

connection between political action and political judgement, instead of being discernible for comparison against each other, tends towards physical singularity, thus creating a fusion of a nature from which neither the author nor the undiscernible reader would be in a position to extract himself.

It is, thus, essential at this very crucial cross-road of world history to examine and understand the polarisation that has occurred between the individual, the role of the institution and the nation-building process. It appears that for the first time in the history of our human civilization the institutions and nation states, due to their organic and functional myopicity, will be the cause of structural violence and where man has been so strongly urged individually to turn against his own nature, simply because institutions are insensitive to the requirements of social justice and nation states, are oblivious to the higher ethos of tradition and cultural preconditions.

While reviewing RSR's earlier works viz. TCCR and ICSC, it was observed<sup>4</sup> that he has tried to link and operationalise the abstract notions of theory into possible implementable policies for national integration and that he has grown to believe and work out the framework of analysis in the field of social philosophy and concern for the operation of political domain. The trilogy, when applied as a whole, has far reaching consequences in the area of development and developmental strategies. *The Primacy of the Political* analyses political problems as a 'search for legitimate authority' with the aim to protect 'the social order and arts of life'. In the process he identifies two contextual problems i.e. (a) the autonomy of the new nation states in the context of encroaching dominance and (b) the internal integrity of the state *vis-a-vis* various groupings and ethnic pressures and pulls. One is, thus, tempted at this stage to postulate the emergence of the individual in the new world order and secondly examine the inter-relationship between the nation-building and the individual in the most contemporary context. More of that, however, later.

With the end of the cold war, the ideological battle between the two dominating military powers following two different political ideologies for governance have taken different dimensions in the area of international relations, international political economy and international balance of power. The basic premise of RSR's *Primacy of the Political*, as observed earlier, is formed by the interplay of the two notions i.e. political competence and political culture must necessarily begin with the central position of the individual in the above-mentioned background in the post cold war

era - individuals who will belong to a new class called international business community.

These individuals will be identified as a new class of world citizen maintaining different passports without any bearing to their country of origin, transnational in nature, highly qualified professionally and capable of working out their briefcases with a lap-top computer, a cellular telephone hooked to a world wide communication system and a plastic credit card for using international banking system and facility. Such individuals will surpass even the mobility and flexibility of multinational companies and international banking systems. Backed by the latest communication facility they will have exceptional access to information and operational activity in their professional levels of existence. Being individuals and not belonging to any institution, country or system will make them totally a commodity on which no control-factor can be implied and, hence, such entities will display no national ethos or emotions towards a set of culture or traditions. One can see the emergence of a biological robot which can think for its own existence, development and growth and, hence, more dangerous than any form of artificial intelligence.

According to the parameters prescribed by RSR, the 'political' is mediated by ethics whose interrelationship 'preserves its normative character as concerned with vision of good life' and rhetorics provides the political with a 'dimension of friendly discourse with others in which one is willing to persuade as well as be persuaded by'. Does it not strike as significant that the role of ethics and rhetorics, when actually seen in action, resulting in the formation of an individual in contemporary situation comparable to an inhuman machine more dangerous and destructive than any other form conceivable? Where, then, is the applied value of the work in trilogy?

There are seminal notionalities which are well-postulated, corroborated and documented in RSR's work. The first is directed towards the understanding of the theory of modernization, nationalism and concept of political development. RSR indicates that the twin consequences of the contemporary theory of modernization primarily makes us concentrate our attention on the regional level rather than on the global level and allows the growth of the elites within that system which is primarily urban based. Yes, as well as no. One is not sure if one could stratify the way the above observations have been made. John Galtung, the celebrated peace researcher, has often taken recourse to centre-periphery models of analysis to explain the theory of structural

violence incubated in the international relations among nation states. Concepts of nation and national autonomy, far from being marginalised, come to the forefront of international system at a systemic level to an extent that the pressures and pulls exerted by local actors at regional level become the turning point of peace and stability at the global level. One can argue conversely that it is essentially the impact of science and technology in the form of technocracy following naturally and essentially to the regional levels of underdevelopment which raises the issue of participation and obligation at a global level.

Thus, from the highest point of modernization to the nascent stage of incorporation of modernization, the attention necessarily is at global perspective — this is a direct output of the shrinking world in an age of communication explosion. The reality of our situation and that of the world we are living in are very much rooted in the relationship between nation-building and the individual on one hand and the interrelationship between nation-building and theory of modernization both at macro levels of world politics of internationalism and at the micro levels of regional inter-nationalism. One, thus, may have to disagree with RSR's attempt to delink the theory of nation-building from the theory of modernization which allows him to postulate in terms of new categories of nationalism and nation states.

From a critical point of view, it will be interesting to postulate the intrinsic linkage between nation-building and the individual in the changed world order today. The individual is both the receptor and the responder to the fast changing situation and his role in nation-building is far more pertinent. The situation has been accentuated because of the explosion of population in less developed nation states and an unending requirement of skilled manpower in amongst developed nations of the world. Peace, stability, nationalism and development *per se* will all be affected by the transient nature of the individual in the modern age and hence there would be the emergence of new linkages between nation-building and the individual.

Nation-building is a process of development which must incorporate harmonious interaction between the individual and institutions for achieving political and technological optimization in order to improve the quality of life. For political it creates traditions, norms and values and for the technological it creates institutions and centres of excellence. Thus, the individual in his own right and merit is encouraged by the institutions within the country to optimise the efforts of his skills to fulfill the needs of a nation at large. In developing countries, economic

disparities reduce individual's choices while trying to utilise one's own skills which have been acquired due to the availability of subsidised educational system sponsored by respective governments. Thus, the third world countries, which produce a plethora of skilled human resources, are unable to absorb them fully in their own country leading to a continuous attempt for migration to developed countries.

Interestingly, the absorbed part is not necessarily the best amongst those produced. Their selection within is influenced by a variety of factors ranging from subjective sociological reasons to political anticidents. The remainder remains unemployed, virtually sitting on the fence waiting for the opportunity to move out for absorption in the international labour market.

A country like India over the past forty years has produced and accumulated the third largest pool of scientific manpower in the world - the best portion of which have systematically relocated themselves by migrating to greener pastures of the United States, Western Europe or in the oil rich countries of the Middle East and elsewhere. Thus, the manpower available in India, be it in the field of management, technology or scientific, are far from the very best produced.

Controlled planning and over protectionism due to ideological overtones have destroyed the individual's ability to stand upto the challenges at all levels of operations. The individual, hence, finds himself at a loss while encountering cut-throat competition. The decision making elites in general lack vision, creative outlook and culture to promote individuals with potentials. Institutions, be it educational or corporate, are infested with mediocrity and are over politicised at all levels of functioning, making them unaccountable in the absence of work ethics and norms. Manpower is, thus, produced in a mechanical fashion and those employed for nation-building process are incapable of achieving targets of excellence as expected of them. Role of skilled manpower, thus, never becomes fully complimentary to nation-building process and at best remains adhoc in nature.

The new world order and the subsequent rearrangements in market forces will eradicate all past barriers that existed between the individuals *per se* and international political economy. The individual will be alienated against his own nation state, institution or the roots to which the individual claimed his cultural moorings. Freed from the bonds of culture, religion, tradition and even society the individual is now on the threshold to exist as an entity utterly devoid of all humanness and categorises himself as a part of the world business civilization. Hence, in

the new world environment the individual will be singularly responsible for de-humanizing the entire developing countries to a level of primordial ethnic existence as never seen or envisaged before. The ethos of "primacy of the political" as expounded in the utterances of Aristotle or Kauṭilya in *Arthashastra* with a view to acquire, preserve & distribute with social justice for the good of the many will now be superimposed by the ethos of business in culture and market forces in traditions and civilizational preconditions.

The new world order will also eradicate all constraints and political linkages that each developing country had with either of the super powers. Communication explosion and technological revolution will widen the gap between the developed and developing countries further. Real power will rest on the economic, social and technological advancement and the way these variables would be monopolised. The developed countries led by the USA, Western Europe and Japan would require an equally unending supply of the best skilled manpower working with total freedom to develop technologies, create data-banks transferable through vast and frighteningly fast communication set up. Ironically, this entire revolution will be carried out mainly by the human resources produced in the third world nations. Thus, the new world order is poised to utilise the individuals of the third world to under develop the very roots from which they have emerged. This is a frightening inevitability.

We have earlier observed that this review essay must link up RSR's earlier two works with the present. RSR has already moved from a Marxian view point to a deeper commitment to Kant and his central notion of 'what is man'. His methodology to make the reader understand the meaning contextuality, functions of exemplars and the study of the inter-relationship between meaning and actions is pertinent to the observations that have been made in the preceding paragraphs as a commentary on nation-building and the individual. Thus, in the book *Towards a Critique of Cultural Reasons* one has to accept fully the originality of RSR's contribution which connects Kant's notion of aesthetic ideas with Ricoeur's perspective on speech and textual discourse.

The same strand of original interpretation can be seen in the second and the third chapters of the *Primacy of the Political* which attempts to describe two specific paradigms of the political - the classical and the contemporary. The two approaches are dubbed as discursive model and the behavioural model, respectively. In the discursive model an essential linkage between political judgement and political action is shown along

with the one between language and communication.

The fourth chapter on language, politics and judgement is virtually a must reading for all who teach communication as a specialised subject. The subtle technical differences between speech and language in terms of subject, addressee and references are well expounded. There is much to learn even in definitional terms from this chapter as it clearly charts out the strategy to spell out the inner connection between language and politics. The author has done well by starting with Ricoeur, touching Wittgensteinian 'argument concerning the impossibility of private language, moving to Kuhn's conceptualisation of paradigms in which stability of judgement is seen in terms of the dominance of a reigning paradigm', to highlighting Plato and Aristotle's obsession with forms of government and transformation of constitution to show that classical perspectives ingested the dimension of power. Similarly enunciated is a very lucid exposition of Kant's consideration of judgement, attitude towards rhetorics and the contrast between Aristotle and Kant on the value of judgement.

Chapter four is hence a chapter intended to mobilise ideas on the theme of judgement and the nature of judgement and their co-relation to political competence. In his complex deliberation RSR has intimately commented on Periclean judgement of political exigencies, Thucydidean's interpretative historical judgement and Aristotle's meta-theoretical judgements. In the process the author shows as to how in all the three contexts there exists a linkage between politics and ethics on the one hand and with rhetorics on the other.

The fifth and the last chapter merely re-states the Primacy of the Political and the implications for philosophy of Science. What is essential to point out is the innovative skills of RSR to link up the role of science for ethical responsibility to society and to provide an integrated concept of development in five interlinked stages as quoted below:

1. The acquisition of what has not been gained  
(science as an innovation)
2. The preservation of what has been acquired (science as conservation)
3. The improvement of what has been preserved  
(science as empowerment)
4. The distribution of what has been improved (science as participation)
5. The transformation of what has been improved

into quality of life (science as enrichment)

No where one can find a better integration of Kautilya's nation-building conception with the role of science and technology. RSR, thus makes science both as responsible and responsive with a view to taking it out of its apolitical nature and make it an integral part of the principles governing the primacy of the political.

By giving science a placement in creative and preservative modes, the philosophy of values governing the role of action or inaction of scientists is put on a plane where its services are necessarily directed towards the justification and preservation of life and not for the purposes of destruction. Thus, what emerges as a communicational model of science places it in an 'essential relationship' with other orders and interests. RSR points out the essentiality of not allowing any form of knowledge to become a power over life. In essence what comes out unerringly is that man's perceptions, intuitive acumen coupled with rational, ethical and moral sense, must formulate policies to harness science or the philosophy of science to the service of life and mankind and not the other way round.

It is necessary to provide at the end comments on the entire trilogy of work submitted by RSR to serious students not only in philosophy but those in other disciplines of social sciences and sciences alike. This will essentially mean that we must also reiterate what we have already recorded in the reviews earlier and place it in the context of a new world order which is emerging today. Most astounding of the development in the world polity will be that by 1st January 1992, the red flag with its golden emblem of the great Soviet Union will no longer be fluttering over Moscow. RSR makes a pertinent observation that every social system has somehow to come to terms with three problems of 'efficiency, justice and happiness'. The world events of today could not be better explained than by the theoretical premise of the above statement. Ideologies are no longer confrontational and tolerance is not only a methodological norm for philosophy but also of ideology. No where is self reflexivity more profound than in political ideologies which are in the process of fore-shadowing the twenty-first century.

*The Primacy of the Political*, thus, cannot be the end of the quest for RSR for a just world order. Rather it should serve as a beginning for a larger dimension of understanding of developmental strategies for mankind which is today standing on the cross road of history. From the strategic dimension of the use of force and the role of war seen as an extension of policy by other means by Carl von Clausewitz, we have to shift the focus

of RSR and goad him into placing the principles of the primacy of the political into the non-strategic dimensions for the protection of the environment, security of energy, reduction of population, balancing of ecology and protecting the ethical right of the unborn. RSR must answer and I will hold him responsible to articulate the issue as to whether man has inherited the world from his ancestors or he has merely been permitted to borrow it for living from his children.

RSR would have done better if he would have also hinted on works of two contemporary thinkers - Gandhi's concepts of the primacy of the political and his strategies to operationalise during the freedom struggle and Amartya Sen's deliberations on Ethics and Economics. However, it is absolutely understandable and reasonable to see RSR's rigorous and methodological treatment in his triological work. He has vitalised, reinterpreted the thematic forms of Kant, Marx, Wittgenstein, Aristotle, Plato, Hegel and hoard of others in a single stroke of his pen. No work can be totally total and no work can be beyond criticism. Our critical views must be seen as genuine appreciation of RSR's daring to articulate the unmanagable without being unconventional. The trilogy has a tangible message to all aspiring scholars and students alike - a teacher who exemplifies the correctness of research-methodology, rigorous display of scholarship with academic integrity. In a world where specific questions on morality of authorship are being raised, RSR stands out as an exemplary teacher, scholar and a researcher. I cannot help but repeat once again that the world of philosophy in India and in the sub-continent is richer by RSR's contributions.

Department of Defence and Strategic Studies  
University of Poona  
PUNE - 411 007

GAUTAM SEN

#### NOTES

1. Sundara Rajan, R.; *Primacy of the Political*; OUP, Delhi, 1991.
2. Sundara Rajan, R.; *Towards a Critique of Cultural Reason*, OUP, Delhi, 1987.
3. Sundara Rajan, R.; *Innovative Competence and Social Change*, Indian Philosophical Quarterly Publications, Pune, 1986.
4. Sen Gautum ; Review of (2) & (3) above; *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol XVII.1, 1990.



**OUR LATEST PUBLICATION**  
**REGULARITY, NORMATIVITY AND RULES OF**  
**LANGUAGE AND OTHER ESSAYS IN**  
**PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS**

**PROF. RAJENDRA PRASAD**

pp .310

Rs.100/-

In this volume twenty essays of Prof. Rajendra Prasad, published earlier in different journals in India and abroad, are collected. In the essays philosophical analysis is brought to bear upon such themes as nature of language, relation between language and philosophy or that between modern logic and philosophy. There are essays in the collection which consider such issues as practical relevance of philosophy, the distinction between a priori and empirical propositions etc. In addition, some essays deal with concepts of substance, mind and religious belief, while some other discuss problems connected with objectivity of historical judgements, relation between man and god, role of reason and sentiment in human life. The last four essays in the collection discuss difficulties connected with philosophical synthesis and consider relation between tradition, progress, freedom, reverence and creativity.

The essays would be immensely helpful to both students and teachers of philosophy.

For further details contact :

The Editor,  
Indian Philosophical Quarterly,  
Philosophy Department,  
University of Poona,  
Pune 411 007.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **I**

## **TWO SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE**

### I The changes of the picture of the world

1. When we consider various changes of our picture of the world we distinguish two main classes: creation-destruction, conjunction-disjunction, synthesis-analysis. We are speaking about two forces of change, two sources of change.

When our picture of the world is changing (for example when we perceive a new object, or when we introduce a new notion) the state of our knowledge is changing too, so we also speak about two sources of knowledge.

2. From all the changes we distinguish those, which we assume as consequences of our own actions. These changes are important because by selecting one or another action (and obtaining corresponding change of the picture of world) we can achieve the desired state (achieve our goals (*artha*)).

Thus, we divide the changes (both classes) as "dependent on our activity" and "independent" of it. ("free" and "forced").

### II Synthesis

1. Preliminary definition: Synthesis is an introduction of general notion, assertion from the given collection of notions, assertions. This sort of introduction is one source of knowledge; it acts by producing new notions, assertions. Thus, we must have, first of all, observation of some similarity and then-introduction, construction of general (notion or assertion).

Examples: 1) generalisation, abstraction (for example introduction of the notion of "number"). 2) "abstraction from some quantities" - the same as 1). 3) introduction of new general law from the (similar) experiments ("scientific method"). 4) application in some theory analogues from the other (this amounts to using some assertions, common for both theories).

Now we must note that when we introduce a new notion or new