The 'Subaltern Studies' approach represents a departure from existing Indian historiography of peasant movements by distinguishing two domains of politics: 'People's politics' and 'Elite politics' - A structural dichotomy resulting from; "the historic failure of the Nation to come to its own". 'Subaltern' historiography regards as its central problematic, the study of this 'failure' and represents an attempt at developing an alternate discourse, emphasising the co-existence and interaction of these two relatively 'autonomous' domains (Guha,1982:7).

This approach seems to reflect the perception of a hiatus between real historical events and existing Marxist theory as is evident in P.Chatterjee's mention of "elements of indeterminacy" (1984b:xxxiv); the "Contingency" of power relations, emphasised by Guha as the site where the (Hegelian) "human passions... mediates the concept of power and turns it into real history" (1989:230). Althusser's contention that "real-humanism" could and should be displaced by "Theory", i.e., Dialectical Materialism² (1965:242-7), seems to have given rise to ideas that 'Subaltern Studies' represent a "retreat from theory"³ (Bayle.C.A:110ff). However, It must be pointed out that Althusser did not rule out "the theory of the specific effectivity of the superstructures and other 'circumstances' (including even; "traditions which haunt human minds", which at present)...largely remains to be elaborated" (1965: 112, fn. 28, 113, italics in original). He also saw these
elements as having "an existence largely specific and autonomous" and that Marxist political practice constantly comes: "up against that reality known as 'survivals'". 'Subaltern studies' then can be seen as an attempt at elaborating the specific effectivity of these 'survivals' in the context of colonial and even post-colonial Indian history - Guha's attempt at isolating 'Invariant structures' of insurgent consciousness representing a theory of the essence of these 'survivals', which resisted colonial penetration in the Indian context. 'Subaltern studies' therefore is not "a rejection of western categories but signals the beginning of a new and autonomous relation to them" (Das.V, 1989:310). It would be somewhat premature to attempt a formal theoretical elaboration of this approach as it "is by its very nature still rather precocious, incomplete and generally endowed with all the immaturity of a thing in its formative stage" (Guha, 1989:222).

However a beginning can be seen in P.Chatterjee's attempt at elaborating "modes of power", and also Guha's attempt at creating a model of insurgent consciousness as an objectified system of representation, as well as his characterisation of domination and subordination and its constituents, based on a principle of differentiation, in terms of an indigenous Indian 'structural' model. The incorporation of both humanistic as well as 'structural' approaches, discontinuous with each other has been noted by G.C.Spivak: "one must see in their practice a repetition as well as a rupture from the colonial predicament". A result of the 'subaltern collective' to be "fully moved" by the crisis of anti-humanism. However, she views such "cognitive failures" as irrede-
ucable and therefore does not suggest any formula for correct cognitive moves (1985:337-8)

Establishing the centrality of the historical moment of rebellion, in understanding the 'subalterns' as subjects of their own histories, appears to be the central concern in 'subaltern-studies' (Das.V.1989:312). But there seem to be some divergence in approach. D.Hardiman finds Subaltern studies at a cross-road with two directions:

One road leads towards greater concentration on textual analysis and a stress on the relativity of all knowledge; another towards the study of subaltern consciousness and actions so as to forward the struggle for a socialist society (1986:290).

"Dominance without hegemony" results from the "discrepancy between the universalizing tendency of capital as an ideal and the frustration of that tendency in reality" (Guha,1989:225). This perspective has "the advantage however of emphasising the fundamental relationships of power, of domination and subordin-

ation" (Sarkar,S.,1984:237).

Resistance to domination as particularly expressed by insur-
gency yields an access to the relatively autonomous domain of peasants' consciousness. This however does not mean that the autonomous domain of consciousness comes into being only in times of open defiance of authority. It also exists even in times of apparently hegemonic sway, though in a fragmented, individually inarticulate, obscure and undocumented forms; but which allows deep insights into apparently spontaneous revolts. Resistance in
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this context includes:

footdragging, dissimulation, false-compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and so forth. These Brechtian forms of class struggle have certain things in common. They require little or no co-ordination or planning; they often represent a form of individual self help; and they typically avoid any direct symbolic confrontation with authority or with elite norms (Scott, J. C., 1986: 6).

The 'Subalternist' focus on the relatively autonomous domain of peasant consciousness, originates from Gramsci's observations on studying the subaltern classes: "the objective formation of the subaltern social groups... their qualitative diffusion and their origins in pre-existing social groups whose mentality and ideology and aims they conserve for a time; ...those new formations which assert the autonomy of the subaltern groups, but within the old framework... (A consciousness which) is always subject to the activity of ruling groups, even when they rebel and rise up: ... every trace of independent initiative on the part of the subaltern groups should be of incalculable value for the integral historian" (1971: 52.55).

It is the neglect of these traces of independent initiatives which the 'Subalternists' have objected to, strongly. It is according to Guha; "an appropriation of (their) past" (1989: 212). Similarly, P. Chatterjee says, "it is to merge their life into the life-history of the dominant class ... indeed to destroy its history" (1983b: 59).

It would be quite naive however, to see the 'subaltern' and 'insurgent consciousness' as a homogeneous, un-differentiated and static entity, impervious to the activities of the elites, as evidenced in some accounts of the 'subaltern studies' group. S. Sarkar attributes it to a structuralist approach with emphasis
on synchrony (1984, fn. 8, 317-8). A point affirmed by S. Dube (1985:445). E. J. Hobsbawm's caution on model building, (particularly in the case of societies subject to rapid social change), and his criterion for such models (to be based on how their components fit together and provide a guide to both the nature of collective action in specifiable social situations and their limits), seem pertinent here (1974:16). The use of single terms like 'collaboration' has also been found wanting in accommodating complex relationships between people and State, elites and subaltern, in empirical situations by David Arnold (1985:50-1).

However, this emphasis on the 'autonomy' of the 'subaltern domain' must be seen as an attempt at isolating:

the ideological invariants of peasant consciousness and their relational unity, that is to say, its paradigmatic form . . . he (Guha) has not attempted to give us a history of this consciousness as a moment of self-transformation . . . having found an access into the structural form of this consciousness in its aspects of autonomy has given us the theoretical basis to ask the appropriate questions about its history (Chatterjee, P., 1988:8-12).

While 'subaltern consciousness' is seen as, "contradictory, fragmented"; it is:

held together in a more or less haphazard whole — the common sense, . . . is the contradictory unity of two opposed elements which expresses the common understanding of the members of the subaltern group (Chatterjee, P., 1989:170-71). . . .

(it, through the notion of belonging to a group, in relation to the others.) Hegemony is also seen at work within a 'subaltern' group reflecting an acknowledgment of differentiation, as also seen in Gramsci's writings: "Among the subaltern groups, one will
exercised or tend to exercise a certain hegemony through the mediations of a party" (1971:53). The acknowledgment of differentiation within the 'subaltern domain', though not strongly emphasised, can be seen as reflecting on one hand, a political gesture on the part of the 'subaltern studies' group. However, it also reflects the recognition that, in concrete empirical situations, economic differentiations are often masked by ideological factors like ethnic considerations. The surface resemblance of such a conception has however led to accusations of Populism. Tom Brass dubs the 'subaltern studies' as "neo-populist revisionism", due to the displacement of 'class' in favour of 'tribe' as an ethnic category⁴ (1991:191).

While the 'subalternists' acknowledge the fact that, "the subaltern groups are always subject to the activities of the ruling groups even when they rebel and rise up". Sarkar finds the roles of the elites marginalised in many essays of this group. He therefore stresses the need for: "an ideal of totality" (Sarkar,S,1984,fn8, 317), so as to develop into social history in the broadest sense. Perhaps it would not be very inaccurate to see this 'totality' encompassing the two domains, resembling L. Althusser's "Pre-given Complex Structured Whole", though shorn of its economic determinism⁵ (1965:193ff).

The 'subaltern project' then appears to be based on assigning to the three instances: the economic instance, the political instance, and the cultural/ideological instance, their relative importance in reproducing social relations. An approach which however seems to reject the base/super-structure dichotomy. They
seem to be saying that, the economic instance might dominate in a capitalist mode of production, the legal-political in the 'feudal' mode, the cultural ideological organisation of kinship in another and the possibility of the co-existence of these modes in a single historical period—a possibility which accounts for the variations in the exercise of power (Chatterjee, P., 1983:348-9).

Partha Chatterjee quotes from Etienne Balibar, the possibility, of other histories than those of the mode of production, histories whose objects remains to be constituted:

The determination of the objects of these histories must await that of the relatively autonomous instances of the social formation, and the production of concepts which will define each of them by the structure of a combination... Attempts like those of Foucault gives us a good example of this (1984b:xxxiii, from Althusser, L and Balibar, E, 251).

That this project is still un-realised, is evident in P. Chatterjee's statement:

we need to produce adequate concepts of the modes of transition, (and again,) ... our conceptual apparatus is at present incapable of charting out this problematical area ... the exercise must end by designating a very large area of problems as theoretically indeterminate (ibid.xxxiv).

Perhaps establishing the subaltern domain, via a symptomatic reading of elite discourse — to reveal it's 'other' (Guha, 1983a: 1-40, 1983b,14-17) (a process which severely circumscribes an approach to 'totality'), also reveals the bind in which the 'subalternists' find themselves. There are however different perceptions regarding this: P. Chatterjee appears confident that, "one day the vast storehouse of Indian social history will become
comprehensible to the scientific consciousness"(1988:5). Others like Kaviraj, Guha, and Spivak appear to agree with Gramsci's view on the relativity of all knowledge, including even Marxism—an approach strongly criticised by Althusser (1968:119-44). On the other hand, "Ranajit Guha argued that it is futile to try to discover the 'real-truth' of the past, for our understanding will always reflect the time in which we write and thus be subjective" (Hardiman,D,1986:289).

This divergence appears to reflect the debate in western Marxism; The 'Humanistic' approach of the Frankfurt school, which stresses the relativity of all knowledge, and on the other hand, the Marxist 'Structuralists', epitomised by Louis Althusser's belief in the scientificity of Dialectical Materialism as a real "Theory". The resultant 'victory' by the relativists at the textual level, (while leading to what G.C.Spivak calls the "crisis of anti-humanism"), does not appear to lead to fresh initiatives (Gouldner,A.W, 1973: 425ff). The second subaltern studies conference (Calcutta, 1986) saw Pranab Basu raising questions on the apparent lack of interest in finding answers to problems of subaltern consciousness, relations of domination and subordination; Problematics raised by the 'subaltern studies group' themselves (Hardiman.D,1986:289). Ranajit Guha's opinion, on the other hand was; "that subaltern studies had to seek first to attack and break down existing historical paradigms ... only after a prolonged critical exercise can attempts be made to construct an alternate paradigm"(Hardiman,D,1986:289-90). History was now: "a game for two to play as the alien colonialist project of
appropriation was matched by an indigenous nationalist project of counter-appropriation" (Guha, 1989:212). The 'subaltern historians' can then be seen as interventionists with their own counter-counter-appropriation project. History can now be seen as a three way game with its own brand of complexity. A fact disliked by the two earlier players.

An approach to social history, based on the division of society into two domains - of domination and subordination - does not deny the existence of complex structures in society; it merely seeks to highlight the major contradictions in society by relegating other contradictions to the background. This emphasis should not be construed as their concept of 'totality'. It becomes one-sided as the "elitist-historiography" they reject. This emphasis should be seen as a 'strategy' to bring to crisis what is perceived as a narrow one-sided history. They apply 'deconstruction' so as to create the grounds for a new paradigm for the study of society in its totality - not just as the study of systems - A paradigm which can accommodate the possibilities of a multiplicity of histories of a given society and the ways in which they inter-relate with one another, and also in relation to the 'whole', not just in terms of synchrony but also in diachronic terms.

From the perspective of epistemology, the 'subaltern studies' group appears to be elaborating at two levels, the study of society. On one hand, there seems to be an affirmation of finding "universal regularities" in society, as evident in Ranajit Guha's isolation of 'invariant structures' of insurgent consciousness,
applicable it seem to a trans-historical, trans-societal context (his extensive usage of European materials to relate it to Indian peasant movements). In this context, human passions seems to be the crucial intermediary between fundamental associative operations and actions of man. Here, passions are seen as motive springs, analogous to uniform systems of nature, which shapes human actions conjoined in all places and time, due to the fundamental constituents of the human mind. On the other hand, they (subalternists) also seem to subscribe to R.G.Collingwood's position that, thoughts attributed to people of other cultures may only be our own projections of what we perceive, and therefore not amendable to scientific inquiry - an assumption of basic difference which makes it difficult or almost impossible for one to share the ideas, beliefs, values, etc., of a different culture or period (Rex, Martin, 1977:introduction ). The 'subalternists' also seem to subscribe to this view as seen in R.Guha's belief in the relativity of all knowledge. Perhaps S.Sarkar's approach, viewing history as an attempt to create an "as if true" narrative, and not a positivistic one, claiming for this "as if true" account, an accurate and unmediated correlation with reality, should perhaps be seen as underlying subaltern studies. From this perspective, Guha's apparently contradictory positions - the admission of the relativity of knowledge, while at the same time attempting to isolate "invariant structures" - should perhaps be seen as elaboration at two levels. On one hand, creating an "as if true" history, while accepting that these projections are based on our own perceptions. The outcome is that even subaltern
studies is not immune to 'deconstruction' as seen in O'Hanlon's hints that behind the deconstructed subject of the subaltern studies project, necessarily lurks another (or 'an other') subject, potentially or actually reconstituted (Brass, T, 1991: 191). Tom Brass also argues that R. Guha has "reconstructed" the 'tribe' - A colonialist construct, which Historical Materialism had deconstructed (ibid). R. Guha, on the other hand, sees in the classification into 'tribes' an index of the social organisation (1983b:312), and not, therefore, a purely colonial construct or arbitrary action.

While the majority of 'subaltern studies' have dealt with related themes of the failure of colonialism to establish 'hegemony' in India - A failure yet to be surmounted in post-independent India - and the consequent existence of two domains of politics. Subalternity arising out of relations of domination and subordination is perceived as a loose concept to cover; "the general attributes of subordination... in terms of class, age, gender, and office or in any other way." (Guha, R, 1982: preface). This approach appears to open up many avenues for inquiry, and establish subalternity in many instances, eg., women's subalternity, or even within the subaltern groups themselves.

One of the important results of the 'subaltern' approach has been to bring into sharp relief, aspects marginalised by traditional (seen as elite) historiography; The ways in which 'traditional' or pre-existing culture shape the countors of 'modern' movements. The Tebhaga movement, celebrated as one of the first class based movement in India, is shown as determined by other
loyalties as well. Class loyalty are shown to be displaced by
ethnic loyalties, when the nature of mobilisation is examined,
giving many class based movements a "duplex character" and in the
process exposing the limitations of a purely class based analysis
in the study of society (Guha, 1983b:169-70).

'Subaltern studies' is then a radicalised development of
Althusser's view that, "the theory of the specific effectivity of
the super-structures and other 'circumstances' largely remains to
be elaborated" (1965:113), however, an elaboration radicalised by
the very rejection of the base/super-structure dichotomy.

This elaboration of subaltern history from what seems to be a
"rag-bag of assumptions and beliefs with little internal consis-
tency or cohesion... A conception which, even in the brains of
one individual, is fragmentary, incoherent and inconsequential"
(Arnold, D, 1984:159), this has resulted in a lot of polemics, as
anticipated by E. Balibar (1988:251). T. N. Madan similarly voices
the problem of establishing the subaltern;

we do not get the subaltern's point of view in subaltern
voices but rather by inference. The suppressed voice, too,
has obviously to be constructed ... it seems to me to be an
echo rather than an independent or complementary voice. The
prevalence of the dominant voice is not easy to overcome.

G. C. Spivak also finds a certain dissonance in the approach to
subaltern consciousness: The"...bestowal of a historical specific-
city to consciousness in the narrow sense, even as it implicitly
operates as a metaphysical methodological presupposition in the
general sense" (1985:339). She also finds suggestions, "that
'subaltern consciousness' is subject to the cathexis of the elites, that it is never fully recoverable”, even in the works of the subalternists themselves (ibid.)

Spivak reads in Guha's usage of "demographic differences" two different ways of locating the subaltern. One emphasising on the "demographic" to differentiate 'elites' from the 'subalterns' (an approach she finds positivistic), and the other emphasising on "difference", "which opens the doors to deconstructive gestures" (ibid:340-1). In this case, the attempt to retrieve an emergent 'subaltern'(collective) consciousness can be seen as a political strategy to "undo a massive historiographic metaplesis and 'situate' the effects of the subject as subaltern" (ibid: 342-3). Another aspect of the 'subaltern project' pointed out by G.C.Spivak is that "the emphasis upon the 'sovereignty,... consistency and logic' of 'rebel consciousness' can be seen as the deployment of 'affirmative deconstruction'" if embraced as a strategy. But if the project is seen as "the establishment of an inalienable and final truth of things, ...inevitably objectify the subaltern and be caught in the game of knowledge as power" (ibid:345). The lack of any clear 'subaltern' Theory was seen as strength rather than a weakness:

'subaltern theory' lacks a clear cut model and is not attempting to set up one. Only after considerable work has been done can we even begin to construct an alternative historical paradigm which can replace the older paradigm (Hardiman,D 1986:290).

This perhaps reflects the present status of 'subaltern studies' - a strategic practice to bring existing historiography
to a crisis. This political strategy is also evident in Ranajit Guha's location of the 'studies' in, "another, and historically antagonistic universe," (1989:220). The 'subalternists' while admitting their complicity with their subject, also point out the same in 'elitist' historiography, as evidenced by blanks in their approach.
NAGAS AS 'SUBALTERN'-I.2.

The present study is an attempt to see whether the 'invariant-structures' of insurgent consciousness isolated by Guha can be located in the 'consciousness' informing Naga insurgency. Guha establishes the 'autonomous' subaltern domain by locating discontinuities:

Between the politics and culture of the elites and subaltern sections of pre-industrial society (including even colonial and post-colonial India) ... E.P. Thomson like Guha, dissents from Gramsci's hegemony theory in so far as it suggests an almost total political, cultural and ideological control by the elites over the subaltern classes (Arnold D, 1984:165).

'Elitist' historiography, which tended to ignore these discontinuities was seen as endowing a false hegemony and thereby constituted a one-sided account. It was, according to Guha:

A serious misrepresentation... of the power relations of colonialism in historical discourse. The crux of that misrepresentation is that dominance in colonial conditions has quite erroneously been endowed with hegemony (1989:228, italics in original).

T.V. Sathyamurthy points out Guha's neglect of the structuring of the "actual consciousness as elaborated through rebellion and also the points at which false consciousness asserted itself (1990: 228, italics in original). However, considering Guha's objectives, it perhaps would be outside his concern to specify the actual structuring of insurgent consciousness as a historical phenomenon. False consciousness however, has been amply dealt with by the 'subaltern studies', and gives vivid insights on how
even false consciousness can give the insurgent peasant, confronted by superior forces, the strength to rise up and rebel.\footnote{9}

Naga 'insurgency' and the 'consciousness' behind it has been seen as the result of British policies of isolation, which hampered assimilation and thereby the process of nation-building. Naga identity also, has been seen from the narrow perspective of an imposed identity. Imposed on isolated village based communities, by educated elites and the encouragement of British administrators (cf., Das, N.K., 1982:39-40). These approaches ignores all subjective parameters; an important and integral component of identity formation and is thereby one-sided. S.K. Chaube's approach, centered on the emergence of differentiation in the traditional social structure, results in a crude dichotomy between the 'modern' (educated, progressivist and national) and the 'traditional' (illiterate, reactionary and secessionist) elements. The then contradictory presence of 'modern' elements among the Naga 'insurgents' is explained away in terms of employment problems (1982:32-6).

A narrow behavioural approach has also been called up to explain the 'problem' of Naga 'insurgency' in the work of Phillip Mason. Mason attributes 'insurgency' to the contrast between the 'paternalism' of British administrators and the 'authoritarian' Indian administrator's attempt to "drag such people as these quickly into the 20th century... and their impatience with a culture utterly different from their own but not so remote as to be idealised" (1971:173-4). This perspective ignores the fact...
that the demand for self-determination dates back to 1929, and also the rejection of the 'crown colony' under the same 'paternal' British administrators, by the Nagas.

These incongruities in existing accounts of Naga 'insurgency' can perhaps be better understood by positing the existence of an 'insurgent consciousness' based on the mentality, ideology and aims of pre-existing social groups. "an autonomous domain... traditional only in so far as its roots could be traced back to pre-colonial times, but it was by no means archaic in the sense of being outmoded" (Guha.,1982:4). Such a genealogical, historical approach perhaps represents at present, the best approach for understanding many aspects of social history neglected by contemporary historical discourse.

Naga 'insurgency' and the 'consciousness' informing it therefore, is seen embedded within the parameters of Naga culture and ideology in this study. It is seen as emerging from within "fairly well established structures of defiance over the centuries... operative in a weak and fragmentary manner even in every day life and in individual and small group resistance" (cf.,Guha.1983b:12). A domain, 'autonomous' in the sense that it did not originate from modern elite politics (Guha.,1982:4).

Naga 'insurgency' perhaps best reflect Guha's characterisation of colonialism, and even post-colonial Governance in India as a "dominance without hegemony". An instance where the process of nation-building (or dominance) was resisted by a culture which did not recognise the legitimacy of an authority regarded as alien. The Nagas were not organically assimilated as a strata
into the larger social-stratification system of Indian society. A state of affairs maintained by the British as a result of colonial expediency and the lessons from 'tribal' insurrections in mainland India. It was also the demands of the Nagas that they be excluded from the politics of the mainland.

Relations of domination and subordination therefore greatly differed in this case from the 'feudal' type of societies as studied by Gramsci and also by Guha. The peasantry in these cases constituted a class or social classes within a highly differentiated social stratification system where the identity of the subaltern and the 'consciousness' informing 'insurgency' was "imposed by those who had power over him by virtue of their class" (Guha, 1983b:18), and which resulted in the 'negation' of the properties and attributes of his superiors (ibid). This aspect seems to be limited in the Naga case, due to the relatively few points of contact with the larger society. The Nagas as 'subalterns' seems to be more accessible from a positively grounded approach, more in line with P. Chatterjee's "modes of power" (in this case, the "communal" mode, with emphasis on the 'community'. From this framework, identity is seen as resulting from the subjective perception of belonging to a community.

Following G.C. Spivak, it would be "most useful" to see 'negative consciousness' as by definition incomplete. 'Consciousness' becomes useful when seen in a narrow and positive sense as 'self-consciousness' and not, 'consciousness in general' (Spivak, G.C., 1985: 339):
It is within the framework of a strategic interest in the self-alienating displacing move of and by a consciousness of collectivity, then, that self-determination and an unalienated self-consciousness can be broached (ibid).

It is in this context that she prefers re-writing 'inversive' as 'displacing', so as to accomodate the two-fold meanings: 'maintain' and 'sweep-away'. Insurgency is an attempt to 'sweep away' the domination of the ruling class. But at the same time, there exists within the subaltern classes, an acceptance of subalternity. The use of the term 'displacement' appears to offer a less stark alternative to Guha's 'inversion' in which those who: "...chooses to continue in such subalternity is regarded as hostile towards the inversive process initiated by the struggle and hence as being on the enemy's side". (cited by Spivak, G.C., 1985:342). Guha's stark categorisation also does not seem to fit Naga 'Insurgent consciousness' due to the relative absence of dominance particularly in the erstwhile "Tuensang area" which remained outside the ambit of colonial administration.

Guha's approach to 'insurgent consciousness' based on 'negation' appears more pertinent to highly stratified societies of the 'feudal' type where extensive codes of dominance/deference are long established. Negation alone does not appear to account for the spread and character of Naga 'insurgency'. Extensive structures of power relations could not develop due to historically specific reasons; The late entry of the British into the Naga inhabited areas; The war-like disposition of the Nagas, resulting from a culture which placed a high premium on 'head-hunting'; The 'inner-line' and other administrative and legislative measures adopted by the British; The hostile terrain; Conversion to
Christianity and also 'modern' education, which fostered ideas of Naga Nationalism, self-determination, etc., all contributed in maintaining a discontinuity in relations with the larger Indian society and culture. Naga 'insurgency' therefore did not 'negate' any pre-existing code of domination and subordination derived from a caste based cultural context, unlike in 'society' studies by Guha. However the fears of an imminent imposition of these alien cultural codes was very much existent, and its negation was expressed in an inverted manner; by the 'positive' 'appropriation' of symbols of British dominance and British culture as understood by the Nagas.

The absence of an 'organic' assimilation with the larger Indian society, coupled with the inculcation of 'modern' ideas of nationalism, shaped a highly focused and articulated demand for self-determination.

'Negation' in Guha's study was an aspect of insurgent consciousness in a relatively "pure" state (as mentioned earlier) within a highly stratified 'feudal' type of society before the advent of ideas of nationalism and socialism (1983b:13). Here 'signs' had been systematised into elaborate codes of authority and deferential response. A result of "centuries of recursive practice at the grassroots level... (and had) congealed into a naive tradition" (ibid:37). 'Negation' in Guha's study was expressed through 'discrimination' against certain social classes, 'extended' it's range of violence against objects and classes of people through the 'atidesa' function, and 'inverted' by acts of 'appropriation' and/or deconstruction of all symbols
which traditionally marked the distance between the subaltern classes and the elites (ibid:18ff). It was in other words, a semiotic break (ibid:36).

'Negation' and its modalities: 'discrimination' and 'inversion' were therefore qualitatively different in Naga 'insurgency' though certain structural similarities can be discerned. There was no tradition of dominance and subordination as part of a stratified society. Naga 'insurgency' therefore did not express itself by appropriating cultural markers of the dominant group. However 'appropriation' can be read even here; The formation of the Naga Federal Government (henceforth NFG), "...on the model of the Constitution of India" (Luthra,P.N.,1974:3). There also was a demand that the Prime Minister of India, "...should pay a reciprocal visit to Kohima and hold the next rounds of talks in Nagaland" (Horam,M:129).

It was a 'negation' of dominance and also a 'positive' act of 'appropriation' of an alternate authority and legitimacy. However it would be wrong to over-estimate the maturity of this 'consciousness'. The inability to fully 'discriminate' and 'extend' itself against the symbols anti-ethical to its existence, indicates the relatively weak quality of 'negation', and also perhaps, the 'positive' presence of ethnicity and other 'primordial' loyalties in shaping this 'consciousness'.

Finding parallels in the structuring of Naga insurgency with the 'elementary aspects' of insurgent consciousness derived from,
"...politically less sophisticated agrarian uprisings of the period before 1900" appears to agree with Guha's view; "...the actual career of this consciousness extends well beyond the nineteenth century. Many of the mass movements which have swept through our land since then bears at least some of its hallmarks...one cannot help noticing the structural similarities between their articulation and some of the 'elementary aspects' discussed above" (Guha., 1983b:170,334). However it is natural to expect differences in 'insurgent consciousness' much influenced by 'modern politics' in its articulation, as is the case with Naga 'insurgency'.

The problems of an approach based solely on 'negation' is more evident in attempts at retrieving Naga 'insurgent consciousness', due to the obscuring presence of 'modern politics' on both sides of the conflict. It however would be wrong to read the presence of 'modern politics' alone in shaping this 'consciousness' as it amounts to denying the role of Naga villagers—without knowledge of ideas of 'Sovereignty', 'Independence' etc.,; of their consciousness of their own actions. 'Negation' does not explain why people without much ideas of 'Independence' joined in a conflict over the same. It also does not explain why resistance to domination took on a mass form, unless a 'positive' approach, as a logical counter-part of 'negation' is also incorporated; in terms of ethnic identity and ethnicity, which made possible the fusing of 'modern politics' with the 'traditional'.

However the problem of adopting a 'positive' approach in locating 'subaltern consciousness' is evident in that it violates the theoretical framework of 'subaltern studies'. David Hardiman
mentions that, "...'negation' is inscribed on the subaltern banner" (1986:290). Similarly, G.C. Spivak points out that the position of the 'subaltern project' is heterogeneous to the subaltern classes. One can only speak 'for' the subaltern, and not 'with' the subaltern. 'Subaltern consciousness' "...is always askew from its received signifiers" (Spivak, G.C., 1985:339).

The 'positivistic' attempt to objectify the 'subaltern', paradoxically has the effect of controlling the subaltern, according to G.C. Spivak, "...to control him through knowledge even as they restore versions of causality and self-determination to him." On the other hand, 'failure' and the acknowledgement of adopting the 'subaltern studies approach', as an attempt at displacing existing discursive fields - an attempt destined to 'fail' due to 'historical' reasons - aligns 'subaltern studies' with deconstruction (Spivak, G.C., 1985:336ff). If seen from this perspective, the emphasis on the grounding 'positive' view of consciousness, stressing the 'sovereignty', 'consistency' and 'logic' of rebel consciousness, "...can be seen as 'affirmative deconstruction': knowing that such an emphasis is theoretically non-viable, the historian then breaks his theory in a scrupulously delineated 'political interest'" (ibid:345). This approach then employs 'negation' in two senses. Firstly, the 'resistance to domination' approach; the peasant negates domination by launching a project of 'turning things upside down'. Secondly, 'subaltern-studies' in its 'affirmative deconstruction' mode, negates existing accounts of peasant uprisings, employing the very tools seen as 'elitist'.

'Subaltern studies' in its objectifying, positivistic mode
can be bracketed along with recent trends in peasant studies which focus on the peasantry as 'conscious actors', the 'subject' of history. An approach that moves away from structuralism by emphasising that 'culture' and 'consciousness' should not be isolated as an abstract realm of thought, but analysed as a concrete social force. The evidence of peasant consciousness is seen as lying less in intellectual or cultural propositions but more in actions. Peasants are being seen as being able to draw upon and transform historically inherited elements of culture and also use consciousness of cultural distinctiveness for purpose of resistance and in this way give new ideas and social forces the legitimacy of tradition. this approach not only emphasises the study of fixed and structured sets of systems and values, cultural institutions and their continuity, but also less articulated, fragmented, every-day elements of popular culture, stressing the moment of creativity, the recreation and re-inter pretation of inherited elements in the face of new experiences and in particular, the emergence of new ideas and practices which are not only critical within, but also go beyond existing cogni- tive and ideological paradigms (Ranger,T.,1986:562-3).

These trends, reflecting a growing disillusionment, with anti-humanist approaches as best exemplified in L.Althusser's statement that there is no such thing as history in general- Only specific structures which have specific history (Jones,G.S.1975: 96-115), or the Straussian, "...categorising system, unconnected with a thinking subject" (Das.V,1989:311).

This disillusionment however, is still unresolved as alterna-
tives to this approach is still rooted in the western tradition, even when it rejects an eurocentric perspective. The 'subaltern studies' can then be bracketed together with the 'elitist' historiography it attacks as seen from Ashis Nandy's perspective; "The west has not only produced modern colonialism, it informs even this interpretation of interpretation" (1983:xii).

On the other hand, 'subaltern studies' in its deconstructive mode, has not opened new alternate frameworks for the study of social phenomena, and therefore, a 'failure' in this sense. What they have managed to do is to expose the 'failure' of contemporary historiography - how 'elitist' accounts 'successfully' shielded this 'cognitive failure' on their part. The exposure of this 'successful cognitive failure', however does not lead to the 'consciousness' of the subaltern groups, except by harnessing the 'successful cognitive failure' of 'elitist' historiography to posit the existence of this 'consciousness' (Spivak, G.C, 1985: 334-5).