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CONCLUSION

The study was, from the very outset, confronted with an essentially fundamental problem of generating an adequate theory of the new middle class, thus involving more broader, arduous and demanding theoretical concerns of class-research. The analysis has sought departure from the prevalent theories of the new middle class and has demonstrated that solutions to this interactable problematic lie beyond the parameters of the existing debate on this class. By postulating 'work-Moksa' as the 'social essence' and positing the active subject of history as constantly struggling around this 'social essence', it is revealed, that social formation of the new middle class historically turns out to be 'a perdurable mode of work-Moksa'. Consequently it is argued, that basic to the socio-historical formation of the Indian new-middle class had remained the 'multifarious struggles of the man of cognition' and the 'work-Moksa potential of collectivism'. The process of its formation culminated into a socio-political domain that got historically constituted within the democratic structures of Indian state and society.

I

The problematic of the new middle class has long remained one of the most contested issues in sociology. Many a social theorists, since the turn of this century, have attempted to resolve this issue of daunting complexity. The protracted debate on this theme has generated a large number of conflicting theories of the new middle class viz., 'Proletarianization' and
'Embourgeoisement' theses; 'Fragmentary class'; 'Structurally ambiguous class'; 'New petty-bourgeoisie'; 'surplus class'; 'contradictory class locations'; 'New class'; 'Professional-Managerial class'; 'Service class' etc. The critique of the theoretic concerns of the new middle class has revealed the inadequate and inconclusive nature of the ongoing debate on this area of class structure.

The diversity of solutions to the problem of this class suggests that there is a wide range of disagreements about the exact composition of this class, the basis of its class formation and its location within the class structure of concerned societies. Each and every new attempt to understand the class character of new middle class has remained fraught with more complex difficulties. The whole issue has obfuscated to such an extent that there exists an unceasing theoretical controversy on the class nature of this social formation.

Earlier debate on the new middle class had taken place in the context of an abruptly developing capitalism in Weimar Germany. Predominant Marxist traditions and the existence of a strong labour movement had heavily influenced the theoretical understanding about the social and political significance of this class. Much of the debate was addressed either in defence of or as a challenge to orthodox Marxism. Socialists had considered the new middle class merely a new proletariat while the conservatives had expected this class to become an effective and harmonizing buffer between the working class and the bourgeoisie.
All the theoretical stances had, more or less, fluctuated corresponding with the political upheavals and the attendant immediate political considerations. This prelusive theorization, no doubt had generated valuable insights about the nature and social character of this class, but on the whole it had failed to produce a consistent and coherent theory of the new middle class.

After the second World War, the resurgence of theoretical interest in the new middle class revived the debate in mainstream sociology. The problematic of this class was met with both an unnatural enthusiasm and a stubbornly neglect within the renewed debate. Social theorists following Weber often projected this social formation as refutation of Marx's theory of class. Their preoccupation with market relations' (and neglect of production relations) led to the import of distinctions such as 'status-communities' and 'occupational groupings' etc. in the new middle class. And the overconcern with empirical descriptions of socio-economic nature, devoid of any historical perspective obscured the analysis of this class to such an extent that whole issue bogged down to heterogeneity -- amounting almost to the perdition of the very concept of class.

In the beginnings of the renewed debate, the problem of the new middle class found not much currency in Marxism. For long it was considered nothing but a new proletariat and the whole exercise remained limited to cast it in the political role of the traditional proletariat. However, as this class stubbornly resisted to play the a priori assigned revolutionary
role; Poulantzas acknowledged the 'distinct social characteristics' of new petty bourgeoisie as the carrier of political and ideological roles within the capitalist reproduction system. Neo-Marxism further identified this class as containing the features of 'wage-work positions' as well as elements of 'capital valorization' and 'supervision tasks'. A wide range of competing theories of the new middle class viz. Poulantzas' 'new petty bourgeoisie'; Nicolás' 'Surplus class'; Wright's 'contradictory class locations'; Braverman and Carchedi's versions of 'Proletarianization' etc. have emerged in Marxism. The critique while providing detailed discussion and highlighting the salient features of the debate has identified the various difficulties encountered by different theoretical formulations.

Despite recognizing the social distinctiveness of the new middle class, a perverse kind of optimism prevails to somehow contain the problematic of this class within the Marxist theory of polarization. Employing dichotomous criteria such as manual/non-manual; productive/unproductive; propertied/non-propertied; skilled/deskilled; authority/lack of authority etc. the central tendency remains to split the new middle class and force the analyses to the side of either capital or labour.

A predominant insistence within Marxism is that given the monopoly and global character of capital and the collective nature of labour, this social formation will degenerate and wither away and in future will polarize in between labour and
capital. What is more, Marxist theories of the new middle class are mainly devoted to conceptual levels or when dealing with empirical matters are not clearly located in the general structure of class relations. A notable feature of all the theories is their profoundly unhistorical and, in a wider sense, insufficiently sociological character. Though recent considerations of the new middle class have led to new developments in Marxism, yet thus far, all such attempts have not much advanced beyond Kautsky's analysis. Marxist theory of class is still confronted with deep-rooted serious difficulties to build an adequate analysis of the new middle class.

The earlier as well as later debate remained closely tied with the growth of capitalism in the Western societies. The incessant search for solutions to the problem of this class concomitant with the recent developments within capitalism has compelled social theorists of different dispositions to abandon the rigid paradigmatic domains. For instance, Neo-Marxist and Neo-Weberian scholars have in fact found a converging ground in this area of class structure. In dealing with the new middle class, Neo-Marxists while no more solely limiting to the 'mode of production' have taken note of good many other significant developments within capitalism and Neo-Weberians have increasingly recognized the importance of production relations in their theoretical formulations.

Despite this development, most of even such analyses at their best have only notoriously slipped 'in' and 'out' of
'market ...' and 'work-situations'. The efforts are far from any concrete theorization of the new middle class. Beyond that there is no dearth of disparate approaches to this class employing a variety of ill-assorted arbitrary criteria. To make matters worst the undue obsession with trivialities has blown up sundary issues out of all proportions -- e.g. persistence of 'Boundary Problem' as if classes are regimented formations. Almost all theories of the new middle class strived to incorporate different types of subservient relations or have tried to build various forms of subordinate linkages with capitalism. Any independent social dynamics remained stripped off the new middle class since no theory accorded any consideration to the autonomous socio-historical process of its class formation.

Within the ongoing debate, no theory has earned a general approval; class nature of the new middle class remains enigmatic; the social and political significance of this class is unclear and the more general problem of its class interests remains unresolved. The epistemological potential of the paradigms involved seems to have exhausted while this intractable issue is yet defying resolution. It became apparent from the critique that an adequate theory of the new middle class must locate its class essence, determine the objective basis of its existence while simultaneously integrating within it the active and struggling subject of history. It must reveal the independent historical process of its class formation and furnish a clear statement about the social and political significance of this
class. Consequently emerged the conviction that the scope for the construction of such a theory of the new middle class lied somewhere beyond the parameters of the existing debate on this class.

II

The role and significance of the new middle class is considered not unimportant rather it is seen as central in the non-Marxist paradigms, however it is not regarded as a problematic. It is only within Marxism that the problematic of the new middle class exists as such, demanding persistent resolution. Since the indeterminacy in various analyses of the new middle class, more or less, stemmed directly from the more broader concerns of class theories, it became of paramount importance to examine the class debate in Marxism. Marx did not furnish a consistent theory of class. Following Marx, classes for long were simply defined in terms of their relationship to the means of production. Emergence of the new middle class becomes symptomatic of an obvious theoretical difficulty i.e. of objective economic determination of classes. The absence of a consistent theory of class was strongly felt in Marxism and the need to build one was listed on top of Marxist agenda. Confronted with this formidable challenge, Marxist scholars -- particularly since 1960s -- have remained actively engaged to fill this lacuna in Marxism. The various efforts aimed at the construction of a Marxist theory of class have resulted in a full-blown class debate in Marxism.
The discussion revealed that Marxist class concerns are complexly manifest at different levels: attempts have been made to build class theory as proposed in 'Capital'; attention has been paid to laws of development of capital, accumulation processes and their attendant consequences for class structure. Class analysis has also visualized class structure in context of the domination of state monopoly capitalism. Class theories have further displayed concern with the role of ideological and political relations as determinants of classes and as reproducers of social structure; capital relations of domination/subordination; methods of control of work-process; the differences in domination/exploitation positions within the production process; and the extent to which various classes bear tasks of 'global capital' or 'collective worker'. Theoretical derivations are also developed or extended to study class relations, class struggles and forms of consciousness.

Recent class theories have given, more and more, consideration to aspects of subjectivity and to cultural and ideological moments in class analysis. Taken into account are new organizational forms of social action, emerging alternative movements, social practices and struggles -- more particularly the constitution of classes, class consciousness and development of classes into political forces etc. within civil society. However, all these class theories have various limitations and are confronted with a whole range of difficulties at the levels of class structure, class consciousness, class action, the basis for

* Part of the Marxist class concerns of the Anglo-French debate i.e. of Poulantzas, Wright, Crompton Gubbay Carchedi etc. may be referred in the chapters on the new middle class.
determining class location, relation between class location and political action and organization, class formation, class struggle, the processes whereby economic classes become social classes, the relations between class position and ideology, state etc. and so on. Above all, to reiterate, the central indictment against all the theories is the unresolved question of the new middle class.

Notwithstanding other aspects, class theories which rigidly adhere to 'objective economic determination' tend to eliminate the 'social form' of classes. Sought in economy are different class positions hidden under various social categories. The extremes of this tendency are to be found in 'proletarianization' theories seeking a complete elimination of the new middle class. The distanciation from 'objective economic determination' results in the gradual lowering of abstraction imparting arbitrary character to class theories while simultaneously conferring different meanings on class structure: e.g. conceiving of classes in terms of structural relations of domination/subordination (exploitation) generates 'contradictory class locations'.

The movement (transformation) from class structure (objective, economic) to class consciousness (politico-ideological) invoking the much famous distinction of class-in-itself-class-for-itself, brings in the need of an organized intervention of an external agency i.e. party. Beyond that class theories have sought refuge in the state — an institution posed extraneous to civil society. More recent class theories have sought complete departure from objective economic determination of classes.

The analysis has given particular attention to such
approaches as have sought the integration of 'subject' within Marxist theory of class: 'reformation of subjectivity'; 'purposeful' action of the subject' (cultural); constitution of subjects within civil society; 'subject in class formation and class struggles'; formation of subjects in ideological practices etc. It is revealed that this area of class research is of vital importance for understanding the social dimensions of classes and in essence represents a movement away from economism. These theories have explored a variety of significant class concerns: Constitution of classes within civil society; classes as determined by social practices; cultural determination of classes; formation of class in the political-ideological domain; class action, class struggles (including the general democratic struggles); class consciousness and socialization process; development of classes into political forces etc.

However the analysis has identified various difficulties and shortcomings of these theories. The problems emerge at different levels and such class theories start faltering: trivializing culture; entering into sensual areas of human interaction; coming to moral-existentialistic rather than practical-experimental experience; imposing social and regional limitations on class analyses; leaving out the entire historical process of the constitution of civil society; turning collectivities equivalent to classes; creating confusion of unrelated social categories of civil society—hence often producing a highly complex and differentiated image of class structure. Above all, while abhorring objectivism and reductionism of the economic type, these theories have not strived to enunciate some other 'class essence' having
more or less equivalent power of abstraction or universal content. The failure on this count generates adhocism; arbitrariness and particularism.

Of critical significance is that Marxist class concerns of the subjective variety reinforced the earlier contention of this analysis -- making evermore essential the need for some viable 'class essence' along with the integration of 'subject' in class theory. However, as these class theories were found wanting and unsatisfactory, the research-work confronted the 'question of subject in Marxism'.

III

The theoretical concerns of the 'subject' in Marxism had emerged against the following background: Marxism after Marx remained closely associated with the then prevalent revolutionary activities all over Europe. Marxist theory flourished mainly under the aegis of political parties and more or less, remained the exclusive prerogative of party ideologues. Pure political practicism as an end in itself became synonymous with Marxism. Scientific vision of socialism strengthened the belief in the inevitability of revolution: materialism turned into mechanism and dialectics was relegated to the background.

Objective factors tailored to suit immediate political considerations gained mastery over subjective aspects resulting in the fetishism of organization. The subject of history was rendered subservient to the will of the 'Party'. The mystique of Russian Revolution further strengthened the scientific tendencies in Marxism. Theories were invented to make virtue out of necessity. Fatal objective factors were consistently
given precedence over subjective ones. Party was projected the
true consciousness of class. Party and state fused together
were set above the independent action of class. Marxist theory
having lost its living connection with reality ossified into
state ideology. Subject of history evaporated into thin air
from within the Marxism.

Significant, against this back-ground, are the works of
Marxist theoreticians who sought the restoration of subject to
the heart of Marxism so as to bring out its repressed conscious-
ness. The analysis has furnished a pointed discussion of the
major theoretical reconstructions of subject in Marxism: Lukacs'
thetical and practical search for the subject of history;
Gramsci's 'subjective-revolution', the formation of subject,
ideological hegemony etc.; Korsch's concern with the 'self-
activity' and needs of the subject; Marcuse's overarching
interest in subject's free action; Habermas' constitution of
subject within the structure of intersubjectivity and Sartre's
concretization of the 'totalizing-subject'.

These theories displayed hostility to the materialism
of orthodox Marxism since it neglected the active subject and
subjective conditions essential to the realization of socialism.
The central concern remained to purge Marxism of economic redu-
cisionism, determinism, scientific and positivist tendencies.
This revitalization of Marxism methodologically placed at the
center the concepts of 'totality' and 'concrete Universal' and
considered history as the unfolding and actualization of subjecti-
vity -- its object nothing else than social life.
The professed fundamental assumption inherent in this Marxist tradition remains that unity of 'form' and 'content' must be found and dialectical analysis must discover the 'essence', 'universal content' or meaning implied in concrete existence. However it is precisely on this count that this tradition has utterly failed. The starting stand-points for the reconsideration of the subject-object problematic are retained those of Marx or have retreated into the philosophical premises of Hegel or Kant. No fresh ground has been broken and no efforts made to establish some 'essence' or 'universal content' beyond Marx's philosophical premises.

Through cumber-some exercises, some theories have crammed the subject into Marx's theoretical bases producing technically superb obscurantism. The others by inducting, 'technology', 'language etc! have spilled over Marx's paradigmatic bounderies. Yet others have displayed obsession with 'subject' to such extremes that it roams freely in sund-ry paradigms: Weberian, psychoanalysis, phenomenology and existentialism etc. In theoretical and methodological terms these theories have remained unsuccessful in integrating the subject within Marxism while such theoreticians have ended up in 'subjectivism', scientific positivism (later Korsch), pessimism (Marcuse) and even despair (Sartre).

The efforts of the 'New Left' to unearth and seek the relevance of these theories to build a critique of social change--not only limited to economic and political institutions but also embracing the everyday life of the subject--have simply bogged down in 'sponotaneity'. On the whole, this Marxist tradition
has failed to generate a comprehensive social theory having sufficient potential even for building an adequate analysis of class relations and class structures of Western capitalist societies.

Counterpoised to the above discussion is Althusser's structuralistic theory — an influential Marxist approach opposed to any idea of 'subjectivism' and the one that abhors any kind of empiricism, economism and historicism. It is revealed that rejecting the 'subject/object, essence/phenomenon' problematic there crop up an entirely different set of problems in Marxist theory. Above all while attempting to confer scientific status on Marxism, Althusserian structuralism capitulates to scientific positivism and smacks of latent functionalism.

It became crystal clear from the whole exercise that practical dilemmas faced by Marxist theories and difficulties encountered within Marxist class research 'including the new middle class' boil down to a single most important issue of meaningfully relating the 'subject' with the 'essential premises' of Marxism. The indentification of this lacuna became a compelling reason to draw a significant conclusion that something exceedingly indispensable must be amiss within the very essentials of Marx's paradigm. Hence the analysis set before it the task of locating the root-cause of this lacuna in the works of Marx.

IV

Critically examined, in brief is the formative context of Marx's materialist thought. Particular attention has been paid to Marx's break with earlier forms of materialism and his
materialistic conception of history and society. It is argued that Marx's rooting of 'essential premises' in 'social' and 'social forms of intercourse' etc. is arbitrary since any determination of 'social essence' is absent. Marx's concerns with the origins and constitution of social are fragile; conception of work is faulty; 'natural existence' and 'social existence' of man are erroneously treated as synonymic; causality is left indeterminate and open to different interpretations; materialist view of history is truncated, dialectical movement runs into problems. Social is peripheral and can not be contained in Marx's method -- any question of 'social class' (including the new middle class) falls extraneous to Marxism.

A close reading of Marx revealed that the arguments with which he built the 'essential premises' lie scattered and are structured both in the domains of 'natural' and 'social'. By sifting the 'essentials' the analysis traced the various steps involved in Marx's movement from natural (prehistory) to social (history). The movement from prehistory to history is imperfect, hazy and vague: Nowhere at a stretch, Marx worked out in detail the essential aspects of the origins and constitution of social. Either there are to be found broad and sweeping statements pertaining to the sphere of prehistory or the discussion abruptly shifts to the domain of history and is carried on unfettered exclusively within the preconstituted social.

The 'natural' and 'social' contents lie mixed up, mystified often embedded in single sentences. Concepts valid under 'natural existence' find a logical extension to history and are treated as constitutive of social. A false appearance of
continuity is built under the cover of abstraction since no qualitative distinction is effected between 'natural existence' and 'social existence' of man. A pointed dealing of or a direct encounter with the transition period (real moment of social origins) -- whereby prehistory ends and protohistory leading to history begins -- is absent. Only with difficulty one can extract a rough sketch of Marx's movement from prehistory to history-- that too merely to reveal that Marx's concerns with the constitution of social are fragile and peripheral, and method employed is queer:

The starting standpoints are generally needs, wants or interests etc. conceived as natural, individual or in abstraction. Immediately Marx -- in an unassuming and obvious fashion -- would introduce in the analysis some or the other categories of rudimentary 'social' (valid only under 'natural conditions'). Soon the needs, wants or individual interests originally conceived in abstraction are transformed by induction into social needs, wants or common interests etc. As needs, wants etc. become 'social' and historico-specific, solutions demand new forms of social intercourse. Hence emerges the social and corresponding social consciousness. Next Marx would set about consistently eliminating social and gradually replacing it by the material content through the examination of some entirely different process, say production. In effecting such a materialistic abstraction or reduction, Marx's elimination of 'social' is as erroneous as its erroneous induction in the first place. Thus 'social' merely trespasses in Marx's Writings while in reality it can not be
contained in Marx's essentialist method.

The post-Marx efforts to generate some sound social theor (integration of subject etc.) or to build an adequate analysis of social classes merely tentamount to flogging the dead horse. Of critical significance is that appearance of fragile continuity from 'natural' to 'social' entirely rests on an essential attribute of man i.e. work as a 'producing activity', and nature-imposed eternal condition of human existence. The synonymic treatment of 'natural existence' and 'social existence' particularly stemms from Marx's faulty conception of 'work'. After exposing the ambiguities associated with Marx's misconception of work, the analysis rejects it.

V

Thus indentifying the blank-spots in Marx's essential premises, the analysis examined in detail the evolutionary and prehistoric concerns of man. It is revealed that work as a 'procuring' and 'producing' activity did form a specific attribute of man during prehistory. Prehistoric man could imagine and conceive; mould and fashion nature's materials by the conscious application of his mind and body so as to 'produce' the desired results. However social never flourished because 'work' had insufficient capacity for the effective negation of work's and consequently generated insignificant work-Moksa moment. The marginally released 'work-Moksa' moment beyond the fulfilment of hunger etc. was readily absorbed in routine survival pursuits. Hence 'work', throughout prehistory, remained nature-imposed external compulsion, entrapped within the vicious cycle of day and night -- hunger, work, sleep and survival.
It was only by the beginnings of Neolithic -- origins of agriculture etc. -- that 'work' attained sufficient potential for the effective 'negation of work' -- work done during certain periods could generate some other durable and lasting work-Moksa moments. Man's existence while no more remaining closely tied to a narrow day and night cycle, got broadly structured within the crop or yearly cycle. The social which had not taken off from the ground for lakhs of prehistoric years, flourished and progressed by leaps and bounds in a short span of time constituting proto-history and history.

It is revealed that 'work-Moksa' is the 'social essence' on which social originated and got constituted. Work may be basic (not solely) to the existence of man but central to the existence of social is work-Moksa. The formation and constitution of each and every category or institution of 'social' originally required a work-Moksa moment, and the further existence or perpetuation of 'social' without 'work-Moksa' is beyond argument. What originally goes in a 'product' and what the 'end product' signifies in relation to 'subject' is a certain equivalent of 'work-Moksa' moment. Work-Moksa is the motive force of history and a socio-historical causality.

'Subject of history' through a never ending process of qualification-requalification invented, created or adopted such forms of work as imparted a more durable work-Moksa moment thus transcending earlier existent forms of work. Historically the 'subject' has consistently struggled for the creation, expansion, preservation or perpetuation of the sphere of work-Moksa
while simultaneously seeking entry into this domain. The analysis determines 'social essence' integrates the active and struggling subject of history; establishes 'socio-historic causality; imparts movement to 'dialectics' thus generating theoretical basis for understanding the emergence and constitution of socio-historical formations.

While 'work-Moksa' is the 'social essence', the 'durability of work-Moksa' turns out to be the 'class essence'. Class formation, class struggle and class consciousness are visualized in terms of work-Moksa. It is argued that historically the 'subject' struggled to create, invent or adopt such callings as imparted more durability to his work-Moksa. Consequently his concern remained for the elimination of all factors detrimental to the flow of work-Moksa. The process accentuated into a dynamic socio-historical movement directed at the creation of social and production conditions; cultural, ideological and political practices etc. and corresponding social consciousness conducive for the expansion, preservation or perpetuation of the work-Moksa domain.

Discussed in detail is the historical process of the origins and constitution of different 'social-existences' within the 'social'. Established are the essentials of 'social existence' characteristic of agriculturist, artisan, trader, 'man of cognition' etc. in terms of the durability of work-Moksa determined in time and space. These 'social existences' are visualized as 'social classes'. It is revealed that kernel of the 'man of cognition' lied in the successive negation of
historically existent various forms of work hence effecting extreme distanciation from the original threshold of agriculture etc. 'Man of cognition' is the culmination of 'subjects' unceasing search for an ever - during work-Moksa moment.

Subject's incessant derive for the ultimate 'negation of work' through a never ending qualification-requalification process, resulted in the reduction, suppression or elimination of any kind of disruptions to the flow of his work-Moksa. Subject struggled to acquire such qualifications as involved less of an external medium (material & non-material), found more and more expression through the very self of the subject and remained valid and applicable in a broad domain (both in time & space)– hence incurred least obstruction to his work-Moksa in a given universe of social. Thus emerged the 'social existence' characteristic of the 'man of cognition' and constituted by the Priest, Scholar, Official and Clerk etc. This 'social existence' is viewed as the new middle class. It is demonstrated that new middle-class is a 'perdurable mode of work-Moksa'. The theoretical stance, thus developed opened the path for building a socio-historical analysis of the new middle class.

VI

If to establish the essential basis of the new middle class proved to be an arduous exercise, the translation of this nascent theoretical stance in a concrete historical context, so as to build a socio-historical perspective of the Indian new middle class emerged a no less demanding concern to this study.
The research-work has furnished an analytical account of the socio-historical formation of the Indian new middle class. It has revealed the fundamental basis of its origins, historical process of its constitution both in the colonial and post-independent periods and its social and political dynamics in Indian society. Though rudiments of the new middle class had emerged and existed during the early phases of colonialism, however, the phenomenon remained of not much consequence until the middle of the nineteenth century.

The essential basis of the formation of the Indian new middle class has been indentified in the work-Moksa potential of 'collectivism': Collectivism's inherent potential for generating and conferring legitimacy on new forms of work having increased work-Moksa moment; and its in-built mechanism so that one's work-Moksa may accrue from any other societal source i.e. the relation between work and work-Moksa becomes hazy, mystified and indeterminate. To give credence to the active 'subject' of history, the arguments of this analysis are rooted in, linked to and draw their vitality from various historical struggles. Attention has been paid to class struggles, changes in the British class structure and their subsequent effects on the transformation of the nature and character of colonialism.

Of critical importance to this analysis emerged the rise of collectivism (1860s onwards), consequent growth of the British new middle class and the dimension that over a period colonialism had no more remained conducive to the economic interests of the British capitalist class. The multifarious
struggles which stemmed from 'collectivism' produced the British new middle class. Having structured upon the work-Moksa potential of 'collectivism', this class gradually struggled to undermine and displace the 'aristocratic' and 'bourgeois' ideals from within the British state and society. Towards the close of the nineteenth century, under collectivism the British new middle class was already taking over a social position similar to the one old middle class had occupied under 'individualism'. Hence the new middle class determined the shape of British society and considerably influenced the constitution and politico-ideological stance of British state.

The whole process had produced far reaching consequences in colonial society. The effects of 'collectivism' were almost simultaneously transmitted to colonial state and society. On the one hand there occurred an increasing reorientation and restructuring of the colonial state on the principles of collectivism. It resulted in the reorganization of the administration of justice, land revenue and general administration etc.; matters of public concern viz. large scale public works, railways, irrigation works, roads, bridges, forests, agriculture, co-operatives etc. emerged as important considerations; and issues of social significance 'education of masses', general human suffering and public health etc. gradually appeared on the agenda of the colonial state. What had been achieved through various class struggles by the British society under the influence of collectivism, the colonial state was more willingly transmitting the same to the colonial social structure. The opening of more
and more departments and offices reinforced by considerations of execution, control, supervision, specialization and professionalization etc. resulted in the marked growth of 'white-collar' in the colonial state. The colonial state's activities and the consequent expansion of the white-collar domain were, in essence, an expression of collectivism's inherent potential for generating and conferring legitimacy on new forms of work having better, durable and ensured moment of work—Moksa. The whole process turned the colonial state into a repository of white-collar workers -- predominantly British and to a lesser extent Indians -- that bore no relation to colonial economy. Due to constant interaction with political struggles which ensued in the colonial society, the colonial state more and more behaved as independent political formation -- white collar workers graduated to a politically conscious new middle class. Above all the formation of the new middle class in the colonial state was tantamount to the constitution of a distinct work—Moksa domain perpetuating a perdurable mode of work—Moksa in colonial society.

On the other hand increasing manifestation of 'collectivism' in the colonial state and consequently its dissemination to colonial society had for the first time raised possibilities for all types of 'collective' social and political action. The analysis refutes existent simplistic explanation which attribute the origins of politics in colonial society to British education system etc. It is revealed that for long British education had produced merely 'dubashs' and 'babus' while
politics had remained out of sight. It was not British education peruse rather 'collectivism' which had introduced modern politics to colonial society. It is significant to note that emergence and formation of all sorts of modern social and political activities and consciousness in the form of 'societies', associations, organizations, trade unionism, press, freedom-struggles etc. had been concomitant with the rise and growth of 'collectivism'.

The 'collectivism' which was radically transforming the nature of colonial state had almost simultaneously found an explosive expression in the wider arena of colonial society. Because of collectivism's in-built mechanism for the transcendence of existing forms of work, a critical consequence of the multifarious struggles was the generation of a politically conscious new middle class in colonial society. The British new middle class had emerged by struggling against and undermining and displacing the 'aristocratic' and 'bourgeois' ideals from within the British state and society. However, the formation process and struggles of the Indian new middle class in colonial society, from the very beginning, had developed and maintained an uninhibited political dialogue with its counterpart of the colonial state.

The formation within the state internized the effects of political struggles, displayed a distinct political behaviour and continuously transformed the nature and character of colonial state. Colonial state more and more behaved not as the 'British' but predominantly as the British new middle class. The colonial state determined the political domain, set limits for possible political strategies, influenced and moulded the formation
process and political consciousness of the new middle class which led and directed the multifarious struggles in colonial society. Though the new middle class within the colonial state was predominantly British and its counterpart that emerged in colonial society was completely Indian, however, they had throughout recognized the ultimate limits of a particular political discourse and well identified the common denominator in politics since both had essentially structured upon the work-Moksa potential of 'collectivism'.

Once the colonial society had seized upon collectivism it constantly struggled to capture that distinct domain (colonial state) ensconced wherein was the 'foreigner' perpetuating a durable mode of work-Moksa. The displacement and disposal of the 'foreigner' from within the colonial state completed the formation-process of the Indian new-middle class and its structuration in various institutions of Indian state and society. The analysis rejects all the inconclusive and fragmentary explanations about the Indian new middle class which emanate from British education, legal systems or Imperialist economy etc. It is revealed that formation of the Indian new middle class was essentially the constitution of a perdurable mode of work-Moksa characteristic of the 'man of cognition'.

After independence the new middle class turned out to be the sole custodian of new forms of knowledge and determined the nature and character of democratic institutions of Indian state and society. The new middle class increasingly captured a vantage ground in all the new structures and displayed an independent class dynamics in Indian society. It played a
consequential role in shaping the social, economic, political, legal and educational structures of modern India. The work-Moksa domain of new middle class, in fact, represented a historical and ideological disjunction whereby 'work' no more remaining contingent upon traditional structures, drew its meaning, organization and vitality from the new structures essentially based on collectivism.

The predominant stance of the new middle class and increasing manifestation of 'collectivism' meant a bewildering expansion of 'collectivist' institutions, organizations, corporations, departments and offices in the fields of agriculture, industry, commerce, finance, banking, insurance, education, science, re-search, law, politics, trade unionism, cooperatives, development & welfare etc. Collectivism also produced a plethora of autonomous, semi-autonomous, and voluntary societies, associations and organizations. The unprecedented growth of the new middle class in the form of administrators, executives, managers, teachers, scientists, doctors, engineers, judges, lawyers; representatives, spokesmen and leaders and advocates of diverse 'collective' interests; supervisors, assistants, deputies, clerks etc. reinforced by an in-built tendency of endless multiplication, reproduction and proliferation of white-collar positions is increasingly soaking up the 'surpluses' of Indian society.

The irrepressible ballooning of the new middle class within the democratic institutions of Indian state and society bears no relations to economy. Thriving upon collectivism, and motivated by an insatiable desire for work-Moksa, the Indian new
middle class is an ever expanding domain of work-Moksa. The analysis is basically an attempt to generate a socio-historical perspective of the Indian new middle class -- a dimension conspicuously absent even in the Western debate on this class. The historical process of its class formation has been visualized independent of the mode of production or economy etc. The new middle class is essentially the culmination of 'man of cognition's unceasing historical struggle and search for a perdurable mode of work-Moksa.

Finally the analysis has revealed the social and political significance of the Indian new middle class. The knowledge, information, specialization and professional expertise of the new middle class form the essential basis for the existence and perpetuation of the political institution of Indian democracy. Since the larger sections of the population are still embedded in traditional structures, the new middle class remains the main vehicle of secular, democratic and egalitarian values of justice and freedom -- the life-line of all the new structures of Indian society. Indian democratic state and its attendant institutions structured upon collectivism are a socio-political domain of the new middle class.

The politics of the new middle class is discreet and circumspect and is complexly manifest in the structural crevices of Indian state and society. On the sheer strength of 'collectivism' (translated as public interest), the new middle class is constantly busy in evolving rules, laws etc. under secrecy from within the state. It is the new middle class that determines the broader parameters of political discourse and the political content of governmental
decisions influencing the fate of wider society. The policies, planning etc. which are outwardly attributed to politicians and political parties are, in essence, the handiwork of the new middle class. The politicians are merely captives of the new middle class.

It is revealed that politics of the new middle class operates in an invisible and subtle fashion at various levels; starting from policy formulations down to implementation process, the new middle class plays an active political role in the functioning of governments; the politicization of the new middle class in the public sector is to the extent that it forms the part of exchange and other benefits which constitute the basis of faction formation and alliances in Indian politics; new middle class unions are highly organized, have greatest capacity to act on all-India basis and if conflicts become inevitable they display extreme forms of solidarity adopting aggressive and militant course of action like that of manual workers — the notions such as fragmentary politics of the new middle class characteristic of particularistic interests etc. are frivolous — the professional organizations are increasingly translating their socio-economic interests into political action; educational structure is highly politicized and student-politics has emerged as a radical wing of the new middle class; Non-Governmental organizations have grown into a significant factor in polity and is simply yet another social and political form of the new middle class.
Discussed is also the intricate, complex and manifaceted politics of the new middle class which is at work in the urban and rural social structure. The new middle class is essentially a 'political form' and its socio-political dynamics is consequential in producing structural changes in the Indian society.

To conclude: the study has generated a general theory of the new middle class; furnished a socio-historical perspective; determined the essential basis of origins and structuration, examined the historical process of class formation and revealed the socio-political significance of the new middle class in India.

*****