicity in the north-east by illustrating the Metteilon movement in Manipur. He also brought into sharp relief the role of immigrant groups and the state and market forces in stimulating ethnic disturbances in the north-east. K. Gopal Iyer analysed the Jharkhand movement in terms of transformation from ethnicity to nationality and regionalism. Having begun on the base of a pan-tribal identity, the social

base of Jharkhand movement has now broadened to include non-tribals and has thus transformed into a regional movement. Iyer also provided an account of the Dravidian movement and characterised it as an anti-racial, anti-caste and anti-Hindu movement. R.K. Jain dilated on the question of ethnicisation of caste in Uttar Pradesh in the light of Mandalisation and the rise of Bahujan Samaj Party in Uttar Pradesh. Amita Malik made an entertaining and enlightening presentation on ethnic nuances in the cinema and electronic media.

Kumar Suresh Singh made a scintillating presentation on ethnicity, ethnic movements and ethnic conflict resolutions based on his personal experiences. He maintained that ethnicity has passed through three historical phases globally — the Soviet, the American and an all-encompassing. He also stressed the fact that ethnicity has moved from a bio-social concept to a psycho-social concept, i.e., from looking ethnic to feeling ethnic. For ethnic conflict resolution, he pleaded for a change of

perspective from unity in diversity to diversity in unity.

J.S. Grewal held that ethnicity has been transformed from the property of a settled community in pre-colonial era to the political mobilization of a community in the post-colonial era, thanks to the forces of modernisation and development. Randhir Singh said that this has to be explained in terms of non-ethnic factors such as the role of relations of production, distortions of the capitalist path of development, market forces and, above all, the politics of the ruling class.

Attempting a theoretical consolidation, S.L. Sharma underlined the generalities emerging from the analyses of various ethnic movements in contemporary India. Notable among them were the role of religious resocialisation like Islamisation, Christianisation or Hindutva, the role of politics of ruling class and state response, the role of bureaucracy including security forces, the role of distortions in development and the significance of the location of secessionist movements in the border areas.