Sensitiveness to the problems of contemporary society has been a remarkable feature of Ghurye's writings. Ghurye thinks that a sociologist should be interested not only in abstract theoretical formulations but also he should have some concrete suggestions to solve the problems of society he lives in. The main focus of Ghurye's interest is on culture. Ghurye thinks that it is culture that determines social structure and individual behaviour. In his own words, "Endeavour and ideals, values and virtues, are the concomitants of culture and civilization. Every civilization or society, however, simple in its composition or factual in its existence, has a number of these. Whether they are articulated or not, they are the subtle determiners of individual as well as social actions." So Ghurye's approach in this respect is 'culturological', if we may say so. In the context of modern India, Ghurye tries to envision the problems associated with the working of this common cultural foundation.

1 Personal communication to the present author.
But Ghurye's concept of cultural unity is of a new genre and is not secular in orientation. If one looks deeply, one will find a religious undertone in it. He is concerned with 'India of Hindu Culture' and uses the term 'Indian Culture' and 'Hindu Culture' synonymously.

Hinduism in traditional India, he says, provided an excellent normative base for maintaining social and political unity in the country. Hinduism had brought within its fold widely different groups living in India. The various sects of Hinduism constitute a vast mosaic holding together millions of people in the different parts of India. This process had worked through the entire period of Indian cultural-political history, starting from 2000 B.C. when the Indo-Aryans first entered into India.\(^4\)

This theme comes up in Ghurye's writings recurrently. Ghurye analyses the normative structure of Hinduism, the teaching of the sacred religious texts - the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Brahmanas etc. to show how they provide the common cultural foundation. Second, the role of such great Hindu thinkers as Panini, Patanjali, Kalidasa, Sankaracarya, Ramanuja, Jnaneswara, Tulsidas, Madhusudana Sarasvati, Kalhana, Ramadasa, Ramacandra etc. has also been discussed by Ghurye. In the cultural regenerative process, the roles of such dynasties as the Mauryas, the Guptas, the Pandyas, the Vijayanagara Kings and others also came up in his discussion.

Ghurye thinks that it is largely as a result of Brahmanical endeavour that cultural unity in India has been built up. All the major institutions of Hindu society, he shows, originated among the Brahmans.

\(^4\) There is an excellent account of this political-cultural history of India in Ghurye's *Indian Costume* (1951), pp. 34-66.
and gradually they were accepted by other sections of the community. Though Ghurye calls this a 'process of acculturation', it was basically a one-way flow, in which the Brahminical ideas and institutions infiltrated among the non-Brahmins. Several factors helped in the widespread acceptance of the Brahmanical institutions, eg., the prestige-factor of the Brahmins, the cooperation of the various ruling dynasties, the endeavours of individual thinkers in inspiring the non-Brahmins to accept these institutions etc. This is how, Ghurye maintains, the 'fundamental traits of the culture-complex represented by the Vedic and Brahmanic lore' have kept Indian society together for thousands of ages.\textsuperscript{5}

It is in the background of such an approach that Ghurye analyses the problems and prospects of Indian unity in contemporary India. The concept of cultural unity looms so very large in his thinking that he cannot help being disturbed by the 'fissiparous' tendencies in modern India. To him, the prognosis of such a process is complete fragmentation of the country.\textsuperscript{6} He blames the political leaders for this because 'the country's leaders followed a course of action which was more or less exactly the one that should have been avoided'.\textsuperscript{7} But the foundation for this national cultural unity had been built and maintained by the Hindus for thousands of years. "The fruits of the ferment of thought,  

\textsuperscript{5} Ghurye - 'Indian Unity: A Retrospect and a Prospect' in \textit{Anthropo-Sociological Papers} (1965), pp. 242-45.  
\textsuperscript{6} Ghurye said in an interview with the present author that the Balkanisation of our country is not very far away as the separatist forces have become quite active at present.  
\textsuperscript{7} 'Preface' to \textit{Whither India} (1977), p. vii.
speculative, critical and synthetic, which the intellectual elite of India conveyed through the medium of Sanskrit, were visible in the manifest over-all unity or homogeneity of the country and its culture ... Challenges to national unity have increased in post-independent India because, firstly, on the positive side, the disintegrative forces have been well-articulated and politicised, and secondly, from the negative side, there is no strong political or administrative determination to take up the challenge.

The theme of integration is nothing new in Ghurye. It became discernible as early as in 1932 when Ghurye first published his book on caste. The dominating theme of his book on tribes also is national integration. Concern with the question of integration became recurrent and cumulative in Ghurye's writings since 1967. In that year, at a Conference held in Bombay, Ghurye urged the sociologists in India to study the problem of integration and 'made an impassioned plea for the development of political sociology in India'. Ghurye himself published subsequently his 'trilogy' in the field, viz, Social Tensions in India (1968), Whither India (1974) and India Recreates Democracy (1979). Ghurye strikes a clear pessimistic note in these works and concludes that the very existence of the nation-state is at stake today.

---

8 Ghurye - 'Indian Unity: A Retrospect and a Prospect' in op.cit., p.246.
9 Ghurye - 'Foreword' to The Scheduled Tribes (1959).
Since 'integration' is the key word in Ghurye's political sociology, it is important to understand what Ghurye means by it. Ghurye recognizes that society is not just an aggregation of isolated individuals, but that group life provides the bridge between the individual and the society. An individual acquires social attributes and is socialized through groups. This is the integrative function of groups in society. In Hinduism, "it is through the mediacy of a group, sub-caste or caste and craft-guild or village and not only the family, nuclear or extended, or even the kin-groups .... that an individual got his experience of the social milieu and became its constituent."\textsuperscript{12} When groups perform this function efficiently, integration is achieved. National integration is achieved when an individual transcends his loyalty to his own immediate group and identifies himself with the larger group known as the nation-state. Integration refers to the whole process by which an individual transcends his group loyalty in favour of the larger group and internalizes the norms and values of the larger society.\textsuperscript{13}

Tensions in the process of this integration in India arise today because the various groups of people have failed to transcend their narrow group loyalties. The religious and linguistic groups are to be particularly noted in this connection. There are other groups also which foster this spirit of ethnocentrism, e.g., regional groups, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes etc. But religious and linguistic minorities are the most potential sources of danger to Indian unity in modern India.

\textsuperscript{12} Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 10, 19.
\textsuperscript{13} Ghurye - Ibid., p. 40.
The constitution recognized these minorities but its entire emphasis was upon the speedy integration of these groups into the mainstream. Misinterpretation or misapplication of these provisions of the constitution is the root cause of the present situation. Ghurye engages himself in the exploration of the nature of these tensions at various levels. Let us analyse Ghurye's opinion regarding religious and linguistic tensions in particular, as, according to him, these are the crucial areas causing disintegration of the country.

Social Tensions in India, pp. 113-28.
As a community, the Muslims in India constitute the most significant minority group. Their relationship with the majority community as well as the problem of their integration into the body-politic are vitally important from the standpoint of political sociology. The crux of the problem centres around 'Muslim identity' and 'Muslim role' in independent India. Attempts have been made to understand the pattern of Muslim integration with the rest of the community in terms of a 'minority complex' or Muslim behaviour has been sought to be understood in terms of some 'pan-Islamic' concepts.

Ghurye attempts to interpret Muslim behaviour in India in a cultural-historical perspective. He believes that historically the Muslims in India have always maintained their cultural identity and separateness. Pre-Muslim invaders and conquerors had, in course of time, been merged into the Hindu social polity. But the culture of the Islamic rulers was fundamentally opposed to Hindu culture and the contradictions were insaluble. Problems of Hindu-Muslim relation in independent India is to be understood in this perspective. It is the manifestation of the contradiction and conflict between two different socio-cultural systems.

17. Ghurye - Social Tension in India, p. 192. Ghurye notes, "the impact of Islam was too strong to work as a leaven in the Hindu community. The culture and religious practices of its followers were so different that ... the Hindus and Muslims looked upon each other as contraries and natural enemies". - Caste & Race in India, p. 110.
Ghurye is bitterly critical about writers like Abid Husain, Humayun Kabir, Tara Chand and others who maintain that Muslim culture in India did influence Hindu culture and society, and the two together gave birth to a synthesised 'Hindustani Culture'. Humayun Kabir, for example, speaks eloquently about the emergence of this new 'Hindustani way' which was different from either the classical Islamic or Hindu cultures.

Ghurye thinks that any talk of synthesis and compromise between Hindu and Muslim cultures is historically deceptive. "The opposition between the Hindu and the Muslims was an inherent one and not an adventitious phenomenon capable of being resolved through talk of sweet reasonableness."

By a detailed analysis of the various aspects of Hindu and Muslim culture, Ghurye makes an endeavour to show that they have never mixed up with each other. This becomes evident if we analyze their sartorial habits and their food habits and the methods of preparing food.

Regarding religious festivals, although there was some common participation in each other's festivals, basically the two streams operated independently of each other. Residually also the two communities were segregated from each other. In the sphere of art and architecture, Ghurye makes a detailed analysis of the phenomenon both regionwise and periodwise and shows that the Hindus, in medieval India, not only held on to their own style, they started new chapters in this period also.

---

18 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 140, 186.
19 H. Kabir - The Indian Heritage (1955), pp. 81-82, 137-42.
20 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 209.
21 Ghurye - Indian Costume (1951), p. 118, 220; Social Tensions in India, pp. 188-89.
22 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, pp. 189-90.
The Rajput style of architecture, particularly temple architecture, rose to a new height at this period. A new school of architecture emerged at this period in the South also.

So Ghurye thinks that the hypothesis of Hindu-Muslim cultural synthesis is nothing but a myth. Historically, the rivalry and hostility of the two communities have been evidenced through communal riots which started from the time the Muslims entered into this country. Communal riots, according to him, resulted from the attempts of the Muslims to impose their culture and way of life forcibly upon the Hindus.

The frustration of Indian Muslims became acute during the British period as they lost their centuries-old political domination over India. So when the end of British rule came in sight, they made a determined effort to carve out a separate portion of territory for them. This culminated in the creation of Pakistan. But this did not solve the problem. The so-called 'nationalist Muslims', those who decided to remain in India, continued their separatist designs and activities. They were interested only in securing an 'extra pound of flesh from the body-politic'. Partition of India, Ghurye declares, 'did not create the climate favourable to harmony, leave aside some kind of homogeneity or to unity in diversity. The operation, on the other hand, soon begun to show signs of its turning septic.'

23 Ghurye - Rajput Architecture (Popular : 1966) ; Social Tensions in India, pp. 222-47.
24 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, pp. 257-58.
25 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 304.
It is significant that Ghurye does not use the term 'Indian muslims', but says that they are 'muslim Indians' - they are primarily muslims and then only Indians. In fact, we can think of three levels of identities of Indian muslims viz, pan-Islamic, sub-continental and national. Ghurye thinks that the Muslims in India are more motivated by pan-Islamic and sub-Continental identities rather than national. Their role in crucial times, in one word, has been subversive. Again, analysing the foreign policies of various muslim states, Ghurye shows that the idea of 'Muslim Brotherhood' has been their dominant consideration. Thus the aggressive character of muslim personality stands in sharp contrast to the qualities of tolerance, magnanimity and docility of the Hindus. That is why Ghurye talks of the 'inherent opposition' between the Hindus and the Muslims.

While discussing the attitude of the muslims in independent India, the role of the Aligarh Muslim University comes in for particular criticism in Ghurye's writings. He alleges that the University was the principal centre of Muslim Leaguers during the British period. In independent India, its main concern has been 'that of activating the muslim community to the position of a pressure group so as to secure political and other special rights' for them. He even charges the University of being associated sometimes with organizing communal riots in that part of India. The Aligarh Muslim University helps the Muslims to maintain their separate attitude and so it is basically 'anti-national' in character.

27 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 250.
30 Ghurye - Ibid., p. 280.
Two other 'ominous' aspects have been particularly mentioned by Ghurye while discussing 'muslim communalism'. Firstly, he is bitter about the role of the ruling party in dealing with the situation. Instead of firmly tackling 'muslim particularism', the ruling party is concerned with getting their votes at any cost. This has aggravated the situation. As he says, "we can however be certain that so long as the Congress itself tries to woo the block vote of this or that community, the communal cancer will continue to grow." Secondly, the muslims are trying to join hands with other sections of the community enjoying reservations, like the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes etc. They are acting as the self-appointed champions of minority rights. They are urging the recognition of Urdu as an official language. All these are expressions of their particularistic orientation. Ghurye feels that the existence of group prejudice among the muslims is more dangerous for Indian unity than it is in the case of the Scheduled castes etc. The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes are connected with Hinduism organizationally and culturally. In spite of contradictions, these groups operate within an over-all framework of unity. But in the case of the muslims, it is a case of organization by a group which has its distinctive culture and tradition and which has got a transnational allegiance. That is why, Ghurye concludes, muslims pose a danger to the unity of India.

32 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 386.
34 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 385; Whither India?, p. 244, 287-88.
Linguistic Tensions in India

Language is vital to a people's life and culture - it is the embodiment of its aspirations and achievements, the vehicle of its self-expression, and the means of preserving its identity. Language is a great unifying factor. It is a vehicle of culture, it is also an instrument of promoting culture. As such, the process of nation-building is intimately connected with the question of language. In case of India, common or link language is a mirage we have been running after for the last three decades. The question of language requires delicate handling; otherwise instead of helping the process of unity, it will only aggravate the forces of disunity and disintegration.

Ghurye gives a great importance to the role of language in the process of nation-building in India. Even in case of tribes, tribal life and culture may be improved only when they pick up a developed language of a neighbouring community. In India in all the ages, language has acted as a great integrative agency. In historic times, a common cultural tradition was built up and maintained through Sanskrit language. It was the language of the elite in all the parts of the country.

The first creak in this homogenous looking cultural front began to appear when Sanskrit ceased to be a creative language and increased vernacularisation of religion and philosophy took place in different parts of India. The process gathered momentum during the medieval period. Ghurye mentions that the same thing happened in Europe with respect to Latin language. Ghurye has an innate dislike of what he calls the process of vernacularisation. Development of local language and religion is not inherently dangerous. In fact this diversity is desirable provided it does not disturb the framework of unity. But what happens generally is that the two work at cross purposes. If in the sphere of higher education, people are trained in local languages, then they will not understand each other - this will undermine the very basis of nationalism. So Ghurye says, "the enthronement of the state or regional languages .... is quite plainly an indication of the regionalization of the political entity."

The framers of the constitution were fully alive to the dangers of the situation. They clearly envisaged that Hindi is to be developed in such a manner that it can be "a medium of instruction for all the elements of the composite culture of India." Sanskrit was to act as the primary source of vocabulary-making of Hindi. But the scheme failed to function properly. As a result of this we have witnessed in independent India bitter and prolonged linguistic rivalries between well-organized groups. But the failure of this scheme is also due to the indecent haste of the Hindi enthusiasts.

Ghurye - *Social Tensions in India*, p. 522.
Ghurye - *Social Tensions in India*, pp. 514-15.
Ghurye - *Whither India?*, p. 251.
Linguistic tensions which have arisen in independent India are principally of three types. Firstly, there are those connected with the existence of minority language groups in the various linguistic states. Bengali speakers in Assam or Urdu speakers in Uttar Pradesh or Bihar are the examples. Secondly, there are those that are bound up with Urdu. And thirdly, there are those arising out of the opposition to the implementation of Hindi as the official language. These forces became particularly active in the Tamilnad region. In the latter case, it is the expression of both linguistic and regional rivalries.

Ghurye does not think that the process of vernacularisation is as much dangerous to national integrity as the challenge posed by Tamil and Urdu languages. The working contents of culture of these vernacularised languages are largely influenced by the same Sanskrit sources. As they share the same cultural heritage, there are many features which they have in common. But this is not so in the case of Urdu and Tamil languages. Ghurye is very much apprehensive about the designs and activities of Urdu speakers in particular. Firstly, language is not merely a vocabulary for communication, it provides an important linkage with one's own history and social milieu. Urdu language represents Muslim culture based on Islamic religio-social system totally different from Hindu culture. Thereby it is potentially disintegrative in Hindu India. Secondly, Urdu

43 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. ix, 515.
44 Ghurye - 'Indian Unity' etc. in Anthropo-Sociological Papers, pp. 247-48.
45 Ghurye - Whither India ?, p. 408.
46 Ghurye - 'Indian Unity' etc. in Anthropo-Sociological Papers, p. 247.
language provides a good rallying point for Muslims in all the parts of India. It acts as a symbol of unity for Muslim Indians. It also creates a transnational attitude of the Muslims.\textsuperscript{47} Thirdly, by claiming a false exaggerated strength, Urdu is striving to fulfil its ambitious plan of being recognized as an official language at least in some parts of the country. The vacillating attitude on the part of the government to deal with the problem firmly has encouraged the Urdu enthusiasts.\textsuperscript{48} Ghurye holds that "the recognition of Urdu as a second regional language in eight or nine states as demanded by the Urdu or Muslim campaigners would automatically tend to make the Union trilingual."\textsuperscript{49}

The other type of agitation relates to the 'anti-Hindi' agitation, spreaded particularly in Tamilnadu. Ghurye blames the DMK as the principal instigator and organiser of these disintegrative elements.\textsuperscript{50} He thinks that the national flag, the national anthem, the national motto etc form important symbolic elements of national integrity and attempts to dishonour them strike at the root of national integrity. This is exactly what is being done in Tamilnadu.\textsuperscript{51}

The recognition by the government that both Hindi and English will enjoy equal status and the stipulation that both of them will continue for an indefinite period as national language, has not, according to Ghurye, solved the problem. On the other hand, it has divided our nation in two.

\textsuperscript{47} Ghurye - Whither India? p. 335.
\textsuperscript{48} Ghurye - Ibid., p. 412. Also 'India Recreates Democracy' (1977), p. 10.
\textsuperscript{49} Ghurye - Whither India? p. 58
\textsuperscript{50} For a detailed discussion on the role of the DMK in this respect, see the Chapter on 'Alienation' in Whither India? pp. 166-209.
\textsuperscript{51} It is interesting to note that Ghurye stresses upon this 'symbolic manifestation' in his discussion on the fissiparous tendencies among the tribes, also. See, Supra, Chapter III, p. 95.
separate blocks, some championing the cause of Hindi and others that of English. The fact that regional language patriotism is being inculcated in non-Hindi states and that higher education is being vernacularised at the expense of either English or Hindi, also constitutes a potential source of danger to the cause of national unity. This is now, according to Ghurye, linguistic and regional tensions stand in the way of national integrity in India.

As we have seen above, the forces of conflict and disintegration in independent India have become far more potent and destructive than what they were at the time of independence. In fact, the problem of national integration has assumed new dimension and urgency in independent India. The primordial bases of cleavage have acquired new legitimacy and they are becoming more and more vigorous. When the framers of our constitution used the term 'Nation', they referred more to the process than to the product. They hoped that our politicians will vigorously pursue the nation-building endeavour. The incidents of the past thirty years, Ghurye thinks, have belied this expectation and there is every indication that our country is going to be fragmented into different parts.

The situation in every front is discouraging. Communalism - by which Ghurye means muslim communalism-linguism, regionalism, caste consolidation and segmentation on a national scale, secessionist designs on the part of the tribes, particularly in North-East India - all these are the dark clouds hovering around the Indian sky. Of them, the problem of the muslims is the most severe because they combine the evils of

53 Ghurye - Whither India ? p. 11.
54 In an interview with the present author, Ghurye told that India is going to be divided into several parts consisting of the 1) the Scheduled Castes, 2) the Scheduled Tribes, 3) Sikhs, 4) Tamils and all southern people, 5) Upper Caste Hindus and 6) Muslims. As many of the groups are spread all over India in local concentrations, Ghurye apprehends that it will lead to 'Balkanisation' of our country.
communalism and linguism. The Tamilians and other southern people are vigorously pursuing linguism and regionalism. From the standpoint of caste, the integrative role of the village community has ceased to exist and the various caste groups have been politicised. Regarding the tribal situation, the recent outburst of violence in the whole north-east India, engulfing every state of the region, shows how explosive the situation is.

Ghurye says that all these are ominous portents which show that Indian society is heading towards the dangerous rocks of a 'plural society'. Before analysing Ghurye's position, let us briefly review the development of the theory of plural society in sociology. Furnivall developed and applied this concept first in the case of the Dutch Netherlands society. In such a society, the colonial administration artificially unites people who are racially, culturally and socially different from each other. Economy and market place provides the meeting ground of these people. There is no community-feeling in such a society, the community tends to be organized for production rather than for social life. So a plural society is characterized by dissension, disharmony and conflict between various ethnic and racial groups and it is held together only by the economic bond where the only common deity is mammon.

In his work, Colonial Policy and Practice, Furnivall slightly changed his opinion and said that nationalism may provide the cementing bond in such a community.

---

55 'Introduction' in Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. viii.
58 J.S. Furnivall - Netherlands India; A Study of Plural Economy (1944), p. 457.
59 J.S. Furnivall - Colonial Policy and Practice, p. 308.
60 See John Rex - op.cit., p. 116. Also, Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, p. 67.
It was M.G. Smith who made the theory of plural society more universal in character by detaching it from its colonial matrix. Smith maintains that there may be three types of pluralism, viz, cultural, social and structural pluralism. In cultural pluralism, different and incompatible forms of institutions exist among different sections of population. In social pluralism, institutional differentiation coincides with sharply different social blocks who may have conflicting relationship with each other. Structural pluralism, on the other hand, consists in the association of cultural and social pluralism with differential incorporation into the body-politic, where membership of any group is a prerequisite for citizenship.\(^{61}\) Furnivall's is an example of structural pluralism but there may be societies based on the others. Subsequently, more flexible formulations of pluralism have been made by various other writers. Leo Kuper, for example, has tried to identify plural societies in terms of some continuous variables. He postulates that there may be different levels of pluralism based on different degrees of association and integration.\(^{62}\) Even Myrdal's analysis\(^ {63}\) of the social situation in the United States of America in terms of the process of development of a value-pattern serving the interests and ideals of groups brought together by economic, political and socio-cultural forces, has been stated.


\(^{63}\) M. Myrdal - The American Dilemma, Passim.
by Rex to be an important contribution in the realm of plural theory. Cultural differences among people in Canada, Switzerland, Trinidad and the like are also regarded as examples of plural society.

It is said that these plural societies maintain an integrational framework with the help of some mechanisms. Thus Despers thinks that such 'broker institutions' as political parties or ethnic associations may help in the conversion process. The growth of such universalistic bases of allegiance as nationalism, modernization, industrialization also may establish the bridge between the old and the new. Altogether it appears that the major thrust of Pluralist theories today is to show how such societies function in spite of deep internal divisions.

But Ghurye's conception of a plural society is entirely different. He says that there is a difference between cultural pluralism and a plural society. There may be a society with plural features but not a plural society. The dividing line between the two is a vital one. A society based on 'cultural pluralism' or on 'pluralistic features' does not entirely lose its homogeneous base. But a plural society, as envisaged by Furnivall, is not a society at all, it is an assemblage of functionally unrelated communities. In fact, the word, 'plural society' is a contradiction in terms.

---

64 John Rex - op.cit., p. 121.
68 Ghurye - Social Tensions in India (1968), p. 65.
69 Ghurye - Ibid., pp. 96-97.
Coming to the Indian situation, Ghurye does not think that caste system functioned in traditional India in a pluralistic social framework. He contradicts F.G. Bailey's suggestion⁶⁹ that Furnivall considered caste society as a form of solution of a plural society.⁷⁰ In fact, caste system functioned in an organic and integrated framework where everything, including economy, was socially determined.⁷¹ That was furthest from the idea of a plural society. But with independence, and with the granting of separate rights and privileges to various groups, the situation has changed. The important point is, Ghurye notes, that groups, "if afforded protection of entrenching themselves, tend to use it to make themselves permanent privileged pockets within a state, to create all kinds of tensions, and, to that extent, to impair the social health of the nation community of which they are components."⁷²

This is happening in the sphere of caste. Castes, instead of being liquidated, are becoming more powerful.⁷³ All indications are there to suggest that our society is heading toward the dangerous rocks of pluralism. This would definitely result in the disintegration and dismemberment of our 'centuries-old society'. That explains why Ghurye is so much alarmed over the recent developments.

What is Ghurye's suggestion in this respect? True to his 'culturological' approach, Ghurye thinks that the solution is to be found in the cultural sphere, by imparting the message of cultural unity. This

---

⁶⁹ Bailey - Tribe, Caste and Nation, p. 257.
⁷² Ghurye - Social Tensions in India, pp. 71-72.
can be done by overhauling the educational system, particularly university education. This will produce individuals with "a mind that is impervious to mere propaganda, an intellect which refuses to be satisfied with catchwords, in short, a balanced and intellectual mind."\textsuperscript{74} Ghurye recommends the creation of a Central University, or 'a centre for intellectual unification', "which should form the focus for the crystallization of the modern point of view and thence should introduce the binding cement of intellectual culture through the medium of the common language of the nation."\textsuperscript{75} Students who would come out of this institute would be the powerful emotion workers of the nation. They would form the educated bridge, so to say, entrusted with the function of maintaining national unity.

This is his suggestion in respect of caste also. He says that the change must come through education and increasing social justice and not through communal representation.\textsuperscript{76} He denounces untouchability and says that we must educate the people in such a manner that untouchability is viewed as both undesirable and impracticable.\textsuperscript{77} On priesthood, he suggests that the Brahmins should not have a monopoly right of it. A cultural organization with provincial branches should be started to impart training in priesthood and the right to join such institutions should

\textsuperscript{74} Ghurye - Culture and Society (1947), p. 195.
\textsuperscript{75} Ghurye - 'Indian Unity: A Retrospect and A Prospect' in Anthrano-Sociological Papers (1963), p. 254.
\textsuperscript{76} Ghurye - Caste and Class in India (1957), pp. 203-4, 205-6.
\textsuperscript{77} Ghurye - 'Untouchable Classes and their Assimilation in Hindu Society' in I and Other Explorations (1973), pp. 316-23.
be caste free. He denounces the DMK move to eradicate priesthood because he thinks that it is priesthood which provides the running thread binding different sections of Hindu society. So these are Ghurye's proposals for the maintenance of national unity.

---

In this section, we shall be concerned with the examination of Ghurye's ideas regarding the nature of national unity in India. Ghurye holds that though groups play an integrational role in society, this is true only up to a certain extent. Excessive identification with one's own group generates a sense of 'group-patriotism' which creates obstacles for national unity. In modern Indian Society there are five sources of danger for national unity coming as they do from a sense of excessive attachment with groups: 1) the scheduled castes, 2) the scheduled tribes, 3) the backward classes, 4) the Muslims as religious minority groups and 5) the linguistic minorities. As we have discussed the validity of Ghurye's assumptions with regard to the first three, here we shall be primarily concerned with the analysis of the last two aspects, viz, the religious and linguistic groups and the nature of challenges which they create for Indian society.

With regard to the Muslims, Ghurye's views may be examined from three standpoints, viz, historical, political and sociological. From the historical standpoint, we take up for analysis the statement of Ghurye that "the main current kept the two communities separate and distinct, the native Hindu endeavouring to keep himself alive with honour and even to regain his lost dominion and the incoming Muslim ... strenuously countering the moves ... There was hardly any rapprochement

80 Supra, Chapter II and III.
But we do not think that available evidences lead us to such a conclusion. Though the two communities did not lose their identities, historically there also occurred a confluence of the two cultures. Communalism, in the sense of a hostile relationship between two entire communities, was never a historical phenomenon in India. It is true that there were cases of conflict between Hindu and Muslim dynasties but there were similar cases of conflicts between the Hindu rulers or between the Muslim rulers. The point is that in such cases of conflict and alignment, politics was the main consideration and not religion. The social and economic life of the masses were free from religious hostility.

The basic difficulty in this respect arises from Ghurye's concept of Indian culture. Indian culture is equated with Hindu culture. It is assumed that Hindu religious norms provide the essence of this culture and that it remained unchanged through ages. Because this culture was supposed to be a finality, 'foreigners' had the option of either wholly accepting it or wholly rejecting it. It is said, that the Muslims opted for the latter. But, as it has been rightly said, "The two nation theory follows from this view of Hindu culture being more or less fixed and immutable. Muslim communalists also subscribe basically to the theory that their very culture is unique and cannot be tampered with."

81 Ghurye - 'Introduction' in Social Tensions in India, p. viii.
82 See, R. Thaper and Others - Communalism and the Writing of Indian History (in Bengali), (1976), pp. 36, 58-9, 44-45, 47.
Hence, both the Hindu and the Muslim communal views reject the possibility of cultural assimilation or synthesis. It is unfortunate that while citing the Muslim views, Ghurye has basically drawn upon the writings of the Muslim communalists while he has jeered at those who are more progressive.

Communalism has been defined by Moin Shakir as the "tendency to promote the religious grouping of a community for political purpose, in other words, the phenomenon of imposing religion on politics". Communalism in this sense arose in British India due to certain deliberate policies pursued by the British. At first, the British rulers pursued a general policy of hostility towards the Muslims. Then the government tried to adjust its educational policies to encourage Muslim participation. The Hindus and Muslims were thus differently treated. Robinson says, the politics of the 1860s had little truck with communalism and every district officer knew that a man like Syed Ahmed had much more in common with his great political antagonist that he ever had with a humble Muslim weaver. Yet the British insisted on discussing Indian politics and society in terms of Muslims and Hindus.

This was also a period of the growth of nationalism in India. Unfortunately, nationalism was aroused in India on communal lines. Our nationalist leaders, in order to awaken and mobilize the masses, began to...
appeal in the name of religion. Reference to the glorious past to them meant the glory of the Hindu, fight against 'foreigners' by Shivaji, Rana Pratap etc. was idealized and religion was accepted as having a great symbolic value for unity. The muslims could not be enthusiastic about all these, and they developed their own symbols of unity - also an religious lines. Religion, thus, could not promote national unity in India. It proved to be a divisive force and damaged the cause of nationalism in India.

With the partition of India, one would have expected communalism to die a natural death. This did not happen; on the other hand, it increased. There is no disagreement with this basis a factual statement of Ghurye. But the muslims alone are not to be blamed for this situation. There are deep rooted economic and social reasons for the growth of communalism in independent India and these factors should be understood before any conclusion is made in this regard.

Let us turn to the question of the economic roots of communalism, a phenomenon which Ghurye has totally ignored. It is true that the general economic situation in the society operates independently of religion. But the muslims, in general, have been particularly disprivileged. This was true even in British India. Describing the condition of the Utter Pradesh muslims in British India, Robinson says, "Muslims were mainly

88 See, Bipan Chandra's Article in R. Thaper (ed.) - Communalism and the Writing of Indian History, pp. 59-60, 74-77.
From the political standpoint, it is true that the Muslim elites, in general, maintain a communal orientation to political issues. This suits their interests because thereby they can ensure a virtual monopoly of their control over their religious group. Minority politics thus becomes more religion oriented than issue oriented. Moin


91 K.D. Sharma - Education of a National Minority: A Case Study of Indian Muslims (1978), where he concludes that low literacy rate among the Muslims is combined with poverty, bad housing condition, family illiteracy etc., p. 230 ff.


93 The riot which occurred in Aligarh in October 1978 bears ample evidence of this phenomenon. See - The Statesman, 22.10.78 and 17.11.78.


Shakir says, "Communalism has been adopted as political ideology of the muslim elite which has developed a vested interest in it. It has been an operative political principle because it helps in sharing power and spoils." 96

But do the muslim masses respond to these communal appeals of the elite? Over the last few election, it has been found that the muslims, in general, are giving up their connections with communal parties and are lining up with secular democratic parties. Analysing the trends of the 1972 election, Gopal Krishna noted that Muslims voted by "and large for the Congress and other secular parties and much less for the Muslim League or others like that." 97 The same process was observed in subsequent General Elections. 98

This does not mean, of course that secularism has been achieved. The obstacles are many. The functioning of our national political parties shows their indifference towards mobilizing the muslims on secular lines. These national parties are also keen to accommodate the communal muslim elites in order to gain political advantage. "Secularism in India, therefore, has amounted to no more than political rhetoric and a compromise with religion for political purposes." 99

96 Moin Shakir - Muslims in Free India (1972), p. 80.
   Also, M. Shakir - 'Muslim Electoral Behaviour in India' - Mainstream, Feb 12, 1977, pp. 11-14.
Furthermore, when we talk about Muslims, it is conveniently forgotten that Muslims in India do not constitute a homogeneous category. There are multiple levels of identity of Muslims determined by regions, cultures, communities, classes, ideologies - superimposed as well as cutting across one another. The Muslims have this multiplicity of identities at vertical and horizontal levels and in order to maintain their multiple urges, they may have to enter into a varied pattern of interaction at various levels. Religion is only one aspect of such phenomena but it may not even be the most important aspect. Rasiduddin Khan rightly says, the Muslims are a fragmented community - fragmented regionally, linguistically, culturally and ethnically. "Except the bond of religion and that too at the sentimental level rather than in specific terms .... there is no other binding force to coalesce a so-called Muslim identity." So while making a generalization about the Muslims, we should be extremely cautious. In fact, it is a fundamental tenet of the sociology of religion that religious behaviour is to be explained in terms of not only religion but also secular positions and secular problems. A common religious affiliation may sometimes be important but sometimes it may not transcend the influence of these variables. To take the example of the cultural and sentimental attachment of the Muslims in favour of Urdu language, which Ghurye has

102 For a very nice exposition of this theory, see - Simpson and Yinger - Racial and Cultural Minorities (1955) passim.
frequently mentioned, it is to be remembered that for the Muslims in Assam and West Bengal and also in the South, it is not so important. That Islam is not identified with Urdu becomes clearly evident through the establishment of Bangladesh.

From the sociological point of view, there is a need of explaining the phenomenon from the standpoint of the behavior pattern of a minority group in a larger society. It is an established truth now that the Muslims in India have generally a low socio-economic position. They live in separate residential areas. This physical segregation generates a feeling of distance among the two communities. They have a poor representation in the occupational world. All these give birth to a feeling of frustration and deprivation among them. This leads them further to resort to religions as a solace. The Muslim elites have also failed to break this impasse. All these may create a vicious circle in which each disability may create, justify and reinforce other disabilities. Broadly, these are the reasons why Ghurye's analysis of the Muslim problem does not become fully acceptable to us.

Coming to the problem of the linguistic minority groups, Ghurye's position that language is a symbol of national integrity and that the integrational effort of a community is largely to be viewed in

---

104 Gopal Krishna - 'Muslim Politics' in Seminar, May, 1972, p. 18.
105 For Ghurye's version on this aspect, see his Whither India? pp. 234-37.
terms of its language policy is unchallengeable. Ghurye rightly says, that the regional language has a symbolic integrational value for the region. The regional languages ensure the unity of the territory at the local level and all efforts should be made to improve that.

But how to solve the problem of the relation between the regional languages and the official language? Ghurye's answer that the development of regional language is conducive to disunity at the national level or that it is an obstacle for national unity, is too simple a formula to stand critical analysis. The forces which generated nationalism in India made regionalism also a strong phenomenon. Prof. Nihar Ranjan Roy shows how the growth of linguistic regionalism can be traced back to India's past history, ecology and culture. Merely to dismiss the entire process as anti-integration, does not reflect a realistic attitude.

With regard to the constitutional provision regarding the official language, the trouble lies in the fact that Ghurye assumes that the constitution fixed a static model of national unity. But national unity is an evolving process. The model set by the constitution may prove to be inexpedient in a changed situation. We have also to remember that constitution-making itself was part of a political process. The language provisions of the constitution provide a nice example of how that process worked. Granville Austin has termed the language provisions

107 See Prof. Ray's address to a Seminar held at Simla in Language and Society in India (Simla, Institute of Advanced Study, 1969), p. 6.
of the constitution as a 'half-hearted compromise'. There were two problems which required solution, the problem of the relation between Hindi and Hindusthani and the problem of the relation between the Hindi states and the non-Hindi states.

During the time of the freedom movement, Hindusthani - and not Hindi - was accepted as the language of India by the Congress leadership. Gandhi wrote, "my definition of Rashtra Bhasa includes a knowledge of both Hindi and Urdu and both the Nagari and Urdu scripts. Only thus can a happy fusion of Hindi and Urdu take place." Nehru also subscribed to the same opinion. In fact, in an atmosphere of communal tension, Hindusthani provided the bridge language which could assuage the feelings of both the Hindus and the Muslims. The extremists on either side did not want it. Nehru summed up the situation squarely by saying, "Scratch a separatist in language and you will invariably find that he is a communalist and very often a political reactionary." The Fundamental Rights Sub-Committee of the Constitution in 1947 also decided in favour of Hindusthani. But the Partition changed the entire political complex. As K. Santhanam, a member of the Constituent Assembly, told Austin, "If there had been no Partition, Hindusthani would without doubt have been the national language; but the anger against the Muslims turned against Urdu."

109 Quoted by A Austin - Ibid., p. 273.
112 G. Austin - op. cit., p. 275.
The controversy between the Hindi and the non-Hindi states was essentially concerned with the future status of English as a link language. Ultimately, we believe, a form of national consensus has been achieved over the language issue through the Official Languages (Amendment) Act, 1967, which provides for the use of English as an associate link language for an indefinite period.\textsuperscript{113} There was some confusion over the language policy of the Government when the Janata Party came to power in 1977.\textsuperscript{114} At one time five Chief Ministers of the South formed a 'club' in July 1978 to resist the centre's alleged attempt towards 'Hindi imposition'.\textsuperscript{115} But the controversy was set at rest by the Government's assurance to the people that it "stood committed to the Official Languages Act of 1967."\textsuperscript{116} While discussing the language problem, Ghurye has not taken into consideration the post-1967 language situation in India. Perhaps, it would not be an exaggeration to say that we have passed out worst days in so far as the language question is concerned.

To review the entire situation from the theoretical standpoint, Ghurye's approach to the problem of nation-building in India may be said to represent an "authoritarian model of integration and development." Existing tensions and conflicts seem to him to be insoluble unless firm measures are adopted from above. It appears that he is a prophet of

\textsuperscript{113} For a text of this Act, see J. Dasgupta \textit{Language Conflict and National Development} (1970), pp. 271-73.
\textsuperscript{114} From an analysis of the earlier role of the various constituents of the Janata Party - see, J. Dasgupta, \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 227-233.
\textsuperscript{115} See \textit{The Statesman}, 22.7.78.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{The Statesman}, 28.7.78; 6.8.78 and 28.8.78.
gloom regarding the future of Indian unity. Ghurye's attitude in this respect corresponds with the attitudes of Rupert Emerson, Selig Harrison, Clifford Geertz, David Apter etc. It is significant that Ghurye has quoted Emerson to prove his stand. All these writers stress the need of a strong and unified government to tackle the disruptive situation in India. Emerson says that the prime requirement of these new states (like India) is not for more freedom but for discipline; not for opposition but for a national consolidation. Selig Harrison even goes to the extent of saying that 'autocracy is thus intrinsic to a developmental situation.' Geertz speaks about 'primordial-civil Dualism' and says that the fact that primordial loyalties are continuing in these new states, is a source of danger for their stability. To all these writers the future appears to be bleak unless these contradictions are resolved.

But in spite of these prophets of gloom, Indian society and political system has continued to exist. This phenomenon has been explained by some others in terms of what is known as "the developmental model". This model puts its emphasis on the dynamic context of social and political transformation and contends that old structure and patterns of loyalties may make themselves useful and may utilize the existing political channels of negotiation, adjustment and resolution of conflict. Democratic structure

117 R. Emerson - From Empire to Nation (1960), pp. 189-90.
See also C. Myrdal - Asian Drama, vol. 1, Ch. 3, pp. 83-122.
and R. Segal - The Crisis of India (Jaico: 1971), ch. 1, pp. 13-34 for such a dismal picture of India.
in a traditional society is not automatically harmful. Sometimes, it allows a continuous flow of communication between various segments and various groups of people. Development of nationalism depends on the effectiveness of this communication. It allows the people to develop the art of making demands and the art of negotiating their interests for the optimum pay-off from the interaction of diverse interests. It is said that the development of this process will ultimately lead to the widening of the traditional bases of segmentation and the society will gradually be modernised.

The growth of caste associations in India has been analysed from this standpoint. Referring to the backward classes, Betelille says, "the growth of communal consciousness need not be viewed as necessarily an unhealthy or disruptive force. It may, on the contrary, be a condition for the integration of a minority group into the wider body-politic." Rasiduddin Khan similarly stresses upon the functional role of Communalism in India; such group loyalty may be harmful in the short run but ultimately it may lead to "the development of a plural polity towards its political integration." Regarding language conflict and the role of linguistic associations, Dasgupta maintains that they led to the "development of a coordinated community

---

122 For an application of this model in the sphere of caste, see among others, R. Kothari - Caste in Indian Politics (1970); Rudolph & Rudolph - The Modernity of Tradition (1967); F.G. Bailey - Tribe, Caste and Nation (1960).
123 See, A. Betelille - 'Future of Backward Classes' in Philip Mason (ed.) Indian and Ceylon - Unity and Diversity, p. 115.
124 Rasiduddin Khan - 'Understanding India's Communal Politics' in Mainstream, 13.69, p. 10.
Thus we see that a large number of writers explain these group loyalties as welcome features because they ultimately help people to come out of their traditional boundaries and join in the participatory politics of the modern community.

In a book published recently, Paul Brass has challenged the viability of this concept of nation-building whereby loyalties are supposed to be transformed from parochial to national orientations. For the multi-ethnic states of Asia and Africa, he maintains, this transformation never occurs and national unity is built up on the basis of these ethnic divisions. As he says, "India is, in fact, a developing multi-national state or a state containing a number of dualized nationalities without a dominant nationality in which the central leadership of the country seeks to accommodate the political demands of diverse language, religions and cultural groups in ways which do not detract from the unity and integrity of the country." It must be pointed out here that Brass's concept of multi-nationality is not similar with the Marxist concept. Where Brass talks about the key-role of the elites belonging to these groups, in the Marxist scheme, more importance is attached to the nature of socio-economic position of these groups.

127 For an explanation of the Marxist theory, see, Stalin-Marxism and the National Question (New York: 1942).
We cannot accept either the 'developmental model' or 'the concept of multi-nationality'in toto. The developmental model conceals the main contradictions of the system. It assumes that tradition smoothly passes into modernity and so its emphasis is upon structural continuity rather than change. Paul Brass's theory presupposes a homogeneity of the elite structure of the various groups in society but actually the elites may be divided and they may be pulling in different directions. Besides, we cannot ignore that there is the existence of an over arching concept of nationality. But all these do not mean that Ghurye's theory and the theories which predict an imminent breakdown of Indian society, are correct. The greatest criticism against this approach is that Indian society and political system persists and that national unity here is more persistent and enduring than in many other Afro-Asian countries. Probably the time of theory-building with regard to the nature of Indian Unity has not yet come. In any case, any such theory will have to take into consideration the role of such variables as the nature of Indian tradition, the culture of the different Groups, the nature of elites at various levels, the character of the political system and most important, the nature and direction of socio-economic development of the national community.